

THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

**INTERVIEWS WITH
JOHN T. CASTEEN III**

**Conducted on
February 21, February 22, and February 23, 2012
by Sheree Scarborough**



**HISTORY ASSOCIATES INCORPORATED
300 N. STONESTREET AVENUE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850
Telephone: (301) 279-9697
Fax: (301) 279-9224
hai@historyassociates.com**

John T. Casteen III

Biographical Statement

John T. Casteen III was born in 1943, in Portsmouth, Virginia. He received three degrees in English from the University of Virginia (B.A. in 1965, M.A. in 1966, and Ph.D. in 1970). He began his professional career teaching English at the University of California, Berkeley. In 1975, he returned to the University of Virginia where he served as Dean of Admissions and taught English until 1982. Between 1982 and 1985 he served as Secretary of Education in the cabinet of Virginia Governor Charles S. Robb. Returning to higher education, Casteen was president of the University of Connecticut from 1985 to 1990. In 1990, he became the seventh president of the University of Virginia and resigned from that position in 2010 to become president emeritus. Mr. Casteen's twenty year tenure as president is the second longest in the history of the University of Virginia.

Interview Synopsis

Mr. Casteen begins the interview by describing his childhood, early education, and family background in Portsmouth, Virginia. He recounts some of his experiences and the cultural milieu of his undergraduate and graduate years, as well as scholarly influences, at the University of Virginia. He describes courses he taught, the English Department, and what he learned about the American academy during his time at the University of California. Although touching on his stints as admissions dean at the University of Virginia, Virginia's Secretary of Education, and president of the University of Connecticut, the majority of the interview focuses on Mr. Casteen's years as president of the University of Virginia. He explores such topics as the shortfall in state appropriations and the University's successful refinancing effort, restructuring of the University's administrative structure, the two capital campaigns in which his administration was involved, and major expansions of the University's physical facilities. Other topics he addresses include the importance of a diverse university community, the role of a university president, the honor system, Thomas Jefferson's impact on the University, as well as several tragedies that occurred during his tenure. He concludes with thoughts on the current state and future of the University of Virginia and of higher education in general.

The University of Virginia Oral History Project
Interview with John T. Casteen III
Conducted on February 21, 2012 by Sheree Scarborough

SS: Today is February 21, 2012. This is Sheree Scarborough, and this is the first interview with John T. Casteen III, President Emeritus of the University of Virginia. We are meeting in his office in Alderman Library.

John, a lot of the interviews that I've read with you don't talk very much about your family background. I thought we could start today with that. Could you tell me a bit about that?

JC: I grew up in a suburb of Portsmouth. When I was a child, it was actually in a jurisdiction called Norfolk County, which was abolished when Virginia reorganized some of its cities and counties in the late fifties. It's the place where my dad's family had lived for several generations. My dad's family appears to have settled in the Great Dismal Swamp at a place called Ballahack or Northwest Landing. Those places, as far as I know, don't exist anymore.

My grandfather was a shipyard worker. He was in the supply or materiel unit. His father, as I recall, was a clerk for the Norfolk and Western Railroad. His father was a small merchant. They were always blue-collar workers or white-collar workers who had moved up from clerical jobs.

My mother's family came from a place called Lee Hall, which was also in one of the reorganized counties—now part of Newport News. She grew up in a place called Mulberry Island. It's largely occupied by Fort Eustis, which is the Army Transportation Command headquarters. She grew up in the household of her grandparents. She had been born on Mount Olympus in Washington, a place called Matlock. The family broke up when she was a small child. She and her sister made their way back to Virginia, and their grandparents raised the two of them.

I have two brothers. One is a retired teacher in the city schools in Chesapeake. He was a middle school teacher. The other is an outside machinist who works in the shipyard and has worked in other naval installations. It's a fairly small family. The family name still exists in that region, but at least in my time, there has been some migration away.

My parents were actively involved in support for the public schools. They were advocates of public schools during Massive Resistance in Virginia—when a lot of state elected officials were talking about abolishing the public schools. They were engaged in various community activities, simply because they believed that that was what good citizens had to do.

My mother was primarily the housekeeper. She was active in her church. She had a role in women's life in the area. She sponsored in her home, sessions for young women on managing their households or beginning their careers or whatever. She had a

relationship with Virginia Tech's home demonstration program. She would convene women who were new in the community to meet with the home demonstration agents and learn what was to be learnt from that source.

She had interest in a few other things, but at least when I was growing up, her primary engagements were with the needs that women had in the community and then her church. My dad had very similar interests. He was at various times active in the PTA, was an officer of the PTA, would go to state conventions of the PTA, and so on.

SS: That was unusual at that time.

JC: It is, but they were determined that their children were going to have good educations. They believed that the schools were under siege, and that their obligation as citizens was to protect the schools.

SS: They were under siege because of—

JC: It was political. It had to do with racism in Virginia law, the determination not to desegregate the schools on the part of state political leaders and so on. They were very conscious of the civil rights struggle. The great political issue that got discussed in the household when I was growing up was the conflict or contrast between the political mood at the time, and certainly a lot of the laws, and what they saw—issues I've seen—as constitutional rights that belong to women, to minority people, and so on. It was not a

matter of lifelong activism; it was a quiet concern. My parents' lives were lives of quiet concern with occasional gestures that made a difference in the community about principles that are embedded in the Fourteenth Amendment.

They really believed that the playing field had to be flat, that everybody had to have a chance to survive, to succeed, to thrive. The principles they taught were pretty straightforward. There was not a lot of rhetoric about Americanism, but there was a lot of determination that we would understand the core principles. The Bill of Rights was a topic of repeated conversation in the household. That's probably characteristic of blue-collar families of similar backgrounds who were determined that their children were going to be successful.

We weren't pushed very much at home. We were simply made to understand that performing in school and complying with the school's culture were steps toward adulthood. I remember being told as a small boy that the goal was to see to it that at the point when we would go on to college—and the assumption was always that we would—we were to be ready to become lawyers or doctors because my dad, at least, believed that if you had that capacity, you could choose anything else you wanted. Both of my parents were believers in hard work. That was part of the culture.

SS: You were a good student?

JC: Not uniformly so, but I found good teachers, including some who took profound interest in me and stayed with that until the ends of their lives.

SS: In elementary school or further?

JC: Certainly in elementary school, but the ones I was thinking about were actually high school teachers. My teachers were led by a school principal who was powerful in his impact on that community. He was what you would have to describe as an old style schoolmaster and he believed in the concept of master teachers. He believed that teachers had to be accountable to one another within the structure of a faculty in order to produce sound results, and he was determined that all of his students were going to have the same opportunities to succeed.

He never apologized at all for the rigor of the hard courses. It was not a wealthy community. Probably two-thirds of the kids who went to my school, for one reason or another, did not go on after high school. There was a fairly high dropout rate during high school. I have no idea what it was statistically, but not everyone made it. At the same time, the school, largely because of this principal and this group of loyal teachers he had assembled around him over a long period of time, was a culture where children were allowed to succeed on their own terms. You didn't have to fit a single mold, but you definitely had to perform.

