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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As developed in this study, the establishment and growth of Richard Bland College and the type of higher educational institution it has become was based largely on decisions which have been of a political nature. The consequences of these political decisions resulted in the College becoming the only two-year, state-supported branch college in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

These political decisions were first initiated by individuals within the Southside Virginia area who saw the need for creating a two-year institution for students within commuting distance of their homes. Further, as the idea for the College gained support, political forces within the community began to exert influence at the state level. After the College had become firmly established, judicial decisions at the national level dealing with the problem of integration affected the growth and viability of the institution. Throughout the early period of the establishment of Richard Bland, decisions "of the moment" were often made which had little to do with what might be considered by educators as sound academic planning. These decisions have been included in the study as a part of the total analysis.

---

1 Davis Y. Paschall, interview held at the home of Davis Y. Paschall, Charles City County, Virginia. 12 May 1980; W. Roy Smith, interview held at the home of W. Roy Smith, Petersburg, Virginia. 3 June 1980; James M. Carson, interview held at the home of James M. Carson, Williamsburg, Virginia. 26 May 1980.
A Need is Established

The need for a two-year college in Southside Virginia was enhanced by the interest of and support generated by The College of William and Mary. Even though William and Mary was not the first four-year institution approached by interested citizens in the Petersburg area, it was the one that agreed to support a local branch college. The establishment of Richard Bland by William and Mary would serve as a base for William and Mary exerting an influence on the direction of higher education in Virginia, reaching from south of Richmond to the North Carolina line and east to the Atlantic Seaboard. This political goal of William and Mary coincided with the desire of certain citizens in the Petersburg area to make available to high school graduates an inexpensive, state-supported, commuter institution near their homes. Only Virginia State College, a four-year, black, state-supported institution existed in Southside Virginia at the time of the creation of Richard Bland College. The closest white college was Richmond Professional Institute, a four-year institution which served as a branch of The College of William and Mary and was located thirty miles to the north in the capitol city of Richmond.

At the time of the establishment of Richard Bland College in 1960, higher education in the Commonwealth of Virginia remained racially segregated. Thus, 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. Apparently, no thought was given by any of the individuals or groups who were seeking to establish a new institution in
Southside Virginia to approach an already-established, four-year, black, Virginia State College in Petersburg. Also, it should be noted that the Community College System did not exist in the Commonwealth of Virginia at the time of the inception of Richard Bland College.

Higher Education in Virginia: 1950-1960

What, then, was the status of higher education in the Commonwealth during the time when Richard Bland became an integral part of this diverse system? Why might there be a need to increase the number of two-year colleges in Virginia in the emerging decade of the 1960's?

There were many changes taking place in Virginia during the years following World War II. In the field of higher education one of the most imminent ones appeared to be the projected lack of classroom space for the increasing number of high school graduates who would be enrolling in the state's colleges and universities during the period 1960-1975. There also appeared to be a need for the establishment of some type of coordinating agency which would focus its attention on ways of meeting this and related problems.

In an effort to meet the various needs which would be confronting the higher education community in the post World War II era, the General Assembly of Virginia directed the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to develop a comprehensive report on the status of higher education in the state. As a Consultant to the Committee, Fred J. Kelly

---

of the United States Office of Education, reported in a series of background statements, a summary of previous studies authorized by and conducted for the General Assembly of Virginia. Of primary importance was the recommendation made by Kelly that Virginia develop a state-wide system of coordination for its publicly supported institutions of higher learning. In his effort to present solutions to the many problems facing the higher education community, he stated that:

...the present study should concentrate on solving the problem of coordination. It should avoid distracting recommendations concerning detailed controversial matters. When once the machinery to assure a state-wide coordinated program is set up, most of these controversial matters will be settled outside the halls of the General Assembly. They will be settled by a State educational agency which will be set up for that purpose.

The thrust of the Kelly study was to develop the framework for creating a state coordinating body for higher education in Virginia. It appeared to be his feeling that if such a body were created, then solutions to many of the educational problems facing Virginia could be approached in both a reasonable and coherent manner. The significance of the Kelly report seemed to be that further groundwork was laid for meeting the enrollment increases which were to accelerate in the years between 1960 and 1975.

In 1954, the General Assembly of Virginia..."adopted House Joint Resolution No. 46, directing the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to

---

3 Ibid., pp. 14-17.
4 Ibid., p. 17.
study and report on the educational opportunity offered by the extension services of the various universities and colleges of the state. "5

The findings and recommendations of the study included a number of predictions related to a sizeable increase in the number of students who would be seeking admission to the colleges and universities in Virginia between 1955 and 1975.

The Virginia Advisory Legislative Council reported the results of population studies conducted by Dr. Lorin A. Thompson, Director of the Bureau of Population and Economic Research; by Dr. John K. Folger of the Southern Regional Education Board, and by G. Tyler Miller, President of Madison College. 6 In all of these studies, it was noted that there was a substantial increase in the number of available eighteen to twenty-one year old students. Virginia was on the brink of a massive increase in the number of citizens who would seek admission to its colleges and universities and the State had begun to seek ways to meet these needs.

It was apparent that present facilities could not accommodate all who would seek the benefits of higher education. One way that this need might be met was through the expansion of the branch-college concept. The Virginia Advisory Legislative Council viewed this approach with favor:


6Ibid., pp. 7-8.
The practicality of branch institutions has been demonstrated in Virginia. The Norfolk divisions of The College of William and Mary, and Virginia State College, the Richmond Professional Institute, a division of William and Mary, the Danville branch of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and the recent establishment of a similar institution at Wise by the University of Virginia, have met local needs in those areas.\(^7\)

This report showed that in 1954, the precedent for sponsoring branch colleges by the University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Virginia State College, and The College of William and Mary had been established. It, therefore, would not appear unusual for the General Assembly of Virginia in 1960 to react favorably toward the willingness of William and Mary to agree to sponsor additional branches in Petersburg and Newport News, the former being named Richard Bland College and the latter Christopher Newport College.

Further evidence of the possible willingness of the Commonwealth to support additional two-year colleges came with the results of a study directed by S. V. Martorana of the United States Office of Education.\(^8\) In the Martorana report prepared for the Virginia State Council of Higher Education, an attempt was made to identify projected needs, policies, and plans for two-year colleges throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia. For the purposes of this study special importance can be attached to the enrollment figures for students in the public high

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 7.

schools of the Petersburg, Hopewell, and Colonial Heights areas. In fact, specific mention is made of the desirability of locating a two-year college in this growing geographic region. To meet this anticipated rising student demand the site mentioned as a possible location for such a facility was the Petersburg State Training School. This location later became a part of the Richard Bland campus.

**Initial Problems for Richard Bland**

As mentioned earlier, a black, four-year college was already near the chosen locale for Richard Bland. In addition, a fledgling private University of Hopewell Foundation had begun operating a college in the evening a few miles to the east of Petersburg. Based on the existence of these two institutions it was concluded in the Martorana study that:

> since the former institution [Virginia State College] is already serving a definite statewide function as Virginia's land grant college for Negroes, and the latter, [Hopewell College], is an institution of as yet proven stability and one which has to operate on a self-sustaining basis of charges made upon students, the study staff concluded that these two institutions were not sufficient to meet the local needs of the area.  

The formation of the University of Hopewell Foundation in 1959 created a significant impact which affected the growth of Richard Bland College. Influence was exerted by certain community political leaders from nearby Hopewell who envisioned Richard Bland as being a threat to the viability of their institution. In fact, the mere existence of

---

9Ibid., pp. 75-77.

10Ibid., pp. 76-77.
both colleges: the non-accredited Hopewell, Virginia, based private college and the state-supported Petersburg branch of The College of William and Mary, resulted in animosities which were to surface more visibly when plans were drawn to place a community college in the area.

It is important to note further that as a part of the parent institution, Richard Bland was blessed with the "umbrella" accreditation which was initially bestowed on William and Mary. Could it be that the establishment and growth of Richard Bland led to the early demise of Hopewell College? If the aforementioned statement were true, there may be evidence to support the view that the move by influential Hopewell citizens to add technical and vocational courses to the curriculum of Hopewell College further increased the conflict with Richard Bland. As this movement emerged in Hopewell, there appeared to be a counter reaction by those in Petersburg who supported Richard Bland. An examination of the political rivalry between the localities and of the response from the industrial establishment demanding technical and vocational training in Southside Virginia may have further magnified the already existing tensions.

By 1966 state-wide political pressures resulted in the creation of the Virginia Community College System. The establishment, subsequent growth, and curricular offerings of two-year colleges in Chester, Richmond, Franklin, Keysville, and Lawrenceville served to affect the viability of Richard Bland. Many students, who, in the
absence of other two-year colleges, might have commuted to Richard Bland, now turned to these newly created and less expensive institutions near their homes. John Tyler Community College, constructed in 1966, just north of Petersburg near Chester, serves the same geographic area as Richard Bland and even though John Tyler Community College is a comprehensive community college offering both terminal and transfer programs, it does duplicate many of Richard Bland's transfer offerings. It appears that the decision to establish John Tyler in an area which already possessed a two-year college was a political one which has adversely affected the growth of Richard Bland. An analysis of these developments are included in the study.

One of the most important factors that affected the growth of Richard Bland during the period being investigated came from predominantly black Virginia State College. As previously mentioned, Virginia State College was a four-year institution for Negro students which was created in 1882 as a result of the Land-Grant College Act. Located approximately nine miles from Richard Bland, the leadership of Virginia State College had not been considered by Southside Virginians who favored the establishment of a two-year institution. It appeared to be viewed as a college for black students that would likely continue with that mission.

From 1966 to 1970 political forces were at work which would result in Richard Bland College being given the authority by the

---

Virginia General Assembly to escalate to four-year degree-granting status. The approval for such escalation came in the 1969 Extra Session of that governing body.\(^\text{12}\)

Opposition to the escalation of Richard Bland to four-year degree-granting status came from certain segments of the black community within Southside Virginia and from some members of the faculty at Virginia State College. A suit was soon filed to prohibit the escalation. The ultimate judicial decision rendered by the court placed a prohibition on such escalation. The political factors involved in movement toward four-year status are investigated in this study.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is both to identify and to analyze those major political factors which had a significant impact on the establishment and growth of Richard Bland College. In a broader sense, the study is designed to record a significant period of the history of a two-year branch college and to provide insight into the political nature and developments of a changing Southside Virginia. Both the social and political conditions which existed in the area at the inception of Richard Bland in 1960 had changed considerably by 1972. The results of the study may provide an insight into the nature of

these changes through use of historical perspective.

It is important to develop an understanding of the past accomplishments of an institution so that its future decisions can be based on responsible and purposeful action. Richard Bland is a junior college offering two-year associate degrees and in this respect an understanding of its establishment and early history can add to the literature which relates to the two-year college movement in America.

In his study of the early life of the American nation, Curtis Nettels wrote about the importance of understanding the rationale behind the creation of that nation. There appears to be considerable merit in applying this same principle to the acquisition of knowledge about an educational institution. Nettels stated that:

> History is man's guide to action in the present and future. And such action is certain to be most constructive when it is informed by an understanding of the problems and conditions which, having emerged slowly from the past, mold and limit the activities of today and tomorrow. Those who know the circumstances of their country's development and who understand the elements of its civilization will be the one's best qualified to meet present issues with decision, intelligence, and economy of effort.13

While Nettels included information about the establishment and early history of the American nation, this study will focus on the

establishment and early growth of Richard Bland College. Particular emphasis has been placed on the effect of political factors which have molded the institution into the kind of establishment it is today. An understanding of these factors can serve as a basis for future planning at Richard Bland College and at other similarly-situated institutions.

One area which was examined in the study relates to the course of action taken by certain administrative officials at The College of William and Mary prior to 1960. Another consideration to be studied was the interaction between these individuals and certain public and private citizens in Southside Virginia. Further, in the first decade of the existence of the College (1960-1970), political decision-making at the local, state, and national level set the stage for the current statement of mission of Richard Bland College. This mission states:

Richard Bland College, a branch of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, has as its primary mission, the offering of transfer associate degree programs in liberal arts, business administration, and other career programs appropriate for a junior college. The College also recognizes its role and responsibility in community education, public service, and cultural activities.14

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study there are certain terms which are

---

commonly used in the paper. Most of the terms relate to influence which is exerted by both the individuals and groups who participated in the process of establishing and developing Richard Bland College. These terms are defined as follows:

1. Politics: ..."is the process through which man orders the society in which he lives according to his political ideas about the ends of man."\(^{15}\)

It is an attempt by man to use the various means at his disposal to convert others to his point of view. Politics further involves the interplay between one member or group in society with another and relates to "the process of making significant community-wide decisions."\(^{16}\)

2. Political Life: ..."concerns all those varieties of activity that influence significantly the kind of authoritative policy adopted for a society and the way it is put into practice."\(^{17}\)

3. Power: ..."the ability to influence people by persuasion or compulsion."\(^{18}\)

These terms all relate to the interaction of forces among individuals and groups who sought to exert influence on the creation and growth of the College.


4. Branch College: A 'branch' of an existing accredited institution of higher learning, consists of a center of instruction under the sponsorship of the parent institution but located away from its campus where it owns or occupies on a long-term lease, a physical plant, maintains full-time administrative and faculty personnel, offers a prescribed program of study providing two or more years of standard work leading to a degree or degrees in general or professional studies.¹⁹

Additional terms are appropriately identified within the context of their use in the body of the study.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

A major consideration in the study was to establish an appropriate period for examination. The years 1958 to 1972 were used in order to review achievements by Virginia in higher education prior to the actual establishment of the College in 1960 and to conclude the study in 1971 when a judicial decision was rendered which prohibited the institution from offering degrees beyond the associate or two-year level.

A limitation placed on the study was related to the possible sensitivity of certain information obtained from some of the actual participants and observers who were interviewed. Information which could not be substantiated or that which would probably cause undue embarrassment to certain individuals still living has not been included in the study.

Method of Research

The historical method of research was used in writing about the establishment and growth of Richard Bland College. "The process

¹⁹The Crisis in Higher Education in Virginia and A Solution, p. 11.
involves investigating, recording, analyzing, and interpreting the events of the past for the purpose of discovering generalizations that are helpful in understanding the past, understanding the present, and to a limited extent, in anticipating the future." Further justifications for the use of this method of study has been stated by Paul D. Leedy when he noted that "the historical method aims to assess the meaning and to read the message of the happening in which men and events relate meaningfully to each other."  

Since the study has required a methodical search of such sources as documents, newspapers, and Board Minutes, the method of research must be reflected in the design procedures. The task reflects "...the systematic and objective location, evaluation, and synthesis of evidence in order to establish facts and draw conclusions concerning past events." The analysis of political factors affecting the establishment and growth of Richard Bland College has included:

...the three essential steps in the production of any written historical work: the gathering of data; the criticism of the data; and the presentation of facts, interpretations, and conclusions in readable form.

---


The use of the historical method has allowed for the examination of primary source documents, the obtaining of oral testimony from participants and observers, and the examination of relationships among people, places, and events which were related to the establishment and growth of the College.

As data were gathered for the Richard Bland College study, both external and internal criticism has been employed as a part of the historical method. The relative merit of the sources being investigated has been analyzed. "The essential data remaining after the evaluations and sifting have taken place must be sufficient for a logical defense of the investigator's conclusions or for a true summary of the actual events."24 The types of data which were evaluated include:

2. Official Minutes of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in Virginia.
3. Court records.
4. Official reports and documents developed by the Council of Higher Education for the Commonwealth of Virginia.
5. Correspondence relating to Richard Bland College and its environs.
6. College catalogues and related publications.
7. Newspaper files.
8. Institutional self-study documents.
10. Master site plans.
11. Documents pertaining to the University of Hopewell Foundation and John Tyler Community College.

These primary documents were used as the basis for analyzing information related to the establishment and growth of Richard Bland College during the period under investigation.

Oral testimony has been another method used as a supplement to written data and to verify events. Suggestions made by Thomas E. Felt regarding the interview process were considered. Felt observed:

The choice of whom to interview will be inspired mainly by the nature of the topic under investigation. You need a person able to 'speak a document' for your use, and you can anticipate somewhat the quality of the document in advance. Knowing the person is much like knowing an author. It is not enough that he or she was there. What was his capacity to understand and explain the event, and what has happened to him since to flavor or dull his recollection.25

Individuals chosen to be interviewed include former Richard Bland College officials, selected administrators who were associated with the parent campus in Williamsburg, local and state political leaders who played a major role in the establishment and growth of the institution, and other persons who exerted influence on the College in its early days. A majority of the interviews were taped while others consisted of conversations where notes were recorded. Selected telephone interviews were conducted. The persons interviewed gave their permission to use the majority of information which they supplied. In instances where material was of too sensitive a nature to be printed, or reflected an

opinion which could not be substantiated elsewhere, the material was not used in the study although general reference to the material was made.

Review of Junior College Literature

The focus of the review of literature has been placed on works which relate to the origin and development of the junior college movement in America and on studies which emphasized the establishment and growth of individual institutions. (Both the terms "community" and "junior" are used interchangeably in the literature).

In the review of the history of the junior college movement, Daniel Gerber observed that "one of the foremost contributors to the idea of the junior college was William Watts Folwell." The value in developing an understanding of the contributions of a single individual such as Folwell showed how important a role a single individual played in the development of an educational idea. Even though Folwell's idea was not recognized as an important contribution to American higher education until many years after his death, it was a beginning point for the movement. His perseverance served as a link in the chain of events which ultimately placed the junior college in a position of educational leadership. Similarly, the ideas and political influence exerted by those who became associated with Richard Bland College during its formative years, also produced long-range effects upon the College. The influential role of these individuals in their respective communities helped to

produce the conditions which fostered the "idea" of Richard Bland College.

In their comprehensive work entitled *Higher Education in Transition*, Brubacher and Rudy gave credit for the origin and development of the American junior college to such higher education administrators as Folwell at Minnesota, William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago, Henry Tappan at the University of Michigan, and Andrew White at Cornell. Each had expressed a desire to meet the needs of students who wished to terminate their formal education at the end of two years and for those who sought to prepare themselves for the rigor of upper division and graduate education.

Brubacher and Rudy felt that:

In one direction Harper thought a lower or junior college with an entity of its own might beckon students who otherwise would never attend college. In another direction the partition might incline some students to find it both convenient and respectable to terminate their college course at the end of two years.27

Even though the junior college movement met with little success during the administrations of these nineteenth century educators, much of the foundation for the junior and comprehensive community college of today was laid because of their willingness to attempt new educational endeavors. Correspondingly, the efforts of people in Southside Virginia were to be rewarded as they sought to establish a two-year institution for their area.

---

Thornton has indicated that "junior colleges have developed in response to various local influences, and are subject to the laws of the fifty states and to the guiding principles of their own governing boards."\textsuperscript{28} Thornton's reference to the localism involved in the creation of community colleges and his identification of the legal ramifications for such establishment were important for understanding the founding of Richard Bland College and its political climate. The perceived local need for the College, coupled with the various legalities involved in the process, played a major role in the establishment of the institution. Thornton's emphasis upon the "idea" followed by a historical analysis of the evolutionary development of the movement from the 1850's to the 1960's has paralleled the shorter time-frame envisioned in the present study of Richard Bland College. The emphasis upon economic, political, and social forces all can be contributors to the complexity involved in the founding of an educational institution.\textsuperscript{29}

In his study of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Michael Brick viewed the junior college movement as the opening up of college educational opportunity to a new clientele. He saw students entering college who heretofore had only limited access to higher education. Brick affirmed that:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28}James W. Thornton, Jr., \textit{The Community Junior College} (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1960), p. 73.
\item \textsuperscript{29}Ibid., pp. 45-47.
\end{itemize}
the junior college, offering two years of education beyond the secondary school, is a product almost entirely of the twentieth century. The junior college idea, however, is the result of centuries of philosophical and institutional struggle which influenced all of American education and developed an educational system with characteristics not to be found anywhere else in the world.\textsuperscript{30}

Brick further noted that the junior college by 1960 had expanded its curricular offerings to include vocational, technical, and adult courses as an integral part of the total college program.\textsuperscript{31} It appears noteworthy that the establishment of Richard Bland College as a public junior college did not follow the pattern designed by Brick of providing a comprehensive educational program for both the transfer oriented and terminal student. At Richard Bland the curriculum was designed primarily for the transfer student. An investigation into the reasons for the decision to cater primarily to the bachelor's degree-seeking student was included in the study.

It was important to the current study to note the heavy emphasis which Brick placed on the role played by politics in the formulation of educational policy. He cited the value in utilizing the services of government and of not being hesitant about contacting governmental officials for assistance. Even though he spoke primarily of an


\textsuperscript{31}Ibid., pp. 26-27.
organized approach to the exertion of political influence via the American Association of Junior Colleges, there were similarities in the strategies used by Richard Bland in its efforts to move from two-year to four-year status.32

There was a need to identify secondary references in which the impact of local politics on the success or failure of educational institutions is emphasized. As a commuter institution, the establishment and growth of Richard Bland depended on the mobilization of local support from its Southside Virginia constituency between 1958 and 1972. Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson concluded that an understanding of the community power structure was an essential ingredient in the success of any community-based two-year college. They stated that:

"the principles of the community power structure apply significantly to the public, private, and technical colleges which have either a limited clientele (religious group or economic level) or limited geographic service area."33

Since Richard Bland has served students who reside primarily in Southside Virginia and since the College has sought the support of contiguous political subdivisions, it has been involved in political power struggles of the area. These struggles included conflicts between the cities of Petersburg and Hopewell concerning the offering of two-year programs for their citizens. The conflict is investigated in this study.

32 Ibid., pp. 89-103.
Further support for the theory that community politics has played a major role in the development of educational institutions has been found in the research of Ralph B. Kimbrough. Even though Kimbrough relied largely on data related to public school districts, he suggested that many of the educational decisions which were made in localities across the country were based on:

1. The informal use of political power.
2. The involvement of influential individuals within the community and state who, through their political connections, moved public institutions in desired directions.
3. The changing nature of the power structure.
4. The substitution of political expediency for sound educational planning.\textsuperscript{34}

In his discussion of the pluralism found in most communities, Kimbrough drew upon Robert A. Dahl's research of the New Haven Community in which 'Dahl emphasized that the public decisions in New Haven were often made informally by a very few leaders.'\textsuperscript{35} The informality of the decision-making process as described by Dahl was used by participants in the early history of Richard Bland and the nature of that informality is considered in the research.

Several dissertations were reviewed during the preparation of the proposed study. Those that were related to or provided assistance for the study are included in this review of the literature. One such dissertation was written by John Patrick Martin.


\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., p. 204.
Martin's choice of the case study method of research was not used in the Richard Bland study. There were, however, certain tools of research such as written minutes of the Board, correspondence, and interviews utilized by Martin which provided assistance in the current research. Since Martin was a participant-observer during the fledgling years of Luzerne County Community College he was able:

...to observe more closely the operations and activities of the sponsors and to gain insights more directly than otherwise would have been possible. Also it served to promote informal discussions with a number of individuals involved, thus permitting a fuller understanding of their motives and goals.\(^{36}\)

An underlying theme in the work of Martin related to the necessity of understanding the past in order to relate to present circumstances and problems and to give guidance and direction to planning for the future.

Another apparent understanding found in Martin's research was that political decision-making often played a major role in the immediate development of the institution rather than in long-range educational planning. The subtle and informal political maneuvering of educators and other public figures often became the driving force that ignited change within the institution.\(^{37}\) The substantiation of these

---


\(^{37}\) Ibid., pp. 22-29 passim, 87-89, 131. 182-185.
later observations are sought in the Richard Bland study.

Lloyd Dell Reed used oral testimony, correspondence, and other college-related documents as primary sources of information in his study of Jessee Parker Bogue, an administrator of a two-year college. 38 Although the current study of Richard Bland does not focus on a single individual, insights were gained into the use of oral history.

In a dissertation completed in 1978, Aine Peterson Smith relied heavily on the use of oral history as a means of acquiring information about her topic for research. She stated that "the oral history approach was complemented by archival research of financial records, admissions data, college publications, public records and personal papers." 39

The study of Richard Bland includes the use of oral history as a means of providing insight into the numerous written documents which were available. As Smith suggests, the use of using oral history was one method of analyzing data, by which the accuracy of written material by interviewing actual participants can be ascertained. Such an attempt is made in the current study to include local and state public officials, former college administrators both at Richard Bland and at The College of William and Mary, and citizens from Southside Virginia.


Two additional studies proved valuable to the extent that each provided information about the founding of selected American colleges. Larry W. Nutter's history of junior colleges in Oklahoma and Stuart B. Medlin's discussion of certain denominational colleges in Virginia were general works in which the researchers utilized the historical method of research. In the current work there is a difference from these previous studies in that one institution was studied in depth. Further, while the aforementioned works were general histories, the Richard Bland study attempts to evaluate the effect of political factors on the establishment and growth of the College. Medlin's work focused primarily on religious factors while Nutter dealt with the general history and development of the junior college movement in Oklahoma.

Jack Howard Aldridge contributed to the research related to the junior college movement by delineating two major historical periods. He asked:

What relationship exists between the expressed ideas and theories concerning the junior college of educational leaders of the period 1900-1935, and of those of the

---
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succeeding generation of educational leaders in the period 1945-1960. The Aldridge dissertation provided background information on the junior college movement, but did not provide insight into the role played by politics in the establishment or growth of that movement. The identification of political factors was the primary objective in the Richard Bland study rather than a comparative study of ideas and theories in higher education as studied by Aldridge.

In a study conducted by Burton R. Clark, the author used the case study method in analyzing the growth and development of San Jose Community College in California. Clark sought "...to delineate the character of a junior college, show how this character was determined, and indicate its consequences." Clark's study provided an understanding of the relationship between an institution and its constituency. In particular, it was found that the success of the institution was dependent on the degree of support that it received from its service. Conflict over issues related to the offering of terminal versus technical programs became an issue during the early period of San Jose's existence.

---


46 Ibid., pp. 9-40.
conflict also appeared to be a major issue confronting those responsible for the early years of operation of Richard Bland.

As he viewed the two-year college movement and its role in providing programs to meet changing community needs, Ralph R. Fields observed that:

A social or educational movement is like the sea; sometimes in flow, sometimes in ebb, but forever changing; restless, uneasy even when calm, turbulent in response to storm. I suspect that it is hard to paint a picture of the sea because of its restlessness and its changing moods but the challenge to try to catch its spirit must always be great. 47

In the study of Richard Bland College, meeting community needs was often controlled by the ability of influential individuals to meet political needs first. Meeting these political needs seemed to have more to do with the direction of the College than established principles of long-range planning.

Background information has been gained from a review of the literature into the development of an understanding of the junior college movement in America. The material which has been included in this review is of a general nature, but represents studies related to the current research topic. The remainder of this study deals with those political factors affecting the establishment and growth of Richard Bland College from 1958 to 1972.

Organization of the Study

In Chapter II of the study there is an examination of the factors affecting the establishment and demise of short-lived Hopewell College. The political interrelationship of the establishment of Hopewell College to that of Richard Bland was determined to be significant since it serviced the same geographical area as Richard Bland. As a part of the Hopewell College study the views of certain citizens are examined insofar as those views relate to their perception of post-secondary educational needs in the Southside Virginia area.

A second major topic considered in Chapter II is the discussion of the factors leading to the establishment and early growth of Richard Bland College. Particular emphasis is placed on determining the part that Richard Bland would play within the state-wide system of higher education in 1960. Individual and group views on the needs of higher education in Southside Virginia are included as is the involvement of certain administrators and board members from The College of William and Mary. The views and actions of members of the administration at The College of William and Mary to include Richard Bland as a part of their master plan are included. The Chapter concludes with the opening of Richard Bland College in 1961.

In Chapter III the political factors affecting the creation of John Tyler Community College are examined. Since John Tyler was within commuting distance of Richard Bland, and, therefore, serviced the same geographical area, its establishment affected the growth of the latter
institution. Political factors affecting development of Richard Bland from 1961 to 1967 are also considered. In Chapter III the period under study concludes with the year 1966 when the Virginia General Assembly approved the founding of John Tyler Community College and when individuals began to develop plans for the escalation of Richard Bland to four-year status.

Chapter IV includes a study of political factors affecting Richard Bland College from 1967 to 1972. The relationship of Richard Bland to Virginia State College and, in particular, the move of the former toward four-year status, is examined in light of subsequent court action which was intended to prohibit the escalation of Richard Bland from a two-year to a four-year institution.

Chapter V includes a summary of the investigation, observations that have been drawn from the study, and implications for future research.
CHAPTER II

ESTABLISHMENT OF RICHARD BLAND AS A TWO-YEAR INSTITUTION

Introduction

This chapter presents a study of the political factors which led to the establishment of Hopewell College in 1959. The existence of animosities and rivalries among the area political subdivisions contributed to the tension which developed at a time when groups were attempting to establish Richard Bland College. In order to understand the political realities of the period, it is necessary to examine both Hopewell College and Richard Bland College.

The first section of this chapter presents a study of the establishment, early development, and subsequent demise of Hopewell College. There is also found throughout this section a discussion of the political relationships which existed among those individuals in Hopewell and adjacent localities who wanted to establish a two-year college in the area.

The Founding of Hopewell College

Both the establishment and the growth of Richard Bland College were affected by activities of a political nature which were initiated by community leaders within Southside Virginia. At times these

political activities emanated from Petersburg and at other times from adjacent political subdivisions. One such activity which helped to generate an eventual impact on Richard Bland occurred with the establishment of the University of Hopewell Foundation, 1959.

As a political entity, the City of Hopewell is located approximately fifteen miles from the campus of Richard Bland College. In the late 1950's the city relied heavily on big industry both for its tax revenues and for its job opportunity. Such large industrial firms as Allied Chemical Corporation, Hercules Powder Company, and Continental Can Company were functioning within the city. In a brochure published by the Chamber of Commerce there appeared to be ample justification for the future industrial growth of the city:

The Hopewell industrial family is expected to grow. There are many advantages such as water, gas, transportation by land, rail, and water. Hopewell has always been an inland port. Our location only eighty miles from the sea on the James River will become more important in years to come. The present river channel of twenty-five foot depth is shortly to be dredged to thirty-five feet. Industries requiring river transportation and fresh water will find ideal sites in and around Hopewell. Other assets to the port and industry are Norfolk and Western and Seaboard Railroads, good highways and the proximity to markets.²

Besides the growing industrial strength of the city, between 1956 and 1959, a number of the citizens of Hopewell sought to establish a

college in the community that could provide educational opportunities for the young people who were just being graduated from secondary schools and for those who were employed in the industrial plants. Courses in the liberal arts and sciences and certain technical studies seemed to meet the needs of the potential student population as well as the aspirations of the trustees who sought to establish a college.

The chief advocate for bringing a full college program to the city was Homer C. Eliades. On returning from the military service in 1956, Eliades began practicing law in Hopewell. Soon he began to discuss with other interested citizens the desirability of establishing a private four-year college in the city in order that Hopewell youth would have an opportunity for higher education studies in the liberal arts and sciences. Following a series of exploratory moves designed to determine the degree of local support for such a venture, the citizens under the leadership of Eliades' group formed the University of Hopewell Foundation, Incorporated. On 25 June, 1959, the Foundation was granted a charter from the State Corporation Commission in Richmond, Virginia. With the granting of the charter, the Foundation was legally authorized to offer courses of instruction at Hopewell,

---

3 Homer C. Eliades, interview held in law offices of Eliades, Robertson, and Eakin, Hopewell, Virginia. 29 May 1980.

The first classes were scheduled to begin during the Fall, 1959. It was the desire of the trustees for the Foundation that the Hopewell School Board would grant permission to allow evening classes to be scheduled at Hopewell High School. The School Board was contacted by the trustees on 10 July, 1959. It was reported in the minutes of the Hopewell School Board that:

...Mr. Robbins, after requesting for the group, the use of public school facilities for the establishment of night classes on a temporary basis and after being informed by Chairman Broyhill that the Superintendent of Schools would let him know of the Board's decision, withdrew from the meeting.

At a subsequent meeting of the School Board:

The Superintendent reported that he had met with Mr. Robbins and Mr. Eliades to outline the conditions under which the School Board would allow the use of Hopewell High School facilities at night for the purpose of starting a non-sectarian non-profit college and that these conditions were acceptable to them. Mr. Eliades assumed the responsibility of drawing up an agreement subject to approval of the City Attorney to include these conditions.

As a further step in the establishment of Hopewell College, it was essential that the trustees take appropriate political action by making

---

5 University of Hopewell Foundation, Inc., Minutes of Meetings of the Board of Trustees, Meeting of 21 July 1959.

6 City of Hopewell School Board, Minutes of Meetings of the Board, Meeting of 10 July 1959.

7 Minutes of Meetings of the Board, Meeting of 7 August 1959.
contacts with both the general public and school officials. The need to determine the viability for the venture rested on the ability of the leadership to exercise their influence on certain members of the community. If these preliminary contacts had not been made between the trustees and members of the Hopewell School Board and the Superintendent of Schools prior to the official meeting of the University of Hopewell Foundation, the initial success of the Foundation might not have occurred. Further, if the Articles of Incorporation of the University of Hopewell Foundation had been rejected by the State Corporation Commission, the College would not have existed. The astute political ability of the leadership of the Foundation to ascertain the appropriate educational needs of the city seemed to enable them to create a viable enterprise.

What was the purpose of the University of Hopewell Foundation?

An examination of the first official bulletin revealed that the purpose of Hopewell College:

is to provide those persons young and old of the Hopewell and Southside areas a chance to attend college and earn a degree, Hopewell College is eventually to be a full four-year, day college with a night division. It is chartered by the Virginia State Corporation Commission to award degrees in the arts and fine arts and sciences.