SS: Interesting individual. What was his name?

JC: His name was Judson Booker. James Judson Booker, Jr. His family lived in an adjacent community. The town where I grew up is roughly defined as Cradock. It was built around the time of World War I as a planned community for shipyard workers. It was designed to be what it was. The Bookers were from an older town called Deep Creek, where there were members of my family also, but not people I knew well. Mrs. Booker was the intellectual leader of the community. She made regular presentations to the Cradock Book Club, which was a women's club that met midday about once a month.

I remember once hearing Mrs. Booker talk about the novel *The Shoes of the Fisherman*, and beginning to understand that she had an approach to literature that was critical. She was interested in how this thing was made and what it might mean and what's not in it that is relevant to the way you react to it and so on.

It occurs to me, I don't know what Mr. Booker taught. I assume it was social studies. But he had taught previously. He became the principal at Cradock School, I'm guessing, but probably in the early fifties. Again, I'm guessing, he was probably there for fifteen to twenty years. When the counties were reorganized and the school became property of the city of Portsmouth, which subsumed the village of Cradock, Mr. Booker eventually became the superintendent of instruction. He wasn't the school superintendent; he was the one who handled the academic part of the school program.

I've stayed in touch with his family, and was invited to make remarks at his funeral, which occurred probably in the mid- to late nineties. I was interested in his background,

because it had something to do with his impact on the community. He had grown up on the Northern Neck on a farm. His family was attached to Farnham Baptist Church, one of the Baptist churches that probably was an outgrowth of the period when the Wesleys were preaching in Virginia. It's of that antiquity. It was a compact community, very focused on its farming, its children, its institutions, the church. It matched what I understood of Mr. Booker.

One of the most interesting things I ever saw him do, by the way, was react with horror when Virginia's General Assembly voted to close public schools whose school boards would not desegregate. What he did fascinates me. It was an act of civil disobedience. Some of Norfolk's schools were to be closed. He looked for children who were going to be displaced from those schools.

One of the families he found was a Jewish family. Cradock, to my knowledge, had only two Jewish families, and I think both of them were World War II refugee families who had settled there. I don't really know a lot about them, but they were there, and we were aware that there were Jewish people there. The town was basically a blue-collar Protestant town with a constantly increasing Catholic population because of the diversification of the workforce. One of the families Mr. Booker found—I can't remember their names—had twin daughters who turned up in my eighth or ninth grade classrooms.

The schools were not allowed to go out and recruit these displaced children, but the Norfolk interim schools were organized, as I understand it, by churches. Because they

were active in the synagogue, and the synagogue apparently was not right in the center of all of this, it was just easier for them to find a place in a cooperating public school. I don't know others that did it.

SS: Interesting.

JC: I learned the most fascinating things. I listened to those girls talk about their lives and discuss the family attachments to Europe. The world where I grew up was tightly centered on Americanness, because it had been so long since the migrations occurred that everybody thought their ancestors came from England. They didn't. From these girls, I was able to learn a totally different take.

SS: What an education.

JC: I don't know how long they stayed, probably a semester or so. They had quite an impact on me, because they opened up a world in which people were simply more diverse, in which talent and perspective and knowledge came from sources that I had just never seen.

They fascinated me. They knew things about the Holocaust, for example, that nobody was talking about in those days. They had a grasp of the public rights involved in the school closures. These girls were no older than I was, but they were very sophisticated

about things that I was finding very difficult. I couldn't imagine the notion that schools would not be a fundamental public commitment.

SS: That's amazing.

JC: The most appalling political event of the period. In any event, I'm not sure how I got into that, but Mr. Booker was the influence who brought those two students, but also others.

SS: Is that also the period that you learned about and started loving literature?

JC: Yes. I know exactly when I began to enjoy literature. In the fifth grade, I was out of school for several weeks because of viral pneumonia that must have been a very serious illness. My mother had her high school textbooks, and I needed something to read because I was bored. She was interested in George Eliot. There was some George Eliot text—I don't know what—that she had. When she realized that I was interested in George Eliot, she started explaining to me why she was. She started collecting George Eliot texts. I remember she found a paperbound edition of *The Mill on the Floss* somewhere. She started providing these books. It wasn't common reading material in the house.

I remember, during the illness, reading Shakespeare. She had an edition of Shakespeare that was edited by William Hazlitt, with Hazlitt's notes. I began to be able to hear the plays in my ear as I read. It was a fascinating discovery: that you could actually make

these things come alive in your imagination. That experience turned me into a reader, because it opened up the possibility of reading for pleasure, but it was also reading as a way of understanding the world.

I felt really isolated. I remember being put in my parents' bedroom while I was sick. I don't know where they slept, but they put me in their bedroom. It had a different view out of the house and I was in a strange setting. The books that she brought were tremendous benefits. As long as she lived, we exchanged books back and forth—not necessarily talking about them very much. She was always interested in houses and gardens. After their deaths, my brother, who was taking care of their estate, gave me back a number of the house and garden books that I had given her over the years.

My dad was fascinated by the Navy. I don't think I have any of those books. I think one of my brothers took them. I gave my dad books about the Navy for probably forty years. So did my brothers. If I spotted something as I traveled through the world that had to do with the Navy, I would get him a copy and pass it back.

SS: I imagine it is nice to have had an intellectual relationship with your parents.

JC: My dad was disabled beginning in about 2002, so in the final years of his life, the relationship was less and less that way. As long as we were able to carry on conversations, he had interests of that kind. For several years, he could not, and so we had a different kind of time together. My mother maintained her faculties right to the

end. She did slow down her reading, and had less interest in reading as she got to the last year or so. So the relationship evolved. Close and very good relationships.

SS: So your mother had her college books, it sounds like?

JC: High school. My mother never went to college. Neither of my parents went to college. My mother was graduated from an old eleven-year school district, as I understand it. I don't know about the school my dad went to. It may well have been an eleven-year school, too. They got married just after high school. I believe it was in 1940 or maybe '41. He went into an apprentice school to become a sheet metal worker. The shipyards ran apprentice schools. Still do, I think. He did that. My mother had various kinds of jobs at an old manual telephone exchange. I don't know what else she did. She used to talk about her jobs a little bit, but I was more focused on the oddity that she was working away from the house, nothing else. During World War II, my dad had skills that the Navy needed, and he joined the Navy and went off eventually to Alaska, where he spent the latter part of the war.

SS: When you were just a small child?

JC: I was small. I do remember his coming back once. I've never tried to sort out his entire service career. I'm not sure how it all worked. People with the kinds of skills that he had were sometimes kept in the shipyards because they needed them there. He did similar work in Alaska—boat construction, boat repairs, and so on. After the war, he came back.

My mother and I were living in a rental development. I guess, conceivably, it was developed by the city or the state. It was for naval enlisted people. I'd say he came back probably in late 1945, maybe early '46. I'm not sure.