The aforementioned purpose was not contradictory to those set forth in the Articles of Incorporation:9

The purposes for which the Corporation is formed are as follows: To establish, build up or purchase, a non-sectarian institution of higher learning for the instruction of youth in the various branches of science, literature, philosophy, liberal, useful and fine arts; and to admit, or confer degrees to those who become proficient in the various branches of science, literature, philosophy, liberal, useful and fine arts, to such persons who are usually admitted to other institutions of higher learning.10

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees held on 15 July 1959, Dr. Richard C. Coulter, Trustee, Dean of Hopewell College, and Pastor of Woodlawn Presbyterian Church in Hopewell, reported that the curriculum for Hopewell College:

...will consist of world history, sociology, psychology, English, literature and English grammar in different semesters. College algebra, economics, biology (sic) and introduction to philosophy.11

It is significant to note that while in an industrial community such as Hopewell, the founders of the College stated their desire to establish trade and technical training programs12 for that particular constituency, but at the same time the leaders approved the initial course offerings consisting of the traditional ones generally found

---

9 Commonwealth of Virginia, Articles of Incorporation, op. cit.
10 Ibid.
11 Minutes of Meetings of the Foundation, Meeting of 15 July 1959.
12 Homer C. Eliades, interview. 29 May 1980,
in the typical liberal arts and science school. For the purposes of this study, it is important to record that these courses were comparable in description to many of those which were later to be offered at Richard Bland College. Could it be that a similar curriculum offered by this state-supported institution within fifteen miles of Hopewell would become a primary rival which would contribute to the demise of Hopewell College?

Eliades continued to provide the leadership for Hopewell College during its embryonic stage. He seemed to be the strongest political force for the College and as Chairman of the Board of Trustees became the chief spokesman for the Foundation.

In a press release, Eliades spoke on behalf of the Foundation when he said:

The University of Hopewell Foundation, Inc. has been established to lead in the creation of a private, four-year community college for Hopewell to teach the liberal arts and sciences.

Eliades commented further on the desirability of establishing the College when he announced that:

13 Minutes of Meetings of the Foundation, Meeting of 7 October 1959.


15 Minutes of Meetings of the Foundation, Meeting of 22 July 1959.

the individuals who are officers of the Foundation have been working many months toward the actual start of this College. They, as individuals, feel that a community college should become an asset to Hopewell, as important as our industry. Culturally and economically, such an endeavor can make Hopewell into a truly outstanding city of its size.  

Even though the initial offerings consisted of the traditional liberal arts and science courses, the Foundation sought to expand its course offerings by seeking advice from the industrial community. In fact, it was reported in *The Hopewell News* in late July, 1959 that the Foundation was seeking the advice and support of the Hopewell Manufacturers Association. On August 21 the general public was asked to notify the Foundation of any courses that they would deem appropriate for the new institution. Further, as a recruiting device, Dean Coulter appealed to adults and especially to those women who had been out of the job market and who wished to return to College on a part-time basis.

In an effort to acquire credibility for the new institution, contacts were made with the University of Richmond regarding the acceptability of transfer credits. It appeared that the University of Richmond agreed, under certain conditions to accept credits from Hopewell College for courses where the student had earned grades of

17 Ibid., p. 1.


19 Ibid., 21 August 1959.

20 Ibid., 8 September 1959.
"C" or better and if the student subsequently performed satisfactorily at the university.\textsuperscript{21}

Classes began at Hopewell College on 28 September 1959, with approximately 175 students enrolled.\textsuperscript{22} Eliades spoke optimistically about the future of the College when he announced that:

\begin{quote}
We believe that an enrollment of this size shows that the people of this area want and need a full college program.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

While efforts were being made to develop the curriculum of the College the trustees investigated possible sites for the construction of a permanent residence for the College.\textsuperscript{24} The subject of land acquisition was discussed on at least nine occasions between 16 February 1960, and 14 December 1961, however, in each instance the land under consideration was either not available or the financial condition of the Foundation was not sufficient to warrant such large purchases.\textsuperscript{25-32}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 23 September 1959.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 29 September 1959.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 29 September 1959.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Minutes of Meetings of the Foundation, Meeting of 21 July 1959.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 16 February 1960.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 14 December 1960.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 23 February 1961.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 2 March 1961.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 6 April 1961.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 8 May 1961.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 26 October 1961.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 14 December 1961.
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James A. Rideout, a former student at Hopewell College, observed that the University of Hopewell Foundation was composed of men with exceptional leadership ability. However, attempts by these leaders to establish a private four-year liberal arts college without gaining substantial support from local industry helped to place the institution in jeopardy from its inception. Rideout felt that the future establishment of Richard Bland with its strong political backing from Petersburg as well as the affiliation of Richard Bland College with the state-supported College of William and Mary helped to weaken the College in Hopewell. The effort by members of the Foundation to include only those individuals from Hopewell as trustees resulted in limited geographical support for the endeavor.

Even though limited to classes in the evening, the students at Hopewell College were enthusiastic about the prospects of becoming a part of an optimistic and ambitious local venture. They did not appear concerned over the traditional curriculum, in fact, many had enrolled because of the emphasis on the liberal arts.

Rideout observed that Hopewell was a community that took pride in being self-reliant. If the College could establish itself as a strong liberal arts institution without the financial backing by industry, it would later turn to that same industry for the necessary

---
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support in the technical area. This strategy would result in the creation of two departments of the college, one emphasizing the liberal arts and sciences with the other fulfilling the needs of those students who wanted a technically oriented instructional program. Both segments of the College would operate under the aegis of the University of Hopewell Foundation.\footnote{Ibid.} This movement did not materialize although the practicality of offering such courses did reoccur from time to time.

In 1959 the issues of accreditation and the transferability of credits seemed to cause the trustees a considerable degree of concern.\footnote{The Hopewell (Va.) News, op. cit.} The trustees realized the importance of seeking formal accreditation for the institution and the move toward accreditation seemed to be their way of gaining for the institution the respectability it needed for competing with established colleges and universities.

In their continuing effort to obtain accreditation, Eliades reported to a joint meeting of the Foundation and to a local advisory board that he hoped to gain affiliation with Virginia Polytechnic Institute. It was reported in the minutes that:

\begin{quote}
VPI seems to favor idea, without financial aid. Mr. Eliades said a Hopewell College delegation expects to call in Blacksburg shortly to continue this effort. Current thinking would call for a two-year engineering school here to be administered by VPI as a part of a four-year Hopewell College,
\end{quote}

\footnote{Ibid.}
to remain an independent and private institution. Also, Council on Higher Education has agreed to survey this area when requested to determine need for technical education facilities.  

Following a meeting between Eliades and Coulter at Virginia Polytechnic Institute on 11 December 1961, it was reported to the Foundation that discussions between Eliades and Newman, President of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, were held and that Eliades had conferred with a representative from the State Council of Higher Education regarding "affiliation with VPI [sic] and establishment of a two-year technical school at Hopewell College." Even though the matter had been discussed informally, affiliation of a state institution with the privately supported Hopewell College did not materialize, although a later formal meeting would be held between the two parties.

In 1963, the question of accreditation again began to threaten the future of Hopewell College. A. Gordon Brooks, Director of the Division of Teacher Education for the State Department of Education, in writing to Eliades, asked for a written response to two questions:

1. What was the basis or by what authority did the University of Hopewell Foundation award degrees for the first time in June, 1963? This question is raised in view of Section 23-9 of the Code of Virginia—Conferring College Degrees.

37 Minutes of Meetings of the Foundation, Meeting of 26 October 1961.
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2. Is it the desire of the trustees of the University of Hopewell Foundation to make application for accreditation by the State Board of Education?40

Again it appeared that political activity between state officials and the citizenry had played a role in the process of development for Hopewell College. Although efforts were exerted by Eliades and the trustees to provide a measure of educational opportunity to the citizens of the city, the actual legitimacy of the institution was to be questioned by educational officials at the state level.

In his response to the inquiries by Brooks, Eliades stated that the State Corporation Commission in granting a charter to the University of Hopewell Foundation had authorized the awarding of degrees, however, the trustees did plan to seek formal accreditation from the Virginia State Department of Education at the earliest possible time.41

The correspondence between Eliades and Brooks continued in September, 1963, when Brooks wrote:

In your letter of August 20, 1963, you stated that Hopewell College was chartered by the State Corporation Commission of the Commonwealth of Virginia and said charter authorizes the award of degrees. In this connection, the Department has been advised informally that the granting of a charter by the State Corporation Commission does not overrule the provisions of Section 23-9 of the Code of Virginia.42

---

Brooks further outlined the specific procedure that would have to be followed if the trustees wished to pursue the accreditation issue. In reflecting on the correspondence and dialogue between Eliades and Brooks, the latter, now retired, stated that he, as an employee of the Commonwealth of Virginia, was enforcing the regulations of the State Department of Education and in no way did he intend to inhibit the work being done to make a success of the Hopewell College venture.

Brooks did visit with Eliades in Hopewell in 1963, but no visiting committee ever formally evaluated the program of the College.

In further pursuit of the goal of accreditation for Hopewell College, Eliades in early 1964, wrote to Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson, Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Commonwealth of Virginia regarding the accreditation of selected courses which would be offered during the Fall of 1964. Eliades apparently had been under the impression that individual courses could be accredited through the State Board of Education. This impression was quickly corrected by Wilkerson when he replied that:

---
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As a matter of information, the State Board of Education does not accredit individual courses. An institution of higher learning receives accreditation provided the established standards are satisfactorily met. The State Board of Education is the official accrediting agency in Virginia for high schools and institutions of higher learning.47

It is significant to note the underlying political implications of the correspondence between Wilkerson and Eliades. In the Eliades letter carbon copies were sent to Governor Albertis S. Harrison in addition to three other prominent members of the Virginia General Assembly; delegates C. Hardaway Marks and Sam Pope, and Senator Garland Gray.48 Being an appointee of the Governor, Wilkerson provided copies of his reply to Eliades, to those same individuals and additionally copies were sent to the members of the State Board of Education.49

A major issue which continued to surface during the entire operational period of Hopewell College (1959-1964) was related to the role that vocational and technical education would play in the life of the College. To place this issue in perspective, consideration should be given to deliberations held in Richmond which affected the comprehensive educational efforts of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

48Letter from Eliades to Wilkerson. op. cit.
49Letter from Wilkerson to Eliades. op. cit.
These deliberations received state-wide attention in 1963 when the Commission on Vocational Education presented to the Governor and General Assembly a comprehensive report on the status of vocational and technical education in the Commonwealth of Virginia.\textsuperscript{50} The Commission had carefully reviewed the status of both secondary and post-secondary vocational and technical offerings, the projected employment outlook for the state's workers, and the level of occupational training for Virginia's work force. From this wide range of sources they developed a series of recommendations which would change the shape and scope of Virginia's offerings in future years.

Among the recommendations which seemed to bring a response from the patrons of Hopewell College was the proposed creation of a State Board of Technical Education and the construction of a series of community colleges.\textsuperscript{51} The Commission remarked that "...the State should consider meeting all of these post-high school education needs through a system of comprehensive community colleges under the proposed State Board of Technical Education."\textsuperscript{52}

This concern for vocational and technical education in the state seemed to offer a possible solution to long-range enrollment problems

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Vocational and Technical Education in Virginia; Present and Future Needs. Report of the Commission on Vocational Education to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia.} Richmond, Virginia: Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Purchases and Supply, 1963.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., p. 15.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., pp. 15-16.
that were being projected for Hopewell College. Members of the University of Hopewell Foundation felt that since no permanent site had been found for the construction of its own buildings and that affiliation with a state institution had not materialized, the College should seek an alternative to its predominantly liberal arts and science curriculum. Nearby Richard Bland, under the accreditation given to William and Mary continued to grow and to draw students from Hopewell and the adjacent Prince George County area. If this trend continued it appeared that the Hopewell institution would not be able to continue its operation.

Soon after the 1962 Regular Session of the Virginia General Assembly had passed Joint Resolution No. 81, creating a Commission on Vocational and Technical Education, the University of Hopewell Foundation began to examine its statement of purpose in light of current realities. A decision was made to pursue the goal of redirecting the mission of Hopewell College toward that end of the educational spectrum which contained vocational and technical education.

Further impetus was given to this movement as a result of

53Minutes of Meetings of the Foundation, Meeting of 14 December 1961.


correspondence between State Senator Garland Gray and Eliades in July, 1962. Gray congratulated Eliades on the interest which had surfaced at a public meeting in Hopewell on 26 June 1962. At that meeting Dr. Stewart B. Rowe, Director of Virginia Polytechnic Institute's Extension Service told "approximately fifty Hopewell business, industrial and civic leaders that VPI [sic] is willing to cooperate in helping Hopewell realize its goal of local establishment of a two-year technical college." It was reported in The Progress-Index that, Eliades, Chairman of the Special Committee on Technical Institute for Hopewell, was instrumental, with the Chamber of Commerce in arranging last night's meeting, and plans other public meetings in the interest of the College in an effort to inform the people of the need for the College here.

It is significant to note the political interplay which had developed among the three Southside Virginia cities. Richmond Times Dispatch reported on 20 June 1962, that the Colonial Heights City Council asked "that a two-year technical training school be established at the Richard Bland College at Petersburg."
Progress-Index also noted that the Petersburg City Council had endorsed Richard Bland for the site of a technical college.\(^6\)

To accentuate further the rivalry among the local political subdivisions, it was announced by Colonel James M. Carson, Director of Richard Bland College "that Bland could easily include an expanded technical program in its existing facilities, at least on a limited scale."\(^6\)

This public announcement by Carson apparently had prompted Senator Gray (who represented Greensville, Hopewell, Prince George, Surry and Sussex in the 6th Senatorial District of Virginia) to correspond with Eliades on 5 July. In alerting Gray to Carson's efforts at Richard Bland, Gray responded:

I am glad that you called my attention to the effort that is being made by Colonel Carson to divert our school to his operation. I shall write Roy Smith regarding this matter at once.\(^6\)

The role played by W. Roy Smith in the vocational/technical programs is essential to an understanding of the political relationships which had developed regarding the feasibility of providing a post-secondary program in vocational and technical education to the citizens of Southside Virginia. Smith represented the city of

\(^6\)The Progress-Index, 27 June 1962.

\(^6\)Richmond Times Dispatch, 28 June 1962.

\(^6\)Letter from Gray to Eliades, 5 July 1962.
Petersburg as a delegate to the General Assembly of Virginia. He had been a strong advocate of Richard Bland College and in the two years, 1962 and 1963, had been appointed by Governor Albertis S. Harrison to be Chairman of the Commission.

During the course of the study, Mr. Smith, on account of the press of business and the demand upon his time by other activities, requested the Governor to relieve him from his duties as Chairman of the Commission. The Governor then appointed D. French Slaughter, Jr., to succeed Mr. Smith as Chairman.  

As a result of the action of the General Assembly of Virginia to create a Commission on Vocational Education, other localities aside from the city of Hopewell had begun to provide the Commission with information about the advantages of establishing a vocational and technical center in their area. In late 1962 a cover letter with supportive data was sent from Ed Garland, Managing Director of the Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce, to Louis H. Shirley, Director of the Hopewell Chamber of Commerce. The intent of the letter was to encourage the Hopewell Chamber to take an active role in lobbying to have the Commission establish a series of recommendations which would be favorable to localities throughout the Commonwealth. Specifically, Garland stated that:

---
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Correspondence is being directed to all of the Chamber of Commerce offices in the State of Virginia in an effort to enlist assistance in obtaining the establishment of area vocational-technical schools in this state. As will be seen from the Joint Resolution, the Commission must submit its report to the Governor and General Assembly not later than July 1, 1963. We earnestly hope that you will take action to support this project and let your wishes be known to the Commission.

The letter from Garland was referred by Shirley to Eliades to determine what action might be taken by the trustees of Hopewell College. The trustees seized this opportunity to expand the curricular offerings of the College and to enhance future chances of becoming affiliated with a state-supported institution.

Eliades observed that he saw Hopewell as the center of industrial activity in Southside Virginia and it followed that the primary demand for technically trained personnel was in that city. He concluded that:

It had been established by a survey of our local industry that people trained as technicians and people trained in the vocations are critically needed. Further, with the rapidly expanding industries in our locality in the early 1960's it was only logically concluded that the training of people for those industries must be in Hopewell.

The role played by the Commission on Vocational and Technical Education in Virginia must be one that not only recommends the need

---
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for training of industrial workers, but also for the training to be easily accessible to the people being trained. The school should be located in close proximity to the place of employment of the people. The degree of emphasis placed on this perceived role of the Commission can best be understood in terms of the obsession of Eliades that Hopewell be the major recipient of the Commission's recommendations. In a series of notes for the record, Eliades reacted to a statement attributed to Colonel James M. Carson, Director of Richard Bland College, in which Carson stated that Richard Bland add to its liberal arts curriculum a series of vocational and technical program. Eliades responded that:

Facilities for a technical and/or vocational school are quite different from those of a liberal arts college such as Richard Bland College. The cost of constructing facilities would be as great in Petersburg, as in Hopewell. The argument propounded by the advocates of Richard Bland, can only look at the cost of establishing Richard Bland originally. Although facilities were existing, the cost of a sewage disposal plant and renovations were very costly. The argument of existing facilities is one that can be eliminated on careful consideration of the cost to be involved in the project. We should also like to point out that the location of Richard Bland is certainly a far cry from being located near the concentration of industry. Again, it is pointed out that this is an important factor to be considered.

---
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On 15 January 1963, the Commission heard from nearly two dozen witnesses from across the state. The majority of the pleas came from those industrial leaders in Hopewell who stressed the need for skilled workers in the trades at Hopewell. Also these leaders recommended that a school be constructed in their locality. To counteract the growing support and concerted effort that seemed to be coming from the Hopewell community, Director Carson at Richard Bland invited an influential group of political and industrial leaders to a luncheon at Hotel Petersburg. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the role that technical training might play in the future curricular plans of Richard Bland College.

Davis Y. Paschall, President of William and Mary and Donald J. Herrmann, Coordinator of the Two-Year Colleges (Richard Bland College and Christopher Newport College) representing The College of William and Mary, expressed belief that if the appropriate state officials recommended that Richard Bland be designated as a recipient of a technical training program, that William and Mary would be supportive of that decision. Paschall further supported publicly the idea that a two-year liberal arts college could compliment and enhance

---
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technical education better and more economically than constructing a separate facility at another location. This latter view was supported by Dr. Hugh McFarlane, Director, State Council of Higher Education, who pointed out "...that technical training is an expensive program and where it is needed it should be offered in an existing college." Ruth H. Barner, reporter for The Southside Virginia News, suggested that training in such technical subject areas as "civil and highway technology, drafting and designing, electrical technology, architecture, electronics, chemical technology, and the like" could very well become a part of the Richard Bland curriculum. The willingness of William and Mary to support Richard Bland's role in technical education was again enunciated by Paschal in an address to the Petersburg Education Association.

The increasing support to establish Richard Bland as a technical center helped to cause Eliades to form a special committee of the Trustees of Hopewell College whose purpose was to assure the location of the technical program in Hopewell. This select group from the Foundation agreed that:

The success is dependent upon political action. This success depends upon the effort we make to keep it uppermost in the minds of the prominent politicians. The key politician is 'Peck' Gray, Senator representing our area.

76 Ibid.
77 The Southside Virginia News, 7 March 1963.
78 The Progress-Index, 2 May 1963.
79 Minutes of meetings of the Foundation, Special Committee Meeting of 28 March 1963.
80 Ibid.
Members of the Foundation and other civic organizations began immediately the writing of at least one letter per week to Senator Gray asking him to support Hopewell for the location of a technical college.\textsuperscript{91}

At a time when Richard Bland appeared to be engaged in a concerted effort to bring a technical program to the College, Homer Eliades began to seek to influence D. French Slaughter, successor to Smith as Chairman of the Commission on Vocational and Technical Education, that Hopewell was the logical site for such a school. In response to the inquiries of Eliades, Slaughter, in mid-1963, advised Eliades that he did not think the Commission was going to recommend specific sites, but would be making general recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly.\textsuperscript{82}

Even after receiving the Slaughter letter, Eliades continued to encourage local industrial leaders to push for a Hopewell site for the vocational and technical college. In fact, a meeting was held between industrial representatives, members of the Hopewell Chamber of Commerce, and officials from Hopewell College for the purposes of discussing the desirability of the College making major curricular changes along vocational lines in the Fall Semester of 1963.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{82} Letter from D. French Slaughter, Jr. to Homer C. Eliades, 18 June 1963.

\textsuperscript{83} Letter from Homer C. Eliades to Francis Smith, Superintendent of Industrial Relations, Nitrogen Division of Allied Chemical Corporation, 19 June 1963.
The expansion of the curriculum did not appear to be a realistic goal for the College since classes were still being held in the evening at Hopewell High School. Regular classrooms which were used daily by secondary school students enrolled in strictly academic subject fields could not accommodate the type of equipment which was required for technical courses. Neither did the Foundation have funds to purchase such equipment even if the space had been available. F. Carroll Alexander, former Principal of Hopewell High School indicated that only regular classroom space was provided to the College and that this occurred at a time in the evening when the public school students were not using the facility and, therefore, no special arrangements for securing or providing for vocational and technical training equipment was ever anticipated.

In spite of the problems that are associated with operating a college in temporary quarters, Eliades began to call upon the services of State Senator Garland Gray of Waverly, Virginia to help establish a permanent site for Hopewell College. In June 1963, Senator Gray arranged a meeting between Eliades, Governor Albertis Harrison, and himself. It appeared that Eliades was using this connection as a means of bringing state political support to the Hopewell College venture. The fact that the Governor along with the General Assembly were to be the recipients of the Commission’s report, it seemed
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expedient to inform the governor personally that the city of Hopewell was a logical choice for one of the proposed vocational-technical schools.

This was not the first time that Governor Harrison had been made aware of the educational program of Hopewell College. Harrison, the former Attorney-General of Virginia who was in November, 1961 to be elected Governor of the Commonwealth, was the guest speaker at the Spring 1961 Convocation at Hopewell College. At that time Harrison did not make a formal statement of support for the College, but did indicate that private colleges such as the one at Hopewell, contributed much to the educational welfare of the Commonwealth, "...and that the job of giving our young people a good higher education could not be done by the State supported institutions alone." He further indicated that the College might remain private as had Washington and Lee University or enjoy "...church affiliation such as Randolph-Macon, Lynchburg College or Hampden-Sydney, or finally it could do as the oldest college in Virginia, William and Mary did and become part of the state system." By 1963, it appeared that Eliades had not forgotten Governor Harrison's statement regarding the possibility of Hopewell College receiving state affiliation. Eliades followed


89 Ibid., 25 May 1961.
through with his visit to the office of the Governor in June of 1963. No commitment was received from Governor Harrison, but Eliades and his followers continued for the remainder of 1963 to solicit support for their Hopewell College venture. An attempt was made to publicize need for state affiliation by means of adding technical training courses to the curriculum.

For the first time technical courses will be offered by the College as requested by industries in the Tri-City area. The courses are planned to train men in subjects such as electronics and industrial engineering which can be utilized in local plants. The full program of liberal arts courses available in previous terms will also be offered.90

Again it appeared that little success in winning the Governor's attention occurred as a result of the inclusion of technical offerings in the Hopewell College curriculum. The lack of a permanent site for the complex, expense of the equipment needed for the support of such a curriculum, and the inability of the trustees to predict the outcome of the future recommendations of the State Vocational and Technical Committee seemed to reduce the chances for vocational-technical studies at Hopewell College. These proposals did, however, display the sincerity of the trustees in their attempts to attract a fully state-supported vocational-technical program to the city.

In early 1964 the recommendations of the Commission on Vocational Education were presented to the Governor and General Assembly of Virginia.90

Virginia. The report of the Commission set the stage for the direction which Virginia was to take in its post-secondary vocational and technical education programs. Among the recommendations the most significant was the creation by the General Assembly of a State Board of Technical Education.91

The newly-created Board was given the responsibility for working with the State Board of Education. The State Board of Technical Education would seek accommodation with the Council of Higher Education in order to coordinate and to expand those responsibilities already existing for extension training utilized by Virginia Polytechnic Institute, the University of Virginia, and The College of William and Mary.92

To the proponents of Hopewell College and to the Richard Bland supporters the two most trenchant tasks of the new Vocational-Technical Board was its determination of "...the most feasible locations for the new area vocational and technical schools and its consultation with the Council and the three state universities currently sponsoring branch colleges regarding the feasibility of establishing a state-wide community college system."93

In response to these recommendations, the General Assembly of Virginia on 31 March 1964, formally approved the necessary legislation

91Vocational and Technical Education in Virginia, p. 15.

92Ibid., pp. 15-19.

93Ibid., pp. 16-17.
establishing the State Board of Technical Education. The creation of this Board and the subsequent appointment of Dr. Dana B. Hamel as the State Director of Technical Education did not in itself bring about the demise of Hopewell College. What this legislative act and the ensuing gubernatorial appointment did was to legitimatize the state-wide movement toward the establishment of technical colleges across the Commonwealth. It took out of the hands of strictly local leaders like Homer Eliades the idea that two-year technical colleges were going to be created for each community. These colleges were to become regional centers supported by a number of localities and a wider base of political support was going to be necessary to ensure their location and subsequent success.

By no means did Eliades and his followers give up the idea of bringing a full-fledged, accredited college to Hopewell. In fact, the legislation heretofore mentioned only gave to the Hopewell group the incentive to strive harder toward their goal. Unfortunately, for the City of Hopewell other political forces were at work which resulted in the founding of an institution approximately ten miles to the west of the Hopewell group's desired location. This movement is discussed in Chapter III when the political factors affecting the creation of John Tyler Community College are examined.

---


95 Dana B. Hamel, interview held at Richard Bland College, Petersburg, Virginia. 27 October 1980.
Why did Hopewell College cease its operations in 1964? Numerous factors seemed to relate to the inability of the Trustees to find a suitable site for the College. Classes could only be offered in the evening hours at Hopewell High School. This may have closed the doors to students who wanted to attend college on a full-time basis. Further, the classrooms were designed for courses which were liberal arts and science based. There was a lack of flexibility in classroom construction and design which is an essential element in the development of a vocational and technical program. Finally, since no permanent or fully accessible location for a library was found and since funds were not sufficient from either tuition receipts nor private sources to adequately support an academic program rooted in the liberal arts and sciences, the endeavor seemed doomed to failure.

Since the primary purpose of the College was to enroll students from the city of Hopewell in the traditional liberal arts curriculum, and as a result of the College not becoming accredited by the State Board of Education nor by the regional accrediting body, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, there appeared to be few positive inducements for the enrollment of large numbers of qualified students. The primary use of adjunct faculty members may have inhibited the needed day-to-day contact between faculty and students.

Reasons of a political nature which may have contributed to the College's demise certainly must include the opening of Richard Bland College in 1961. During its first three years of operation, approximately fifteen percent of Richard Bland's enrollment came from the
greater Hopewell area, thus drawing potential local students away from Hopewell College.\textsuperscript{96}

Richard Bland College was a state-supported institution under the umbrella accreditation of The College of William and Mary, while Hopewell College was a private institution operating only with funds derived from tuition and fees. Hilda M. Traina, former Mayor and City Councilwoman from Hopewell who served until retirement as a member of the Richard Bland College faculty indicated that the inability of the Hopewell College trustees to obtain endowment funds from local industry was a major factor in the closing of the College while Richard Bland could exist with a combination of state-funding and money derived from tuition receipts.\textsuperscript{97}

The failure of Hopewell College to gain affiliation with a four-year state-supported institution of higher learning resulted in the College remaining isolated from the academic community. This resulted in a lack of participation by the College in the state-wide affairs related to higher education. Finally, the unsuccessful and belated attempt of the trustees to obtain the full support of the Hopewell community was a factor in the closing of the College. Evidence to support this view is found in the section of this chapter dealing with the early support for Richard Bland College.


\textsuperscript{97}Hilda M. Traina, interview via telephone, Petersburg, Virginia. 10 July 1980.
Even though Eliades and his followers continued their efforts to bring some type of permanent post-secondary education institution to the city, classes at Hopewell College were terminated in 1964. The matter of officially closing the College occurred when the "University of Hopewell Foundation, a corporation organized under the laws of Virginia, was automatically dissolved on the first day of June 1966, for failure to file annual reports as required by law."\textsuperscript{98}

The closing of Hopewell College served to end one phase of the political history which affected the growth of Richard Bland College. The relationship between the two colleges went beyond the actual competition for students. The roots of the estrangement were firmly positioned in the rivalry which existed among contiguous political subdivisions in Southside Virginia. Further details of the rivalry are found in Chapters III and IV of this paper.

Having described the establishment and demise of Hopewell College, is is now appropriate to elaborate on the establishment and early growth of Richard Bland College.

\textbf{The Founding of Richard Bland College}

Although the official beginning of Richard Bland College came as a result of action taken in 1960 by the General Assembly of Virginia,\textsuperscript{99}

\textsuperscript{98}Commonwealth of Virginia. State Corporation Commission. Certified Copy of Revocation of the University of Hopewell Foundation Charter, William C. Young, Clerk of the Commission. 27 June 1980.

no institution of higher learning begins its operation simply by having been favored by an act of a state legislative body. In the case of Richard Bland the process involved numerous behind-the-scenes maneuverings which preceded the official sanction given by the General Assembly.

The establishment and subsequent demise of Hopewell College was only one effort being made by persons in Southside Virginia to generate support for a two-year commuter institution. The people in the Petersburg area also possessed a determined support for an institution of higher learning, just as Hopewell, as reflected through the efforts of Homer Eliades, had experienced such a desire. In fact, there were certain citizens in Hopewell who did not support Eliades and who worked actively to establish a state-supported college that would reach beyond the political boundaries of one locality. Ruth M. Shuey suggested that Hopewell newspaper man Augustus Robbins and retired Allied Chemical Corporation Nitrogen Division Manager at Hopewell, Frank A. Ernst, played prominent roles in the establishment of Richard Bland College. 100 By virtue of the position that these men held, it could be stated that their strong feeling toward the establishment of a two-year state-supported institution often ran counter to or simply ignored the efforts being made by Eliades and his followers.

100Ruth M. Shuey, interview. 16 July 1980 (Shuey was a writer for The Hopewell (Va.) News during the period when both Hopewell College and Richard Bland College were founded).
W. Roy Smith, who represented the City of Petersburg in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1960, remarked that "Frank Ernst deserves more than passing mention as a primary figure in the early history of Richard Bland College." Throughout the interview with Smith, Ernst's name continually surfaced as being a strong political force behind the creation of a two-year college in Petersburg. It is appropriate to mention the background of Ernst so that his contributions to the founding of Richard Bland can be fully appreciated. Further, it is important to identify the scope of his state-wide political connections in order to establish his credibility as a potent and influential political force. Even though Ernst had spent many years of his adult life at the Allied Chemical Plant in Hopewell, he maintained his residency in Petersburg. In Petersburg he participated actively in the affairs of the city. As a member of the Petersburg General Hospital Authority, he personally authorized the use of the engineering services of Allied to design a facility for the School of Nursing. George Bokinsky, former administrator of the hospital, stated that Ernst was a strong advocate for Richard Bland and that as a member of the Authority supported the making of the contractual arrangement between the Petersburg General Hospital
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101 W. Roy Smith, interview. 3 June 1980.


103 George Bokinsky, interview held at Richard Bland College, Petersburg, Virginia. 20 May 1980.
School of Nursing and Richard Bland College for the purpose of providing college-level instruction to the nursing students.\textsuperscript{104}

The value of Ernst to the movement of higher education in Southwest Virginia from the late 1950's to 1966 can be found in the accolades which he received at the time of his death. When Ernst died in 1966, four area newspapers paid high tribute to the man who each saw as having contributed greatly to the betterment of the Commonwealth of Virginia. Richard Gillis, Executive Director of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, stated that:

The two years, (1955-56 and 1956-57), of his service as president of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce were marked by growth. He presided over the Chamber's affairs in a quiet and fair manner. At board sessions, he encouraged full participation by each member. After everyone had had a say, Frank Ernst would go quickly to the heart of the matter and dispose of the issue in fairness to all.

The Virginia State Ports Authority piers at Norfolk are one of his many monuments. He went about the state with the zeal of an evangelist, carrying the message of the need of the piers to the members of the General Assembly and the public at large. When the bill authorizing the piers came before the General Assembly, it passed with little opposition.\textsuperscript{105}

The Hopewell News also cited many of the accomplishments of Ernst. These included his membership on the Petersburg General Hospital Authority, Virginia Foundation of Independent Colleges, Board of Virginia Polytechnic Institute Education Foundation, and his presidency of the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Association.\textsuperscript{106}

\textsuperscript{104}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{105}\textit{The Progress-Index, 28 December 1966.}

\textsuperscript{106}\textit{The Hopewell \textit{(Va.)} News, 28 December 1966.}
Smith, Bokinsky, Carson, Shuey, and Petersburg State Senator, John H. Temple, all expressed great admiration for Frank Ernst's political knowledge and ability to persuade influential members of the General Assembly on issues which would have a strong effect on their own fortunes in Southside Virginia.

As Chairman of a State Council of Higher Education Advisory Committee, Ernst energetically studied the need for a two-year college in Southside Virginia. His report to the Council was approved by that body in 1958. With the desire having been expressed to establish a two-year college in Southside Virginia,

A committee appointed by Ernst to study needs and feasibility and appropriate sites was composed of A. Robbins, Jr., Hopewell, editor; George F. Brasfield, Public Relations Director, Petersburg General Hospital; John E. Brockwell, Colonial Heights business man; Dr. W. H. Maguigan, Manager of Allied Chemical plants, and Charles W. Smith, Superintendent of Hopewell and Prince George County Schools.
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114 The Progress-Index, 20 March 1960.
By the geographical composition of this committee it was evident that the efforts of Ernst to launch a successful operation was based on the premise that the majority of the localities to be served by the proposed college deserved a voice in determining its location and program. The political support for the College would have to come from a diverse constituency. Each of the variant political subdivisions were represented on the Committee.