They decided to build a house. They bought a lot for \$600. He built the house for \$4,800. Some of my earliest memories of doing things with my dad involve riding on the handlebars of his bicycle to go from the apartment to the house while it was being built. I guess I was helping. I don't know what I could have contributed, but I remember cutting marsh grass away with a machete and learning how to clear a little bit. Then I remember going frequently to see the house as it was being built. The house is for sale now. With their deaths, no one in the family has a use for the house now.

SS: They lived in that house their whole lives?

JC: Yes. My dad spent several years in a skilled care facility, but it was their home, yes. My mother died there.

SS: Are you the oldest child?

JC: Yes, I was the oldest.

SS: Of three boys?

JC: Three boys. The spacing of the boys in the family was roughly four years. I think it was five and three years or three and five years. Both of my brothers still live in the same neighborhood.

SS: That's amazing. You mentioned your high school years as being good years. That was the late fifties, I guess.

JC: Yes. I was graduated in 1961.

SS: Were you involved in any extracurricular activities?

JC: Yes. I was always on a debating team. The teachers would encourage you to do that. I did sports occasionally, but I wasn't a star. I was class president. I was on the student council, and did the kinds of things that, frankly, almost anybody was doing at the time. I had jobs.

SS: In high school?

JC: Yes. I worked in the old city market, the farmer's market, on weekends for several years. I worked in a grocery store after school and on Saturdays. I can't think of what else I did, but I always had some kind of job, carried newspapers and whatever. That was not unusual. That was simply part of growing up there.

SS: Right.

JC: The jobs were good. I had a little bit of money to spend. I was responsible for something. I liked the jobs. The school was in a blue-collar school district. There were kids whose parents were living right on the margin. There were kids whose mothers were alone and were having to figure out how to cope. There were some kids who were in what would nowadays be called foster care. The community seemed to need to embrace essentially everyone. We did not live geographically in the little village; we lived across the train track in a neighborhood with a different name.

But everyone was engaged in the activities of Cradock. The people I knew in those days, by and large, still are active in community engagement. I was down there last fall for my fiftieth-year high school reunion. The place is deteriorating, because the shipyards no longer provide good employment, or not as good as they used to. It's in physical trouble. It doesn't look good right now, although new families are moving in and are putting their time into their houses and their yards. It's a sweat equity investment for a lot of them.

I don't know what the long-term future for a place like that is, because it's close to a hundred years old, and the quality of construction was probably not high in the first place, but people there want to hold on to it.

SS: Yes, there's a revival going on in small towns.

JC: Portsmouth, itself, is a microcosm of what's happened in blue-collar America during my lifetime. So I'm always fascinated by what's going on there—the evolution of African-American political leadership and the destruction of older neighborhoods in the name of urban renewal. There has been a lot of displacement of families who were attached to the neighborhoods, especially the African-American families, who in many cases lost houses that they had acquired. They'd lose by condemnation, when the city would come in to do a project.

The resulting reconstruction, some is quite good, but it's of mixed quality. I go to Portsmouth events occasionally. There are a couple of us on the University's faculty who are from there.

Portsmouth has treated me really well. It's more than flattering, because you get an education there, too. When I was growing up, I did know black families, because my grandfather had always been engaged with the black community.

But meeting people from Portsmouth who grew up leading parallel lives, a mile away from me but in a different environment, attending schools that looked like my schools, is different. The schools were all designed by the same people. Schools that looked like my schools that were teaching curricula that must have been very similar, sending their graduates off to different colleges. I'm not positive of this, but I think I knew the first black person from Portsmouth who came here to school.

SS: Really?

JC: Anyway, these gatherings of people in Portsmouth are, in a sense, reconstitutions of the community, as I understand it, breaking down barriers. You sit in a civic event or at a meal or a celebratory event and listen to people tell the stories of other people's lives and realize that you really were leading this parallel life.

Suddenly, in late middle age, the lines cross. You get to see and appreciate and applaud other people's accomplishments in other parts of existence. Portsmouth is an old city that basically crumbled in the fifties, that struggled to come back in the sixties, and that probably is coming back now. It's a tough one when your core industry is as large and as complex in its labor force as a shipyard is, and the core industry crumbles. The city reels for a long time.

SS: Well, let's talk for a moment about the decision for you to move out of Portsmouth.

JC: I had come here with my parents on a trip somewhere. We used to go camping west of here in the national park. We were probably going to go camping. I had seen the University from the car, and my dad said, "That's where you ought to go to college. That's a good place." That was about as much direction as there was.

In the end, the admission dean from the University of Virginia, a man named Marvin Perry, who was a professor of English, came to my school and did a presentation one

evening. And probably because of an introduction from the principal or one of the college counselors, he turned up the next morning at my parents' house sitting at the kitchen table, talking over what was possible. Mr. Perry showed them that U.Va. was a realistic aspiration, that it was important to come here. He worked with them to figure out how I could afford it. They didn't have the means to send three sons to college.

I always had jobs. It was working—earning subsistence money working—mostly in the library. I borrowed, I believe, \$600 a year and got about \$600 in scholarship. That did it. The total cost must have been somewhere between \$1,500 and \$2,000 for the year. I worked in the summers.

SS: Did you work full-time in the summers?

JC: Well, one summer I had mononucleosis, and in those days when you got that disease, they put you to bed for a while. I worked part of that summer. I worked in the promotional department of a minor league baseball team.

SS: Interesting.

JC: After that, I had jobs here and just stayed here over the summer.

SS: On campus? I mean, on the Grounds?

JC: No, not always. Off and on for a good while, I worked in a Morton Frozen Food plant in Crozet, which is ten or twelve miles west of here. I rented a room out there in a family's house, and worked the night shift, because you made a little more for doing the night shift.

SS: What did you do there?

JC: I was a loader at the end of the assembly line. They would make the meals and then they would come down a belt. You'd have to put them on trays and put them into big racks. I guess they were then frozen quickly and put into trucks. Sometimes I worked on loading and unloading the trucks themselves, but most of my work was simply on the assembly line. I liked the work. It was physically strenuous, and I met a totally different bunch of people.

SS: I bet.

JC: I worked with a man, and I actually saw his obituary notice probably a decade ago. He was a six-times-removed grandson of James Madison, and knew all about it. He'd grown up in the place where Madison's family had lived. He wasn't at all an historian; he was sort of amused by it.

SS: Interesting—only in Virginia!

JC: Well, yes, but this is not all there was to it. There were a lot of other things about those people I loved. But he was a guy who lived very comfortably with a long past and was neither empowered nor immobilized by it.

SS: It just was.

JC: It was just part of the world, yes. It was a good preparation for reading William Faulkner.

SS: So you came to the University of Virginia in 1961, I guess. Early sixties—what was the atmosphere like here?

JC: It was all boys. There was some superb teaching and some rather lackadaisical teaching. Classes met six days a week. One of the keys to succeeding, if you came from a school background that was not high-powered, as I came from, was to show up for your Saturday classes. I learned that pretty quickly. I remember telling a math instructor that I was afraid I couldn't pass the required calculus course. He said, "You be here every Saturday morning, and you'll pass it." I was there at eight o'clock every Saturday morning, and I passed it.

There were academic struggles for me, but they were worthwhile. I learned a lot about studying intensely. I had splendid classroom teachers in English and history. I had some who were distracted. Frankly, I didn't know enough to go hang around office hours and

say, "I'm showing you that I'm a good student." What I knew was to take the assignment, go to the library, and work until I had it right.

We didn't have study groups in those days. We didn't have tutors who would help you with hard courses. You had to figure it out, or you didn't make it. The attrition rate was high. A lot of people did not make it. I remember in the first year, getting a close look at the University's honor system. There was a man on my hall in the dormitory who had cheated on a test and was caught and had to leave. He was dismissed in the honor proceeding. It was a stark lesson about collective responsibility to deal with misconduct. I have thought about it a little bit in connection with a murder trial that's going on in Charlottesville now. I agonized over the death of the woman who was killed.

SS: Yeardeley Love.

JC: Yes.

SS: In what dormitory did you live?

JC: LeFevre House. LeFevre, if my memory is right, was a math professor. The house was one of eight or ten probably built after the Korean War. It was not an idyllic existence. It was a relatively rowdy and kind of grubby assemblage of men my age packed into this building, two to a room, with little in the way of organized social life.

We played softball, and we played touch football. We had that sort of thing. We didn't have any systematic contact with faculty. Part of my philosophy later about faculty engagement in students' lives had to do with the realization that that type of dormitory was a sterile place in terms of social and intellectual development. Most of the lessons you could learn in that environment were negative.

SS: Right.

JC: I didn't have the money or the time to pursue membership in a fraternity. I was working at the hours when you might have been involved in rushing or something. I don't know that I ever felt bad about that. It was just the way my life was. I was doing other things.

I was aware by the mid-sixties that what I was seeing at other places, going off for weekend dates or whatever, was quite different. I guess I saw this at the University of Vermont the first time. I went up there for some reason with other students. I remember realizing that women and men went to classes together, and that the community was simply more complicated.

SS: And that interested you?

JC: Yes. I remember watching and admiring here a man named Wes Harris, who was one of the first, well, in my time, one of the few highly visible African-American students. He is an engineer. Wes has spent his life at MIT and at the NASA research center in

Alabama. When I was president of the University of Connecticut, he came there, and he was the dean of Engineering for several years. As a student here, he was a highly disciplined, remarkably intelligent man who was able to survive in what appeared to me to be a state of utter isolation.

I had the same response when I got to know a student from Hong Kong and realized how far he was from his support base, how difficult it was for him to maintain any kind of life other than his academic life. Those people interested me because they were certainly outsiders, but they were not people who were disabled by being outsiders, any more than this fellow with the Madison connection was disabled by his history. They simply saw this as the world they worked in. They proceeded as students in that context, both doing quite well. Although, Wes Harris is so far above the general run of people in his successes, he stands alone. The man from Hong Kong was always focused on living in America and having a commercial career, and to my knowledge, that's what he's done. I've run across him occasionally. There was that.

As the sixties wore on, I was mostly here, but I'd gone away for a year following my MA, and taught in a U.Va. branch campus that was on the Eastern Shore of Virginia at a place called Wallops Station. NASA has a facility over there. And I had part-time jobs at the old Maryland State College at Princess Anne and at the University of Delaware branch at Dover AFB.

Maryland State was student-centered. The goal was to prepare students for the world. I'm sure that attrition rates were very high. I had no way to know, but I'm sure they were. The failure rates were certainly high. I had a student who was the star football player, and he failed a course that I was teaching. I went to see the dean, and I said, "I've never seen this before. I've never taught a course like this before. But this man is prominent here, and he's failed." The dean said, "Did he fail outright?" I said, "Yes." He said, "Well, he's failed." There was no backing away from the notion that the goal here was to prepare students to succeed in the courses and in what came after.

SS: Were you one of the only white professors?

JC: No, there were several white faculty members. You learn a lot about how racial exclusion works when you walk into a dining hall and discover that there's no obvious place to sit. Not because somebody's necessarily excluding you, but because the groups reflect prior attachments, which happen to coincide with skin color. When I would go sit with somebody at lunch, inevitably I was treated well. If I went and sat somewhere by myself, say I was reading, and somebody came to sit with me, it was always going to be a white faculty member.

SS: Right. And what did you teach there?

JC: Writing courses and public speaking courses. I taught there two summers and a winter term, so counting summers as though they were semesters, four semesters. I taught a

course at a branch college of the University of Delaware at Dover Air Force Base. That put me, for the first time, in touch with a student body that was not primarily a student body at all. They were people working to get the academic credits they needed to advance in their careers as air force people or whatever.

I had a wonderful time up there. They were just totally different. The issues on their minds were completely unlike anything I'd experienced here as a student or at the other places where I was teaching. It was a really productive year in terms of letting me figure out what aspects of collegiate or university life were most interesting to me, and what seemed to me to be the most pressing issues.

SS: What were those?

JC: Well, one was the observation that the American university became, in the sixties, a kind of crucible into which people of all backgrounds came. Old patterns of exclusive access were breaking down at that point. African-American students turned up at the branch college where I was teaching in Virginia. In all three of these places, I saw coeducated classes. But the population at Delaware was older people and people who had very specific reasons to take a course.

Delaware also had a little more discipline than I'd seen in other places about making sure that faculty work was productive. A woman who turned up several times in the class told me as she was finishing up her last bit with me that her job was to make sure that I was

doing the course properly. I was teaching a second-year literature course there, the kind of course that has writing and reading mingled.

I came back here after that, largely because I didn't have a better idea about my life than to continue in the general direction of being a college teacher. Also because I had become, during this year away, conscious of how ignorant I was of a lot of things that I wanted to know.

As an undergraduate, I had been in a tutorial honors program here. I had applied after the second year, was on a waiting list, and got in at the last minute for the fall. I worked with spectacular teachers: with Robert Kellogg, with Douglas Day, with Robert Langbaum, ultimately with Fred Bowers, and others. These were people who were remaking this department of English to make it a world-class center of scholarship. There's a sense in which my liberal arts education was contact with these people.

SS: What was it about their teaching that was so good?

JC: They were very personal. They required a tremendous amount of writing and rewriting and responses to their criticisms and so on. So constant attention to your text was part of learning, as well as broad and wonderful reading assignments with a lot of intensity about the text. What is in the sentence, what is in the line, what's the writer assuming, what's the writer arguing or teaching or demonstrating? How do the words work to communicate the images and the concepts—language-centered, text-centered.