This geographical mix on Ernst's committee was in marked contrast to the "exclusiveness" given to the Eliades' group. Perhaps the perfunctory regional support for Hopewell College can be attributed to the unwillingness of the Foundation to reach out to contiguous political constituencies for support.

Ernst seemed to sense the mood of the people of Southside Virginia. His extensive background in public service and his ability to associate with other prominent public figures placed him in an influential position in 1960 when he was appointed by Governor J. Lindsay Almond to the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary.\footnote{The Progress-Index, 6 April 1960.} Senator Temple saw the appointment of Ernst as being the culmination of several months of effort by the retired Allied executive to bring a quality two-year college program to the Petersburg area and that as a member of the Board of Visitors he could officially use his expertise and state-wide contacts to push for a strong Southside Virginia College under the auspices of William and Mary.\footnote{John H. Temple, interview. 13 May 1980.}
Mary Cherry Allen, writer for The Progress-Index and long-time Southside Virginia resident stated that:

Many persons have expressed the feeling that it is especially fitting that Ernst should have been appointed. They feel it is fitting not only because of his Board background and long record of community and state-wide service, but because of the leading role he played in getting a college, which will be a unit of William and Mary to serve the Southside area. 117

John E. Brockwell, Jr., an appointee of the local planning committee which sought to bring a two-year college to Southside Virginia, felt that Ernst was the driving force behind the movement and that he was an individual who knew personally the "right" political decision-makers. 118

An astute observer of the local scene might have surmised by mid-1960 that of all of the efforts being made to bring a new program in higher education to Southside Virginia, the one being promoted by Frank Ernst and his constituents seemed to have the best long-range chance of being successful. Why might this have been true? It was because Ernst appeared to have been aware that no venture of this nature could expect to be successful without a significant quantity of political support. Were not the efforts of Eliades thwarted by his apparent inability to garner widespread patronage from the larger

117 The Progress-Index, 6 April 1960.

118 John E. Brockwell, Jr., interview via telephone, Petersburg, Virginia, 14 November 1980.
political community? If Eliades had moved to the larger community, namely Petersburg, would he have been successful? No immediate answer seems to be clear, however, it was apparent that the political base being built by Ernst was one which seemed to bolster his own chance of success.

Before returning to the series of events which led to the establishment of Richard Bland as a branch of The College of William and Mary it is necessary to elaborate on one other move to bring higher education to the area. This movement, just as had the one led by Eliades, emanated from the city of Hopewell.

In the late 1950's, members of the Hopewell Optimist Club and their wives organized a campaign to bring to the city a two-year technical college. Their hope was to convince the appropriate legislative officials in Richmond that Hopewell was the logical site for such an institution. Garland Ellis, President of the Hopewell Optimist Club, with the assistance of the Opti-Mrs. organization obtained close to 3,000 signatures from local residents who supported the idea of a technical college for the city. Katharine Minor, who assumed a leadership role in the Opti-Mrs. Club stated that signed petitions were sent to State Senator Garland Gray at his home in Waverly and to the State Council of Higher Education in Richmond. It was hoped that Gray would use his influence in Richmond to encourage his

---

legislative colleagues to act favorably on the establishment of a two-year college. The Optimist organization believed that the industry in Hopewell could serve as an economic base from which potential students could be recruited. Further, the ever-increasing need for a skilled labor force could be met through this educational effort.\textsuperscript{120}

Those citizens who fostered the technical college concept were not in agreement with the liberal arts and science curriculum which was being developed by Eliades and neither did they accept the idea that a private school such as Hopewell College could meet the needs of the local industries.\textsuperscript{121} Minor expressed the belief that those industrial employees in management and research positions were already educated but that the vast majority of the working force had little formal technical training.\textsuperscript{122} This latter group seemed to be the pool from which a substantial enrollment for the technical school would be derived.

There appeared to be no working relationship between the Optimist group and those with whom Ernst had been working, although having generated nearly 3,000 signatures there seemed to be a positive attitude developing toward the movement to bring a new technical institution to Southside Virginia. Even Eliades saw the work of the Optimist Club as having been beneficial in making the citizen

\textsuperscript{120}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{121}Katharine Minor, interview via telephone, Petersburg, Virginia, 14 November 1980.

\textsuperscript{122}Ibid.
more aware of its educational needs. Even though the Optimist effort did not directly result in the establishment of a college, Katharine Minor saw their long-range goal being fulfilled from benefits at both Richard Bland, the liberal arts institution, and John Tyler Community College, the technical college. Shuey saw the Optimist Club as being the seed from which both of these institutions began and developed. Without a joint commitment to bring a college to the area, it was reported that Ellis and the Hopewell Optimist Club endorsed the report of Ernst to establish a college, which was to be presented to the State Council of Higher Education in Richmond and Ellis indicated his specific support for the inclusion of engineering in the curriculum.

Thus, it would appear that in the late 1950's, citizens throughout Southside Virginia were seeking to bring to the area either a liberal arts and science program or a technical program in local institutions of higher education. Concurrently, a state-wide movement to meet the anticipated increase in student interest during the coming decade was beginning to be felt by leaders in higher education. And in the community Frank Ernst became the man who possessed the vigor,
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enthusiasm and political clout so necessary to fulfill that need.

What were the events and who were the other participants involved in bringing the ideas of Ernst to fruition? What were the political factors which led to William and Mary becoming the sponsor of a two-year branch college in Petersburg?

At a meeting of fifteen persons from Southside Virginia on 20 March 1958, Frank Ernst "...reviewed the economic and social aspects of the possibility of setting up a new college." The pastor of Trinity Methodist Church in Petersburg, John W. Hobbs, reported that the committee was seeking to determine the nature of political support for the venture and that once this support was ascertained the committee would move toward establishing ways and means to achieve their goal.

In late Spring, 1958 Ernst reiterated his belief that need and interest in the area favored the establishment of a new college when he stated:

I am convinced there is a definite need for such a college in this area. I believe it can fill a 200-classroom unit and it will be well supported.

An initial show of support for the proposed college came to
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Ernst in a letter written by William W. Greer, President of the Petersburg Area Alumni Chapter of The College of William and Mary.

Greer indicated that:

The Chapter considers that a junior college, affiliated with an existing 4-year college or university, would materially benefit the communities involved. Among the benefits would be increased educational opportunities for residents of Southside Virginia and an easing of the current shortage of classroom space.130

Even though no recommendation was made to the effect that the proposed college should be placed under the auspices of William and Mary, the implication was clear that at least one local segment of William and Mary seemed willing to support the effort of Ernst. It was noteworthy that Greer spoke in terms of an institution that would serve the entire area of Southside Virginia and not any single locality.

In an interview with The Progress-Index, Ernst had indicated that he would be supportive of a liberal arts and science curriculum for the proposed college so long as consideration was given to such specialized areas as engineering training.131 Ernst attributed the emphasis on engineering to the aspirations of the Hopewell Optimist Club.132
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Coinciding with the efforts of Ernst to gain local support for the establishment of a College, was the work being done by the local Site Committee, members of whom were appointed by Ernst.

The Committee composed of Mr. John E. Brockwell, Jr., and Mr. George F. Brasfield, investigated a number of sites in the area which could be secured free of charge for a college and selected four as worthy of consideration.\textsuperscript{133}

Of the sites being considered by the Committee there was one which consisted of several buildings that were scheduled to be vacated in 1959. This location was described in the report of the Site Committee:

For a number of years the State has maintained the Petersburg Training School and Hospital on what was formerly the Seward Farm, about a mile south of the Petersburg city limits. The entire site consists of 1,019 acres, beginning on Johnson Road about one-half mile south of the Military Park Road. Located between U.S. 301 and U.S. 1 it can be reached from all directions over good secondary roads for only a short distance.

It is the opinion of the committee that this property would make an ideal location for a college. The State will move the Training School and Hospital next year, the target date being July 1, 1959, so it would be available for another State agency. The deed is in the name of Central State Hospital which means that the State Hospital Board has jurisdiction.

The buildings and other facilities appear to be in good condition and with a minimum of renovation could furnish classrooms for 300 or more day students and a few boarding students. It would probably be about a fifteen minute drive from Colonial Heights, 25-30 minutes from Hopewell, and would attract students from the areas around Lawrenceville, Emporia and Franklin, as they are only 45-50 minutes away.\textsuperscript{134}


\textsuperscript{134}Ibid.
On 23 June 1959, Ernst presented the report of his committee to the State Council of Higher Education in Richmond. Among the major recommendations of the Ernst Report there appeared to be three elements that would affect the future direction of the proposed institution:

1. The institution become a two-year branch of Virginia Polytechnic Institute;
2. That it be located on the property in Prince George County already owned by the Commonwealth that had been supported by the Brockwell and Braswell study;
3. That the curriculum provide opportunities for students who wished to terminate their education after two years and for others who would desire transfer to a four-year college or university.

It appeared that the rationale to recommend affiliation with Virginia Polytechnic Institute rested on the assumption that courses not only in engineering technology but also in agriculture would best be served and supported by this four-year land-grant institution. In order to win approval of the association with Virginia Polytechnic Institute it is interesting that a curriculum emphasis included agriculture. State Senator John H. Temple, who was a strong advocate for a college which would be based in the Petersburg area wholeheartedly supported the proposal made by Ernst. Delegate W. Roy Smith, too, expressed approval for the presentation made by Ernst and saw the establishment of a two-year college in Southside Virginia as providing an "equalization of opportunity for white students since at that time Virginia State College was still designated by the State as being

\[\text{Minutes of the Meetings of the State Council of Higher Education, Meeting of 23 June 1958.}\]

\[\text{Ibid.}\]

\[\text{John H. Temple, interview. 13 May 1980.}\]
exclusively for blacks. At the time Ernst submitted the Report to the State Council, it was reported that Smith viewed the creation of the two-year college as the first step toward eventual escalation to four-year status. This was not the last time that the issue regarding escalation would involve the College in a political controversy. During the latter part of the 1960's this issue resulted in confrontations which had both state-wide and national repercussions.

During the latter months of 1958 and in the first half of 1959, Ernst continued to build political support for his goals of bringing a branch college to Southside Virginia. In response to his repeated efforts, the Council of Higher Education sent a survey team to the recommended Petersburg area site in August, 1959. The team was composed of Dr. Ernest V. Hollis and Dr. S. V. Martorana, both of the United States Office of Education, and Dr. William Hugh McParlane, Executive Secretary of the State Council of Higher Education. Present at the meeting were Temple, Smith, and Delegate Arthur H. Richardson from nearby Dinwiddie County. The presence of three prominent members of the General Assembly of Virginia and the apparent zeal with which Ernst presented recommendations of his study committee
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must have contributed to the positive response expressed by the survey team. The subtle and artful use of "power" by Ernst can be seen as an effective tool in the hands of this able and persuasive designer of public policy. Both Temple and Smith gave substantial credit to Ernst for his tenacious, yet gentle ability to convince others of the reasonableness of the enterprise. At this critical point in time Ernst had been able to elicit support from such political leaders as Smith, Temple, Richardson and State Senator Garland Gray of Waverly who was also being courted by Eliades at Hopewell. The proposal to affiliate with Virginia Polytechnic Institute is one aspect of the Ernst Report that deserves further elaboration.

Why did the proposed two-year college become a branch of The College of William and Mary rather than a branch of the school in Blacksburg? The answer seems to be found in conversations held in 1959 between Temple, Smith and President Walter Newman of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Temple stated that he and Smith approached Newman for the purpose of determining whether he (Newman) was interested in supporting a two-year branch college in Petersburg. Newman was lukewarm to the idea since he perceived a branch in Petersburg as representing a potential drain on the financial resources of his institution. Petersburg was simply too far from the main campus. Virginia Polytechnic Institute was also on the verge of expansion.

\[143 \text{Ibid.}\]
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of its home campus and the prospect of nurturing a new college did not appear at all palatable to Newman.146

What other four-year college or university might be receptive to the idea of supporting a two-year branch in Southside Virginia? Smith and Temple both indicated their support for the efforts of Ernst and did not seem to be distracted in their attempts to support him just because Newman had stated that he was not interested. The remaining two choices were the University of Virginia and The College of William and Mary.

The President of The College of William and Mary soon after the establishment of Richard Bland College, Davis Y. Paschall, stated that the University of Virginia was approached informally by members of the State Council of Higher Education in 1958, and again in 1959, about establishing a branch in Petersburg.147 In fact, President Colgate Darden of the University of Virginia met with the local committee headed by Ernst at the proposed College site in Prince George County. But Darden was discouraged by the facilities and declined support for the venture.148 It may be surmised that Darden, as had Newman at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, felt concerned about the potential expensive and speculative nature of moving into Southside Virginia. Could he, too, have realized that the responsibility of maintaining branches at Clinch Valley, Mary Washington, and George

146Ibid.
147Davis Y. Paschall, interview held at the home of Davis Y. Paschall, Charles City County, Virginia. 12 May 1980.
148Ibid.
Mason could lead to reduced revenues at the Charlottesville campus? Paschall felt strongly that the University of Virginia was working hard to maintain a philosophy of "benevolent fraternialism" toward these three branch colleges and little time was available for an incursion into Southside Virginia.\footnote{149 Alvin Duke Chandler, former President of The College of William and Mary and Chancellor of The Colleges of William and Mary, supported the view that the University of Virginia had shown only passing interest in promoting a branch in the area.} Since Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the University of Virginia had expressed little interest in becoming involved in establishing a branch in Southside Virginia, only The College of William and Mary remained as a potential sponsor. How did the relationship develop then between the second oldest college in America\footnote{151 Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962), p. 7.} and the fledgling two-year college in Petersburg? Who was responsible for bringing about this union of diversity under a common governing body?

From the available evidence there appeared to have been a combination of factors that brought William and Mary to Petersburg. First, there was a series of conversations in 1959 between Temple and Smith with the William and Mary, President, Alvin Duke Chandler.
These conversations occurred following the refusal of President Newman at Virginia Polytechnic Institute to promise affiliation with a new college in Southside Virginia. Temple and Smith both saw Chandler as being most receptive to the idea of supporting the creation of a branch college in the area. It may be surmised that Chandler viewed the acquisition of property in Southside Virginia as being tantamount to adding to an already established political base of support in Richmond and Tidewater. In 1959, The College of William and Mary governed the operations of Richmond Professional Institute in Richmond and maintained a four-year branch in the city of Norfolk. The addition of a two-year branch in Petersburg and one in Newport News would give to the Williamsburg administration and Board of Visitors effective control over higher education for white students from Richmond, south to North Carolina and east to the Atlantic Ocean. The remainder of the state would be left to Virginia Polytechnic Institute and to the University of Virginia.

Chandler viewed the addition of the Southside Virginia legislative contingent composed of such Assembly men as Smith, Temple, Richardson, and Gray as being essential to his broader goal of expanding the Williamsburg campus during the decade of the 1960's. He

153 W. Roy Smith, interview. 3 June 1980.
obviously realized that his plan both to revitalize the older campus and to construct new physical facilities in the new campus area could only come about if the General Assembly of Virginia approved the issuance of bonds and provided outright substantial amounts of capital outlay. What better way to obtain the necessary approval than by actively cooperating with the political leadership of the Petersburg area in agreeing to support their efforts in creating a two-year state-supported college? This enthusiastic support by Chandler of the idea does not at all diminish his contributions to Richard Bland College during its embryonic period. Quite the contrary, it shows how politically astute he was in recognizing the realities of practical politics in the higher education and legislative circles of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Closely related to the role played by Chandler was the ability of Ernst to convince the leadership in both the academic and the political world, that Southside Virginia needed a two-year college. There, too, was the willingness and personal commitment exhibited by Temple and Smith that the proposed marriage between the local college and venerable William and Mary could be consummated through careful planning and astute political maneuvering.

On 20 January 1960, it was reported in The Progress-Index that the State Council of Higher Education was recommending to the General Assembly that two-year colleges be established at Petersburg and Newport News and further they recommended that both proposed colleges
would become branches of The College of William and Mary. In the newspaper report there was a limited amount of attention given to the work done by Ernst and his committee and there was little to suggest that politics had played any role in bringing the proposed recommendations to this stage of readiness. In fact, the apparent absence of the role played by politics might lead one to believe that the proposal to establish these satellite colleges had become a reality without the usual involvement in the political process. As has been previously discussed, the employment of the art of politics played a key role in development of the colleges. Without politics it is probable that the efforts of all interested parties and the educational needs of the community would have been both unrecognized and unfulfilled.

Having now received the official blessing of the State Council of Higher Education to establish the satellite colleges, House Bill 217 was introduced in the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia. This bill was designed "to amend and re-enact 23-49.1 of the Code of Virginia, relating to divisions of The College of William and Mary in Virginia." In effect, this bill provided for the establishment of two-year branch colleges to be located in Petersburg and Newport News and management of the institutions would become the responsibility of the William and Mary Board of Visitors.

---
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By noting the individual patrons of the bill, it may be speculated that delegates from the Petersburg and Newport News areas of Virginia were resolved to bring higher education to their respective localities.

The preliminary work of Ernst was becoming a reality through the efforts of Southside area patrons W. Roy Smith who represented the City of Petersburg and County of Dinwiddie, and Paris I. Leadbetter, who represented the counties of Prince George and Surry, and the City of Hopewell.\(^{159}\) Apparently Smith had been successful in convincing Leadbetter of the desirability to support the endeavor even though one of the constituencies represented by Leadbetter was Hopewell, the same community from which Eliades was attempting to gain support for Hopewell College.

Following the referral of House Bill 217 to the Committee on Education,\(^{160}\) the bill was passed by members of the House\(^{161}\) and of the Senate.\(^{162}\) Following a suggestion made by Governor J. Lindsay Almond, Sr., that the word division be changed to divisions throughout the document,\(^{163}\) the House\(^{164}\) and the Senate\(^{165}\) concurred with

\(^{159}\)Ibid.

\(^{160}\)Ibid.

\(^{161}\)Ibid. p. 220-221.

\(^{162}\)Ibid. p. 306.

\(^{163}\)Ibid. p. 397-398.

\(^{164}\)Ibid.

\(^{165}\)Ibid.
the amendment and subsequently the bill was approved by the House and signed by the Speaker on 19 February 1960.¹⁶⁶ Concurrence came from the Senate three days later on 22 February.¹⁶⁷

The initial goal of Ernst and his committee to bring a two-year college to Southside Virginia had, with the able assistance of his colleagues in the General Assembly now became a reality.

23-49.1. (a) The Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, the Richmond Professional Institute, and the Divisions at Newport News and Petersburg respectively, (hereafter referred to, respectively, as Divisions and Institute) are hereby established as divisions of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, and are integral parts thereof. Such divisions shall be subject to the supervision, management and control of the Board of Visitors of the College.¹⁶⁸

While the establishment of a division of William and Mary in the Petersburg area was a reality, no official action had been taken by the General Assembly in January 1960, regarding the site for the College. The Site Committee appointed by Ernst had recommended the property just south of Petersburg which was soon to be vacated by the Petersburg Training School.¹⁶⁹ An obvious advantage to the property was that it was already owned by the State, and the cost of purchasing land elsewhere would not have to be considered.

¹⁶⁶Ibid. p. 398.
¹⁶⁹Site Committee Report. op. cit.
The strongest case in support of the transfer of a suitable portion of this property to The College of William and Mary came in a letter from President Chandler to Dr. William Hugh McFarlane, Director of the State Council of Higher Education. Chandler recommended that an area approximating 515 acres be reserved for the proposed college even though most of the tract would not be needed immediately for construction purposes. He cited the problem of land shortage at William and Mary and numerous out-of-state institutions as examples of colleges and universities who had failed to plan adequately for future enrollment increases. His view was that one could always declare land as surplus property if the future needs of the institution had been met.

It is also significant that Chandler cited the possible need for technical programs at the College and that these kinds of programs would necessitate the construction of additional buildings. In this technical area the view probably reflects the interest of Ernst in the field of engineering and of Ellis, Optimist Club President, in the area of industrial education in order to meet the training needs of industrial workers.

It seemed important to continue to maintain close ties with the political base in Southside Virginia as Chandler sent copies of his

---
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In support of Chandler, Ernst contacted Alfred E. H. Ruth, Director of the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals, regarding the transfer of the designated tract to the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary. Ruth responded by saying:

It had been our intention to transfer the requested property under the general authority of Section 2-4.1 of the Code of Virginia. However, we were advised yesterday that a specific bill has been introduced in the current session of the General Assembly authorizing the State Hospital Board to negotiate the transfer of this property. Under the circumstances, the Hospital Board was of the opinion that it should take no action pending the outcome of that bill in the General Assembly.

During February 1960, Smith was assured by Ruth that the delay would have no real effect on plans for the junior college since the facilities would still be needed by the Petersburg Training School until late 1960. Smith felt that Ruth was being cooperative in the matter and proceeded to work closely with Senator Temple in presenting an appropriate bill to the legislature which would, if favorably acted upon, result in the transfer of the desired property. It was Temple in the Senate who was the patron of Senate Bill 240 which officially brought to the Board of Visitors of The College

---
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of William and Mary on 17 March 1960 the initial tract of land for
the two-year institution:

1. The Governor of Virginia and the State
   Hospital Board are hereby jointly authorized and
   empowered, on behalf of the Commonwealth of
   Virginia, whenever in their judgment and
   uncontrolled discretion it is fitting and
   proper so to do, to transfer and convey to
   the College of William and Mary in Virginia,
   as a gift and without any consideration paid
   therefor, all right, title and interest of
   the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State
   Hospital Board in and to any part or all of
   that real estate with improvements now being
   used by Petersburg Training School and
   Hospital.177

The passage of the act establishing the branch college in Peters-
burg coincided with the March meeting of the Board of Visitors of The
College of William and Mary. At this meeting Chandler reported that
plans were underway to open the new college in September, 1961, with
a Director and at least twelve faculty members. He envisaged both
vocational/technical and traditional liberal arts course offerings
that would transfer credit to senior colleges. Chandler also raised
the question regarding responsibility of the board for accreditation
for both the Petersburg and Newport News branches.178

Again one finds evidence to support the view that in the early
period of development for Richard Bland, both a vocational/technical
and liberal arts transfer program were projected for the College to
be located in Petersburg. Students who wished to terminate their

   Regular Session, 1960, Richmond, Virginia. Commonwealth of Virginia,

178 Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary, Minutes
   of Meetings of the Board of Visitors, Meeting of 19 March 1960.
experience in post-secondary education in two years or less and those who planned to move beyond the level of lower division courses would be able to do so. It may have been that those members of the Hopewell community who supported Richard Bland felt that this vocational/technical rhetoric was a strong promise to obtain support of the community. Specifically, if legislators like Leadbetter and Gray could support Richard Bland at a time when Hopewell College was less than a year old, then they must have believed that at least, in part, Richard Bland would provide services to the industrial community.

This matter of incorporating a vocational/technical component in the curriculum of the new college was further supported in a Progress-Index editorial on 20 March 1960. A separate article on the same day quoted Smith as being receptive to meeting the educational needs of the chemical industry in Hopewell.

The diverse political support for the College was publicly reflected in Smith's commendation of Gray and Senator Lloyd C. Bird of Chesterfield County for their interest and support in bringing about the passage of the bill which created the College. It was ironic that within five years Bird was to become the Senate's

179 The Progress-Index, 20 March 1960.
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leading advocate for still another public community college in the Petersburg area. However, in 1960 he used his influence to assist in the establishment of Richard Bland College in Southside Virginia.

Now that the College had been created it was time to plan for the opening of the yet unnamed school. At its final meeting of the fiscal year the William and Mary Board of Visitors was faced with major problems that affected the operation of both the Petersburg and Newport News branch colleges.

The first problem related to the need to obtain additional funding for capital outlay expenses in Petersburg. Since appropriations from the General Assembly did not coincide with anticipated financial needs, a re-appraisal of that budget was a necessity. If additional funding was not forthcoming the College might not be able to open in September, 1961. In a report to the Board on 21 May Chandler stated:

This leaves several alternatives for the procurement of $98,393 for the fiscal year 1960-61; and $15,326 for the second year, 1961-62. In the light of these needs, we can: (1) approach the Governor for additional funds from his Contingent Fund; (2) request the City Council of the City of Petersburg to appropriate funds for this purpose; and/or (3) request public-spirited persons in the area to furnish funds and books for the institution.

I know of no other alternatives at this time to get the necessary funds to put the junior college in Petersburg into operation as of September 1, 1961. 182

182Minutes of the Board of Visitors. op. cit.
Seeking the most direct route not only for the acquisition of additional funds for the two junior colleges, but also for other revenue which would enable the Board to implement recent legislation creating the Office of the Chancellor of The College of William and Mary, William and Mary Board members T. Edward Temple and H. Lester Hooker informed Governor J. Lindsay Almond of the pending financial bind that was being placed on the entire system. It was their contention that if the will of the legislature was to be met, additional monies needed to complete the renovation of the Petersburg buildings must be forthcoming.  

A second concern facing the Board related to the governance of the entire William and Mary system, but in particular to the procedure for administrative controls over the branch colleges. Chandler asserted that:

It is essential that immediate action be taken to set up the Office of the Chancellor, in accordance with law, and implemented by the Board of Visitors, in order that the institutions and the individuals in the institutions will understand the objectives of the Board of Visitors.  

From this May, 1960, meeting of the Board of Visitors came the appointment of Chandler as Chancellor of The Colleges of William and

---

183 Letter from T. Edward Temple and H. Lester Hooker to Governor J. Lindsay Almond, 21 May 1960.

184 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, op. cit.
Mary. His responsibilities as Chancellor would begin on 1 July 1960. The Board further indicated their desire to begin immediately a search for a successor to Chandler.\footnote{185} 

A third area of concern affecting the Petersburg branch was the yet unresolved question of land transfer from the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals to the Board of Visitors. Ernst, as a newly appointed member of the Board of William and Mary began to immediately exert his influence by recommending that additional correspondence between Chandler and Ruth take place without delay. Unanimous concurrence from the Board followed and a letter was approved.\footnote{186} 

Immediately following the Board of Visitors meeting of 21 May, the new Chancellor of the Colleges of William and Mary, Alvin Duke Chandler visited the site of the Petersburg College. He stated at a meeting of the Petersburg Kiwanis Club that the College would begin operations by 1 September 1961 with an anticipated enrollment of approximately 200 students.\footnote{187} 

The man responsible for bringing Chandler to Petersburg so quickly after the Board of Visitors meeting was Frank Ernst. At that meeting Ernst gave substantial credit for the idea of establishing a college in the area to those preliminary surveys that were

\footnote{185}{Ibid.} \footnote{186}{Ibid.} \footnote{187}{Richmond Times Dispatch, 25 May 1960.}
conducted by the Hopewell Optimist Club. He also stressed the cooperative and collaborative efforts of many area citizens.  

Chandler in his remarks reviewed the work being done to open the College by 1 September, 1961, and emphatically stated that:

> It is our purpose to have the junior college serve the people of the area and we are requesting the area to support us in making this school a first-rate junior college, serving general education, vocational education and pre-professional education.

Thus, it may be said that Chandler was speaking to all who might want to seek post-secondary educational opportunities in the area. His speech served to give credence to the belief that the new college could be whatever the people wanted it to be. It was also designed to solidify the area political forces behind the movement.

The contention that politics played a major role in the creation of the College was evident in the remarks made by Temple when he introduced Ernst. Since Temple was both a Kiwanian and State Senator, it may be conjectured that he used this meeting to recognize those citizens who had played such prominent roles in previous community projects. This served as an important opportunity to influence other civic-minded community leaders of the worthiness of the college endeavor.

---
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The following month the Board of Visitors again met in Williamsburg. Among the problems discussed regarding the junior college in Petersburg was that of sufficient funding for the 1960-62 biennium. It had previously been determined that the legislature had not funded enough monies for the renovation of the existing buildings nor for other contingencies which were to take place between mid-1960 and the proposed opening of the school in September, 1961. Letters had been written and other behind-the-scene conversations had taken place, but no clear means for obtaining these funds had been found until 2 June when "a committee of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary appeared before the Governor of Virginia, and discussed with him two letters, addressed to the Governor, dated May 21, 1960."

The board members who wrote the letter to Harrison reviewed the results of their meeting on 2 June with Governor Almond. Their purpose in communicating with the Attorney General was to determine if there were any illegalities present in the agreement which they had reached with the Governor. Specifically, they wanted to know if monies could be transferred from the Governor's Discretionary Fund to William and Mary in order to carry out the mandate of the General Assembly.


191Ibid.
The answer came on 8 June when Almond, Harrison and other members of the Governor's staff met with the Finance Committee of the Board of Visitors in the Office of the Governor. There it was agreed that the Governor:

would appropriate and allot $85,000 from Item 521 of the Appropriation Act for the biennium 1960-62, these funds to be used for improvements to state-owned lands, buildings, and equipment. Specifically, these funds would be used to modify, renovate, convert, and equip, as far as possible, the Petersburg Training School for junior college educational purposes.  

Additionally, the Board of Visitors was given the authority to transfer funds from one institution to another so long as that transaction was approved in writing by the Governor.

The first major obstacle facing the proposed junior college in Petersburg had now been met via the route of political persuasion. Influential public citizens had banded together for the purpose of obtaining, through the political process, the needed financial resources to begin a new college. The remaining problems of transferring title to the land from the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals to the Board of Visitors remained to be accomplished.

The Board, at its meeting of 11 June, accepted, without official comment, a letter from the Director of Mental Hospitals, Alfred E. H.

---
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Ruth which had been sent to Chandler. Ruth conveyed to Chandler that a committee of the Hospital Board would meet with him in Petersburg on 13 July for the purpose of discussing the transfer of land. \(^\text{194}\)

It was the hope of Chandler and the Board that they would obtain 1,027 acres in the proposed transaction. This large tract of land would allow the College more than ample acreage for expansion in future years. \(^\text{195}\) It was the opinion of W. Roy Smith that:

\[
\text{This land belongs to the State, which means that it belongs to all of us - it belongs to none, yet all. If we get all of it now, 50 years hence we will look back and feel sure we did well. It is no longer of value to the hospital board and I hope it gives every consideration to conveying the entire tract.} \]

Among public school people present at the meeting with the State Hospital Board was Hopewell and Prince George County School Superintendent, Charles A. Smith. Smith, who had earlier agreed to allow Eliades and his supporters the use of Hopewell High School for night classes, now was an active supporter in William and Mary's effort to establish a college in Southside Virginia. In fact, \textit{Progress-Index} reporter Mary Cherry Allen stated that Smith spoke openly about the need for William and Mary to acquire adequate land for expansion and to be able to protect itself from encroachment from developers. \(^\text{197}\)

---

\(^\text{194}\)Letter from Alfred E. H. Ruth to A. D. Chandler, 10 July 1960.
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In spite of the apparent overwhelming support for the transfer of property (in excess of 1000 acres) to William and Mary, it was reported in The Progress-Index that the State Hospital Board agreed on 14 July to convey 200 acres for the establishment of the new college. The official announcement was contained in a letter from Ruth to Chandler on 19 July:

At its regular meeting on Thursday, July fourteenth, the State Hospital Board voted to convey to The College of William and Mary, a part of Tract #4 of the Petersburg Training School and Hospital, which part lies east of Johnson Road (Route 608), encompasses the present buildings of the Petersburg Training School and Hospital, and contains approximately 200 acres.

Chandler responded to Ruth on 20 July by requesting that a plat be forwarded so that the Board of Visitors could ascertain the exact dimensions of the site at its meeting on 27 August. At the meeting of the Board on 27 August it is significant to note the role played by Ernst as a member of that body. The minutes reflect that:

Mr. Ernst informed the Board that he felt that the Chancellor had done a very good job in presenting the case to the Committee. He stated that the Chairman had stood throughout the meeting, advocating transfer of the entire property to the

---
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Colleges of William and Mary, and that it had been voted down by the Hospital Board. Mr. Ernst stated further that he felt that it was important to get started without further litigation over the land to first establish the College. He also informed the Board that the Hospital Board had stated publicly and definitely that they would not sell the land, but would retain it and seed it with trees.201

Thus, it was Ernst who had earlier worked so diligently to bring the political forces together to foster the idea of a college, who now as a member of the William and Mary Board of Visitors, recommended that swift action be taken to secure at least a portion of the desired tract for the Board. In response to the plea of Ernst, the Board unanimously approved a resolution to accept Ruth's offer.202 Chandler so advised Ruth of the Board's vote.203

Since some of the financial problems had been resolved and the question of land acquisition had been temporarily disposed of the next logical step was to determine an appropriate name for the institution. In a speech to the Fort Lee Army Advisory Committee on 27 September, Chandler asked that group for suggestions and with Ernst at his side, "predicted that by 1970 the school could have an enrollment as high as 2,300 students."204

201Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 27 August 1960.
202Ibid.
204The Progress-Index, 28 September 1960.
At the October meeting of the Board of Visitors, Ernst made a motion that the College be named "The Richard Bland College of The Colleges of William and Mary."205 The resolution approving the name read in part:

...that henceforth the established division in Petersburg shall be known as the Richard Bland College of The College of William and Mary, this name being derived from the illustrious Richard Bland - a statesman who was the son of Richard Bland of Berkeley and Jordan's Point, Virginia, and who in 1742, first took his seat from Prince George County in the House of Burgesses and served continuously from that date until 1775. Richard Bland was a champion of public rights and a staunch representative of the citizens of Southside Virginia. Therefore, it is appropriate and fitting that an institution of higher learning, located in such a setting, should derive its name from one who contributed so much to its early history and its development.206

In other action by the Board the naming of a Director of Richard Bland College was discussed but no final decision was reached since two of the persons being considered had declined the President's offer. It is again of interest to note that one of the candidates, Charles Smith, Superintendent of the Hopewell and Prince George County Schools and an active member of Ernst's original local advisory committee had stated that he would not consider the offer because of financial reasons. The other person mentioned was E. V. Peele, Dean of the Norfolk College of William and Mary who was stepping down from that

205 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 22 October 1960.
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position because of ill health.  