Doug Day was a great contextual critic. There's a movement now in literary studies to build contextual studies into the reading of the text. That movement is a couple of generations away, but it's the kind of work that Fred Bowers and Bob Kellogg and Doug Day and Bob Langbaum and so on, did. Langbaum was a great critic, largely in the tradition of the new critics, text-based criticism, but also, as many of these other people were, he was a textual critic who worked on the Renaissance. He was a nineteenth century scholar, basically, but his interest in the text and in validating the text and so on drove him in multiple directions. These men taught partly by what they did in class, partly by the way they reacted to one's papers, partly by their own habits of mind. It was an approach to scholarship that was always critical, that constantly needed to find the context and understand what provoked the event that is the text.

Langbaum had me read, among other things, criticism of the twenties and thirties, because in that period are T.S. Eliot and W.H. Auden and so on, who reshaped the way literature is read and understood. Langbaum had me read once an essay of T.S. Eliot's called "Tradition and the Individual Talent," in which an aspect of the argument is that each new work or masterwork or contribution to a culture not only asserts itself, but reconfigures everything else. That once *The Tempest* is written, drama is changed forever. That once Faulkner is heard—his language, language is changed forever.

It's a fascinating way to understand how a tradition works. So I was dealing with—or teachers of that kind were dealing with me. These were people who were working right at the cutting edge of what was understood in the criticism or in the scholarship and who

had tremendous national and in many cases international impact. I went to lectures by Hugh Kenner, who spent the latter part of his life at Santa Cruz, or later on, Roger Shattuck, who went from here to Boston University. But these were phenomenally learned, well-read, and conscientious teachers who saw the experience of teaching as a process of making something new. Bob Langbaum's reading of that T.S. Eliot essay has been working in my head ever since I first read the essay and then listened to him talk through how it worked.

My old *Norton Anthologies* are loaded with little notes from Langbaum and from Kellogg and Day as they would work you through how a line works, how a word works over time. It was a different era in terms of how my subjects were taught.

I remember once watching Bob Kellogg listen to a student who was just a dunderhead get totally off the point in a class. He just let the guy run. When the student was finished, instead of attacking him, Bob said, "That's very nice. Let's look at the next line."
(Laughter.)

SS: I much prefer that type of professor.

JC: These professors were not all as sweet-tempered as Bob was, but they were very focused on the act of teaching something.

SS: And is that what led you to your dissertation?

JC: The dissertation was a second thought. I had worked with a wonderful man who died years ago named Lester Beaurline on Ben Jonson, and I had taken one of the PhD seminars on Ben Jonson. I had done a paper on stock and original characterization in Jonson, trying to sort out which of Jonson's characters were simply derived from the dramatic tradition, which were conventions, and which were Jonson's original creations.

The question of creative originality is always there in Jonson. Ian Donaldson has a current biography of Jonson that actually starts off with the same issue, but it has to do with Jonson himself. To what extent is he representing himself authentically? To what extent is he pulling stock pieces out? I produced a substantial paper, did a dissertation prospectus, and had most of the thesis itself done. I was working with Langbaum and Fred Bowers.

SS: You had most of your dissertation done? Wow.

JC: And I had, over the course of the summer, a sense of crisis, because I did not want to be that tightly specialized. My current perspective on all of this is that the Renaissance and Ben Jonson are anything but tightly specialized. But that's the way I was thinking about it at the time. I decided that I was going to look for an area of scholarship that was open to rethinking. I wanted something that would provide a basis for a career of the kind of research that people do in reading texts and understanding where they came from. I looked at a number of options. I talked to a lot of faculty members. And I came down

finally to thinking that I really wanted to do Old English, to be an Anglo-Saxonist, and that I wanted to work with Bob Kellogg. That's where the project came from.

He helped me find the text. I worked on an analogue to *Beowulf* that is clearly not from an oral narrative tradition. It's a translation of an early Medieval Greek text. But it has been restructured substantially by whoever finally compiled it so that it looks like an oral-formulaic text. It contains a lot of the imagery, thought to be from Germanic pagan poetry. I'm not convinced it ever was that, but that was part of the talk. I was reacting, in part, to scholars of the period around World War II who had taken the notion that England had a suppressed pagan past buried in its early literature. It's a silly idea, was silly when they made the argument, but it still turns up.

This poem is about half the scale of *Beowulf*. I got really interested in what one could do with a major poem in context on the basis of existing linguistic, philological, archeological, documentary and other evidence about the culture that produced it, about the poet who produced it and in what from that you could learn that would help you to read the poem. It's a reading of the poem with an attempt to place it into demonstrable contexts.

SS: So you took the kind of reading that you were doing in your classes, especially with Kellogg, and applied it to this poem?

JC: Yes, I took Old English from Bob, so yes, some of that. The place where I'd seen Bob do more of that actually was in courses on Icelandic prose literature, the saga literature. I was interested in something that would let me work with Medieval Latin.

SS: Did you know Latin?

JC: I had taken Latin in school, and here. I wasn't a particularly good Latinist at the time.

I'm working on a course right now for the School of Architecture on the material or physical representation of Venice in literature in English. If you take something like the *commedia dell'arte*, which is an almost freeform performance that took place in the streets of Venice with a set of stock characters who would interact with each other in the streets and perform. It's actually the aesthetic origin of the opera.

It's also a reaction to the physical setting. Bernini, for example, both designed the piazzas, in which these things were performed and wrote the directions for the performances, and, of course, shaped the opera. So you get a framing of a scene in the physical world that predicts what the variables are in the *commedia dell'arte*, and that, in turn, influences English drama, Shakespearean drama, and so on. It sets up the oppositions of the stock characters.

I did my MA thesis on wit, intellectual humor, and humor—bawdy humor—in *Romeo and Juliet*, and got really interested in Juliet's nurse, who is a creature out of the

commedia dell'arte. She's a stock character who says stock things, but does it in constant interaction with Juliet, and provides a running commentary that's commonsensical and funny, but it's no nonsense in terms of her judgments.

SS: So is the course that you're working on, a course you plan to teach?

JC: I'm supposed to teach it next year. I've been reading for this course for about a year. I'm reading some Venetian sources, travelers' narratives, and popular histories. When you start thinking about Venice as an influence on America, you come across some funny things, for example, the Fort Lauderdale canal communities. Urban planners will often mention that America has more than a few somewhat simpleminded responses to Venice.

SS: Are you having fun doing this? It's been a while since you've been able to teach a course.

JC: The course preparation has been an unexpected, pressured liberal arts education. I wasn't expecting it. I'm wondering now whether students will care about this or not. That could be a different issue. (Laughter.)

SS: Right. Well, you won't know that until you try that, I guess. (Laughter.) Do you need to take break for a minute?

JC: No, but if you do, you certainly can. I have about forty minutes in this session remaining.

SS: Yes, let's do. Thank you.

Okay, we're back. So this time period that we were talking about—you've been working on your master's and your PhD—and it is the late sixties. I thought that maybe I would get your perspective about what it was like here during this period.

JC: I'll tell you what it was. I was in the undergraduate honors program. The Ford Foundation gave the University of Virginia a grant under a program that was called MA-3. At the time, many people thought that there was a shortage of PhDs. So the Ford Foundation subsidized fellowship programs that moved people from undergraduate to first graduate degrees without an interval. There was a dean of the Graduate School, a man named Edward Younger, who was administering this grant. He recruited students.