In a move that was to affect the future of Richard Bland, the Board approved a new administrative organizational chart which reflected the action of the General Assembly in 1960. Within the new organization Chandler was named Chancellor of The Colleges of William and Mary and Davis Y. Paschall, former Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Commonwealth, as President of The College of William and Mary in Virginia. Even though this new arrangement seemed rather permanent, it was to be radically changed within two years partly because of difficulties in assessing responsibilities for the administration of the system and for the College. The lingering problem of the appointment of a Director for Richard Bland appeared to be solved in January, 1961, when the Board of Visitors approved the appointment of Associate Professor of Education at William and Mary, Robert H. McMurry, to that position. McMurry expressed his pleasure at being appointed, but after making several trips to Petersburg decided that the job was not what he had thought it would be and submitted to the Board a letter of resignation which was accepted on 4 March, 1961.

Subsequently, the Chancellor recommended Colonel James M. Carson

\[\text{207 Ibid.}\]
\[\text{208 Ibid.}\]
\[\text{209 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 14 January 1961.}\]
\[\text{210 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 4 March 1961.}\]
for the position.\textsuperscript{211} In conversations with Chandler, he praised highly the work that Carson had done as Professor of Military Science and Tactics at William and Mary and that he was the caliber of person needed to guide and develop a fledgling institution such as Richard Bland.\textsuperscript{212} The Board resolution approving the appointment stated in part:

\begin{quote}
that Colonel J. M. Carson, U.S.A., B.S., The Citadel; Master's Degree, University of South Carolina; public school administrator, school superintendent and governmental educational worker, be appointed to fill the position vacated by Robert McMurry.\textsuperscript{213}
\end{quote}

With less than six months before the scheduled opening of Richard Bland College, a Director had finally been appointed. The work to be done in planning for the first class as well as completing the needed renovation of the Petersburg Training School facility was a job that required the cooperation of many people. One of Colonel Carson's priorities was to move to Petersburg and to begin the process of contacting the prominent supporters of the College. He indicated that without this broad-based political support he did not see how the task could be both accomplished and sustained. He viewed the admission of students, hiring of faculty, and support staff, establishment of a curriculum, and development of schedules as being items that would have to be dealt with, but unless he could develop a personal relationship with those individuals who could assist the

\textsuperscript{211}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{212}Alvin Duke Chandler, interviews. 15 May 1980; 30 May 1980.

\textsuperscript{213}Board of Visitors. op. cit.
College at the local and state level, these basic administrative duties would be of little lasting value.²¹⁴

The fact that Carson would not retire from the United States Army until 31 May presented him with even more of a problem in attempting to accomplish the tasks that lay ahead. A ceremony held at Fort Lee, Virginia on 31 May was the culminating event of his military career, but it was only the beginning of a thirteen-year association with Richard Bland College. In an interview following the ceremonies Carson indicated that even though he had been able to work part-time since his appointment in March, sixty students had been accepted and seven of ten faculty members hired.²¹⁵

The offices of Richard Bland College opened officially for the first time in early June at the Walnut Hill Elementary School in Petersburg.²¹⁶ Throughout June and for the remainder of the Summer, 1960, Carson, Business Manager Kirk Lunsford, Jr., and Sylvia H. McIvor, Secretary, were busy preparing for the opening of the school.²¹⁷

In order to gain community-wide support throughout the summer, area newspapers publicly reported the majority of events which related to the pending opening of Richard Bland.

²¹⁴ James M. Carson, interview held at the home of James M. Carson, Williamsburg, Virginia. 26 May 1980.

²¹⁵ Richmond Times Dispatch, 31 May 1961.

²¹⁶ The Progress-Index, 11 June 1961.

²¹⁷ The Progress-Index, 15 June 1961.
During the remaining weeks prior to opening 14 September, Carson began to build his personal base of political support through speaking engagements at local civic clubs and organizations. Included on his personal agenda were the Petersburg Civitan Club on 31 July, the Petersburg Lion's Club on 2 August, and the McKenney Ruritan Club on 7 August. At the Ruritan Club meeting Carson stressed the transferability of courses to four-year colleges, the accreditation of the College within the William and Mary family, and the provision for courses of a terminal nature for students who wished to enter the job market after one or two years. On 20 August more than four-hundred area residents attended an Open House at the College with another six-hundred being present at a similar gathering on the following Sunday.

These public contacts seemed to solidify the image that Carson was attempting to project, i.e. that Richard Bland College was a

---
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community institution that would either flourish or decline on the degree of success it had in gaining acceptance from its constituents. If contacts were not made with the influential elements of the community little could be expected in return. This philosophy appeared to permeate most of the actions of Carson during these developmental days leading to the beginning of classes on 14 September 1961.

An editorial in The Progress-Index on 10 September best expressed the widespread base of support that had been built by the College. Credit for the establishment of the College was given to Ernst and his area-wide committee; to Senator Temple and Delegates Smith and Richardson; to the Hopewell Optimist Club and the Petersburg branch of The American Association of University Women; to Carson and his staff; to Petersburg School Superintendent John Meade and Walnut Hill Principal Ben Peele; and to numerous other clubs and organizations.\(^{224}\) Even though others were involved this editorial captured the sense of commitment which was present among many people throughout Southside Virginia.

Just as the question was asked earlier in this chapter about the reasons for the demise of Hopewell College, one may now ask the reasons for the successful establishment of Richard Bland College. The answer to this question, too, seems to be found through an

\(^{224}\)The Progress-Index, 10 September 1960.
examination of a number of factors.

Those who supported the two-year Southside Virginia College were successful, in part, because of their ability and foresight in mobilizing that small segment of the population that could influence the decision-makers in their respective communities. Their understanding of the need to move beyond the resources of one community and to draw upon a diverse and energetic constituency brought the initial phase of the venture to a successful conclusion.

A layman like Frank Ernst possessed those qualities of leadership. He had a keen politically-oriented mind that was able to grasp the time-frame in which decisions had to be made. There were able political leaders like John H. Temple and W. Roy Smith who realized the practical necessity of pursuing alternative solutions to resolve problems. An example of this willingness to remain flexible came with the immediate shift of emphasis from Virginia Polytechnic Institute to William and Mary when the former institution failed to show interest in establishing a branch college in the Petersburg area. They, too, along with other area legislators understood the importance of joining forces with the politicians from Tidewater Virginia who were seeking the establishment of a two-year college in Newport News.

At William and Mary, Alvin Duke Chandler, President and later Chancellor, saw his venerable institution as being the recipient of most of the higher educational benefits from Richmond south to North Carolina and east to the Atlantic coast. He did not hesitate when
the opportunity presented itself to make the decision to support establishment of two new colleges.

There was James M. Carson, who arrived on the scene late, but through his recognition of the vital role played by politics in educational circles, quickly acclimated himself to the task of unifying the communities behind the goals established for Richard Bland College.

Besides these people who played leading roles in the establishment of the College there was the immediate attachment and accreditation of the new institution through William and Mary. It seems understandable that such a school as Hopewell College might not survive as it did not have the advantage of being associated with an accredited four-year college or university. Neither did it possess the financial resources of the Commonwealth of Virginia as did Richard Bland. The funds might have appeared meager at times, but at least there was some degree of assurance that they would be available when needed.

Most importantly, Hopewell College did not possess the support of area and state political leaders. The absence of a strong political base seemed to be the major reason why Richard Bland succeeded and Hopewell failed.

A final reason to be cited for the apparent success of Richard Bland in 1960 was the promise made by nearly everyone involved in the venture that Richard Bland was going to provide educational opportunities for those students who were seeking to transfer to four-year
colleges and universities as well as those who wished to terminate his/her education after a year or more of practical training. For what other reasons would a large segment of the Hopewell leadership support the College? Were they not convinced of the diversity of the proposed curriculum at Richard Bland? When this incorporation of both a liberal arts transfer program and a technical and vocational one did not occur as quickly as many felt it should, what then would be the alternative? That alternative came to be the beginnings of a need to establish a two-year, technically-oriented community college which became the rival to Richard Bland and is known as John Tyler Community College.

In Chapter III a brief discussion of the political factors leading to the establishment of John Tyler Community College is discussed. Particular emphasis is placed on those factors which affected the growth of Richard Bland College. Chapter III also includes major political factors which affected Richard Bland from its opening in 1961 to the actual establishment of John Tyler in 1966.
CHAPTER III


Introduction

A discussion of the first five years of existence at Richard Bland College comprises the first segment of the chapter. Special emphasis is placed on the effect of local and state politics on the growth of the institution. The period of establishment includes the reorganization of The Colleges of William and Mary and its effects on the branch college in Petersburg. Of particular importance is the fact that in the Richard Bland curriculum an emphasis was placed on the traditional liberal arts curriculum at the expense of any vocational or technical training. Why did this shift in curricular emphasis take place? Could it be that the strong liberal arts philosophy held by the President of The College of William and Mary, Davis Y. Paschall and his administrative associates became the dominant factor in the over-emphasis of liberal arts programs at Richard Bland College?

If these questions can be answered in the affirmative then it may be suggested that the re-emergence of a movement by local citizens and political leaders to establish a technical college was inevitable. The failure of Richard Bland College to meet the needs of its industrial community may have resulted in the creation of the technically
and vocationally-oriented curriculum offered by John Tyler Community College. It may be further postulated that some local and state political leaders seized upon this opportunity to convert the wishes of the people to those of their own. In short, political expediency rather than sound academic planning may have brought to Southside Virginia and to the Commonwealth as a whole, the added expense of supporting another two-year college within the same geographical area of Southside Virginia.

In the second half of this chapter there is presented a discussion of political factors leading to the establishment of John Tyler Community College. It is of particular importance to discover the relationship which existed among the area political subdivisions and how these interactions affected Richard Bland College. Finally, an analysis will be made regarding the role of the State Council of Higher Education in its assessment of the higher educational needs in Southside Virginia.

**Political Factors Affecting the Growth of Richard Bland College from 1961-1966**

At the time Richard Bland College was just beginning as an institution of higher learning and was in the need of receiving considerable guidance by its parent college in Williamsburg, there emerged both in Richmond at the State Council of Higher Education and in the administrative offices of William and Mary itself, a movement to dismantle much of the structure of The Colleges of William and Mary which had been created by the General Assembly in 1960.

A casual observer might view this decision to wrest control of
the Norfolk and Richmond branches from William and Mary as being necessitated by the need to provide these growing urban colleges with their own governing boards so that decisions of a local nature could be promptly made. Such a reason is logical and on the surface seems to be reasonable.

Upon receiving the recommendations of the State Council regarding structured reorganization, the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary adopted a resolution calling for a committee to study the organizational structure of the colleges and to be prepared to report to the full Board at its scheduled meeting on 6 January 1962. The full report of the Committee was presented to the Board at that time.2

The report consisted of a review of the long-standing commitment of The College of William and Mary through its branch system to bring to the people of the Commonwealth quality in a program of extension offerings. In fact, the College was cited as being the first College in Virginia to establish branch colleges and in a spirit of cooperation and dedication accepted the will of the General Assembly in 1960 to assume an even larger role in this area of fostering branch colleges. In a definitive statement of support for the system, the Committee stated that:

\(^1\)Minutes of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Meeting of 9 December 1961.

\(^2\)Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 6 January 1962.
The Board of Visitors wishes to point out that the system has been in effect only 18 months and that in actuality it has had but one year in which to prove itself. There has not been, therefore, a reasonable length of time in which to assess its full values, its potentialities or any possible shortcomings. At no time was the Board consulted as to whether the system was operating satisfactorily or whether possible changes might be desirable in the interest of more efficient operation.\(^3\)

Incorporated as a part of the Committee's report were the various proposals of the State Council of Higher Education and of more importance their rationale for dismantling the system. The State Council concluded:

a. That there is too wide a diversity of institutional types and programs.
b. That the tasks involved in supervision of the five-college system are too monumental for the present Board of Visitors.
c. That the Council wishes to assist The College of William and Mary in Virginia in preserving its 'prestige and traditional role as a great center of the arts and sciences.'
d. That both the Norfolk College of William and Mary and the Richmond Professional Institute now are able to stand on their own feet.\(^4\)

The Board answered each of these four reasons purported by the State Council by stating that "no evidence has been presented to the Board by the Council to indicate that the system, when established was of a temporary nature or that it is not now working as planned."\(^5\)

\(^3\)Ibid.

\(^4\)Ibid.

\(^5\)Ibid.
They further viewed the establishment of separate boards for the Richmond and Norfolk schools as creating administrative confusion and duplication of effort within Virginia's system of higher education and that the Board had efficiently and effectively carried out the wishes of the legislative body.\footnote{Ibid.}

In spite of the rhetoric contained in the report made by the Committee, The College of William and Mary Board of Visitors seemed to see the futility in ignoring completely the State Council's wishes. It may be theorized that the realities of the political situation appeared to dictate a compromise in the original position of the Board. Acceptance of the compromise by The William and Mary Board of Visitors helped to cause the removal of the Chancellor from the William and Mary campus by means of restricting his authority to oversee the operations of the constituent colleges even though the presidents and directors of these institutions would report directly to the Board. He would also no longer be the chief executive officer for The College of William and Mary itself.\footnote{Ibid.}

What were the underlying reasons for dismantling the system? Why were the duties and responsibilities of the Chancellor relegated to a secondary role? Paschall indicated that there were a number of factors which may have contributed to the discontinuance of a
system which two years earlier had seemed so permanent. His two primary contentions centered around the manner in which many legislators viewed biennial budget requests. These legislators noticed that budgetary elements for all five institutions were lumped together. The individual requests were in themselves no great matter about which to be concerned, but the combined budgets may have appeared to be reflective of a higher educational dynasty that was being created which would eventually bring fiscal havoc to the Commonwealth and could reduce extensively the amount of State funding that would be available to the University of Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. These latter institutions, with their perceived image of being all things to all people across the Commonwealth, could very well see a new rival emerging and spreading across Eastern and Southern Virginia. The influence of the alumni from these two institutions on the State Council and in the General Assembly may have looked with disfavor on this newly consolidated system. 8

Chandler, too, expressed the view that state-wide political clout of the University of Virginia helped to influence recommendations made by the State Council. He saw the University as desiring to limit the potential growth of the law school at William and Mary as it might become a rival to the prestigious Charlottesville school. If William and Mary could be stopped in its apparent attempt to expand its operations then this alleged problem of continuing growth of the

8Davis Y. Paschall, interview held at the home of Davis Y. Paschall, Charles City County, Virginia. 12 May 1980.
law school might be thwarted. Chandler further saw State Council Director McFarlane as being a strong proponent of the University of Virginia and against the expansion of William and Mary. McFarlane had previously served as a member of the University of Virginia faculty.\(^9\)

It might be conjectured that as a result of conversations with Paschall and Chandler and a review of the Minutes of the Board of Visitors, a part of the reorganization controversy at William and Mary appeared to be a struggle between the two men for control of the parent college at Williamsburg as well as the branch colleges. One might understand the inherent problem in administering a system in which the former President of William and Mary (Chandler) is appointed Chancellor of The Colleges of William and Mary while the new President (Paschall) became titular head of the institution.

A cursory review of the organizational chart for The College of William and Mary showed all of the executive officers of the colleges (including William and Mary) reporting through the Chancellor to the Board of Visitors.\(^{10}\) At what point do their roles, responsibilities and personal philosophies conflict? Having served as both President and Chancellor of the College it must have been difficult for Chandler to accept his new appointment to the honorary position of Chancellor

---


\(^{10}\) Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 19 May 1962.
of The College of William and Mary in Virginia. This change of status which was approved by the Board in May, 1962, would, in effect, place Chandler in a retirement status although he would continue after 1 July 1962 as Coordinator of Christopher Newport and Richard Bland Colleges.11

The latter position as Coordinator of the Community Colleges was a short-lived one for Chandler since on 15 September 1962 he informed the Board that:

'My recommendation is that you elect one of the Directors for the additional duties of Coordinator and compensate him accordingly for these additional duties. This is my last day on the payroll of the State of Virginia.'12

Chandler was quoted in the Richmond Times Dispatch that he no longer held any official capacity at the College and "I am no longer an employee of the State of Virginia."13 The Directors referred to by Chandler were H. Westcott Cunningham, Director of Christopher Newport College and James M. Carson, Director of Richard Bland College.

The question of animosity existing between Chandler and Paschall can not be definitely answered in this study but the relationship should be mentioned so that one may understand the effect of the relationship on political affairs which took place at the branch college.

Chandler was a former military man who expressed pride in his

11Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 19 May 1962.
12Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 15 September 1962.
13Richmond Times Dispatch, 16 September 1962.
work as President and Chancellor. He believed that the expansion of William and Mary through the use of politics was the key to an expanding university system. He further did not see a dichotomy between the liberal arts focus of William and Mary and the diversity which existed among the branch colleges throughout central and Eastern Virginia. In fact, the alliances with certain public figures in the region could only serve to benefit the home campus in Williamsburg.\(^1^4\)

The ability to use politics in order to achieve goals was also a way of life for Paschall, but there appeared to be a single goal which served to motivate him throughout his tenure as President of William and Mary. He was dedicated to William and Mary's classical role as a liberal arts college. All other roles for him seemed to be secondary. Whatever could be done to preserve and enhance the reputation of William and Mary as an outstanding liberal arts institution seemed to dictate the kinds of policy decisions that would affect the parent institution as well as its two-year branch in Petersburg. The philosophy of Paschall can best be captured in a series of comments which he made in reviewing the progress of William and Mary from 1960 to 1970. Among his numerous statements the following is appropriate to illustrate his dedication to this liberal arts tradition:

I suggest that liberal arts, for us, connotes the value gleanings of western man in his long, arduous gropings for release from the shackles of barbarism. It embodies the discernible fabric of our civilization emanating from the humane landmarks of the past that must become a dynamic, motivating force in the lives of our students if the hand of tomorrow is to be restrained in releasing the power that would return us to the cave.15

Herein lies one difference between Chandler and Paschall. The former saw William and Mary as being a part of an extensive system of colleges which could rival the other two larger state institutions. The latter viewed the liberal arts traditions which had embodied the College since its inception in 1693 as being an end in and of itself. Based on this assumption, conflict between the two men regarding goals and priorities for William and Mary and its branches seemed inevitable. The conflict was thereby resolved in September, 1962 when Chandler retired. The future direction for William and Mary and its branches would then be established by Paschall. Carson, Director of Richard Bland College, viewed the demise of Chandler as being partly the result of pressures brought to bear on him by the supporters of Richmond Professional Institute and of the Norfolk Division of The College of William and Mary. According to Carson the removal of these two schools by the General Assembly hurt Chandler's chances of remaining in the position of Chancellor and served to show that the legislative body in Richmond was not going to allow William and Mary to emerge as a power broker

For whatever combination of reasons, politics had played a major role both in establishing and in dismantling the system in only a matter of two years. The end result of the most recent changes placed Paschall in charge of shaping the direction of William and Mary for the decade of the 1960's.

In September, 1962, the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary met and accepted the resignation of Chandler. The Board immediately appointed Cunningham as Acting Coordinator of the two-year colleges. There was immediate opposition made by Carson to the requirement that he had to report to the other two-year branch college, Christopher Newport, in order to reach the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary. Carson was so opposed to the idea that he sent a letter to both Ernst and Smith expressing his displeasure at making such a reporting procedure permanent. In his correspondence with Smith he made it clear that if Cunningham was permanently appointed,

...it will place Richard Bland College at a distinct disadvantage by increasing the red tape in dealing with the parent institution, The College of William and Mary, and by giving the impression that Richard Bland is subordinate to Christopher Newport.

---

17 Minutes of the Board of Visitors. op. cit.
18 Letter from James M. Carson to Frank Ernst, 18 September 1962.
19 Letter from James M. Carson to W. Roy Smith, 18 October 1962.
Carson goes on to say:

I see no advantage accruing to us from this arrange­ment. On the other hand there are many advantages as I pointed out to Mr. Ernst if we are placed under the President of William and Mary or if someone at William and Mary is named Coordinator.  

In this instance Carson was appealing directly to the political leaders; Smith as a delegate to the General Assembly of Virginia and Ernst, who, having been a founding father to Richard Bland College, was now a member of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary. Carson indicated his desire to appeal to the strongest and most politically able of the Richard Bland supporters as he hoped they would intervene on his behalf. This transfer of authority to the Christopher Newport-based Cunningham represented in the mind of Carson a diminishing role for his institution and he would use all means available to rectify the situation. This contact with Smith was the first real move made by Carson to pressure the political community. He indicated that more time was spent "putting out brush firs" than for planning and developing the educational program.  

What was the result of the efforts of Carson to bring about a more direct route of communication and support from the parent campus? At its meeting on 10 November considerable debate occurred among members of the Board of Visitors as to the manner in which the

---

20 Ibid.
21 Carson, interview, 26 May 1980.
Directors would report to the Board. In fact, it appeared to become rather heated at times with Ernst as Chairman of the Committee on Two-Year Colleges, calling for the President of William and Mary to become the Coordinator. He revealed that discussions on the matter had been held with the Governor and the State Budget Director and that both of these individuals concurred with his recommendation. Paschall was asked by the Rector for his opinion and he answered that he had sixteen people reporting to him and that the additional responsibility should probably be handled by someone on his staff just as was being done at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the University of Virginia.  

The reluctance on the part of Paschall to indicate his desire to accept the responsibility was ameliorated by his apparent willingness to do as the Board desired on the matter. By viewing the comments made by the active participants at the meeting and by Paschall's comments there can be seen developing the antagonism among numerous individuals about the possible burden which the two-year colleges might bring to William and Mary in future years. As is often found in meetings involving strong-willed public figures a temporary solution was reached after considerable discussion. The motion to declare the position of Acting Coordinator vacant and for the two Directors to report temporarily to the President until January, 1963 was passed without further discussion.  

---

22 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 10 November 1962.

23 Ibid.
Herein lies one of the problems that was to face Richard Bland in future years. It would always be necessary to use sub rosa political activity to assure even a minimum degree of stability for the institution. In this instance it was Carson who urged Ernst to follow a hard line in the Board meeting to keep Richard Bland from falling under the domination of the other two-year branch colleges. The placing of one two-year college under another one did not make sense educationally, but to those who promoted the idea, it was one way to place both schools in a secondary position relative to William and Mary itself.

At its meeting on 5 January 1963, the Board received a report and a series of recommendations from the Committee on Two-Year Colleges. The Committee under the leadership of Ernst had met on 16 December in Williamsburg and in addition, Ernst and Paschall had conferred with Attorney General Robert Y. Button and his assistant Kenneth Patty on 18 December. The intent of the latter conference was to ascertain the legal implications of coordination for the two-year colleges. It was "concluded that coordination of these two-year colleges can best emanate from, and be assigned some person or persons at The College of William and Mary."\footnote{Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 5 January 1963.}

It appeared that Ernst had won his battle to bring Richard Bland more closely under the umbrella of the parent college. In time, however, what appeared to occur often resulted in a rather confusing
arrangement for all of the involved parties. Donald J. Herrmann, who had been serving in numerous capacities at William and Mary since 1951, was named Coordinator of the Two-Year Colleges. Herrmann was an Associate Professor of Education who fulfilled his teaching duties, served as Director of the Extension Program, and Director of the Summer Session in addition to this new area of responsibility. Carson felt that Herrmann contributed much to the growth of Richard Bland in its early years. Carson saw Herrmann as being attuned to the needs of the branch college but felt that Herrmann was not always able to obtain from the School of Arts and Sciences immediate and far-reaching decisions which Herrmann knew would benefit Richard Bland. The inability of Richard Bland to communicate directly with Paschall and the Board is best understood by noting the duties of the Coordinator:

The Coordinator, under the authority and direction of the Board of Visitors, is placed in charge of all matters relating to maintenance, operation and general administration of Richard Bland College in Petersburg and Christopher Newport College in Newport News, and shall be the authorized means of communication between the Board and the Directors, faculty, students and staff of these colleges. He shall establish, with the approval of the Board of Directors, such administrative offices and faculty and staff positions as he may deem necessary for carrying out the work of the two-year colleges. *He shall nominate to the Board, upon recommendation of the Directors of the respective two-year colleges, all persons to serve on the administrative staff and faculty of these colleges.

25Ibid.
26Carson, interview, 26 May 1980.
All matters relating to the two-year colleges in
which he is not otherwise empowered to act shall
be referred to him for report and recommendation
to the Board.

(*Such nomination affecting faculty appointments
shall have approval of the Dean of the Faculty of
The College of William and Mary as hereinafter
explained in this plan.*)

Why were so many people involved in the process of administering the branch colleges? What role did intra-college politics at William and Mary play in this new system of coordination? How many individuals at William and Mary did Carson have to contact in order to provide for the needs of Richard Bland College?

Since William and Mary was responsible for the accreditation of Richard Bland it was necessary for all decisions relative to faculty and staff selections and all course offerings to be approved by the Dean of Faculty at the parent institution. This meant that on certain routine matters the Coordinator would be responsible for Richard Bland. In strictly academic matters the Dean of Faculty at William and Mary would assume this responsibility. On policy decisions which necessitated an immediate reply Carson was obligated to consult with the President. On paper this procedure might have appeared to be an effective means of administering the operations of a new college, but in practical terms it was a cumbersome process that often resulted in delays, misunderstandings, missed opportunities and less than effective management of Richard Bland.

---

27 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, op. cit.
28 Ibid.
Often the inaccessibility of the William and Mary Dean of Faculty regarding curricular and staffing matters caused Carson difficulty. He had been accustomed to working directly with Chandler. Now it was often found that the addition of courses which were not in the area of the traditional liberal arts were simply not approved. Further, the politics of the Coordinator having to report through the President to the Board of Visitors resulted in many recommendations never reaching the Board. In spite of its perceived shortcomings this was the system that prevailed at William and Mary until the retirement of Paschall in 1971. It involved the kind of procedure that seemed to meet the needs of Paschall and his associates even though the needs of the branch colleges might be met best by a more direct route to the Board of Visitors.

By early 1963, Richard Bland College was preparing to graduate its first class of students. The curriculum that had been provided reflected primarily the traditional liberal arts course offerings common to the first two years offered at the parent institution. This similarity between the two schools was not surprising since it might be expected that the best way to assure accreditation for the branch college was to provide those subjects which could best be defended as being reflective of those offered by the College in Williamsburg.

---

29 Carson, interview, 26 May 1980.

Neither was it surprising that in both Southside and Tidewater Virginia that the political support possessed by Paschall resulted in a meeting between the Board of Visitors and the State Council of Higher Education in March, 1963. The two bodies were to consider the possibility of expanding offerings at both Richard Bland and Christopher Newport in the area of technical education. Paschall seemed to want to remain in favor with these politicians and unless he could say that these local branches would seek to meet the needs of both the transfer and terminally-oriented area students, then his newly-acquired political base of support might turn to other sources for assistance. He would always remain a major advocate of the liberal arts but here political expediency could be used as a tool to obtain funds for the same liberal arts.

Carson had already anticipated the need to offer more than just the liberal arts curriculum to area students. It was reported in the Richmond Times Dispatch and The Progress-Index that Richard Bland was planning to provide a limited technical offering in engineering drawing, applied mathematics, technical communications, and technical physics during the 1963 Spring Semester. This technical addition to the curriculum at Richard Bland was precipitated by Carson's desire to meet the needs of local industry. However, the projected courses were not vocational in nature, but reflected a higher level offering

---

31 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 23 March 1963.
32 Richmond Times Dispatch, 18 December 1962; The Progress-Index, 15 January 1963.
in the technical area. It seemed to be a compromise between the vocational and technical curriculums. In any event it was an attempt by Carson to lure potential support from the industrial community and to stake a claim with the politicians that Richard Bland could be the local institution best suited to provide both the transfer and terminal programs if the State so chose to move in that direction.

It was pointed out in the previous chapter that the Commonwealth of Virginia was exploring the possibility of establishing vocational and technical schools at certain strategic locations throughout the State. Eliades and his supporters were attempting to bring this type of public facility to Hopewell and to incorporate it as a part of Hopewell College. This latter effort did not materialize, but it did assist the Southside area in publicizing the need for such a school. In view of the competition that had emerged between Hopewell and Petersburg it was not surprising to see Carson making a concerted effort to add such a program to the already established liberal arts component at Richard Bland.

At the joint meeting of the State Council of Higher Education and the William and Mary Board of Visitors in March, 1963, Paschall voiced his opinion to State Council Director, McFarlane that Richard Bland wanted to go on record as having requested sufficient money from the State to establish a vocational/technical program if the Governor's Commission on Vocational Education should recommend it. McFarlane indicated his willingness to support any of the State
colleges who were serving as branches of four-year colleges or universities so long as they sought to meet the educational needs of the local populace. He was not opposed to Richard Bland and Christopher Newport expanding their curriculum to meet vocational and technical needs, but he was not willing to pre-empt the work of the Governor's Commission on Vocational and Technical Education. The meeting ended in a stalemate with no decision being reached.\(^33\)

What had been the value of this joint meeting? Would the meeting be of future value to Richard Bland College? It may appear that it was good for Richard Bland to have gone on record in 1963 as being receptive to the idea of establishing a technically-oriented curriculum. In retrospect, however, it may now be concluded that this willingness to accept a technical curriculum would serve as a thorn in the side of the College when within two years major efforts were being made to incorporate Richard Bland into a newly proposed state-wide network of technical institutes. At this point in this early history it would be necessary for the College to rely entirely on its political supporters in order to retain its association with William and Mary and to initiate preliminary plans for possible escalation of the College to four-year status.

In 1963 and 1964, plans for the expansion of Richard Bland College seemed to be focused in three areas: (1) land acquisition; (2) establishment of a local advisory committee; (3) addition of a full-fledged technical curriculum.

---

\(^{33}\) Meeting of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in Virginia with the State Council of Higher Education, Meeting of 23 March 1963.
The first part of the plan related to the physical expansion of the College by way of land acquisition. Many of the basic physical needs of the College had been temporarily met with the renovation of buildings formally used by the Petersburg Training School. But, in 1963, it became apparent to Carson, Ernst, and Smith that it was time to seek acquisition of additional acreage from the Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals. Ernst presented a resolution to the Board of Visitors on 7 September which was designed to expand the 200 acre campus in Prince George County by acquiring an additional 512 acres across Johnson Road in Dinwiddie County. Ernst indicated that the State Hospital Board had declared this land as surplus property and that the College was in immediate need of suitable land for various athletic activities. He further cited the need to protect the College from encroachment from area developers as well as possible expansion of its own borders by the City of Petersburg. Carson was particularly concerned about future growth needs of the College and stated that much of the current property held by the Board contained land that was low and swampy and would thus pose a major financial outlay in order to drain. Ernst had mentioned Smith's recommendation that a group of people go directly to the Governor since it would be his responsibility to approve the transfer. This issue of land

---

35. Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 7 September 1963.
36. Ibid., Carson, Interview, op. cit.
37. Meeting of the Board of Visitors, op. cit.; Smith, Interview, op. cit.
acquisition remained a concern of the Board until 4 June 1964, when Governor A. S. Harrison, Jr. notified the State Hospital Board that an additional 512 acres was hereby transferred to the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in Virginia. This transfer resulted in a total of 712 acres being available to Richard Bland College and appeared to meet all future projected site needs for the institution.

The additional acreage had been obtained for Richard Bland because of the personal interest and political influence of such public figures as W. Roy Smith and Frank Ernst. Certainly Carson saw the need for expansion and Paschall viewed the acquisition as being of benefit to the William and Mary system, but it was Smith and Ernst who knew the appropriate political route to take in order to convince Governor Harrison to approve the transfer of land from one state agency to another. In this instance, politics was favorable to the College.

The second concern of the College which brought heated debate to the Board of Visitors centered around a resolution that was proposed by Ernst at a September, 1963 meeting of the Board of Visitors. Realizing the importance of maintaining continued local support for the College, Ernst felt that an advisory committee should be formed for Richard Bland. In fact, he suggested that W. Roy Smith, John Meade, Superintendent of Petersburg Public Schools, Charles Smith,

---

38Letter from A. S. Harrison, Jr., to the State Hospital Board, 4 June 1964.
Superintendent of Hopewell Public Schools, Judge Hunter Barrow of Dinwiddie, and Ernst become the initial members of such a body. It was the opinion of Ernst that the Committee could be of great assistance in advising Carson of local needs that might be met by the College. 39

An immediate negative reaction to Ernst's proposal came from several members of the Board who felt that the creation of an advisory committee was the first step toward separation from the parent institution. Recent unfavorable experiences with advisory committees at Richmond Professional Institute and at the Norfolk Division of William and Mary had apparently caused the opposing group to feel that an advisory committee at Richard Bland would pave the way for local political leaders to reduce the scope of the William and Mary branch college effort. The advisory board would assume powers it did not legally possess and thereby circumvent the Board as it made its own contacts in Richmond. It was obvious that to many Board members, the recent dissolution of The Colleges of William and Mary and resulting separation of Richmond Professional Institute and the Norfolk Division was a bitter blow to the prestige and political power-base of the College. They did not want a repeat performance in Petersburg nor did they wish to impose an advisory system on Christopher Newport. 40

Both Carson and two-year college Coordinator, Herrmann vigorously came to the defense of Ernst's proposal. Herrmann spoke about the

39 Meeting of the Board of Visitors, 7 September 1963,

40 Ibid.
differences between Richard Bland and William and Mary and that as a local, commuter college, Richard Bland needed lay advisory support. What better way was there to meet local needs than seeking advice from the leading citizens of the area? Further, local political leaders like Smith, Temple, and Gray who had considerable influence in Richmond, could bring vital financial support to the College if they were regularly informed first-hand of those needs. Make them feel that they are an integral part of the institution and they will be more likely to provide the kind of continued support so essential to the operation of the College was Herrmann's belief. Carson, too, stated that if for no other reasons than a monetary one, it would be beneficial to have legislators who knew the institution, and public school people who regularly made political contacts across the state, on such an advisory committee.41

It was Paschall who presented an alternative proposal which at least kept the issue from developing into a major confrontation among members of the Board. He advised the Board of the desirability of being able to seek advice and assistance from key people such as those proposed by Ernst, but that this could be accomplished:

...just as affectively without yet taking the formalized step of structuring a committee as such. With this informal understanding, it would leave Mr. Ernst free and Colonel Carson and myself, insofar as William and Mary would be concerned, to meet with these same four or five men informally and get them as community leaders to interpret the needs as they are felt to exist.42

41 Ibid.
42 Ibid.
The compromise suggested by Paschall seemed palatable to those Board members who were opposed to the idea of formally establishing an advisory committee for Richard Bland. As a result of his suggestion it seemed to be understood by all that when Carson, Ernst, Paschall or other leaders seek the advice of local political leaders they could do so on an informal basis. It might be queried at this point if the principle of appointing an advisory committee had been approved by the Board, would Richard Bland have been in a better position to have obtained the necessary support from the State Council and General Assembly to have established a large scale vocational/technical component to compliment its strong liberal arts offering without having to become a part of the soon-to-be established Community College System? Further, would an area-wide advisory committee that met regularly with college officials and selected members of the Board have been able to forestall objections from the black community when Richard Bland made its move to achieve four-year status? In fact, could have such a body been instrumental in assisting the College in becoming a four-year institution in 1966 when the Community College System was formalized and before there would have been an organized local civil rights objection to such a move? There is no real answer to any of these questions, but in retrospect it appears that there would have been a distinct advantage in Richard Bland having been able to expand its base of support in 1963 if the College would have been allowed to appoint such a committee. It was the responsibility of the Board of Visitors to oversee the operations of William and Mary and its branch
colleges, but except for Ernst and a few others at certain times, the Board as a whole, appeared primarily interested in promoting the welfare of the mother college. By the very fact that the branches had to appeal directly to the General Assembly for their financial support, is enough reason in itself to indicate that the Board of Visitors' priorities were well established.