I don't remember how I came into contact with him, but he was very interested in trying to upgrade the intellectual quality of student life. He wanted students to deal with more complex issues, to think more broadly, and so on. I applied for a fellowship and received that financial support to carry me through the MA. I thought that after the MA, I'd go off and find something else to do. It was just to be a one-year extension.

SS: You didn't think you would be a college professor?

JC: No. No, I thought that if I could figure out how to finance law school, I'd go to law school.

SS: Just as your father had wished?

JC: Well, he hadn't exactly wished that. He just wanted the option to be open.

SS: I see.

JC: So I thought I might do that. I thought that I might become a naval officer. I remember looking at the various programs and trying to find a way to do that, but it just never fell out that way.

SS: Was the war going on?

JC: Yes, I got my notice for the draft physical and for the call-up in March of '66. It was right in the middle of this period. In the end, they didn't take me, but I went as everybody else did. You ride the bus down, you spend the day at Camp Lee, and they tell you what your future is, eventually.

In the Graduate School, there were women, and there were a couple of African-American students. I don't remember meeting Asian people in the Graduate School. I did have a classmate in Graduate School who was Latino, and who, for the first time, introduced me to the term Latino, and talked about differentiations within the Hispanic population. Cuba was hot news in those days. He was able to talk through the cultural differences between Cuban culture and other island cultures. He was the first person I ever heard

who talked about the distinction between Francophone Caribbean and the Hispanic Caribbean. His parents were Mexican immigrants into Texas. He had a complex grasp of a culture that in those days was sort of mysterious. People I knew didn't have the money to be going off to Puerto Vallarta or wherever it might be. This man saw it from a different perspective. I think he told me that his parents might have been teachers.

This was a period of fairly hard work. I was working in the library. I was teaching courses. I had other jobs around. I was married. My wife was teaching in public schools. We were busy. It was a good life. I enjoyed that year a lot. We had a good time settling into the graduate student culture in town.

In the course of the year away, we decided to come back. I applied to various places. The one that worked financially was U.Va. It was the right place for us to come. In those days, the assumption was that if you got a PhD, you would also get a job. "Job," in those days, really meant tenure track jobs. The world is different for people in graduate schools now. At least, in the humanities and social sciences, it's different. I was beginning to write out application letters and to ask for appointments at the year's end MLA meetings and so on.

I had a letter from the chair of the English department at Berkeley saying that he was going to be at the airport in Washington and would like to talk. After this meeting, I was working on my job application letters over Thanksgiving, and just happened to check the

post office box on Thanksgiving Saturday, I think, and there was an offer letter from Berkeley there.

SS: So you got sent a letter?

JC: Yes, a letter. What was striking was that I hadn't gone through what I would have thought of as an employment process. I had not seen Berkeley, had not met the specialist in my area and so on. They hired me on the basis of reading papers, dissertation, and so on, and of the interview with the chair. The chair tape recorded the interview and took it back for faculty to hear. I don't know whether I would have become a college professor without that sort of almost accidental introduction into a world-class place.

I went to Berkeley and discovered the complexity of a multiethnic place. Many people talked about Berkeley in those days as a crazy place. It was not. There were crazy elements. But it was a diligent, intellectually powerful department that was very like the department I had grown up in here, but larger, more complex, engaged in broader sets of issues.

There was a man in the department whose life interest was Kennedy assassination theories. There were people who were active poets and who were engaged in another kind of thing. I had an officemate for a year or two who was a Shakespearean who eventually demonstrated that Shakespeare had been in and possibly a student in one of the Inns of Court, the London law schools. He did important, hard work.

He had begun to explore the plays as declamations, speeches used in training lawyers. As an explanation for a lot of the soliloquies and for some of the grand speeches, it's an important step toward understanding Shakespeare. And there were others—just exciting, productive people. It wasn't necessarily that they were individually better or not better than people I had known here. They were different. They were engaged in a different kind of community interaction. They had known and important histories. It was a chance to learn a different set of values.

I learned in the process that coeducation was essential to intellectual existence. That the intellectual sterility of the old, separate-gender colleges was every bit as bad as it had seemed. That the appearance in the departments of persons of other ethnicities from other countries had a fertilizing impact on the academic process that affected both faculty scholarship and what students could learn. People there worked across boundaries. Seamus Heaney, who won the Nobel Prize, was there, and was beginning, in those days, to work on—not exactly dramatic monologues, but poems written in voices. His father's voice, for example.

Seamus published a *Beowulf* several years ago. He doesn't read Old English. The *Beowulf* that he did is based on thirty, forty years of probing the translated texts and working back to what he could do with the Anglo-Saxon text. That sort of thing was going on there.

I went to lectures delivered by Alain Renoir, who was a grandson of the artist and the son of the filmmaker. I never got to be a close friend of Alain's. But I did develop an understanding of how important he and other people, who were as eccentric as he was, actually are to intellectual and social experience of a great university.

There was street violence in Berkeley in those days. There was a lot of political intrigue involving People's Park and opposition.

SS: Really? In the seventies, so it was still going on?

JC: Yes. Telegraph Avenue had devolved from being a student mecca to being a transitional zone. As you went out Telegraph Avenue, it was more and more a street culture, and less and less a university culture. The university was being crowded by the street culture.

SS: Oakland is very close, right?

JC: Yes. I liked Oakland. I remember one Saturday taking an AC Transit bus to the place where Nineteenth Street in Oakland crossed Broadway. Broadway, in those days, was the main street. Nineteenth Street went east and then turned south and wrapped around Oakland on the east side. I decided just to walk the length of Nineteenth Street. It was one ethnic neighborhood after another. It was prospering commercial regions with theaters and so on, and then it was areas that were just destitute. There were areas for people who clearly were impoverished and areas where residents were really doing pretty

well. I stumbled on a park with a zoo up in the hills. It took all day. I just walked my way around that part of Oakland and then found a bus—probably several buses—on my way back. (Laughter.)

I used to go down to Alameda. Friends lived there. Alameda is a manmade island off Oakland. It's where there's a Naval air station. I would go down there to a Mexican restaurant with my friends, the same bus would take you down to Alameda, the Number 51. Again, I liked the diversity of the California communities.

SS: Was this your first time outside of the East Coast?

JC: Yes. It wasn't so much that it was western as that it was different—people lived differently in the landscape.

SS: I meant to ask this earlier. Were you writing your own fiction during this time and in graduate school?

JC: Yes, I was. I wrote short stories steadily until about 1990. I had gotten into contact with a group of writers who had some NEA support for publication. I was not especially successful as a writer, but I was enjoying trying to alter the forms that I had inherited. I was very interested in something that I decided doesn't really work—whether the narrative voice in the saga literature could be an alternative voice for American English.

I was playing with that. I got interested once in whether one could write serious stories using the sort of glib, borderline-dishonest voice that was turning up in popular fiction, and so I did some stories of that sort. I've always been interested in the impact that the rhetoric and diction of the *King James Bible* has had on the American voice. So I played with a lot of the different forms—most of them, not, in the end, wildly successful.

SS: Well, except that some of your short stories won an award.

JC: Well, in the end, some stories were worth publishing. I don't know that that was ever the purpose. The fiction I write now, at least for the last several years, has never been complete. It's fragments—some of them fairly extended fragments, but fragments, usually efforts to capture and use a voice that I either heard or developed in my head. Sometimes they are exercises in point of view. What can you know from a given, call it perspective, it's not necessarily a physical perspective, but within the limits of some defined personality or place, what can you know? How can you describe? I used to write some poetry. I haven't done that in years. For my children, I used to write birthday poems. I don't think any of them exist anymore, but when I used to write those, I'd spend long periods of time on them.

SS: Writing for your children—a poem on their birthday?

JC: Yes.

SS: Oh, how sweet. Did you journal as well?

JC: I never have done that successfully. It's always seemed like trying to crank the clock back, to sit down and describe what happened yesterday.

I think that's one way to teach writing, to have students write something every day, no matter what it is. I guess I've done it, probably, in teaching writing. It never worked especially well for me.

SS: Well, what were you teaching out in Berkeley?

JC: They let me teach introductory and advanced Old English courses, and writing courses. They let me do all three segments, repeatedly, of the English literature survey course. I team taught with other people, and then did on my own, both undergraduate and graduate level courses on Chaucer. I did a Shakespeare course—and I did this more than once—where you'd take five plays, which is too many for a quarter. Three plays is pushing it. Basically, it was to push people to become more deeply engaged with Shakespeare than they'd have been otherwise.

I got to do undergraduate seminars on Faulkner and on Hemingway. I got to work on a revision of the reading list that was required for students in the PhD program.

SS: You were doing a lot in those five years.

JC: For a time, I was the secretary of the department. We had a big debate in the department that ran for several Saturdays on the historic structure of the curriculum. English departments have been reorganized since then; most are no longer arranged historically. But Berkeley's was. Neither the faculty in Renaissance Studies, nor the faculty in Restoration Studies wanted John Milton. But everyone thought John Milton should be taught. (Laughter.) I got into some trouble by copying down word for word what people were saying in a silly debate, and putting it into the minutes.

It was a place with a lot of intellectual ferment, not unlike what I saw here. There was a similar debate here on the curriculum of the college that must have taken place in '68 or '69. I attended that. It was a faculty-wide debate, and went on for quite a while.

Fredson Bowers may have been the dean for the faculty at the time. So I'd go and listen to Fred.

There had been periodic curriculum debates in other places, but those debates of the sixties and early seventies and then Henry Rosovsky's application of the broad principles at Harvard College, that sort of ended an historic period.

Curriculum ought to be the constant subject of faculty discourse. When you get the kind of witch doctory that was involved in the federal No Child Left Behind initiatives, where you have questionably erudite elected officials deciding what teachers ought to do in schools, you get misapplication of bad principles.

SS: That's a very interesting point, that this was a time that that was being discussed a lot.

JC: Well, it was discussed. I think that the adversity in which the core curriculum was developed and implemented at Harvard, and the fact that it overtly demanded faculty to be more learned than people really are in the world, made the discourse difficult. Another reason it's difficult is that there are not many Henry Rosovskys in the world—a great mind, focused on a great issue, and making a hard argument that he's able to enforce on people because he's the dean. Not many people have Rosovsky's mind or his quality of mind or his drive.

U.Va.'s old honors programs (like the one I pursued) became financially not feasible when the Graduate School became the major draw on resources in the late sixties, early seventies. Those programs have largely evaporated. They just took too much faculty manpower, and it's not clear exactly what the products were to be. If you're admitting three thousand freshmen, and if some number, say one hundred, can be admitted to tutorial programs two years later, and if those students get to work face-to-face in groups of five to ten with top faculty, how much difference does it make in the larger picture?

It can give someone like me an education that I keep repeating, that I would never have had access to otherwise. Is it the best and highest use of faculty time, resources, and initiative? Obviously, I've got a pretty strong attachment to it, but it's a difficult thing to sustain, and it poses challenges to a university of this kind, a public institution that has large public obligations.

SS: Right. You experienced it as a student and yet—

JC: Well, you know what? I have not thought systematically about this topic that I've come back to: The notion that one's life may be a series of reeducations. The kind of education I'm trying to describe recurs for you in consequence of what you've done previously.

But it's not exactly liberal arts. It's an engagement with new or reconsidered or restructured—going back to Eliot's notion about tradition and the individual talent—ways of understanding the world of knowledge, of entering into it, of applying it. There wasn't a whole lot of belletristic talk in the area where I grew up. People didn't talk about art for art's sake or aesthetic existence. That wasn't it.

Frankly, the community was tightly focused on its schools and its children. To grow young people who would be strong adults. You asked back when I was talking about how my understanding of what was important to me or what I could do in universities grows out of the year I spent away after the MA. It does it because that one-year loop in my education taught human values up close and personal.

It's one thing to be one of whatever number of boys that were in my class here, six or seven hundred guys, basically all looking alike, all wanting to look alike. You know, everybody had to wear a shirt with a necktie and a jacket to class. Most of us wore the same jacket every day for four years and maybe had two shirts and didn't launder them

regularly. But the idea was that this somehow contributed to our formation as adults. It contributes a lot more to sit head to head with somebody whose background is utterly different from your own, whose aspirations are personal and internal, and confront the body of knowledge that faculty members have to share with students.

SS: It seems that even though this was a period of conformity, what you're talking about students' dress, but it seems you always sought out sophistication.

JC: No, I didn't. It sort of fell in my lap.

SS: That's what it seems you were attracted to, through the stories that you're telling me.

JC: I was attracted to learning hard things.

SS: Hard and new?

JC: Certainly new, but when you think about Old English, that's not a language that everybody walking down the street wants to learn.

SS: No. I would say not.

JC: It's a wonderful language, and it's so different in concept, at least at the level of its phonemes and its morphemes—the units that form its words. It's so different in concept

from any modern language that when I first began to understand what I was learning, it was just mind-blowing. The sound of it is so different, and the poetry is different structurally. It isn't rhymed poetry.

SS: Can you read it and speak it?

JC: Yes. Now, if I were going to teach it, I'd have to get buried in it for several months, because the vocabulary and the syntactic structure are demanding. It's an alliterative poetry, and the points of alliteration are not necessarily points that our ears hear instantly. Some of the capacity to read the poetic line is learned rather than native.

SS: So because you like learning hard things, I guess you liked the challenge. That's one of the things that drew you to Old English?

JC: Yes, it's a different world. It's a world in which the metaphorical basis of language constantly forces itself on you. If God is a "weard," it's cognate with our modern word guard or guardian. If this God has fifty or a hundred other names, too, every time—this is a profoundly devout literature—you come across the concept of a god, you're looking at a different aspect of God.