The third and most controversial area of concern that faced Richard Bland in its formative years was the issue of who was to be responsible for development of a post-secondary program of vocational/technical education in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Numerous references have been made to this issue in this study. Supporters of Hopewell College toyed with the idea on numerous occasions but failed to capitalize on the city's available industrial resources. Other groups in Hopewell and in the surrounding area had continually expressed concern over the lack of available training facilities in the entire Southside Virginia area for those who wished to receive appropriate technical education. Legislators and members of various gubernatorial administrations had too called for a state-wide commitment by the Commonwealth to meet the growing needs of Virginia's industrial community. In fact, this had been one of Ernst's major objectives in his efforts to establish a two-year college in the Petersburg area. Thus, it was not surprising that with Ernst as a member of the Board of Visitors, and Chairman of the Board's Committee on Two-Year Colleges, Carson as Director of Richard Bland, and Smith as an active participant on Governor Harrison's Commission on Vocational
Education, that Paschall and the Board of Visitors became actively involved in recommending the kind of role that Richard Bland was to play in this movement.

At its regular meeting on 12 September 1964, the Board of Visitors heard a report from the Committee on Two-Year Colleges. The report contained a lengthy resolution which had been drafted by the Committee for the purpose of sending it to thirty-nine influential public figures and agencies in Southside Virginia and Richmond. Included on this list were: boards of supervisors, clerks, city managers, commonwealth and city attorneys, and city and county public school superintendents who were within commuting distance of Richard Bland. In addition, a copy of the Resolution was transmitted to area legislators, the State Council of Higher Education and the State Board of Technical Education.43

In drafting the Resolution the Committee intended to make clear its commitment to Richard Bland's responsibility of providing both technical and transfer programs for the citizens of Southside Virginia. In Ernst's view there had never been any question about this dual role for the College and he did not intend to stand by and let the College serve only the transfer constituency. Cited in the Resolution were references to resolutions of support from the City Councils of Colonial Heights (19 June 1962) and Petersburg (12 April 1962) and

43Meeting of the Board of Visitors, 12 September 1964.
the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County (4 May 1962). Each of these law-making bodies had requested "that The College of William and Mary implement technical education at Richard Bland College."  

Since 1962 Richard Bland had been involved in a nursing program with Petersburg General Hospital. The program was terminal in nature and represented the first tangible evidence of the College's willingness to serve the non-transfer oriented student. In addition, the College had, within its fiscal capabilities, been offering a limited number of terminal programs in business. It was the opinion of Ernst and his Committee that the General Assembly should now provide the additional funding necessary for Richard Bland to begin a full-fledged program of technical education to complement its already strong liberal arts program.

Had not the Commission on Vocational Education recommended the expansion of vocational/technical programs in as many existing two-year branch colleges as possible? Had not the General Assembly...
of the Commonwealth acted on the various recommendations of the Commission by establishing the State Board of Technical Education in 1964? Why then should not Richard Bland College be the logical recipient of many of those technical programs which were needed in Southside Virginia? This latter question was to be answered by 1966 but before resolution of the question, numerous politically-related activities were to take place.

Paschall sent a letter to the State Board of Technical Education that reaffirmed the role envisioned for Richard Bland in the technical area. This correspondence took place before the 12 September meeting of the Board, but after the report was drafted by the Two-Year Committee of the Board of Visitors. The reply of State Board Chairman Sydnor was couched in the usual political rhetoric when he stated:

> However, I am sure that you realize that the activities of the State Department of Technical Education are now in the process of formulation. Actually, the Director of the Department, Dr. Dana B. Hamel does not take office until September 1, and until he has had an opportunity to develop a well-planned program in the area of our responsibility, I imagine that our Board may find it desirable to defer a decision on the specific requests of various institutions and communities. This in no way indicates that requests of this nature are not well founded, and I am sure that the Board will be delighted to consider the facts that you bring to our attention regarding the need for technical education in Petersburg.

---


50 Letter from Davis Y. Paschall to Eugene B. Sydnor, Jr., 19 August 1964.

51 Letter from Eugene B. Sydnor, Jr., to Davis Y. Paschall, 26 August 1964.
Hamel responded to the Board of Visitors' Resolution supporting Richard Bland by enclosing a Resolution which had been passed by the Board of Technical Education on 28 August. The intent of the Resolution seemed to assure all interested parties across the State that both the Board and the Director were new and that it would take considerable time before they would affirm or deny Board requests from all the Commonwealth's branch colleges for a share of the technical education which was soon to become an integral part of Virginia's post-secondary educational commitment. Paschall's acknowledgement included the usual social amenities but reiterated the Board's interest in being an active part of the project technical movement.

Not to be deterred in his own efforts to expand the curricular offerings at Richard Bland, Herrmann presented a resolution to the Board of Visitors on 9 January 1965 which would authorize Paschall and Herrmann to prepare a formal letter of application to the State Department of Technical Education for the future inclusion of technical programs at Richard Bland.

Pursuant to the adoption of the Resolution, Paschall and Herrmann reiterated to Hamel that this was the second resolution to be passed by the Board of Visitors which indicated the willingness of the Board to allow Richard Bland to begin a series of technical offerings which

---

52 Letter from Dana B. Hamel to Davis Y. Paschall, 7 October 1964.
53 Letter from Davis Y. Paschall to Dana B. Hamel, 2 November 1964.
54 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 9 January 1965.
would be designed to meet local needs. Further political support was sought by the two William and Mary officials from eleven public officials representing eight Southside area subdivisions. It is of interest to note that one such recipient of a letter was Frank L. Wyche, Commonwealth Attorney for Prince George County, and President of the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation who opposed Richard Bland to be anything other than a liberal arts college.

Wyche, who was to become a strong supporter for the creation of John Tyler Community College, stated unequivocally that John Tyler was destined to fulfill the technical needs of the area. This opinion was to be shared by others in the region who were soon to use Wyche's industrial organization as a base from which they were to exert pressure on local and state political leaders. Hamel commented that Richard Bland never did possess the necessary support from the industrial community to have been able to obtain approval and funding for a technical program.

In May, 1965, as a result of the efforts of Carson to respond to the needs of local businessmen, Herrmann reported to the Board that Richard Bland wanted to begin a two-year terminal work-study program

---

55 Letter from Davis Y. Paschall and D. J. Herrmann to Dana B. Hamel, 12 January 1965.

56 Letter from Davis Y. Paschall and D. J. Herrmann to selected Southside Virginia Political Leaders, 5 February 1965.

57 Frank L. Wyche, Sr., interview held at the law office of Frank L. Wyche, Sr., Prince George County, Virginia. 17 July 1980.
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"...designed to prepare students for middle management, supervisory or specialized sales careers in retail, wholesale and service businesses."\textsuperscript{59}

The proposed program which was approved by the Board would include classroom and occupational experience and would be developed as a joint venture between the College and the Distributive Education Service of the State Department of Education. The program was not a major departure from the traditional liberal arts curriculum of Richard Bland, but it did show Carson's ability to react to pressure from the business community. In a broader sense, did it not show that Richard Bland, if appropriately funded, was anxious to expand its curriculum to accommodate a broader clientele? Was not the industrial community the next most logical recipient of the College's extended commitment to meet the needs of the citizenry?

At the same meeting of the Board, approval was given to the College to begin a training program for people in the insurance industry.\textsuperscript{60} Was the stage now set for the development of a full program in technical education at Richard Bland College?

In order to answer this question and to evaluate the reasons for Richard Bland remaining a branch of The College of William and Mary it is necessary to examine the political factors leading to the establishment of John Tyler Community College. It is important to show the

\textsuperscript{59} Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 8 May 1965.

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid.
role played by local political and industrial leaders in Southside Virginia. Further, there were decisions made at the state level which affected the development of higher education programs of a technical nature. These, too, deserve to be examined before drawing conclusions about why the Commonwealth chose to establish another two-year college in such close proximity to Richard Bland.

Political Factors Affecting the Establishment of John Tyler Community College and a Study of their Relationship to Richard Bland College 1965-1966.

Throughout Chapter II and in much of Chapter III there has been a concerted effort to demonstrate that there were numerous attempts made by several localities in Southside Virginia to bring to their respective area an institution of higher learning. Often the advocates of such endeavors were either unable or unwilling to unequivocally state and adhere to a common set of goals or objectives for their proposed institution. Many, too, seemed remiss in their efforts to obtain the necessary broad-base of political support so necessary to the long-range success of their operation. In Hopewell it was the Optimist Club and the University of Hopewell Foundation who sought to meet the city's post-secondary educational needs. In 1964 the University of Hopewell Foundation's Hopewell College venture came to a close. Much earlier the work of the Optimist Club had seen little success although some members of the group seemed encouraged by the founding of Richard Bland College in 1960.

There had been such men as Frank Ernst, John H. Temple, and W. Roy Smith in Petersburg who pressed for the creation of a two-year
college in the immediate vicinity of the city. Through their efforts and in particular their adroit political maneuvering, Richard Bland was established in 1960 as a branch of William and Mary. The Hopewell Optimist Club had served as a catalyst for the movement, but it was the political leadership of the aforementioned individuals that made it a reality.

Even with all of this movement and high-sounding rhetoric, there still was a missing component which appeared to be a link among all the major political subdivisions of Southside Virginia. What was this seemingly elusive thread which might well have brought together several localities? It was and had been from the middle of the 1950's the promise of a vocational/technical program for both the young people and the industrial worker. Technical education had not come to Hopewell College nor had it by 1965 reached the campus at Richard Bland even though the Board of Visitors had endorsed efforts made by leaders at the Board to seek approval for such a program of studies.

In this study there has been mentioned a number of the official actions which brought the issue of vocational/technical education to the forefront of higher educational thinking in the Commonwealth of Virginia. These official studies and recommendations related to technical education continued to receive attention from both local leaders and from the General Assembly. In 1966 the Virginia General Assembly appeared to resolve the issue by establishing John Tyler Community College as the technical school. The ultimate resolution had much to
do with events which transpired in Southside Virginia between 1964 and 1966. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to discussing these events as they apply to Richard Bland and to its emerging two-year rival, John Tyler Community College.

While the Board of Visitors at William and Mary was supporting Richard Bland's efforts in the technical area, Carson realized that if Richard Bland was to emerge the victor in the impending struggle, he must begin to accelerate his personal efforts to convince the local citizenry and state officials that the College was the logical site for such a program. He sought support from area public school superintendents in April, 1964 when he served as host for their Region I meeting. The topic discussed at the meeting was vocational education. In attendance at the session besides the superintendents were Temple, Ernst, Paschall, William H. McFarland (Director of the State Council of Higher Education), and George Sandwig (Director of the Division of Vocational Education for the State Department of Education). The invitation to come to the College was an obvious political move by Carson to influence educational decision-makers.

This meeting was soon followed by Carson extending an invitation to McFarlane to deliver the commencement address at the College. The appearance of McFarlane was significant because he was a member of

---

61 The Progress-Index, 20 April 1964.
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the Governor's Commission on Vocational Education and as Director of the State Council of Higher Education he could be an influential figure when final decisions were made on higher education's role in the field. This was not the first time that Carson was to invite well-known public personages to the campus. He viewed this practice as being essential to maintaining close political ties between those elements in society which could be of potential benefit to promote positive efforts for his institution. Throughout the remainder of 1964 the struggle in Southside Virginia for supremacy in the field of technical education at the post-secondary level continued to build toward a climax. Carson and his legislative supporters sought to influence decision-makers at the state level as well as conducting a campaign to mobilize various organizations and informal groups locally. The opposing forces were led by such local leaders as Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation President, Frank L. Wyche and Homer Eliades from Hopewell. The latter individual had continued to support the idea of bringing a two-year college to his home city even though his initial efforts at Hopewell College had been largely unsuccessful. Having been forced to abandon his liberal arts aspirations for the College, he sought to draw upon the available political potential of the area's industrial community.

What was the reason for the re-emergence of Eliades as a potential

---

63 The Progress-Index, 29 May 1964.
leader in 1964? Why did he and Wyche feel that the time was ripe for a joint effort to bring to the area a technical school at the post-secondary level?

The answer to these questions appears to lie in the official stance taken by the General Assembly of Virginia in its 1962 Regular Session when it created a Commission on Vocational and Technical Education\(^\text{64}\) which was soon followed in 1964 with the establishment of the State Board of Technical Education\(^\text{65}\). However, the impetus behind the accelerated political movements of Eliades, Wyche, and Carson came from Senate Joint Resolution Number 30 which directed "...the State Council of Higher Education to conduct a comprehensive study of objectives, needs and resources of higher education in the Commonwealth of Virginia.\(^\text{66}\)" The passage of Resolution Number 30 gave to the competing Southside political entities the incentive to marshall their efforts to bring a full-fledged and state-supported program of technical education to their respective constituencies.

Some evidence of support for Richard Bland being the site of a technical program was expressed in a Progress-Index editorial on 26 July 1964:


\(\text{\textsuperscript{66}}\) Ibid., p. 1158.
The question arises whether sufficient attention has been given to the possibility of locating it on the campus of Richard Bland College and making it a part of that institution. Richard Bland is a going and growing concern with the advantage of a large track of land which permits great expansion. There is no reason why it should have to remain a junior college in the present sense. It could be developed into a four-year college or even a university offering instruction of all kinds.67

In his efforts to keep before the public the diversity already incorporated in the curriculum of Richard Bland, Carson on 26 August presented his views on the need for the College to continue to expand its curricular base.68 He also brought to the campus in October, Fort Lee Commanding General, Hugh MacKintosh; Paschall; W. Melville Jones, Dean of Faculty at William and Mary; Ernst; local public school superintendents; Temple and Smith. In this setting and for this particular constituency, Paschall modified his usual exclusive liberal arts stance for Richard Bland when he emphasized the need for the College to be prepared to add a technical component to its traditional offerings.69

To counteract the emergence of support for Richard Bland and to foster a favorable impression for the Hopewell area's willingness to support a technical school, Eliades and his followers had begun an

energetic campaign designed to obtain assistance from the industrial community. The fruits of Eliades' efforts were soon forthcoming as copies of resolutions of support were sent to him from Robert R. Fohl, Director of Region 19, District 50 of the International Union of the United Mine Workers of America. Several of their local unions (Richmond Guano Company, Hyman Viener and Sons; Koppers Company, Incorporated; Hercules Powder Company; Firestone Synthetic Fibers Company; Titmus Optical Company, Incorporated; Virginia Carolina Chemical Division of Sacony Mobil Oil; Nitrogen Division of Allied Chemical Corporation; Continental Can Company of Hopewell; Glasspar Company; Fibers Division of Allied Chemical Corporation; V-C Chemical Corporation; and Coastal Industrial Contractors) had passed resolutions supporting the area for a technical school.70 A copy of the Resolution which had been composed by Eliades emphasized the large concentration of industry in the James and Appomattox River Basins and the corresponding need for trained technical personnel to hold positions of responsibility in those industries. The Resolution further specified that a construction site would be more centrally located to Richmond, Petersburg, and Hopewell if it was near State Route 10 adjacent to the Richmond-Petersburg Turnpike. Copies of the Resolutions were sent to the State Board of Technical Education, Governor Albertis S. Harrison and local state delegates and senators, and to

each political entity in the area. It is significant to note that these supporting industries were located in the cities of Richmond, Hopewell, Petersburg, and Colonial Heights, the latter three being the primary service area of Richard Bland College.

Coinciding with the letters of support being sought from the area's industrial unions, Eliades was working to obtain financial support and land from the Fibers Division of Allied Chemical Corporation. He was elated when word was received from V. A. Romito, Director of Operations for the Industry, that they would be willing to donate approximately thirty acres of land at their Bermuda Hundred site to the State if a technical institute would be built there. Eliades informed Senator Gray of the offer and indicated that Romito wanted to know by 30 October 1964 if the Department of Vocational and Technical Education would accept the offer. If they would, Romito wanted to make a public announcement of the deal at the corporation officer's meeting on that date. In fact, Romito suggested that he and the Governor provide a joint press release at that time.

It was Eliades' view that a joint announcement of the State's acceptance of the land would be a final blow to any chances that Richard Bland might have to acquire the technical program. In fact,

---
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by 9 October, he had obtained resolutions of support for a Route 10 site from the cities of Colonial Heights, Hopewell, and Petersburg and the Counties of Chesterfield, Prince George, and Surry. This information and the resolutions of support which had been adopted by the local unions had been sent to Hamel, the Director of the State Board of Technical Education. In his letter Eliades specifically mentioned the desirability of the school being located in the Bermuda Hundred Subdivision of Chesterfield County, adjacent to the City of Hopewell. Eliades indicated that he was particularly pleased with the offer of property from Allied Chemical and he hoped that the state would readily accept the property. He saw this potential location as being the fulfillment of part of his earlier objective for Hopewell College.

Throughout the Fall of 1964, Eliades and Gray continued their dialogue just as they had done in the early days of Hopewell College. In early December, Gray sent Eliades a copy of a letter he had received from C. Wesley Peebles, Sr., President and Treasurer of the Virginia and North Carolina Department Store chain. Peebles, a long-time friend and Southside Virginia political supporter of Gray, was a member of the State Board of Technical Education who had recently

---
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visited the site of a Greenville, South Carolina technical school. He advised Gray that he would be pleased to discuss with him his impressions of that visit "...and what would be best for the people in the Hopewell area to do to get a school." Peebles stated to Gray that "of course, what I tell you I would like for you to keep to yourself because being on the Board, I want to keep myself uncommitted at this time." 77

Gray recommended to Eliades that a group of supporters of the Hopewell technical movement should go to South Carolina to view for themselves the operation of the Greenville school. He further indicated that he would contact Hopewell industrialists whom he could count on for support. 79

In response to Gray, Eliades indicated his interest in following Gray's suggestions, but that he was more immediately concerned with the fact that Carson was requesting in the forthcoming 1966-1968 biennium "...$611,296.00 for the purposes of constructing a two-story technical education building and equipment at Richard Bland College." 80 Eliades asked Gray to discuss the matter with State Board of Technical Education Chairman, Sydnor as soon as possible. 81

77 Letter from C. Wesley Peebles, Sr. to Garland Gray, 7 December 1964.
78 Ibid.
79 Letter from Garland Gray to Homer C. Eliades, 8 December 1964.
80 Letter from Homer C. Eliades to Garland Gray, 9 December 1964.
81 Ibid.
Eliades appeared anxious to use whatever political force was available to thwart Carson's continued effort to bring the technical program to his school.\textsuperscript{82}

The support that was received from Gray had been complimented by the emergence of Hopewell Delegate to the General Assembly, C. Hardaway Marks. Marks, too, lent his assistance to the technical movement by sharing the stage with Eliades, Fohl, and other union officials at a meeting of District 50 members in Hopewell. "He (Marks) said in a short speech he had been interested in promoting the technical idea for the past five years."\textsuperscript{83} It thus appeared by the end of 1964 that the Hopewell area contingent had the upper hand in organizing support for their cause.

The month of January, 1965 was the most active and controversial period of the entire campaign to bring post-secondary technical education to the Greater Southside Virginia area. Throughout the month most of the political subdivisions engaged in debate over the issue. Local industry extending from Petersburg to Hopewell and from Chesterfield to Richmond expounded on their desire to be supportive of the idea of bringing technical education to the area. The Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation (ABIDC), under the leadership of Executive Director, J. J. O'Leary and the Corporation’s President, Frank L. Wyche, actively sought to establish the school in Chesterfield.

\textsuperscript{82}Richmond Times Dispatch, 3 December 1964.

\textsuperscript{83}The Hopewell (Va.) News, 21 October 1964.
County. Carson, with support emanating primarily from Smith and the William and Mary Board of Visitors, recommended Richard Bland as the logical choice for the school.

The month began with the Petersburg City Council hearing a request from the City's Chamber of Commerce recommending the use of Richard Bland as the site for the technical program.\textsuperscript{84} The same night Hamel advised the Federated Women's Club of Petersburg that it might be necessary for two technical schools to be built in the area. He said that one should probably be located in Richmond, while the other one would serve the Petersburg, Colonial Heights, Hopewell triangle. He cited industrial expansion and local financial support as being the keys to determining the location of the schools.\textsuperscript{85}

On 12 January, the Hopewell City Council and the Prince George Board of Supervisors endorsed the Chesterfield County site that had been offered by Allied Chemical Corporation. While Prince George did not indicate the amount of support, Hopewell's financial commitment for the endeavor was in the amount of $150,000.00. At a meeting on the same evening, the Petersburg Jaycees heard Carson, Smith, and Wyche debate the question of location for the technical program. Smith endorsed Richard Bland because of its already existing physical facilities and complimentary liberal arts curriculum while Wyche saw the College as being on the fringe of the industrial community.

\textsuperscript{84}Richmond Times Dispatch, 6 January 1965.

\textsuperscript{85}Ibid.
Carson stressed the value of developing a comprehensive program at his institution and thus saving the taxpayers money which would have to be spent at a completely new facility. The Jaycees agreed with Smith and Carson and unanimously endorsed the Richard Bland site.\textsuperscript{87}

At the 12 January meeting of the Hopewell City Council Vice Mayor Elmo M. Parr severely criticized the move by Carson to bring the technical school to Richard Bland. Having been a member of a team representing the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation who had recently visited a technical school in Greenville, South Carolina, Parr accused Carson of presuming to know more about the components of a technical program than the various plant managers who preferred a separate facility in Chesterfield County. In an apparent emotional appeal, Parr further accused the City of Petersburg of always trying to intimidate Hopewell, even to the extent of not supporting the city's attempt to build a bridge across the Appomattox River. Mayor Harold A. Butterworth of Hopewell also denounced the move to have the technical program placed at Richard Bland. Butterworth, Parr, and Eliades all spoke against the localities having to put up money for the school, but agreed that since it was required, they would comply.\textsuperscript{88} Again one can observe the apparent long-standing political animosities that existed between Petersburg and Hopewell. Meeting the educational needs of the citizenry was important so long as it did not interfere with territorial preferences held by the political leaders.

\textsuperscript{87}The Progress-Index, 13 January 1965; Richmond Times Dispatch, 13 January 1965.

\textsuperscript{88}The Hopewell (Va.) News, 13 January 1965.
Further backing of the Bermuda Hundred site came from the Chesterfield County Board of Supervisors when they pledged a $225,000.00 contribution to the project. Their major stipulation was that in order to receive the money it would be necessary to build the school in their county. If Richard Bland was chosen the pledge would be withdrawn. Mayors Arlie Andrews and Aubrey Lucas of Petersburg and Colonial Heights respectively announced that their governing bodies would withhold final judgment until later in the month.89

Carson sought to stem the tide against those who opposed Richard Bland by stating that there would be numerous cost-saving factors if his college was chosen. Chief among them was the need for students enrolled in technical programs to also be able to include certain liberal arts and science courses in their curriculum. Further, these same students should have the option of switching to a baccalaureate degree program if they so chose to do so.90

The debate continued at the 19 January meeting of the Petersburg City Council where Smith stressed the flexibility of the Richard Bland curriculum and the savings that would accrue by eliminating unnecessary duplication in staffing and classroom space. Wyche expressed the belief of ABIDC when he cited the need for a technical facility near the heart of the industrial community. No formal action

89 The Progress-Index, 14 January 1965.

90 Richmond Times Dispatch, 17 January 1965; Carson, interview, op. cit.
An editorial in *The Hopewell News* strongly supported the Chesterfield site for the technical school and openly criticized Smith:

> On any side the coin is turned it shows the Chesterfield site merits the support of state officials; support that has already come from officials in Prince George, Hopewell and Chesterfield, where more than $400,000 has been pledged for the construction of a school on land offered free by Allied Chemical Corporation. When speaking before Petersburg City Council Tuesday night, Del. W. Roy Smith of Petersburg was quoted as saying Bland would clearly have an advantage over a separate technical institute because the general and liberal education courses are already established there. True, but are we talking about general and liberal education courses? Or, are we resolved to provide the best vocational training for those students in the tri-city area who are not inclined toward the liberal arts, who are in need of concentrated training in skills, who are in a hurry to become wage earners?  

On 21 January, Eliades, in a letter to the editor, expressed his view that it was now up to the State Board of Technical Education to accept the local site. He stated:

> This Bermuda site has piled up the impressive support of all the major industries in the area. Labor has endorsed it publicly, numerous business and professional people have been counted, the governing bodies of the area have also gone on record for this site. Who else then is there left to endorse this location?

In a major effort to bring all the localities together, Wyche

---
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and the ABIDC called for a public meeting to be held on 21 January at the Colonial Heights Junior High School. The principle speaker was Preston S. Marchant, past chairman of the Greenville, South Carolina Technical Education Board and Chairman of Building Committee of Greenville Technical Education Center. Prior to his introduction of Marchant, Wyche made clear his position on the proposed technical school and Richard Bland College when he said:

You have seen and heard through the news media that there is an apparent conflict of interest between the Technical Center we have in mind and the two-year community liberal arts college, and specifically, Richard Bland College, located in Prince George County. Please let me state at this time, finally and definitely, that Appomattox Basin and the governing bodies in this area, have no desire or intention to establish a Technical Center in conflict with, or in competition to, the liberal arts or scientific program offered its students in the Arts and Sciences by Richard Bland College. All of us are proud of the achievements of Richard Bland College and we wish it every continued success as a liberal arts college, to the ultimate goal of the establishment there of a four-year college offering degrees in the Arts and Sciences. It is our intention, however, to exert our best efforts to establish in the southern area of Chesterfield County a Technical Center on the "college level," offering technical courses for semi-professional workers, special training for specific job opportunities, trade courses, emphasizing up-grading of skills, and adult training in the general fields of learning along with instruction to keep employees abreast of technological changes in their fields of work, or to prepare them for new occupations, all within the policies and prescribed procedures of the State Board of Technical Education and under the supervision and direction of this Board. It is our firm and earnest belief that the program offered at such a Technical Center and the courses offered at Richard Bland College will not conflict, but will complement and implement each other.

Wyche strongly defended the position of separating the technical and liberal arts schools, but attempted to ameliorate the strained relations which existed between the opposing sides. In doing so, he sought to gain the support of the Petersburg and Colonial Heights city fathers for the funding of the technical school while praising Richard Bland for its work in the liberal arts field. It was an adept political move that was destined to achieve success for him.

As might be expected Marchant spoke in favor of separating the technical and liberal arts educational components as he saw a difference between a liberal arts college and his conception of a technical center.

In a special session of Council, the City of Petersburg neither pleased nor angered local technical school proponents when they provided financial assistance for support of a technical education facility. Their preference was the site at Richard Bland as they endorsed the position taken previously by the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary. However, they agreed to accept whatever site that was chosen by the State Board of Technical Education.

Between 19 and 26 January, Wyche and O'Leary attempted to influence the decision of the Board of Technical Education by means

95 The Progress-Index, 22 January 1965.
96 Ibid.
of soliciting letters of support from twenty-four industries in the area. Each expressed their views on specific courses they felt were needed for their particular plant and the majority endorsed a Chesterfield County site for the school. Those responding were Tredegar Company, Laras and Brother Company, Inc.; The Paperboard and Kraft Paper Division of Continental Can Company; The Cardwell Machine Company; Remmie Arnold Pen Company, Inc.; Nitrogen Division of Allied Chemical Corporation; Fibers Division of Allied Chemical Corporation; U.S. Filter Corporation; Firestone Synthetic Fibers Company; KEL-WIN Manufacturing Company, Inc.;
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(Shirley was Executive Secretary of the Hopewell Chamber of Commerce and a strong advocate of the Chesterfield County site).
Corporation. Of these twenty-four industries, none mentioned the Richard Bland site while fourteen specifically endorsed a convenient site in Chesterfield County. From the series of positive responses received from the industrial community, Wyche and his supporters were further buoyed by the receipt of formal endorsements for the Bermuda Hundred site by the Boards of Supervisors of Charles City and Dinwiddie Counties and from the City of Colonial Heights. All local political subdivisions except Petersburg had now specifically accepted the position held by Eliades and Wyche. Even Petersburg had stated that they would abide by the decision of the State Board of Technical Education.

Wyche immediately sent to Hamel copies of all the letters and resolutions of endorsement and asked for his support when the State Board of Technical Education made its final decision. He also included the results of a student survey taken from the area's graduates of secondary schools in 1964 in which he noted a positive interest in the project. M. W. Burnett, Executive Secretary of the County of Chesterfield supplemented Wyche's data with an endorsement of his own for the Chesterfield County site.

121 Letter from Archibald Robertson, Jr. to J. J. O'Leary, 26 January 1965.
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During the next several weeks the various Southside area political subdivisions awaited word from the State Board of Technical Education as to the selection of a site for the technical program. Throughout the period, Director Hamel investigated the various sites which had been recommended for consideration. Even with the offer of free land, water and sewage facilities from the Allied Chemical Corporation site at Bermuda Hundred, Hamel indicated that he had not ever viewed that site as being a serious contender for the school. His rationale was based on two major deficiencies of that location. First, there was insufficient acreage as the minimum standard which has been set by the State Board of Technical Education was fifty acres. Secondly, he did not view the location as one that was easily accessible to major highways such as Routes 1-301 and Interstate 95. Neither did he view Richard Bland with its liberal arts curriculum and geographical location as being an appropriate institution for a major technical endeavor. Further, Richard Bland did not have the endorsement of the industrial community whose full support was essential to the success of the venture.\footnote{126Dana B. Hamel, interview, 27 October 1980.}

In order to establish a firm basis for the final selection of a site for the school, the State Board of Technical Education had appointed a steering committee from the Southside political subdivisions. Included among the participants at the first meeting of the
local committee and who were asked to recommend a site were Harold Goyne of Chesterfield County, Louis Shirley of Hopewell, and Frank L. Wyche. By the composition of the sub-committee on site selection, it appeared obvious that the subcommittee would probably endorse a Chesterfield County site since Wyche and Shirley had already expressed their preference for one in that locality.

On 5 May, Hamel, Sydnor, and Wyche announced at a press conference held at the Virginia State Capitol in Richmond that a ninety-three acre site near the intersection of Interstate 95 and Route 10 would soon be purchased. Rationale for the selection of this site rested primarily on the basis of accessibility for the greatest number of potential students.

There was an immediate negative reaction from members of the Hopewell community as they could not understand why the gift from Allied Chemical Corporation was not accepted by the State Board of Education. The land was free and there was the promise that additional acreage might become available if the thirty acres was determined to be insufficient. Mayor Butterworth of Hopewell did indicate that the city would still honor its financial commitment to the proposed institution. Eliades, too, expressed disbelief that the

---

127 The Progress-Index, 12 April 1965.
128 Ibid., 5 May 1965; Richmond Times Dispatch, 6 May 1965.
129 Richmond Times Dispatch, 6 May 1965.
Bermuda Hundred site had been rejected. It was evident that his personal stake in the idea of bringing a college to the city had been dashed. In conversations with Eliades, one could still observe his keen disappointment, although he indicated his willingness to support wholeheartedly the new site.\textsuperscript{130}

In the adjacent localities there was also concern over the rejection of free land which would in turn necessitate the spending of additional tax dollars for the new acreage. In Colonial Heights, Mayor Aubrey L. Lucas expressed concern over not only the loss of land but the forfeiture of sewage and water privileges. In Dinwiddie, Board of Supervisor's Chairman A. Mitchell Smith, was dismayed, but pledged the County's support for the venture. Surry County officials preferred the Bermuda Hundred site because of its close proximity to the County, but advised that they would still adhere to the decision of the State Board of Technical Education.\textsuperscript{131}

What was the reaction of Richard Bland supporters to the decision? Smith felt that considerable duplication of administrative costs could have been saved if Richard Bland had been chosen. He further viewed the opportunity for students to move from a technical curriculum to one emphasizing the liberal arts as being an advantage. However, he hoped that the localities would back up the judgment that was rendered.\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{130}Eliades, interview, 29 May 1980.

\textsuperscript{131}Richmond Times Dispatch, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{132}Ibid.; W. Roy Smith, interview held at the home of W. Roy Smith, Petersburg, Virginia. 3 June 1980.
The immediate reaction of Carson to the selection of the Chesterfield County site was one of disappointment. Since Richard Bland College had received approval from the Board of Visitors of William and Mary for funding for the construction of a technical building during the 1966-1968 biennium they met with the Governor’s budget advisory committee in an effort to revise the construction requests during the ensuing six-year period. As a result of the meeting, plans for the technical building were deleted and the request for a liberal arts and science facility was moved back from the 1968-1970 biennium to the 1966-1968 period. Carson felt betrayed by certain members of the industrial community and by their supporters in the Hopewell area. He apparently viewed Eliades as a formidable foe who helped turn the Hopewell industrial leaders against him. From the conversation with Carson it may be further conjectured that the emergence of Richard Bland at a time when Hopewell College was in its infancy resulted in animosities that were not to be forgotten by either man. Carson may also have felt that Wyche as President of the Appomattox Basin Industrial and Development Corporation, used his influence among industrial leaders to keep Richard Bland from obtaining the technical program. Wyche stated clearly that his efforts to bring a technical college to the area had nothing to do with his feelings toward either Hopewell or Richard Bland. He wanted to attract

133 The Progress-Index, 27 May 1965.
134 Ibid., 27 May 1965; Carson, interview, op. cit.
135 Carson, interview, op. cit.
industry to the area and unless a school for the training of personnel was available he did not see that goal being fulfilled. It was not a case of being for or against Richard Bland, rather it was his job to assist in determining the most centrally-located site that was available.\textsuperscript{136} During the remainder of 1965, plans for the construction of the technical college in Chesterfield continued to be developed. Since it is not the intention in this paper to discuss factors which did not measurably affect Richard Bland College only a cursory view of John Tyler Community College's embryonic period is discussed. It should be noted, however, that the site which had been recommended by the State Board of Technical Education in May, 1965, did not become the permanent location for the College. One of the members of the Chesterfield County Board of Supervisors, Harold T. Goyne, Sr. donated in 1965 to the Commonwealth of Virginia, a site in excess of forty-one acres. The Goyne site was located on a tract of land in Chesterfield County which fronted on both the Richmond-Petersburg Turnpike (Interstate 95) and United States Routes 1-301. The additional acreage necessary to meet State Board of Technical Education requirements was also purchased for the school.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{136}Wyche, interview, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{137}Letter from Dana B. Hamel to Irvin G. Horner, 26 May 1965 (Horner was Chairman of the Chesterfield County Board of Supervisors); Letter from Eugene B. Sydnor, Jr. to Mr. and Mrs. Harold T. Goyne, 2 June 1965; Letter from Eugene B. Sydnor, Jr. to Irvin G. Horner, 2 June 1965; Letter from Dana B. Hamel to Frank L. Wyche, 4 June 1965; Minutes of the Chesterfield Region Technical College, Meeting of 2 December 1965; The Progress-Index, 7 January 1966; Hamel, interview, op. cit.; John Tyler Community College Catalog: 1967-1968. Chester, Virginia: John Tyler Community College, 1967, p. 7.
Prior to the naming of the technical school, the Board of Trustees met under the auspices of the Chesterfield Region Technical College. At its first meeting Hamel presided and concurrently announced that he had been appointed Acting President by the State Board of Technical Education. Officers were elected at this initial meeting and it is significant to note that Wyche became Chairman of the Board and Eliades assumed the position of Chairman of Public Information.138

Both of these men were to play active roles in the ensuing years at Richard Bland College. Other trustees who had or were to become closely associated with Richard Bland College were John D. Meade (Superintendent of the Petersburg Public Schools) and Elmon Gray (son of State Senator Garland Gray, who was to succeed his father as a Senator in the Virginia General Assembly).139

On 2 December 1965, the Board of Trustees voted unanimously to name the College in honor of John Tyler, the tenth President of the United States. Tyler had been closely associated with each of the six counties which comprised the service area of the college and had been born in Charles City County, Virginia, one of the counties to be served. A press release of the Trustee's decision

---

138 Minutes of the Board of Trustees of the Chesterfield Region Technical College, Meeting of 7 October 1965.

139 Ibid.
for the name of the College was held pending approval by the State Board of Technical Education. The approval came on 7 January 1966 with the announcement that the institution would be called John Tyler Technical College.

What effect did the establishment of John Tyler have on the development of Richard Bland College? The establishment of the College seemed to indicate that Richard Bland would remain a two-year liberal arts branch of The College of William and Mary. With its hopes of adding a technical component now apparently eliminated and with the generally accepted fact that the secondary schools would continue to graduate increasing numbers of potential students, the future of the College still seemed bright with promise. Might it even be possible to consider the possibility of expanding its transfer-oriented curriculum beyond two years? Would there be a demand for Richard Bland to become a baccalaureate degree-granting institution? Had not the Richmond and Norfolk branches of The College of William and Mary become independent four-year institutions?

In concluding this Chapter it must be said that politics played the major role in helping Richard Bland College to become a liberal arts center. The problems dealing with dismantling of The Colleges of William and Mary and the ensuing reorganization movement; the

---

140 Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Meeting of 2 December 1965.

141 The Hopewell (Va.) News, 7 January 1965; The Progress-Index, 7 January 1965.
apparent conflict between Paschall and Chandler and its effect on
the branch in Petersburg; the difficulties associated with the acqui-
sition of additional land; the reluctance of the Board of Visitors
of The College of William and Mary to allow Richard Bland to have
a local advisory committee; and the major struggle over the proposed
addition of a technical component to the curriculum of the branch
college, all were determined by the interplay of politics some of
which is marked by industrial interests at the local and state level.
It did not appear that any time during these early years that the art
of politics was not the major factor in determining any of these
decisions that were made.

The answers to the questions about the future of Richard Bland
will continue to be based on factors of a political nature. In
Chapter IV an attempt is made to identify the political factors
that affected Richard Bland from 1967 to 1972. Since there was a
major change in 1966 in the curricular structure of John Tyler Techni-
cal College it is necessary to continue to describe its effect on
Richard Bland. However, the majority of the discussion in Chapter
IV will center on the political factors which resulted in the move-
ment to escalate Richard Bland to four-year status. This final phase
of this study involves the relationship that existed between Richard
Bland College to nearby Virginia State College.
CHAPTER IV

POLITICAL FACTORS AFFECTING THE GROWTH OF RICHARD BLAND COLLEGE
FROM 1967 TO 1972

Introduction

A discussion of the political factors affecting the growth of Richard Bland College from 1967 to 1972 comprises the majority of this chapter. It is necessary at the beginning of the chapter to illustrate how a major policy change at the state level altered the curriculum at John Tyler Technical College and in doing so affected the future educational role of Richard Bland. This change in the status of John Tyler coincides with the beginnings of a movement by certain public officials to begin a long-range plan of changing Richard Bland from a two-year to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution.

The chapter includes an examination of the factors underlying the movement toward escalation to a four-year institution and, in particular, emphasizes the role played by politics in that movement. Of special significance is the opposition to the escalation by certain members of the Petersburg community who felt that if Richard Bland was allowed to move to four-year status, then efforts to desegregate the largely black Virginia State College would be obstructed. The results of this struggle by the supporters of Richard Bland to add upper division work culminating in a bachelor's degree
did have profound and far-reaching effects on the eventual mission of that institution.

What role did The College of William and Mary play in this movement? Did the death of Ernst in December 1966 leave a vacuum on the Board of Visitors which was not so easily filled by a strong Richard Bland proponent? Was the Board of Visitors more susceptible to the political pressures exerted by the Tidewater supporters of Christopher Newport than by those in Petersburg? Is this the reason Christopher Newport received approval for escalation prior to Richard Bland? What role did Carson, Paschall, and Smith play in this scenario?

The study concludes with an examination of a judicial decision which resulted in Richard Bland being prohibited from escalation to four-year status in spite of having received the blessing of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth.

The Emergence of John Tyler as a Comprehensive Community College and the Movement of Richard Bland College to Four-Year Status

The change of the mission of John Tyler to become not only a technical school but also liberal arts began in 1964, when the General Assembly of Virginia authorized Governor Harrison to appoint a Commission on Higher Education whose purpose was "...to conduct a comprehensive study of objectives, needs and resources of higher education in the Commonwealth of Virginia."\(^1\) The Director of the study, John Dale Russell, and his staff recommended a number of comprehensive changes for the Commonwealth, but for the purposes of this study, two

---

appear particularly relevant to the development of Richard Bland College during the mid to late 1960's. It was recommended that:

The development of a state-wide system of comprehensive community colleges be encouraged and promoted, and the system of community colleges be coordinated with the remainder of the publicly controlled program of higher education in Virginia by the State Council of Higher Education.2

The second specific recommendation that was to affect Richard Bland was that:

Steps be taken as soon as possible to transfer the two-year branches of the State Higher institutions, the post-high school area-vocational school programs, and the two-year technical colleges to the Community College and Technical Education Board.3

These recommendations which were contained in the report on Two-Year Colleges, if accepted eventually by the General Assembly, would have resulted in major changes in the curriculum and mission of Richard Bland College. The affiliation of Richard Bland with The College of William and Mary would be dissolved and the College would apparently develop the same type of educational program as John Tyler. The area would then possess identical state-supported two-year colleges located within fifteen miles of each other.

At the 14 January 1966 meeting of the Board of Visitors of The

---

2A. J. Brumbaugh, The Two-Year College in Virginia: Staff Report #4, Richmond, Virginia: Commonwealth of Virginia, Virginia Higher Education Study Commission, 1965, p. 5 (Brumbaugh was a consultant from the Southern Regional Education Board who wrote this particular report. John Dale Russell was the Director of the Study).

3Ibid., p. 7.
College of William and Mary, the matter was discussed at some length. It was brought out that the Higher Education Study Commission in its detailed recommendations had excluded George Mason of the University of Virginia and Christopher Newport from the list of institutions that it felt should become a part of the proposed new state-wide system. The exemption of these two institutions caused Carson and Ernst to think that if enough political pressure could be brought to bear on the General Assembly, then Richard Bland might also be excluded. Paschall appeared to be reluctant to modify the Commission's recommendations, thus favoring retention of Richard Bland as a two-year institution. Paschall feared that Tidewater supporters of Christopher Newport would think that the Board of Visitors did not want to retain the institution. The reverse would be true if the opposite view were taken. Circumventing a true decision on the matter, Paschall convinced the Board of Visitors to adopt a statement:

...which purports to say that the Board of Visitors at its meeting on January 14, 1966, assessed the matter carefully, but in view of the brief time that it has had advantage of the availability of the Commission's report it did not feel that it could take a position without further study.4

This was an easy decision for the Board of Visitors and reflected their unwillingness either to support or to oppose the recommendation. It appears that they should have endorsed Christopher Newport's

4Minutes of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Meeting of 14 January 1966.
exemption and rejected the omission of Richard Bland from that exempt category. *Richmond Times Dispatch* reported that Paschall would consider the reaction of the Petersburg area to the Higher Education Study Commission's report prior to recommending a course of action to the Board of Visitors. 

Carson, Ernst, and Smith began immediately a local campaign among the various political subdivisions in an effort to enlist opposition from both the citizenry and area political leaders. Mayors Arlie G. Andrews (Petersburg) and Harold A. Butterworth (Hopewell) and Vice-Mayor E. Webster Andrews (Colonial Heights) responded by expressing support for Richard Bland College to remain as a part of William and Mary. Andrews and Butterworth hoped that Richard Bland would be able to expand its liberal arts offerings to the four-year level. At a dinner held at the Fort Lee Officer's Club for Richard Bland staff and faculty, Paschall indicated that he could see Richard Bland better serving its constituency by expanding beyond the two-year level. While in the presence of the Richard Bland faculty and staff he appeared to be more resolute than he had been at the recent Board of Visitors meeting. Certainly politics must have played an important role in his words of encouragement to Richard Bland College. Paschall was quoted in *The Progress-Index* as saying:

---


But we cannot forget our rural sections and if we can bring it together - Southside Virginia - we can lift the sights of education in this area of the state. With Richard Bland and a technical college, this area can become a citadel of learning.

At a time when Paschall was apparently committing William and Mary to a policy of retaining its two remaining branches, Virginia Polytechnic Institute through its Executive Committee of the Board of Visitors, agreed to turn over control of its branches in Covington-Clifton Forge, Wytheville, Roanoke, and Danville to a new statewide board. They further expressed a desire to see the colleges retain a strong technical component. Expressions of support came to Richard Bland from area localities. The Hopewell School Board passed a resolution favoring the College being retained as a branch of William and Mary. Charles W. Smith, Superintendent of Schools, felt that removing the College from the parent institution would thwart the efforts being made to bring it to a four-year status. City Councils in Petersburg and Colonial Heights also favored retention of the College under the supervision of William and Mary. Even the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Authority through Wyche strongly advocated Richard Bland to remain as a part of William and Mary. It seems ironic that this organization which had been so opposed to Richard Bland receiving the technical program, now praised the College for its liberal arts curriculum. The Authority would have probably agreed with The Progress-Index editorial that viewed

---

7 The Progress-Index, 17 January 1966; Richmond Times Dispatch, 17 January 1966.
8 The Progress-Index, 18 January 1966.
9 Ibid., 19 January 1966.
the continued association of Richard Bland with The College of William and Mary as providing both prestige and transferability to those from the area who attended the school. It appears that the proposed technical curriculum to be offered by John Tyler would meet one of the needs of the citizenry while the liberal arts offerings at Richard Bland could provide the other.

In his continued effort to support Richard Bland, Delegate Smith, in a letter to the Petersburg City Council, advocated support for the state-wide system, but strongly endorsed an exemption for Richard Bland from that system. Smith stated that he saw the College becoming a four-year institution with a student population in excess of 2500 students.

Thus, at the time when plans were being made to incorporate Richard Bland within the proposed new state-wide system of two-year colleges, the institution's chief advocate in the General Assembly was thinking ahead to the day when the College would attain baccalaureate degree-granting status. It appeared at this point in the life of the College that considerable marshalling of the political forces would be needed if this escalation were to occur. As an active member and future Chairman of the powerful House Appropriations Committee, it might be surmised that Smith was in possession of a considerable amount of that political power. A copy of his

10 Ibid.

11 The Progress-Index, 1 February 1966; W. Roy Smith, interview held at the home of W. Roy Smith, Petersburg, Virginia. 3 June 1980.
intentions for Richard Bland was sent to Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr.\textsuperscript{12}

The results of Smith's letter to the Governor soon became apparent when Godwin sent to the General Assembly his recommendations on the establishment of a state-wide system of two-year community colleges. In the version of the bill submitted by Godwin, Richard Bland was omitted from the system. In his efforts to garner widespread support for his position which would exempt Richard Bland, Smith voted for the adding of Clinch Valley College (a branch of the University of Virginia in Wise County) to a bill which would establish George Mason (a branch of the University of Virginia in Fairfax County) as a future four-year institution.\textsuperscript{13} The political logrolling had begun and would not end until a considerable number of special interest groups had been heard.

It is significant that the Governor's presentation to the General Assembly included a major change for the two-year state system of colleges. In his version of the identical bill which was introduced in both houses, the Governor called for a system of comprehensive community colleges. This meant that the colleges within the system would offer a liberal arts and science transfer program as well as the technical one earlier envisioned.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12}Smith, interview.

\textsuperscript{13}The Progress-Index, 4 February 1966.

\textsuperscript{14}Richmond Times Dispatch, 4 February 1966.
Mary Cherry Allen of The Progress-Index, in an interview with Carson, reported his elation at Richard Bland not being mentioned in the new proposal. Carson reiterated his belief that if Richard Bland could plan for four-year status that he could see no reason for conflict to exist between his institution and that of John Tyler.  

During the first two weeks in February, there was furious reaction from all quarters of the Commonwealth over Godwin's proposed plan. Impassioned pleas to retain Patrick Henry, the two-year branch of the University of Virginia, at Martinsville, came from Delegate A. L. Philpott and Senator William F. Stone. Cries of protest also came from Roanoke and the Eastern Shore as well. In fact, Stone lobbied on behalf of a grandfather clause that would allow sponsoring four-year institutions to decide which branches they wanted to keep and which ones would be allowed to function within the new two-year system.  

On 9 February, the House Education Committee rejected an attempt to include Richard Bland in the proposed community college system. Smith and D. French Slaughter (former Chairman of the Commission on Vocational Education and a personal friend of Smith) of Culpeper:  

---

15 The Progress-Index, 7 February 1966.  
lead the drive to defeat a bill by Del. George J. Kostel of Clifton Forge who sought to include Bland and Danville Community College in the proposed system. Those two institutions plus Clinch Valley College, later voted a four-year facility, were deleted when the bill was offered by Del. Slaughter on February 3.

It is important to note that Smith appeared to possess tremendous influence among his colleagues in the General Assembly. In an interview with him, one could feel his ability to understand the necessity of using the political process in dealing with fellow legislators and with the Governor. His influence especially among members of the House Education Committee and the House Appropriation's Committee, served to point out this sense of timing. Could he have advised the Governor that he might not support funding of the Chief Executive's comprehensive plan if Richard Bland was included in the bill? A possible answer to this question may be found in a Richmond Times Dispatch news release which held that:

Godwin admitted, however, that in order to secure sufficient support of the legislation in the Assembly, it was necessary to compromise by exempting three colleges from the system.

Of course Godwin was referring to Richard Bland of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Clinch Valley College of the University of Virginia, and Danville Community College of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. It is more than ironic that one branch

---

17 The Progress-Index, 9 February 1966.
18 Richmond Times Dispatch, 10 February 1966.
college from the three sponsoring institutions in the state should each be able to retain one of their branches.

Prince Woodward, former Director of the Council of Higher Education, who along with the Council had recommended Richard Bland's inclusion in the newly proposed system of community colleges, stated that Smith personally saw to it that Bland remained a branch of William and Mary. "The concern, interest and political power of Roy Smith was the prime factor behind Richard Bland's success." 19 Hamel, too gave Smith substantial credit for keeping Richard Bland out of the community college system as he confirmed Smith's desire to move the College to four-year status in the near future. 20 Carson viewed Smith as Richard Bland's benefactor at that time in the life of the College. 21 Thus, it was at a crucial period in the life of the College that there appeared another individual who demonstrated his willingness to use his political influence on behalf of the school. In this instance, it was W. Roy Smith who assisted in the development of a compromise solution to the original recommendations of the Higher Education Study Commission. This compromise and ensuing recommendation of the Governor resulted in Richard Bland being excluded from the bill that was eventually approved by the General Assembly.

19 Prince Woodward, interview via telephone, Petersburg, Virginia, 10 July 1980.

20 Dana B. Hamel, interview held at Richard Bland College, Petersburg, Virginia. 27 October 1980.

House Bill 333 repealed those sections of the Code of Virginia which had created the State Board of Technical Education and the Department of Technical Education. The Bill further amended:

...the Code of Virginia by adding in Title 23 thereof a chapter numbered 16 including sections numbered 23-214 through 23-231, creating a Department of Community Colleges and a State Board for Community Colleges, prescribing their powers and duties, and providing for the establishment and maintenance of a state-wide system of comprehensive community colleges.\[^{22}\]

It may have appeared to the casual observer that Richard Bland was well on its way to becoming a four-year institution. Certainly the groundwork had been laid by Smith, but many obstacles were yet to be recognized by the supporters of the Colleges. Being excluded from House Bill 333 did not mean that the road toward escalation would be an easy one.

What position did the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary finally take regarding the sponsorship of Richard Bland and Christopher Newport? As previously discussed in this chapter, it had decided to wait until its February meeting to make a determination on the matter. In fact, at that meeting which coincided with a meeting of the General Assembly, the Board of Visitors

still appeared reluctant to take a definitive position on the matter. A statement of policy that had been prepared by Paschall represented a rather lukewarm endorsement for both the branch colleges. He was keenly aware of the projected cost of the proposed new statewide system of community colleges and of anticipated increases necessary to escalate Clinch Valley and George Mason. In a draft of Paschall's statement it seemed that he intended to protect, first, the expansion interests of the parent campus at the expense of the interests of the branch colleges. Addressing himself to the projected cost of escalation in such areas as library resources, faculty additions, and new course offerings, Paschall asked the Board of Visitors to convey to the General Assembly their willingness to continue its stewardship relationship to the branch colleges if that be the will of the legislative body.23

This, indeed, did not represent an enthusiastic statement of support by Paschall, but seemed intended to placate rather than to encourage the branches. A portion of the statement which was adopted by the Board of Visitors emphasized that point:

The Board feels, therefore, that any legislation purporting to bring either, or both, of these two colleges to a four-year, degree-granting [sic] level should avoid specifying a time period for the same, but leave this determination to the Board of Visitors with the understanding that such a goal will be contemplated within the framework of available resources and academic considerations which, as of this date, are not sufficiently known with certainty to project wisely such a time period within the next two years.24

---

23 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 11 February 1966.
24 Ibid.
The full text of this policy statement was sent to select members of the General Assembly, to the Chairman of the Higher Education Study Commission, and to the Director of the State Council of Higher Education.\(^{25}\) Apparently, the only positive response to the Board of Visitors' statement came from Smith and Newport News Delegate Lewis A. McMurrnan, Jr. These astute politicians, who since the inception of both branch colleges, had stood by their own college's interests, co-sponsored legislation which lifted the restrictions on the two-year curricular offerings of both schools.\(^{26}\) To the layman there appeared to be little change in the wording of the legislation from that which had been adopted by the General Assembly in 1962. The wording in the 1962 document referred in several instances to Richard Bland and Christopher Newport as "the two-year colleges."\(^{27}\) In the new legislation prompted by Smith and McMurrnan, the two schools were designated as "other colleges"\(^{28}\) thus eliminating the two-year connotation. No limit was set on a time-frame for expansion beyond the two years, although McMurrnan indicated that he would soon seek appropriations for the elevation of Christopher Newport to four-year status.\(^{29}\)

\(^{25}\)Ibid.


\(^{29}\)Richmond Times Dispatch, 2 March 1966; 9 March 1966; The Progress-Index, 3 March 1966; Smith, interview. op. cit.
Carson seemed pleased by the actions of the 1966 General Assembly. As a result of that session he had seen Richard Bland escape from the shackles of the community college system and emerge as a legitimate future candidate for four-year standing. He fully realized that he must rely on the political strength and judgment of W. Roy Smith. Smith's influence had helped to save Richard Bland College and any future plans for expansion of the institution would rest in the hands of Smith and his supporters. This connection with Smith appeared especially necessary since the reliability and intensity of support from Paschall and the parent institution was in doubt. 30

In apparent response to pressures from the branch colleges and their supporters as well as fulfilling the obvious intent of the General Assembly to prepare the way for escalation, the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in May, 1966, adopted a resolution which revised the organizational channel of coordination and supervision of Richard Bland College and Christopher Newport College. Since the position of Chancellor or Coordinator had been abolished and the limitation on two-year offerings had been removed, the Board designated the Dean of The College of William and Mary, Melville W. Jones, as the individual directly responsible for the supervision of the branch colleges. It was the responsibility of

30Carson, interview. op. cit.
Jones to work with the Dean of the Faculty at the parent college in order to prepare the two colleges for an accreditation visit from the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Even though both schools had been accredited under the umbrella of The College of William and Mary, it seemed, in light of the recent developments, for them to begin that self-study process on their own. It would also be the Dean of the College's duty to evaluate any moves the branch colleges might make toward escalation to four-year status.\(^3\) It is noteworthy that approval of the Board of Visitors had already been given to Christopher Newport to offer their students up to ninety hours of course work toward a bachelor's degree. Paschall and his Deans had indicated William and Mary's willingness to accept in transfer selected upper division course work from Christopher Newport.\(^2\)

Wide-spread newspaper coverage of the Board of Visitors meeting served to provide the public in Southside Virginia with the encouraging news of the prospect for the future escalation of Richard Bland College. It was reported that W. Melville Jones (Dean of the College) and Harold L. Fowler (Dean of the Faculty) at William and Mary would begin immediately the study of the branch colleges so as to insure an orderly and sound transition to accreditation as four-year colleges.\(^3\) Speaking at the fourth commencement exercises at

\(^{31}\) Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 28 May 1966.

\(^{32}\) Ibid.

\(^{33}\) Richmond Times Dispatch, 29 May 1966; The Progress-Index, 29 May 1966.
Richard Bland, former Coordinator of the Two-Year Colleges, D. J. Herrmann called for the development of an upper-division resident college program for Richard Bland so that the school could reap the benefits of the community college graduates who would, within two years, be seeking baccalaureate degrees.  

For the remainder of 1966, Richard Bland College was involved in preparing itself for the formal self-study which was required for accreditation purposes by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Jones appointed Fowler as Chairman of the Committee that was to assist in the evaluation of the branch colleges.

In a related matter which further confirmed the desire of Carson to see Richard Bland expand to four-year status, the Master Site Plan was approved by Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr. The approval of the Plan by Godwin and the Board of Visitors appeared to give tacit assent to the eventual addition of upper-level course offerings. In fact, extensive projections extended over a thirty-year period. With the approval of the Master Site Plan it seemed to be only a matter of time before Richard Bland would be authorized to begin its expansion.

---

34 *Richmond Times Dispatch*, 4 June 1966.

35 Letter from W. Melville Jones to Harold L. Fowler, 7 June 1966.

36 Letter from Mills E. Godwin, Jr., to Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, 7 July 1966.

37 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 10 September 1966.
It can be observed that while Richard Bland was being prepared for a transformation from a two-year institution, John Tyler, too, was changed from a purely technical school to a comprehensive community college. At a meeting of the John Tyler Technical College Board it was reported that plans and specifications for a main classroom building had been completed and bids were in the process of being advertised and that soon the liberal arts courses would be added to the already anticipated technical ones. When the question of the relationship between John Tyler and Richard Bland arose, Petersburg School Superintendent, John D. Meade stated that he fore-saw John Tyler offering two years of both liberal arts and technical courses while Richard Bland would move to four-year status. This change in mission for John Tyler became effective on 1 July 1966 and reflected a move by the Higher Education Study Commission and Hamel, himself, to offer to the citizens of the Commonwealth a diverse curriculum at a reasonable cost. John Tyler had been sold to the industrial leaders of Wouthside Virginia as being a technical institute, but emerged as a comprehensive community college.

This political action by the General Assembly to broaden the John Tyler curriculum to include liberal arts offerings could have had a disastrous effect on Richard Bland if the John Tyler curriculum

---

38 Minutes of the John Tyler Technical College Board, Meeting of 7 April 1966.

39 Letter from Dana B. Hamel to Frank L. Wyche, 6 April 1966.
had not continued to emphasize chiefly technical programs. Further, if the technical offerings had been fully integrated into the established liberal arts base at Richard Bland it might not have been necessary to have created John Tyler. But politics and a determination on the part of such men as Eliades and Wyche to establish a separate technical institution prevailed. As a further result of legislative action by the General Assembly to allow all proposed community colleges to offer both a technical and liberal arts curriculum, there seemed to be only one option left open to Richard Bland. That option was to begin the drive for escalation as soon as possible. The first step for Richard Bland was to expedite the self-study process that was being directed by the parent institution. Margaret Hess, Dean of Faculty at Richard Bland stated that the attainment of accreditation on its own merits might result in the college becoming a four-year school.  

The urgency for Richard Bland to become a four-year college was further influenced by the unveiling of a master plan for the Community College System by the State Board for Community Colleges on 4 January 1967. This plan envisioned the construction of additional community colleges in Southside and Southern Virginia by 1971. The fear of being encircled by comprehensive community colleges was a "clear and present danger" to Carson since Richard Bland drew many of its

40 The Progress-Index, 11 November 1966.
41 Richmond Times Dispatch, 5 January 1967.
students from the outlying rural areas. The incorporation of liberal arts courses in the John Tyler curriculum caused Carson to become alarmed, but the added menace of two other institutions being constructed to the south of Richard Bland presented an even more alarming threat to the very existence of his institution.  

At its January, 1967 meeting, the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary deferred action on requests from the branch colleges to add additional upper level courses (by administrative action certain third-year courses were already being offered at Christopher Newport and Richard Bland) to their curriculum. A resolution was adopted by the Board that stated in part:

...that the Board of Visitors deems it unwise from the standpoint of standards involved, and other factors related thereto, to act on the matter of additional offerings at the third and fourth-year levels at the branch colleges until after the final report of the current Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Self Study is received and reviewed, the accreditation status of the branch institutions is determined by the Southern Association, and the recommendations of The William and Mary College Committee regarding the branch colleges are also received and reviewed by the Board of Visitors.

Even though this paper does not involve a history of Christopher Newport College it is significant to note that Cunningham made an impassioned plea before the Board to allow his institution to move

---

42 Carson, interview. op. cit.

43 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 14 January 1967.
toward four-year status as soon as possible. He cited the political pressure being used in the Tidewater area to bring about the escalation. Further, he did not see the accreditation issue as materially affecting the four-year drive. In spite of his strong feeling on the matter, Cunningham agreed to abide by the decision of the Board. It was reported in the meeting that Carson had indicated to members of the Committee on Branch Colleges that he did not believe that Richard Bland should offer additional third-year courses until the completion of the Southern Association Study.\footnote{Ibid.}

It is important to report the differing presentations by the directors of the branch colleges. Cunningham advocated immediate escalation while Carson seemed reluctant to press the issue. In any movement that involves the use of political pressure, timing is of such importance. Had not Clinch Valley College and George Mason College achieved success in gaining approval for escalation during the 1966 session of the General Assembly by utilizing their political clout to good advantage? Was not Cunningham laying the groundwork for Christopher Newport to do the same in the near future? Would it have made any difference if Carson and Cunningham had joined forces and presented their cases to the Board? They probably would not have been immediately successful as it appeared the Board was committed to making a final decision when the accreditation was decided.
However, they might have planted the seeds for future joint action if they had been completely united in their approach to the Board.

In an interview with The Progress-Index, Carson was quoted as saying:

"Our main goal right now is accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The Board of Visitors would look very foolish indeed if it gave approval to a four-year program now, and the SACS then found that there were things we still needed to do to be accredited as a two-year college."

From a practical standpoint, Carson's remarks were appropriate ones to make under existing circumstances, however, from solely a political viewpoint they might have been a factor in the eventual delay that was to occur in the Board of Visitors' decision to postpone approval for the escalation of Richard Bland.

While the issues of accreditation and future escalation plans were being studied at Richard Bland, the Board of John Tyler Community College continued to make plans for the opening of that institution in Fall, 1967. It was reported in August, 1967 by the College's first President, Thomas M. Hatfield, that approximately 1100 completed student applications had been received with sixty-five percent indicating an interest in the technical and pre-technical programs. The remaining thirty-five percent would follow the traditional liberal arts curriculum which represented the core of all of the programs.

---

45 The Progress-Index, 16 January 1967.

46 Minutes of the John Tyler Community College Board, Meeting of 5 April 1967.

47 Minutes of the John Tyler Community College Board, 2 August 1967.
the course offerings at Richard Bland.

Without belaboring the effect of John Tyler on the growth of Richard Bland, it is significant to note the tremendous interest in the area for an institution which would provide a major emphasis in the technical field. If Richard Bland had been allowed to add the technical component to its already viable liberal arts program, the movement of the College for four-year status would certainly have been strengthened by the increase in enrollment which would have occurred. A memorandum included in the November, 1967 Board Minutes of John Tyler Community College an enrollment of 1202 students is recorded. In viewing the geographical distribution of students adjacent to Richard Bland, there were 387 from the cities of Petersburg, Hopewell, and Colonial Heights and another 64 from the counties of Dinwiddie, Prince George, Surry, and Sussex. One-fourth of the enrollment of John Tyler could easily have been served on the Richard Bland site if political forces could have favored the latter institution.

It is important to note that there was a 35 percent decline in the 1967 Summer Session enrollment at Richard Bland from the 1966 Summer Session enrollment. A major reason for this decline was due to forty of those seventy-five marginally academically qualified students who were waiting to enroll full-time at John Tyler when it opened in the Fall, 1967. It was further found by Carson that

---

48 Minutes of the John Tyler Community College Board, 10 November 1967.
applications for the Fall Semester were being received at a twenty to twenty-five percent reduction of the rate of applications of the previous year. As a result of these statistics, he predicted a deficit in Special Funds Revenue for the year.\(^4\) A report of declining enrollment would not encourage an institution that was planning to move to four-year status.

Might the revelation of these statistics cause one to speculate that the establishment of John Tyler Community College, with its low tuition rate and highly specialized technical programs as well as its liberal arts curriculum, have resulted in Richard Bland College being unable to move earlier than it did toward four-year status? Did the creation of John Tyler obstruct the growth and diversity of Richard Bland and result in the College being at less than full potential when the approval for escalation came from the General Assembly?

W. Roy Smith viewed John Tyler as a real threat to the viability of Richard Bland and to its baccalaureate degree-granting efforts. He felt that the concentration of political power in the hands of a state-wide board with pockets of power in each region could bring tremendous pressure on their representatives to the General Assembly. Such an observation served as a primary factor in the community colleges being funded at a greater level than any of the other state-supported institutions of higher education.\(^5\)

\(^4\) Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 12 August 1967.

\(^5\) Smith, interview. op. cit.
Smith further indicated that the administration at The College of William and Mary was not oriented toward Southside Virginia and did not provide the support to the idea of Richard Bland escalating earlier than it did. He saw the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary yielding to pressures from the Tidewater supporters of Christopher Newport more than from Richard Bland.51

A report by Dean Jones on the progress of the Self-Study at both branch colleges was presented to the Board of Visitors on 27 May 1967. Jones showed that the Study at Christopher Newport would be completed by 1 July 1967 while the one for Richard Bland would not be ready until September. However, it appeared that the institutions would be both visited by the accrediting agency and accepted as full-fledged members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in late November, 1967. The expectations of Jones that all of this process could be completed in such a short period of time appeared to be quite optimistic, however, Cunningham and Carson felt that each were moving on schedule and their goals could be reached by the time of the Southern Association's annual meeting in late Fall.52

In preparing its 1968-70 biennium budget request, Carson included expenditure increases which would allow the College to add

51Ibid.

52Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 27 May 1967.
additional third-year courses to the curriculum. The same type of increase was a part of the budget prepared by Cunningham. It was Jones who suggested to the Board of Visitors that a separate letter should be attached to the budget exhibit which would assure officials in Richmond that if the two branch colleges did not receive formal approval to escalate during the 1968-70 biennium then the budgets would have to be revised accordingly.\(^5\) The inclusion of the possible disclaimer again showed the Board of Visitors and the administration at William and Mary as desiring to cover all eventualities. They seemed to be saying that if the branches become four-year institutions then they would support them and if they did not, they would accept that decision too.

The Director of the Budget in Richmond, L. M. Kuhn did not accept the budgets submitted by Richard Bland and Christopher Newport and thereby directed them to re-submit the documents without any references being made to the possibility of moving to four-year status.\(^4\) Paschall quickly directed Jones to work with Carson and Cunningham in order to carry out the wishes of Kuhn.\(^5\) With the deletion of any reference to four-year plans, the branch colleges prepared themselves for inspection by the Visiting Committee from

---

\(^5\) Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 12 August 1967.

\(^4\) Letter from L. M. Kuhn to the Rector and Visitors, 16 August 1967.

\(^5\) Letter from Davis Y. Paschall to L. M. Kuhn, 17 August 1967.
the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The visitation was scheduled for late October, 1967.\textsuperscript{56}

Even though Richard Bland was eventually accredited and accepted as a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools,\textsuperscript{57} immediate plans of the College would more directly be affected than the action of the Southern Association.

In its publication of \textit{The Virginia Plan for Higher Education} in December, 1967, the State Council of Higher Education recommended that no additional public four-year colleges be created in the Commonwealth of Virginia and that Richard Bland College, along with Danville Division of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Eastern Shore Branch of the School of General Studies of the University of Virginia, be incorporated into the Virginia Community College System.\textsuperscript{58} This was the same position which had been taken earlier by the Higher Education Study Commission, but that had been curtailed by astute political maneuvering within the General Assembly. Smith had been the patron saint of Richard Bland at that time. Would he play that same role again?

The long-range fortunes of Christopher Newport were also placed

\textsuperscript{56}Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 26 September 1967.

\textsuperscript{57}Letter from Gordon W. Sweet to Davis Y. Paschall, 16 December 1968 (Sweet was Executive Secretary of the Commission on Colleges).

in the hands of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. In that instance, the only promise of change in the future came with an observation that:

As the new comprehensive community college in the Hampton Roads area develops, it may be appropriate for Christopher Newport to become a four-year or a two-year upper-level (junior and senior) baccalaureate degree-granting commuting institution.\(^5^9\)

At least the door was still open for Christopher Newport to advance beyond the two-year level, but if the recommendations of the State Council were accepted by the General Assembly, there would be no such hope for Richard Bland. A report of the actions of the State Council in *The Progress-Index* indicated that there would probably be considerable opposition from the supporters of Richard Bland.\(^6^0\)

In spite of these recommendations by the State Council, the Board of Visitors of *The College of William* and *Mary* approved guidelines that would allow Christopher Newport to escalate when its sophomore enrollment approached three-hundred full-time equivalent students and when library acquisitions and faculty competencies were determined to be sufficient for a four-year college curriculum. At the earliest, the move could take place during the 1970-72 biennium.\(^6^1\) Approval for such a move would have to come from the

\(^{5^9}\)Ibid., p. 41.

\(^{6^0}\) *The Progress-Index*, 9 January 1968.

\(^{6^1}\) *Minutes of the Board of Visitors*, 6 January 1968; *The Progress-Index*, 7 January 1968.
General Assembly and would probably be opposed by the State Council. Any formal discussion of Richard Bland at the same Board of Visitors meeting reflected the absence of dialogue on the future of the College.  

A vehement attack on the high per-pupil costs of operating the Virginia Community College System was sounded by Smith in a joint meeting between the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees. Smith cited the lower operating costs of Richard Bland and other state-supported institutions as being the model from which the community college could learn much in the way of saving money. As in the past, he was joined by Lewis A. McMurran, Jr. of Newport News, Christopher Newport's chief legislative supporter.  

Throughout 1968, construction of additional physical facilities at Richard Bland dominated much of the time of Carson and other administrators at the institution. While plans were being made for the opening and dedication of a new classroom and laboratory building, ground was broken for another structure that was to house the library, student center, and administrative office complex. Both of these structures were built on the 512 acre site in Dinwiddie County across from the old campus located in Prince George County.  

The dedication of the first structure centered around tributes and eulogies to Frank A. Ernst for whom the building was named.  

62 Minutes of the Board of Visitors, op. cit.  
63 The Progress-Index, 1 February 1968; 16 February 1968.  
64 Carson, interview. op. cit. The Southside Virginia News, 14 February 1968; The Progress-Index, 2 May 1968.
Carson's ability to bring to the campus a select group of Virginia's past and present public leaders was clearly in evidence. Some of the early proponents for establishing a college in the area were present at the dedication. These persons were Augustus Robbins and Charles W. Smith of Hopewell; George F. Brasfield of Petersburg; John E. Brockwell, Jr. of Colonial Heights. Joseph E. Blackburn, Chairman of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, was the principal speaker. Richard S. Gillis, Jr., Executive Director of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, presented a portrait of Ernst to the College. Among the representatives from The College of William and Mary were Paschall, Chandler (former President and Chancellor), Herrmann, Jones, and new liaison officer to the branch colleges, John H. Willis. Numerous local and state political leaders were in attendance.65

By inviting Blackburn who was Chairman of the Council of Higher Education to give the principal address, Carson had hoped to influence the State Council's decision to recommend that Richard Bland be placed in the Virginia Community College System was a mistake and that there was a united front in Southside Virginia behind the effort to make the College a four-year institution.66 Time would show that Blackburn was not convinced to change his mind.


66 Carson, interview. op. cit.
In a letter from Blackburn to Temple following the Ernst Hall dedication, Blackburn clearly indicated his views on the matter when he stated:

I appreciate your interest in Richard Bland College and commend you for it. I hope you appreciate why I take the position as a member of the State Council of Higher Education that for the foreseeable future it should remain a two-year college.67

The dedication of Ernst Hall was not the first effort by Carson in 1968 to use his influence to convert the political leadership of the Commonwealth to his cause to make Richard Bland a four-year college. Graduation exercises brought Fred G. Pollard, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, as one of the speaker's at the ceremony. After being introduced by Smith, Pollard, who would fight a losing battle for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1969, predicted that the College would become a four-year institution in the near future. Pollard also praised Smith for his legislative efforts on behalf of the College.68

While Richard Bland was struggling in its efforts to build a solid case for escalation, Christopher Newport was working behind the scenes and through the William and Mary Board of Visitors to obtain that desired change of status. Following contacts with Prince B. Woodward, Director of the State Council of Higher Education, the

67Letter from Joseph E. Blackburn to John Temple, 12 November 1968.
68The Progress-Index, 30 May 1968.
Board of Visitors voted to approve the escalation of Christopher Newport "...to third-year status beginning with the session, 1969 and to fourth-year status in 1970-71."69

Christopher Newport had now received a positive response from the Board of Visitors while Richard Bland seemed to be facing a special funds revenue deficit due in part to the attendance of potential Richard Bland students at John Tyler Community College. The borrowing of up to $69,423 from the State Treasury was authorized by the Governor with the understanding that it would be repaid in the 1970-1972 biennium budget.70 Another possible explanation for the revenue shortfall was the fact that about ninety percent of the community college's operating budgets were provided for with tax dollars, while Richard Bland was expected to generate close to seventy percent of its operating funds.71 This disparity enabled the community colleges to charge considerably less tuition than the other public colleges in the Commonwealth.

For the remainder of 1968 and 1969, a veil of uncertainty surrounded the operations of Richard Bland College. Was it to close because of its possible inability to compete with the surrounding community colleges? Would it be allowed to emerge as a four-year

69Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1 June 1968; Richmond Times Dispatch, 2 June 1968.

70Letter from Mills E. Godwin, Jr. to the Rector and Visitors of The College of William and Mary, 28 March 1968; Letter from Lewis H. Vaden to Davis Y. Paschall, 2 April 1968 (Vaden was the Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Virginia); Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1 June 1968.

71Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 1 June 1968.
college as so many of its supporters desired? Could it be merged with the nearby, predominantly black Virginia State College? This latter possibility loomed on the horizon since the statewide system of public colleges and universities in Virginia would soon be coming under fire from the desegregation campaign of the Federal government. Would there emerge a single political figure or group who would be willing to stand in support of the future of the college. The final part in this chapter will be related to a discussion of these questions.

Carson, himself, asked these kinds of questions when he spoke to the Rotary Club of Petersburg in January, 1969. In his speech, Carson attempted to rally the local citizenry behind his own efforts to make Richard Bland a four-year college. He observed that an apathetic public could be Richard Bland's greatest enemy. The same message was delivered to the Lion's Club of Petersburg later in the month.

An effort was made by Carson to elicit support from Governor Godwin during the 1969 Commencement exercises at the College, but in his address Godwin only dealt in generalities about the expanded physical facilities of the institution. He praised Smith for his dedication to the development of Richard Bland but made no reference to its escalation to four-year status.

\[72\] The Progress-Index, 3 January 1969.
\[73\] Ibid., 30 January 1969.
\[74\] Richmond Times Dispatch, 29 May 1969.
At no time during this period of uncertainty did Carson waiver in his desire to promote the escalation of the College beyond the associate degree level. Through the admissions and counseling office there were announcements about the addition of third-year courses to the curriculum. In a report by Progress-Index staff writer, Fred Van DeVenter, the College was called an anomaly in the Commonwealth system of higher education. It appeared to be more than a two-year school, but not a four-year one. It possessed new buildings and enthusiastic students and a qualified faculty, but it lacked the sense of permanence which was attached to many public colleges and universities in Virginia.

In an effort to marshall the political forces which were to become the bulwark of the College's efforts to convince the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary and the Virginia General Assembly that Richard Bland should be elevated to four-year status, Carson sent a letter to all Southside Virginia State legislators and other influential citizens regarding a report which had been approved by the State Council of Higher Education in July, 1969. The letter criticized the State Council of Higher Education for supporting the Higher Education Study Commission's recommendations that no new four-year colleges were to be created in the near future and that Richard Bland College be placed in the Virginia Community College System.

75The Progress-Index, 19 August 1969.
76Ibid., 24 August 1969.
Carson provided a list of 123 semester hours of third-year work which the Board of Visitors had previously approved for the College.\textsuperscript{77}

The Report to which Carson referred included the criteria to be used by the State Council of Higher Education in determining the future need for additional four-year colleges or universities in Virginia. The criteria, if followed, clearly prohibited Richard Bland from escalating. The Report which received the approval of the State Council of Higher Education stated that no public college would be approved unless the following conditions had been met:

1. There is convincing evidence that there will be enrolled, within a reasonable time, enough students to assure effective and economical operation without displacing any community college in the area.
2. No other state-controlled baccalaureate degree-granting institution able to provide for such students is located within commuting distance of the proposed location.
3. Its establishment will not injure any private college or university within the immediate vicinity.
4. It is clearly understood that any new institution will be adequately funded without impairing the States' ability or lessening the States' obligation to provide necessary support for existing state-controlled institutions - two and four-year.\textsuperscript{78}

If the criteria was to be adhered to without exception, the future of Richard Bland did indeed appear dim. But Carson was not to

\textsuperscript{77} Letter from James M. Carson (with attachments) to twelve Southside Virginia political leaders, 23 October 1969.

\textsuperscript{78} Minutes of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, meeting of 16 July 1969.
be thwarted in his efforts and concluded his correspondence to the political leaders when he stated:

In any event, Richard Bland College is operating under a pall of uncertainty. This makes it extremely difficult to retain and recruit capable faculty who desire a stabilized situation. It is hoped that 1970 will clarify the situation. The future of Richard Bland College itself lies in the hands of the Southside Virginia political and community leaders.\(^{79}\)

The position of the College as seen by Carson was reiterated at a meeting of the Petersburg Kiwanis Club in November. In this talk when asked about duplication of programs already being offered at nearby Virginia State College, he stated that there would not be any more duplication at the four-year level than at the two-year level. He advised that Virginia State College enrolled students from throughout the State and nation and that Richard Bland as a commuter institution would serve primarily those students from Southside Virginia. He further extolled the virtues of small four-year colleges better meeting the needs of individual students than large universities where they become lost in the crowd.\(^{80}\)

This speech by Carson appeared to trigger what was to become a major struggle between the supporters of Richard Bland and those who saw the expansion of the College to be a threat to the future development of Virginia State College in Southside Virginia.

---

\(^{79}\)Letter from Carson to Twelve Southside Virginia political leaders, op. cit.

\(^{80}\)The Progress-Index, 7 November 1969.
letter published in The Progress-Index seemed to set the stage for this struggle. W. Rick Garr, a supporter of Virginia State College's efforts to reach beyond the black community for its students, questioned the need for the expansion efforts of Richard Bland. Garr further criticized the Petersburg Chamber of Commerce for its support of Richard Bland's expansion efforts. 81

In related incidents at Virginia State College, both students and faculty reacted angrily to the proposed merger of the College's School of Agriculture with that of Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Blacksburg and with the efforts being made to escalate Richard Bland College. Certain members of the administration at Virginia State College were also criticized for their alleged lack of support for and interest in the future of the College. 82 These actions are mentioned to illustrate the emotional atmosphere which existed at the time when Carson at Richard Bland was making his major move to achieve four-year status for the school.

This study does not purport to discuss events relating to the history or development of Virginia State College, but there are certain times when Virginia State must be mentioned. This is done only in light of their effect on the development of the proposed four-year program at Richard Bland.

81 The Progress-Index, 16 November 1969.
A forecast of actions which would be considered in the 1970 session of the Virginia General Assembly was discussed in local newspapers. Smith, who was to become Chairman of the powerful House Appropriations Committee when the General Assembly convened in January, candidly expressed his hope that Richard Bland would become a four-year college. He cited the advantages of having another four-year college in an area that was destined to grow in future years. Smith saw no conflict in creating a four-year institution so close to Virginia State College and said the need was there for commuting students in the area. In fact, he felt that he had contributed to the financial well-being of Virginia State College through his personal efforts as a member of the House Appropriations Committee and that there should not have been any feeling of animosity toward him because of his stand on Richard Bland College.

Delegate Arthur H. Richardson of Dinwiddie County openly advocated the escalation of Richard Bland College. He stressed the efficiency and economy practiced by the College.

The Petersburg City Council voted four to one to support the escalation of Richard Bland. The negative vote was cast by Councilman Hermanze E. Fauntleroy, Jr., who had been Vice President of Development and Secretary of the Alumni Association at Virginia State College.

---


84 Smith, interview, op. cit.

85 The Southside Virginian, op. cit.
State. The Colonial Heights City Council concurred with Petersburg's recommendation the same evening.

Added concern from the Virginia State College Chapter of the American Association of University Professors came in a letter from its President Carey E. Stronach to the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary. In referring to the escalation of Richard Bland and the third-year course offerings, Stronach stated that:

This is an imposition into the educational domain of Virginia State College, the four-year degree-granting institution also located in the Petersburg area, since all of these courses are, and have been, offered by Virginia State.

Not to be outdone by those protesting against Richard Bland, the Executive Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Petersburg endorsed the expansion of the College to baccalaureate status. Their letter of support was widely circulated in the Petersburg area and was used as a political device to bring pressure to bear on the Board of Visitors who convened in Williamsburg on 30 January.

The Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in response to pressures from Southside Virginia did not approve a resolution supporting the escalation of Richard Bland. Several members of the Board of Visitors questioned the timing of a resolution

86 The Progress-Index, 21 January 1970.
87 Ibid.
88 Letter from Carey E. Stronach to the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary, 23 January 1970; Richmond Times Dispatch, 24 January 1970.
89 Letter from Paul D. Welch to Davis Y. Paschall, 28 January 1970 (Welch was Executive Vice President of the Chamber of Commerce).
which would recommend a change of status for the College. J. H. Willis, Jr., Liaison Officer for the Branch Colleges, indicated that he did not view the addition of more third-year courses as being appropriate at that time. He felt that conditions were uncertain and that no action should be taken until the future of the College was more clearly determined. Only Russell Gill, Board member from Petersburg, presented a relatively strong case in support of Richard Bland. The meeting ended with a very general statement of support for the College, but no positive effort for escalation.\(^90\) Thus, it appeared that if Richard Bland was to be successful in its efforts, support would have to come from the political leadership of Southside Virginia.

That support from the political community was building as Senators Garland Gray of Waverly and Joseph Hutcheson of Lawrenceville; Delegates Arthur H. Richardson of Dinwiddie and C. Hardaway Marks of Hopewell publicly announced their support for the expansion of the College. However, there was legislation introduced in the House of Delegates which would leave the question of state-supported two and four-year colleges in the hands of the State Council of Higher Education. This was House Bill 48 which was presented by the Chairman of the House of Delegates' Education Committee, Samuel Pope of Southampton County.\(^91\)

Pope was not the only member in the General Assembly to oppose

\(^90\)\textit{Minutes of the Board of Visitors, 30-31 January 1970.}

\(^91\)\textit{The Progress-Index, 27 January 1970.}
making Richard Bland a four-year school. Senator Lloyd C. Bird of Chesterfield, who had earlier led the movement to establish the Virginia Community College System and had served as Chairman of the Higher Education Study Commission in 1965, and who in 1970 was Chairman of the Senate Education and Public Institutions Committee, expressed serious concern over the development of another four-year college in Petersburg. Bird indicated that the proposed change of status for Richard Bland would probably precipitate action by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare since the Federal agency would probably see the action as an attempt by Virginia to avoid establishing a state-wide program for the complete desegregation of its public-supported colleges and universities.88

Formidable opposition continued to build throughout January and February to the College's escalation. In the content of letters written to The Progress-Index there was concern expressed regarding the duplication of course offerings for black and white students and the addition of public expense to support another four-year college in the area.93 One such letter came from the Petersburg Chapter of the Virginia State College Alumni Association.94 The Petersburg Area Chapter of the Virginia Council on Human Relations met with Joseph E. Blackburn, Chairman of the State Council of Higher Education, Roy McTarnaghan, Director of the State Council and the Commonwealth's

88 Richmond Times Dispatch, 19 February 1970.
only black Senator, L. Douglas Wilder of Richmond. The group had
previously called for the merger of Richard Bland with Virginia State. Wilder stated that he would oppose escalation of Richard Bland and
that he saw only duplication of effort and added cost to the taxpayers. Apparently, viewing the move as having racial overtones, Wilder reportedly said that he would ask the Federal government to
investigate the situation. Other indications of opposition were also
reported while the General Assembly was considering the issue. Most
of the local opposition to Richard Bland came from the advocates of
a strong and viable Virginia State College, a number of whom partici­
pated in a mass meeting of approximately 1,000 people on 2 February
at the four-year college campus. Following the meeting, Virginia
State College President James F. Tucker was burned in effigy by the
students. Opposition to Tucker, Dean of the College, Elwood B. Boone,
and the Board of Visitors of Virginia State College, stemmed from
what Larry Thompson, a spokesman for the Concerned Student and Faculty
Committee, called a true lack of concern for the welfare of the College.
One such area of concern was the proposed expansion of Richard Bland
College.

95 The Progress-Index, 12 February 1970.
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Into this charged atmosphere of confrontation between the various segments of Southside Virginia came a fact-finding team from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Although the long-range effects of this visit and others from the United States Office of Civil Rights were to affect profoundly the future of both institutions and, in fact, the entire system of higher education in the Commonwealth, the relationship of the Federal government to the expansion of Richard Bland is focused on the judicial decisions which affected Richard Bland during the years 1970 and 1971 and not on extraneous events which took place at the predominantly black college.

One of the most significant examples of the role played by politics during the first twelve years of the existence of Richard Bland College was expressed at the 16 February 1970 Special Meeting of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary. Having issued only a statement of general support for Richard Bland at its January meeting, the Board of Visitors was now faced with a request to immediately approve the escalation of Richard Bland to four-year status. Who requested the Board to do an about-face and recommend escalation? It was the man who had so many times in the past used his political influence to help the College avert disaster. It was W. Roy Smith who asked Paschall to meet with him and Governor A.

---

Linwood Holton just prior to Paschall's scheduled appearance before the House Appropriations Committee of which Smith was Chairman.\textsuperscript{100}

Paschall told the Board of Visitors that he did as Smith advised and at the meeting Smith indicated that he did not accept the rather ambivalent statement adopted by the Board at the 30-31 January meeting and that he (Smith) felt very strongly that the time was ripe for the elevation of Richard Bland to four-year status. In the presence of Paschall and Holton, Smith asked the Governor to advise the State Council of Higher Education not to oppose the move in spite of previous recommendations to the contrary. Smith further expressed his concern for Pope's bill which prohibited establishment of four-year colleges without State Council approval but promised to discuss the matter with him.\textsuperscript{101}

In a subsequent meeting among selected members of the Board of Visitors, Smith, and Dean Jones, Smith advised the Board to request of his Committee enough money from the current session of the General Assembly to begin the escalation. Gill and Carson stated to the Board that they had accepted the earlier statement when they realized that the body was not going to approve a stronger resolution, but now they saw the need for the Board to take a definite stand on the issue.\textsuperscript{102}

In a profound revelation it was revealed by Paschall that Smith

\textsuperscript{100}Special Meeting of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary, 16 February 1970.

\textsuperscript{101}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{102}Ibid.
would assist Virginia State College in its efforts to retain a School of Agriculture so long as Virginia State College did not oppose Richard Bland. Smith reminded officials of Virginia State College that he did much to provide needed financial outlays to Virginia State College just as he had greatly helped Richard Bland College.

Carson interjected the comment that he would work with Liaison Officer Willis in drawing up the necessary documents to support a request for additional funding for full third-year status in 1971-1972. Board member R. Harvey Chappell, Jr. expressed concern over the about-face which appeared to be in the making. Chappell felt that the Board of Visitors would incur a certain amount of criticism if they chose to act at that time, but if the other members of the Board felt that a resolution should be approved he would also agree. Without further discussion the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary approved a resolution which provided for the development of a third-year program in 1971-1972 and a fourth-year program in 1972-1973. It was stated that the full implementation of this program would be contingent on the receipt of appropriate funds from the General Assembly.

This meeting of the Board of Visitors was extraordinary in that

---
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105Minutes of the Board of Visitors, op. cit.
the decision to escalate Richard Bland was based on a political move by a most persuasive and powerful House Appropriations Committee Chairman Smith who once again intervened on behalf of the institution that he deemed destined to become four-years. The decision was made in opposition to the recommendations of higher educational agencies and resulted in a gubernatorial-appointed body changing its mind because of political pressure. This approval by the Board of Visitors was only a beginning in this political process to make Richard Bland College a four-year college. The legal step to make it a reality now rested with Smith and his legislative colleagues.

Widespread press coverage was given to the resolution adopted by the Board of Visitors and the expected displeasure and praise came from the opponents and supporters of the College. Since the primary legislative opponent of any bill to change the status of Richard Bland appeared to emanate from Delegate Sam E. Pope, efforts were made by Smith to have Pope modify his stand. Pope did not change his bill but he did indicate that he would abide by the actions of the State Council of Higher Education regardless of the decision of that body.

With approval having been granted by the Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary for the escalation, Carson submitted


107 Letter from Sam E. Pope to Harold W. Thompson, 23 February 1970 (Thompson was President of the Student Government Association at Richard Bland College).
a request for additional costs related to third-year concentrations in selected area for 1971-1972. It was Delegate Arthur Richardson of Dinwiddie who requested that the House Appropriations Committee add that amount to the proposed budget of Richard Bland. Support for the request came from Delegates C. Hardaway Marks of Hopewell and L. Ray Ashworth of Emporia.

Another significant legislative victory came to Richard Bland on 27 February when Pope's House Bill 48, with an amendment by Smith to exclude Richard Bland from immediate State Council of Higher Education purview regarding its expansion, was reported out of the House Education Committee. Considerable debate ensued over the issue with Smith defending his support for the escalation of Richard Bland and his feeling that the School of Agriculture should remain at Virginia State College. It was a classic political battle in which the views of Smith prevailed.

In subsequent legislative meetings and hearings, the House of Delegates approved Pope's bill with Smith's amendment and sent the bill to the Senate for its consideration. Pope was not to be outdone by his defeat in the House of Delegates and actively pleaded his case to the Senate Education Committee. However, Acting Senate Education Committee Chairman (Senator Lloyd C. Bird of Chesterfield
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was hospitalized during most of the Session), Joseph C. Hutcheson of Lawrenceville and a long-time friend of Smith and Richard Bland College, expressed his opinion that since Richard Bland had been designated a branch college by the General Assembly in 1966, that it already had received approval to move toward four-year status. Senator L. Douglas Wilder of Richmond supported Pope before the Education Committee, but House Bill 48 was voted out of committee, along with another bill which would retain the School of Agriculture at Virginia State College.  

On 13 March the Senate voted to concur with the measures already taken by the Senate Education Committee and the full House of Delegates. Richard Bland became exempt from State Council of Higher Education scrutiny regarding its move to four-year status and the School of Agriculture at Virginia State College was retained at the Petersburg school. Both of these measures had been the work of W. Roy Smith and his supporters. Without the support from Smith, there seems little doubt that Richard Bland College would not have been approved for escalation. Political expediency and an indepth knowledge of the political process had enabled Smith to achieve his goal. The results of this legislative action became official when Governor Holton signed the measure, but more importantly when the

---
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Appropriation's Act included funding for "operating expenses and educational and general activities including escalation to third and fourth-year status."\(^{114}\)

It seemed on the surface that administrative and faculty officers could now begin the rigorous but rewarding task of organizing, developing, and implementing a four-year curriculum of which the College could be proud. The task could be undertaken immediately and be completed in time to offer baccalaureate degrees by June, 1973. This was the plan but there were again to be politically motivated events which were to take place during the months following legislative approval of escalation that were to affect the future mission of Richard Bland College.

It has been mentioned the Federal government had a role to play in the very nature and scope of higher education institutions in the Commonwealth of Virginia. This involvement in the higher educational affairs of the state was to be seen in two areas. One related to judicial action which was to strike at the very legal basis for Richard Bland moving toward four-year status. The other involved the inquiries by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare into the Commonwealth of Virginia's plans for the desegregation of its public colleges and universities.

Each of these two areas appear independent of each other, but after careful examination, it may be said that they are interrelated.

Within days after the official approval for escalation was granted by the Virginia Assembly, David Sprunt, Chairman of the Virginia State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights notified Governor Holton and the Federal government that the escalation of Richard Bland College would be in direct opposition to any plan to desegregate the colleges and universities of the Commonwealth. The Advisory Committee indicated that Richard Bland would be a largely white four-year school and that Virginia State College would remain a predominantly black four-year school. How could desegregation be encouraged in that kind of social and political setting?\textsuperscript{115}

Coinciding with this opposition to the expansion of Richard Bland was Holton's outline of a plan for college desegregation which was sent to the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The plan was a preliminary one and was submitted to the Federal government in July. As it related to Richard Bland and Virginia State, little action was taken by the Federal government primarily because of their location being in close proximity to each other.\textsuperscript{116} The only direct involvement by Richard Bland in the matter was the submission of material pertaining to the admissions policy of the College

\textsuperscript{115} \textit{Richmond Times Dispatch}, 5 April 1970

\textsuperscript{116} \textit{The Progress-Index}, 14 April 1970.
Carson was encouraged by the Office for Civil Rights to expand efforts made by Richard Bland to the black community and "...undertake cooperative programs with Virginia State College looking toward student and faculty exchange."  

The exchange of correspondence between Richard Bland College and the Office for Civil Rights was interrupted by a class-action suit brought by citizens living in Southside Virginia. The very nature of higher education in the Commonwealth of Virginia was directly affected when the class-action suit was filed in United States District Court on 30 June to prevent the escalation of Richard Bland College to a four-year status.  

The plaintiffs in the case included (1) three infants on whose behalf their fathers proceeded, (2) four students enrolled at Virginia State College, and, (3) six faculty members at Virginia State College. The defendants named in the suit were (1) State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, (2) A. Linwood Holton, Governor of Virginia, (3) Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, (4) James M. Carson, and (5) The Visitors of Virginia State College.


118 Letter from Eloise Severinson to James M. Carson, 9 July 1970 (Severinson was Regional Civil Rights Director for the United States Office of Civil Rights).


In the nine-page complaint brought by the plaintiffs there were two basic concerns expressed in the complaint. First, if Richard Bland College moved to four-year status the desegregation of Virginia State College would be impeded and both predominantly black Virginia State College and largely white Richard Bland College would remain with that ratio of racial composition that had existed in 1970. Secondly, if Richard Bland escalated it would result in a duplication of courses which were already being offered by nearby Virginia State College and would result in Richard Bland being funded for upper-level work at the expense of Virginia State College. In conclusion, the plaintiffs asked:

A. That the defendants, the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in Virginia and James M. Carson, President of Richard Bland College, be restrained and enjoined from escalating the program of instruction and course offerings at Richard Bland College beyond the two-year level.

B. That the defendants, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia and A. Linwood Holton, Governor of Virginia, and his successors in office, be restrained and enjoined from permitting the escalation of the program of instruction and course offerings at Richard Bland College beyond the two-year level.

C. That the defendants be required to provide for and effectuate the racial desegregation of the several colleges and universities maintained by the Commonwealth of Virginia, specifically including arrangements for the prompt interchange of faculty members and administrative staff personnel of the two colleges next named and the ultimate merger of Richard Bland College into Virginia State College.

D. And that such other, further and general relief be granted as to equity may seem meet.121

121 Ibid.
In the absence of Carson, who was on vacation in Europe, Henry J. Wuensch, Executive Administrator, and James B. McNeer, Dean of Admissions and Administrative Assistant to the President, attended a preliminary meeting in the Office of the Attorney General of Virginia, Andrew P. Miller. Participants included representatives from: the Governor and Attorney General's staff, the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary and Virginia State College, the State Council of Higher Education, the President of The College of William and Mary and the Acting President of Virginia State College. Even though there was considerable discussion by the participants, nothing was resolved at the meeting except the fact that there appeared to be a difference of opinion as to the approach that would be used by state Assistant Attorney General William G. Broaddus, who had been assigned the task of representing the defendants.\textsuperscript{122}

In subsequent action, the Office of Attorney General Andrew P. Miller, filed in the United States District Court a series of three motions which in effect would result in the appointment of a three-judge court to rule on the dismissal of the class-action suit. In short, the defendants were challenging the legal validity of the suit itself and were asking the court to uphold the concept of "freedom of choice" in the realm of higher education.\textsuperscript{123}

\textsuperscript{122}Letter from Henry J. Wuensch to James M. Carson, 14 July 1970.

\textsuperscript{123}Letter from William G. Broaddus to Ernest Goodrich, 23 July 1970 (Goodrich was Rector of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary); The Progress-Index, 22 July 1970; Richmond Times Dispatch, 25 July 1970; The Richmond News Leader, 25 July 1970.
Carson, upon his return from Europe, sent to Paschall a lengthy chronology of events that had taken place during the first six months of 1970 which, in his opinion, represented an organized conspiracy against the escalation of Richard Bland College and in the letter he further alleged that a number of the plaintiffs and their supporters had sought to bring about the actual demise of the College. He stated that he could no longer stand by while his institution was being maligned for reasons he felt were fully unjustified. In his concluding remarks Carson asked:

...that Richard Bland College be authorized to employ a competent attorney to protect its interests, possibly to the extent of requesting court injunction for the discontinuance of these events and efforts to demean Richard Bland College. In the event that the court action and complaint pending against the Board of Visitors of William and Mary and this College is acted upon in favor of the plaintiffs by the Federal court, it can be expected that many of our faculty will not return another year.124

On 13 August a meeting was held at the State Council of Higher Education between administrative officers from Virginia State College, Richard Bland College, and The College of William and Mary. Associate Director of the State Council, Daniel E. Martin, Jr., sent to Paschall a copy of the draft that was agreed upon by the participating parties. The statement reflected an effort by the State Council to establish mutual areas of agreement by which Virginia State College and The College of William and Mary might deal with the escalation of Richard Bland College. The parties agreed to the following:

124Letter from James M. Carson to Davis Y. Paschall, 7 August 1970.
The administrations of Virginia State College and William and Mary discussed jointly matters of concern to both institutions relating to possible areas of further cooperation and agreed to the following:

1. Recommend to their respective boards in September the designation of Board Committees to explore in detail questions that have been discussed administratively, such as maximum utilization of faculties of both institutions; avoidance of duplicate programs; agreement on limitation for the foreseeable future of Richard Bland College to an undergraduate institution; exchange of students; and any other aspects of inter-institutional relationships as might be appropriate including the future governance of Richard Bland College.

2. Further consideration of budgetary problems of both institutions with the view of submitting recommendations in this regard to the extra session of the General Assembly in January 1971.125

It is significant to note the apparent cordiality of the meeting which is reflected in Marvin's correspondence with Paschall, while in reality Paschall saw the representatives from Virginia State College, Dean of Academic Affairs Elwood Boone in particular, as being openly hostile to Richard Bland College. Paschall viewed Boone as desiring to see Richard Bland being recognized as a part of Virginia State College.126 It appeared by this interpretation of the meeting that the lines were drawn for future confrontation between two of the defendants in the case.

In juxtaposition to the apparent contradiction between individuals at Virginia State College and Virginia State College being named a defendant, the United States Office of Civil Rights demanded that

125Letter from Daniel E. Marvin, Jr. to Davis Y. Paschall, 24 August 1970.

126Letter from Davis Y. Paschall to Ernest Goodrich and R. Harvey Chappell, Jr., 26 August 1970 (Both Goodrich and Chappell were members of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary).
Governor Holton speak to his failure to discuss the implementation of a statewide plan for the desegregation of the colleges and universities of the Commonwealth. Why, in the face of visits and inquiries from the Office of Civil Rights, did not the Governor veto the bill that would have upgraded Richard Bland to four-year status? 127

Not only was Richard Bland College under fire from the Federal government but also The College of William and Mary was being questioned on its role in the escalation of Richard Bland and on its own questionable efforts to recruit black faculty and students. In response to Eloise Severinson, Regional Civil Rights Director, Paschall responded that the escalation of Richard Bland was a legislative act and he and the Board of Visitors were obliged legally to accept that decision. 128 Paschall had denied any wrong doing on his own campus, but seemed to be less than decisive in his defense of Richard Bland. It seemed he was quite willing to protect his own interests, but less concerned about the branch in Petersburg.

Coinciding with the various legal moves that were being made at the state and Federal levels a major effort was made by The Virginia State Advisory Committee to convince the United States Commission on Civil Rights to "...require the State of Virginia to develop a statewide desegregation plan under which Richard Bland College would be
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incorporated into Virginia State College.\textsuperscript{129} This was only one of numerous observations and recommendations which were included in the Report. The Report was discussed at length in the press.\textsuperscript{130}

As a follow-up to the Report, David W. Sprunt, Chairman of the Virginia State Advisory Committee announced a state-wide Conference on "Civil Rights and the Status of Higher Education in Virginia." The conference was held in Richmond and included top-level civil rights officials from the Federal government. Sprunt asked Carson to be a participant in the conference\textsuperscript{131} but instead Carson sent John Oberseider, a member of the English faculty at Richard Bland College. The observations of Oberseider centered on the recommendation by many of the conference participants to use political pressure to attempt to halt the escalation of Richard Bland College.\textsuperscript{132}

As in the past history of Richard Bland College, political factors affected the development of the College to a greater degree than did academic planning. The Virginia State Advisory Committee was another example of an external organization using political pressure to bring about changes at Richard Bland College. In this instance, the change represented an attempt to block the already approved escalation plans.


\textsuperscript{131}Letter from David W. Sprunt to James M. Carson, 3 November 1970.

\textsuperscript{132}Notes of John Oberseider, Petersburg, Virginia. 21 November 1970.
Meanwhile, during Fall, 1970, United States District Court Judge Robert R. Merhige, Jr. rejected the request from Virginia Attorney General Andrew P. Miller to appoint a three-judge court to review the suit involving Richard Bland College. It had been the contention of Miller that the constitutionality of a state statute required the appointment of the three judges. Merhige disagreed, saying he alone could review the contentions of the plaintiffs. On 22 October, Assistant Attorney General Broaddus filed with Merhige a petition for reconsideration of the judge's opinion regarding the appointment of the three-judge court.\textsuperscript{133} Carson saw the three-judge court as the possible savior for Richard Bland.\textsuperscript{134}

In an effort to reduce the potential explosive situation which had grown in recent months between the Federal government and Holton, Holton submitted to the Federal government a revised plan for the desegregation of higher education institutions in the Commonwealth. For Richard Bland and its supporters the Holton plan was a major blow to escalation efforts and appeared to represent a retreat by the Governor at a time when disposition of the court case was pending.

Eminently clear was the Governor's intent to:

\textit{...search for meaningful areas of cooperation among and between largely white and largely black institutions, avoid duplication of programs which could maintain the characteristics of a dual system, and assist all students, white and black, to realize}

\textsuperscript{133}The Progress-Index, 23 October 1970.

\textsuperscript{134}Carson, interview. op. cit.
their full potential through a higher education system that allows for individual differences of ability, interests, financial resources and, at the same time, maintains the integrity of the institutions within a unitary system.  

Holton further struck at the integrity of the General Assembly and the aspirations of Richard Bland College when he stated that "in addition, legislation will be introduced to include Richard Bland in the Community College System, keeping its programs at the two-year level."  

Again politics played a major role in the growth and development of Richard Bland College. Holton seemed to be seeking to appease the Federal government at the expense of Richard Bland. If he could keep the College from becoming a four-year institution, he might be able to forestall any cut in Federal funds. He, too, would be in a better position to contend with future incursions into the higher educational system of the Commonwealth.  

Smith reacted sharply to the move by Holton to convert Richard Bland to community college status. He stated that the Governor was a defendant in the class-action suit and that it was improper for him to suggest such an alternative for Richard Bland. Further, Smith indicated that there was little difference between the Richard  

\[\text{\cite{135}}\]  

\[\text{\cite{136}}\]
Bland-Virginia State relationship and that which existed between Norfolk State College and Old Dominion in Norfolk. Finally, Smith concluded that Holton should have avoided the controversy surrounding Richard Bland by saying the issue is pending in Federal court.  

With the decision of Holton to return the future mission of Richard Bland to the state legislature, there again appeared a pall of uncertainty over the College. Was it to become a four-year institution or was it to become a part of the Community College System? Could its future remain clouded with uncertainty for years to come? When, if ever, would the art of politics cease to become the prime lever behind the manipulation of the institution? It might also be asked what role was the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary to play in this struggle?

At a meeting of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary on 6 and 7 November, Paschall reviewed with that body the myriad of events that had taken place since the court case had been initiated during the previous summer. A matter of particular importance to Richard Bland and William and Mary related to the desirability of the aforementioned defendants obtaining special legal counsel from some source other than the Office of the Attorney General. It was suggested that the services of Robert McIlwaine, III, former member of the staff of the Attorney General and a

---
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practicing attorney in Petersburg, be requested. McIlwaine had extensive experience in Federal courtroom procedures and had indicated his willingness to represent the two colleges. He was asked to brief the Board of Visitors on current procedural developments in the case.\footnote{138}{Minutes of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, 6-7 November 1970.}

Following McIlwaine's presentation regarding the legal aspects of the case, a student delegation from Richard Bland appeared before the Board to advise that body of their profound concern for the future of the College. The students pointed out quite clearly their desire to remain for four years at the branch institution and they asked the Board of Visitors to do their utmost in making this concern a reality. Following the student presentation, the Board again heard from McIlwaine and subsequently voted to retain him as Counsel for both William and Mary and Richard Bland.\footnote{139}{Ibid.}

In response to earlier requests from the Office of the Attorney General that the court case be heard by a three-judge panel and in spite of his previous decision to hear the case himself, Merhige asked Clement F. Haynsworth, Chief Judge of the 4th United States Circuit Court of Appeals, to name a three-judge panel to hear the case. Subsequently, Haynsworth appointed John D. Butzner (United States Circuit Judge), Robert R. Merhige, Jr. (United States District
Judge), and Walter E. Hoffman (Chief Judge of United States District Court) as the panel to hear the case.140

As 1970 came to a close, both the proponents and antagonists in the Richard Bland controversy marshalled their final efforts to determine the fate of the institution. An educator's group called the Virginia Council on Problems in Higher Education met in Charlottesville to denounce the escalation of Richard Bland College. New Virginia State College President, Wendell P. Russell spoke for the group composed of individuals from Virginia State College, the University of Virginia, Virginia Union University, and Hampton Institute. Russell condemned the escalation of the College and advocated support for Holton's plan which would reduce Richard Bland to community college status.141

Carson sent letters to selected area state legislators and local political leaders in which he reiterated the alternatives open to the College. These included: 1) remain under the parent institution until the State Council of Higher Education could meet with area political and educational leaders; 2) remain under the parent


institution and move toward four-year status; 3) be placed in the community college system. All of these alternatives represented a possible solution to the Richard Bland dilemma, but only the second alternative seemed logical to Carson.

The plaintiffs and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's Legal and Defense Fund financially supported the plaintiffs and they were joined by the American Civil Liberties' Union as an "amicus curiae" in January, 1971. The ACLU contended that the colleges and universities in Virginia were in reality public schools and it was the responsibility of the courts to see that all efforts were made to desegregate the institutions of the Commonwealth. The group viewed the escalation of Richard Bland College as being a threat to such desegregation.

Throughout January, 1971, depositions were taken in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. Interested parties representing both plaintiffs and defendants were examined and cross-examined by attorneys from the conflicting sides. The depositions and corresponding exhibits were presented to the three-judge panel for their examination. It was reported by
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McIlwaine at the January meeting of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary that the three-judge panel would probably begin deliberations on all evidence presented in February, 1971. McIlwaine anticipated "...a fairly prompt ruling on this matter."  

It is of interest to note that throughout this period of uncertainty regarding the future of Richard Bland, the College continued to provide educational opportunities to the citizens of Southside Virginia. Since its accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in December, 1968, the College had continued its efforts to complete all required follow-up reports for the accrediting body. At the January meeting of the Board of Visitors, Paschall reported that the Commission on Colleges had accepted the second follow-up report from Richard Bland College and that no further reports were required.  

During March the three-judge court evaluated the depositions and briefs that had been filed by the contending parties and questioned their attorneys in an effort to arrive at a final determination of the case. However, it was not until May that the Court
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rendered its decision. In that opinion the judges stated that:

1. The motion to dissolve the three-judge court is denied;
3. The Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary and the President of Richard Bland College, their officers, agents, and employees, and those persons in active concert or participation with them who receive actual notice of this order by personal service or otherwise are enjoined from escalating Richard Bland College to the status of a four-year undergraduate degree-granting institution;
4. Other relief sought by the plaintiffs is denied without prejudice;
5. The Governor of Virginia and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia are dismissed as parties defendant;
6. The plaintiffs shall recover their costs from the remaining defendants other than the Board of Visitors of Virginia State College.

Hoffman disagreed with conclusions drawn by the majority opinion and stated his opposition to their views regarding the Appropriations Act, the order to prohibit escalation of Richard Bland, and the ability of the plaintiffs to gain court costs.

More than a year after the General Assembly had given approval to the escalation of Richard Bland to four-year status the College was again severely and profoundly affected by the actions of a

---
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political body. This time it was the judicial arm of the government that registered a legal opinion which would change the course of Richard Bland as well as exacting future changes on higher education in the Commonwealth. The legal ramifications of the case were stated by a Richmond Times Dispatch education writer, Charles Cox:

Neither the General Assembly of Virginia nor The College of William and Mary has the authority to make Bland a four-year degree-granting institution because such a step would have the effect of perpetuating a state-supported, racially identifiable dual system of higher education, the court decided. 150

This was the crucial aspect of the case. Simply stated, it meant that all money appropriated by the General Assembly for the escalation of Richard Bland would not be available for such a purpose. Plans which had been made by administrators and faculty at the school would be curtailed. The students who had prepared themselves for their junior year would have to transfer to another college or university. In short, the very fiber of the institution was to be changed by the pronouncement of the court. Wide-spread media coverage of the decision appeared to set the stage for future confrontation among the contending parties. There were those who expressed keen disappointment while the plaintiffs felt that the court should have called for the merger of Richard Bland with Virginia

150 Richmond Times Dispatch, 13 May 1971.
On 14 May approximately two-hundred students at Richard Bland protested the decision and vowed to continue the battle in the future. It was suggested by some students that an appeal of the decision should be made directly to the United States Supreme Court.

What was the reaction by the political leadership that had been instrumental in bringing Richard Bland to the brink of four-year status? It was W. Roy Smith who released to the press a twelve-page statement which demonstrated clearly his reaction to the decision. In part, Smith stated:

I deem it important to the future of education in Virginia that Richard Bland be allowed to escalate in accordance with the action of the General Assembly of Virginia. I deem it to be equally important, to the future of higher education in Virginia and throughout the nation, that the majority opinion of this three-judge court not be accepted as the final word in this case. For these reasons I have communicated to the Attorney General of Virginia my views and my hope that the Commonwealth of Virginia will take prompt steps to appeal this decision to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Smith had been joined by Elmon T. Gray of Waverly, who was seeking the Democratic nomination for the State Senate from the sixteenth Senatorial District which had been held by his father, Garland Gray. Gray castigated the Court decision as being an example of

---
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Federal incursion into the rights of the States and in a letter to United States Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Gray stated:

This precedent-setting action can well serve as a milestone in bringing all institutions of higher learning under the Federal courts. This is a serious and far-reaching decision and one which I deplore.  

With the chief Southside Virginia politician behind the move to appeal the decision of the three-judge court, the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary convened in Williamsburg on 20 May. Following brief presentations by Carson, Paul Clem (Liaison Officer), James B. McNeer (Director of Admissions at Richard Bland), and three student leaders from Richard Bland, McIlwaine and Assistant Attorney General Broaddus advised the body of their reactions to the case.  

McIlwaine urged the Board of Visitors to appeal the case on legal grounds. His contention was that a previous United States Supreme Court decision had already spoken to the issue. Specifically he stated:

that Judge Hoffman goes to great lengths to explain how this case does not differ in any material aspect from the decision in the Alabama case in which an attempt to enjoin the escalation of the Montgomery Branch of Auburn University was denied and the Supreme Court affirmed the refusal of the District Court to enjoin that escalation.  

---
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Broaddus was asked by Board member Harvey Chappell if the Office of the Attorney General would financially support an appeal and if so would the responsibility of appeal fall directly under the Attorney General's authority. There seemed to be more concern by Chappell over who was to pay for the appeal than on his willingness to support the branch college. After lengthy discussion, the Board voted to appeal the case since Attorney General Andrew P. Miller had recommended the appeal. The appeal was to be under the canopy of the Office of the Attorney General and McIlwaine was to serve as Special Counsel. However, no commitment for supporting the appeal came from the Attorney General.

Smith, who spoke at the June Commencement exercises at Richard Bland, continued to exhort the increasing role being played by the Federal judicial system in the affairs of the states. He also praised the students of Richard Bland for their orderly demonstrations against the decision of the court and promised them his continued support in the future.

On 4 August, Special Counsel McIlwaine filed a jurisdictional statement containing a thirty-eight page brief with the United States Supreme Court. Specifically stated the question by McIlwaine was:

159 Ibid.

160 Ibid.; Letter from Davis Y. Paschall to Andrew P. Miller, 27 May 1971; Letter from Andrew P. Miller to Davis Y. Paschall, 2 June 1971.

161 Richmond Times Dispatch, 3 June 1971; The Progress-Index, 3 June 1971.
Did the Court below err in declaring the Virginia Appropriations Act of 1970 Chapter 461, Item 600, p. 754 (Acts of Assembly 1970) violative of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution insofar as it provides for the escalation of Richard Bland College to third and four-year status and enjoining appellants, their officers, agents, and employees, and those persons in active concert or participation with them, from escalating Richard Bland College to the status of a four-year undergraduate degree-granting institution?\(^{162}\)

Extensive local publicity was given to the filing of the appeal even though it would be late Fall before the Supreme Court would announce whether it would hear the case.\(^{163}\) It was the opinion of McIlwaine that his appeal was well-documented and was based on legitimate legal grounds. He saw no legal impediment which should prohibit Richard Bland from escalating and he hoped that the United States Supreme Court would agree with his logic.\(^{164}\)

Soon after the United States Supreme Court convened in October, 1971, a verdict was reached on the outcome of the appeal. The decision of the Supreme Court was rendered on 26 October without a hearing.

---

162 The Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary in Virginia, et. al., v. Ethel M. Norris, et. al., No. 71-170, October term 1971; Letter from R. D. McIlwaine, III, to Davis Y. Paschall and Carter O. Lowance (Executive Vice President of The College of William and Mary), 4 August 1971.


164 R. E. McIlwaine, III, interview held at Richard Bland College, Petersburg, Virginia. 6 June 1980.
and without dissent by the judicial body. In short, the judgment of the three-judge court to prohibit the escalation of Richard Bland was affirmed.\textsuperscript{165}

Carson expressed publicly his keen disappointment over the decision but declined extensive comment until he had received an official word from the parent institution.\textsuperscript{166} In discussions with Carson, he felt strongly that the decision of the United States Supreme Court was the final blow in a long series of political actions that had affected the development of the College from its inception. He cited Chandler as being the only top level administrator at The College of William and Mary that had, in his opinion, ever been truly interested in the welfare of Richard Bland College.\textsuperscript{167}

In conversations with Paschall, the former President of The College of William and Mary, viewed the adverse decision of the Supreme Court as being regrettable but cited the enormous amount of political pressure against the escalation of Richard Bland College that had been brought to bear on his administration. Paschall felt that the parent institution moved to escalate Richard Bland at a time

\textsuperscript{165}Ibid.; The Progress-Index, 26 October 1971; The Hopewell (Va.) News, 26 October 1971; Richmond Times Dispatch, 25 October 1971.

\textsuperscript{166}The Progress-Index, 27 October 1971

\textsuperscript{167}Carson, interview. op. cit.
when the Holton administration "was very anxious politically to have no ruffling of the feathers on any integration issue." 168

Smith viewed the defeat of the movement to bring Richard Bland College to four-year status as politically motivated. He stated that Richard Bland was one of a number of public institutions in the Commonwealth of Virginia that had been upgraded to four-year status. Christopher Newport, Clinch Valley, and George Mason had all been approved by the General Assembly in the same manner as Richard Bland, but the latter was prohibited to do so by judicial decree. 169 Smith saw further the allegation that the escalation of Richard Bland was racially motivated as being a false charge. He felt that it was ironic that he was accused of promoting Richard Bland at the expense of Virginia State College, since he had, in his opinion, worked hard to promote the interests of the predominately black college. He said that this was especially true in his efforts to retain the School of Agriculture at Virginia State College and in his energetic response to the financial needs of that four-year institution. 170

The prohibition on Richard Bland to offer baccalaureate degrees was indeed a pivotal point in the history of the College. There were

168 Davis Y. Paschall, interview held at the home of Davis Y. Paschall, Charles City County, Virginia. 12 May 1980.

169 Richmond Times Dispatch, 27 October 1971.

170 Smith, interview. op. cit.
many events of a political nature which were to affect the institution in the ensuing years of the decade, but since the intent of this paper is restricted to the period of 1958 to 1972 there is no attempt to evaluate them at this time.

In concluding Chapter IV, it must be said the emergence of John Tyler as a comprehensive community college had a profound affect on the status of Richard Bland College. The addition of liberal arts courses to the technical curriculum served to duplicate the majority of work already being provided by The College of William and Mary branch in Petersburg. The political and financial support given to John Tyler by the area's counties and cities had an adverse effect on the well-being of Richard Bland. Further, the financial resources provided to the community college by the Commonwealth of Virginia was in excess of that provided to Richard Bland. This financial commitment to the entire Community College System exceeded the percentage of state funds which were made available to the other state-supported colleges and universities in the Commonwealth. This resulted in students in Southside Virginia being able to attend John Tyler Community College at considerably less cost than at either Virginia State College or Richard Bland College.

Another conclusion that can be drawn from this chapter is that Richard Bland College did not have the full support for escalation from The College of William and Mary at the time Christopher Newport was approved by that body for movement to four-year status.
Christopher Newport College did not face the local opposition that confronted Richard Bland and had no insurmountable difficulty in achieving its goal. Neither did it appear that Richard Bland had an advocate such as Ernst on the Board of Visitors who possessed the necessary political ability or connections.

It was only through the political maneuverings of W. Roy Smith that Richard Bland even received the blessings of Paschall and the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary to seek four-year status. Smith and his fellow legislators were also able to convince those at the state level who opposed the escalation of Richard Bland from speaking openly against the move at the time the act was approved. As Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Smith, too, used his influence to obtain tacit assistance from a reluctant Governor A. Linwood Holton.

The opposition from the supporters of Virginia State College and the ensuing class-action suit eventually curtailed any hopes that the Richard Bland advocates might have had in bringing about the desired change of status for the College.

It may, therefore, be said that political factors did indeed serve as the primary reason for Richard Bland College being enjoined from becoming a four-year college.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, OBSERVATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to show that the establishment and growth of Richard Bland College as a two-year institution of higher education was based largely on decisions which were political in nature. In reflecting on the political factors which affected the institution, it was also the intent of the study to point out that decisions of the moment were often made which had little to do with what might be considered by educators as sound academic planning. In a broader sense, the study was designed to record a significant period of a two-year branch college and to provide insight into the political nature and developments of a changing Southside Virginia. The period of time covered by the study was from 1958 to 1972.

The major findings of this study are summarized in the following sections, which parallel the body of the report.

Political Factors Emanating from the City of Hopewell

The interest expressed by the Optimist Club of Hopewell in bringing a two-year state-supported college to the area, although initially unsuccessful, did plant the seed for such an endeavor to be accomplished in Petersburg.
Although the University of Hopewell Foundation, Incorporated, did not become a successful operation, it did have an effect on Richard Bland College. Homer C. Eliades and his supporters saw the establishment of Richard Bland College as a threat to the development of Hopewell College. Lacking formal accreditation and having no permanent site for a building, the College might still have survived if Richard Bland College had not begun its operations with both of these essential needs already having been met. Animosity between Eliades and President James M. Carson of Richard Bland College helped to turn Eliades from support of Richard Bland to what later would be named John Tyler Community College. In fact, Eliades became a primary opponent of Richard Bland's unsuccessful effort to add a technical component to its liberal arts curriculum.

Hopewell College as an institution also failed because of the inability of its leadership to obtain the full support of the community. Neither did it reach out to surrounding political subdivisions for assistance. Finally, it failed to gain the blessings of the large industries located within the city. Despite these deficiencies, the blame for failure of Hopewell College was placed on the administration at Richard Bland.

The roots of estrangement between Hopewell College and Richard Bland College went beyond the conflict between the two institutions. Rivalry between the two colleges affected matters of education, economics, and politics in the respective localities. Also, this
rivalry did not help Richard Bland, the Petersburg-based college, to gain support from the business and industrial community of Hopewell. In fact, it resulted in the almost unanimous support which was given to John Tyler Community College by the Hopewell industrial and political leadership.

Politics and the Relationship between The College of William and Mary in Virginia and Richard Bland College.

Politics was a primary reason for President Chandler agreeing to sponsor additional branch colleges in Petersburg and Newport News. He saw The College of William and Mary as being the recipient of most of the higher educational benefits from Richmond south to North Carolina and east to the Atlantic Seaboard. Chandler intended to use these two-year colleges as a means for gaining the political support of the state legislators from Southside Virginia and Newport News. With this additional support, The College of William and Mary could become a legitimate rival to the power bases already established by Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the University of Virginia,

Following the resignation of Chandler and the emergence of Paschall as President of The College of William and Mary, Richard Bland was not placed on the same priority that it held under the previous administration. Paschall turned his attention to the upgrading of the traditional liberal arts offerings and projected construction plans at the main campus. Only when pressed by the political leadership from Southside Virginia or by Petersburg's Frank A. Ernst as a member of the Board of Visitors, did he respond publicly to
the needs of Richard Bland. As a devoted advocate for the liberal arts, Paschall and his fellow administrators at William and Mary did not at an early date push for the inclusion of vocational and technical education at the branch campus even though Carson was anxious to add this new dimension to the curriculum. Paschall supported the movement only after being pressured by Smith, Ernst, and Carson. Jones, Fowler, and Willis, as administrators at The College of William and Mary, did not ever support the technical movement or the drive to four-year status.

If this leadership at The College of William and Mary had recommended escalation of Richard Bland College at the same time as they did for Christopher Newport College, it might have been possible to have accomplished the goal without having had such widespread opposition from the Virginia State College community. The movement to escalate in 1969 and 1970 coincided with the turmoil created by internal leaders at Virginia State. The issue of Richard Bland's escalation became a rallying point for those opposing the leadership at the four-year college.

The death of Frank Ernst in December, 1966 left a void on the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary at a time when Richard Bland most needed that governing body's support. Even though another Petersburg resident would be appointed to the Board, few had the ability and influence that was possessed by Ernst. Thereafter, the Board of Visitors only reacted to the political problems which
confronted Richard Bland. They no longer took the initiative as they had done while Ernst was a member.

Other decisions of a political nature that emanated from The College of William and Mary that affected Richard Bland College included the problems associated with the dismantling of The Colleges of William and Mary and the ensuing reorganization movement; the difficulties associated with the acquisition of additional land; and, the reluctance of the Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary to allow Richard Bland to have a local advisory committee. The solution to all of these issues was decided through political means.

The Role of Political and Civic Leaders in the Establishment and Growth of Richard Bland College.

No other individual possessed the political clout that was present in the person of W. Roy Smith. It was he who became Richard Bland's chief legislative proponent. As a delegate in the General Assembly of Virginia, Smith sought to add a technical component to the Richard Bland curriculum. Using his power as a member of the House Appropriations Committee and House Education Committee, he took the initiative to remove the two-year restriction which had been placed on the institution. In spite of overwhelming odds, he saw that financial support was provided for the escalation of Richard Bland to four-year status. Through the efforts of Smith, other legislators joined him even when there prevailed much dissatisfaction from supporters of predominantly black Virginia State College. The political influence
wielded by him enabled the College to escape the Virginia Community College System. The pressure exerted by Smith on Paschall and the Board of Visitors and on Governor A. Linwood Holton served as an example of the degree of political power that was exercised by Smith.

James M. Carson, as chief administrator of Richard Bland College throughout the period of this study, was a strong believer in the role played by politics in the educational process. Carson believed in using the art of politics to obtain that which he viewed as being of importance to his College. Through everything from public announcements and behind-the-scenes maneuvering, his every thought centered on use of political persuasion to achieve desired goals.

It was the effective use of politics by Homer C. Eliades and Frank Wyche that helped them to achieve their goal of bringing a technical school to Chesterfield County. Wyche, in particular, stressed the need to separate the technical from the liberal arts. It was ironic that the movement to develop a comprehensive community college system brought these two different educational programs under one umbrella.

The role played by local political leaders of the counties and cities of Southside Virginia to influence the nature of the curricular offerings at John Tyler and later to support the escalation of Richard Bland to four-year status was evident in the study. The industrial and business community, too, served as catalysts for higher educational change in the area.
The individuals associated with the class-action suit against the escalation of Richard Bland affected the very nature of the institution for years to come. If the suit had not been brought by these local citizens, Richard Bland would undoubtedly have become a baccalaureate degree-granting college. The use of political pressure by the supporters of Virginia State College was instrumental in focusing attention on the desegregation of all state supported institutions of higher learning in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The Effect of Politics at the State Level on the Establishment and Growth of Richard Bland College.

Richard Bland College was a creation of the political process and it remained a pawn in the hands of politicians throughout the period being considered in this study.

With the founding of Richard Bland College in 1960 by the General Assembly of Virginia, the institution was measurably affected by political actions at the state level. The Higher Education Study Commission and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia both recommended that the College become a part of the Virginia Community College System. Certain members of the Virginia General Assembly concurred with that recommendation, but W. Roy Smith and his political associates opposed the recommendation. In fact, Smith engineered successfully the drive to escalate Richard Bland to four-year status.

The creation of the Virginia Community College System was a serious blow to the viability of Richard Bland College. With its
712 acres of land already owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia, it could have easily incorporated a technical component within its liberal arts curriculum. The state-wide system with the establishment of John Tyler, Southside, and Paul Camp Community Colleges served to limit the geographical area from which Richard Bland could reasonably expect to draw students. It may finally develop that the proliferation of all these community colleges was a serious financial mistake by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The political and financial commitment given to John Tyler Community College and to the entire community college system by both the state and the localities was well in excess of that given to Richard Bland, while appropriations from the area served by John Tyler provided adequate annual support for that institution.

The Judicial Decision and its Impact on Richard Bland College.

The class-action suit and the ultimate judicial decision prohibiting escalation to baccalaureate-degree granting status had a decided detrimental effect on the future of Richard Bland College. The outcome of the case resulted in Richard Bland becoming an anomaly within the higher education structure of the Commonwealth of Virginia. The College became the only public-supported two-year college in the state that was not a part of the Virginia Community College System.

Certainly politics played the major role in placing Richard Bland in this position. It was a struggle in the late 1950's when the movement to create a college began and it remained so throughout the period
of the study. The decision of the United States Supreme Court was the culminating experience in this long struggle.

OBSERVATIONS

Because of the overwhelming political influences on the founding and early growth of Richard Bland, it would appear fitting to conclude this study with some observations relating those findings to those of other studies. The focus of the review of literature was placed on works which related to the origin and development of the junior college movement in America and on studies which emphasized the establishment and growth of individual institutions.

Even though the literature review consisted of several studies which indicated that an awareness of politics was an important factor in the establishment and growth of a two-year college, this study showed that politics was the primary factor in the life of Richard Bland College. James Thornton indicated that "junior colleges have developed in response to various local influences, and are subject to the laws of the fifty states and to the guiding principles of their own governing boards." However, Thornton did not view the political maneuvering of various influential individuals and the tactics of pressure groups as being the prime movers behind the development of an educational institution. The unique character of

---

the study of Richard Bland College is that it shows that politics was the single most important factor in the establishment and growth of a state-supported two-year college.

Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson concluded that an understanding of the community power structure was an essential ingredient in the success of a community-based two-year college, but they did not elaborate, as was done in this study, on the effect that political forces emanating from the national, state, and local levels had on a two-year educational institution.

Kimbrough's study of the relationship of community politics to education was concerned primarily with public school districts, while the study of Richard Bland involved these kinds of political struggles at the college level. Further, Richard Bland and the political controversy associated with its founding and growth represents an indepth analysis of a single educational institution in its struggle for survival.

In a dissertation written about the establishment of Luzerne County Community College in Pennsylvania, John Patrick Martin indicated that political decision-making was an important element in the creation of an educational institution, but he did not use

---


politics as the central theme of his case study as has been done in
the study of Richard Bland College.

This study differs from the dissertations of Smith,\(^5\) Nutter,\(^6\)
and Medlin\(^7\) in that their works focused on a number of different
institutions of higher education. They also presented general
historical information which did not relate to the vital role played
by politics in the development of their educational institutions.

The study of Richard Bland College is unique in that it illus­
trates that major political decisions affecting the establishment
and growth of the institution were of more importance than educa­
tional factors. Matters of curriculum, land acquisition, mission,
degree of local and state support, questions of a legal nature, esca­
lation to four-year status, and relationships with the parent campus,
all were based on politics.

In conclusion, this study has shown that politics was the most
important factor involved in the establishment and growth of Richard
Bland College.

\(^5\)Aine Peterson Smith, "A Study of Administrators' Perceptions
of Change in Three Private Arts Women's Junior Colleges: Averett,
Southern Seminary, Virginia Intermont in Virginia from 1966 to 1976"

\(^6\)Larry W. Nutter, "A History of Junior Colleges in Oklahoma"

\(^7\)Stuart B. Medlin, "The Founding of the Permanent Denominational
Colleges in Virginia, 1776-1861" (Ed.D dissertation, College of
William and Mary in Virginia, 1975).
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The primary purpose of this study was to identify political factors that affected the establishment and growth of Richard Bland College from 1958 to 1972. As a result of the summary and observations drawn from the study, it seems appropriate to suggest certain topics which should be evaluated in future research.

1. Using the class-action suit as a beginning point, a study involving the identification and evaluation of political factors affecting Richard Bland College from 1972 to the present should be compared to the growth of John Tyler Community College during the same period.

2. The uncertainty of the mission of Richard Bland in the years after 1971 could serve as a possible theme for further research. Did the College seek accommodation to compensate for its disappointment in not becoming a four-year college or did it drift from year to year relying only on political support for its very existence? The role played by the new leadership at both The College of William and Mary and at Richard Bland College could be analyzed in light of the future mission of the branch college.

3. It would be of value to ascertain the attitude held by the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia toward Richard Bland College from 1971 to 1981. Did this body make specific recommendations for the College or did it assume an attitude of ambivalence?

4. Another topic for research could be in the role played by
Richard Bland College in gubernatorial plans for the desegregation of the public colleges and universities in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Did W. Roy Smith continue to exert influence on the future role of the College? Were there other political leaders who assumed a protective role over the institution?

5. Concomitant to this investigation, there could be an analysis made of the relationship which existed between Richard Bland College and Virginia State College from 1972 to 1981.

6. A study of the similarities and the differences in the growth and development of Richard Bland College and Christopher Newport College would seem to be of value. Both institutions began in 1960 as branches of The College of William and Mary in Virginia. The former remained a two-year branch of the parent college while the latter became a four-year college with its own Board of Visitors.

7. Further research is needed to analyze the rapidly changing political and social nature of Southside Virginia. What effect did these changes have on higher education in both Southside Virginia and the Commonwealth of Virginia as a whole?
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POLITICAL FACTORS AFFECTING THE ESTABLISHMENT AND GROWTH OF RICHARD BLAND COLLEGE OF THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA 1958-1972
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The purpose of this study was to both identify and analyze those major political factors which had a significant impact on the establishment and growth of Richard Bland College. The study was also designed to record a significant period in the history of a two-year branch college and to provide insight into the political nature and developments of a changing Southside Virginia.

It was hypothesized that the establishment and growth of Richard Bland College was based largely on decisions of a political nature rather than on sound academic planning. Further, the effective use of politics enabled the institution to survive many of the crises it faced during the period 1958 to 1972.

The historical method of research was used in writing about the establishment and growth of Richard Bland College. This method allowed for the examination of primary source documents, the obtaining of oral testimony from participants and observers, and the scrutiny of relationships among people, places, and events.

It was concluded that politics permeated every major decision that was related to the establishment and growth of the institution. The role played by local, state, and national political figures and the rivalry that existed among local political sub-divisions materially affected Richard Bland College during the period being considered. Decisions of a political nature which related to nearby public and private colleges also affected Richard Bland.

Further research into the post 1971 period is needed to analyze the changing social nature of Southside Virginia and to determine the effect of neighboring colleges on the future of Richard Bland. The future viability of the institution might be studied in light of state and national educational decisions.