If a woman is simply, generically, a "wif," which is cognate with wife. It's not wife; it's woman. If a woman is a "wif," and when sitting at the head of her table, she is a "hlafdige,"—"half" is loaf and "dige" is someone who kneads with one's hands—if she is

physically the one who shapes a loaf. Then you keep working through the multiple ways of understanding the roles of this person.

The essence of the poetry is the way it forces you to keep the metaphors active. Anglo-Saxon sermons fascinate me because they are intellectually powerful at their best.

There's one, a late one, written by a man named Wulfstan, who signs himself Wolf or Lupo, *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, the *Wolf's Sermon to the English*. It is a condemnation of a society that abuses women and children, that sells off children into slavery, as was the case all over Northern Europe. There was a big commerce in Southern Europe and North Africa in blond-haired children. People would win a war, capture the children of the other group, and sell them off.

The sermon is one of the most powerful pieces of rhetoric I've ever seen. It's powerful because of the way Wulfstan works this poetic language. When he says that there are rapists, the word that he uses for rapists is a word for stealers. But violent stealers, who steal personal identity from people, and that is what rape is. There is a kind of moral or ethical force in that language that you have to confront in order to read it. People will say, "Okay, the metaphorical basis for words is not always the first thing on somebody's mind." Sure. But in any language that's rich in metaphor—and that one's richer than most others—constantly intrudes into your conscious level.

When you get a great orator like Wulfstan and find him working the poetic language for a political and legal and really revolutionary purpose, the language sings. Wulfstan goes

after the king by name. He must have been one of the bravest people in the world, because it would have been very easy to just chop his head off. The study of Old English literature has to do with the applications of knowledge, of moral principle, of metaphor, of the pleasure in language and so on, to real life.

“Hlafdige,” by the way, is the origin of the word lady. Lady is a clipping of “hlafdige.” You can’t speak modern English without constantly reflecting the words that are the results of the intellectual and emotional making that went into forming the surface level of that language.

SS: It seems that individual rights were also very important in Old English, and that seems to be another theme in your life.

JC: Yes, in certain ways.

SS: It’s amazing that after all these years that you’ve been involved with this kind of scholarship, to see the light on your face and in your eyes when you talk about it, is pretty remarkable.

JC: I think when you’re my age, you may find the same thing happening in your head, but the things you learn as a young adult aren’t finished. They’re probably the triggers for these periods of new learning that I’ve enjoyed in the last couple years and probably are one of the rewards of a life spent in some kind of intellectual self-discipline.

I started work on this project on Venice, frankly, without any notion of what I was going to find as I tried to outline the kind of course that the dean had described to me. As I've worked through it, it has become more and more exactly what at this point in my life I do want to do. If it works out, it'll push me to other things. I'm going to need to go back and redo Italian. I'm not going to do it for this course, but I need to.

SS: How many languages do you speak or read?

JC: (Laughter.) A reporter asked me once which languages I have studied. We counted them up, and I realized that the answer doesn't mean much. With reasonable fluency (and dictionaries), I read the ones I use—French, German, Old English, some Old French, some Latin, maybe a half dozen or so. I am relearning Italian now for a course next year. The rule seems to be that languages require maintenance, and that we (or at least I) lose languages quickly if I am not using them.

SS: Well, I think we need to stop for today.

JC: Yes, I do.

[End of Interview]

**The University of Virginia Oral History Project
Interview with John T. Casteen III
Conducted on February 22, 2012 by Sheree Scarborough**

SS: This is the second interview with John Casteen. Today is February 22, 2012. This is Sheree Scarborough.

John, yesterday when we ended, you were about to tell me a story about a librarian at the University of Virginia who made a difference in your education.

JC: Yes, a woman named Anne Freudenberg. Anne was the manuscripts curator and had other positions in what became eventually the Special Collections Library. I had found a job in the fall of my first year in college working in a dining hall in Newcomb Hall and just thought there might be more interesting work. I guess I was walking around the library one day and realized there was a room where the manuscript collection was housed, went in and asked if they hired student workers. After some process—they wanted to make sure you could write and they wanted other information—Miss Freudenberg hired me.

She was a very thoughtful archivist. She wrote about the manuscript collections. She was a member of a circle of talented people who came here as bibliographers or as textual scholars. That group is one of the reasons the library became a great center of scholarship. She had been fairly close to William Faulkner when he was working in the library. She knew essentially everybody.

The library in those days—and it still is—was a gathering point for writers, scholars. Anyone working in humanities and social sciences might turn up in the library. Through her, I got to meet people who came here to work: John Dos Passos, Stephen Spender, and on and on. It was quite an assemblage of people who came through and worked in the library. Carlos Baker was there off and on.

She gave me projects that were intellectually challenging and that involved a great deal of learning. She gave me chances to write in connection with the publication of library materials. The writing is not the kind of thing that would turn up in a bibliography; but, for example, she let me do the news notes that were published each month to show what had come in, in the way of new manuscript holdings. I was able to get a sense of the scholarly life of the library in a way that wouldn't have happened if I hadn't found the job. We remained in close touch right up until her death. She was a generous and thoroughly good mentor, so I was lucky with her.

SS: Okay, thank you.

Yesterday we were talking about your time at UC Berkeley, and I wanted to start today by asking if you could tell me the story about how you came back to Virginia?

JC: There's a relationship that applies commonly to a lot of things I did that I didn't mention yesterday that's important. A man named Don Fry taught me Old English here at one point. He was one of the persons who helped me develop the dissertation proposal we

talked about yesterday. Don left here just as I began that dissertation, and he and his wife and I stayed in close touch. I visited them; I stayed in their house once for several weeks during a summer. He had gone to graduate school at California at Berkeley—and that relationship, his range—he was both a medievalist and a scholar of journalism—affected me deeply.

He left universities and for a number of years was the academic program head of the Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg. Among other things, that's a center for lifelong learning for American journalists. His wife was a classicist at Berkeley. She was the first practicing archeologist I had known. In later years, in the nineties, he retired from his job in Florida. She had been the assistant to the president at a liberal arts college in Florida. She applied for a position here, and they have been back in Charlottesville for fifteen or so years. From the perspective of intellectual growth, the relationship with the two of them, and especially with him, began early and has continued to this day.

Now, could you go back to your question and let me make sure that I answer it?

SS: How you came back to the University of Virginia.

JC: That was a fairly simple story. My son was here and I wanted to be near him. I had reached a point at Berkeley where I had to commit to a specific project or change my whole direction. I was here probably just for a few weeks in the summer, and Ernie Ern, who had been a friend and who'd encouraged me earlier, contacted me. Actually a friend

on the faculty, Arthur Kirsch, who was one of my professors, told me that the University was looking for an admission officer, and that he thought it might be something I would enjoy. I met with Ernie Ern. Eventually, he said that he would like to take me over to meet Frank Hereford, the president. I talked with Mr. Hereford and decided quickly that it was something I would like to do.

SS: Had you known Mr. Hereford before?

JC: I'd met him. He'd been the Graduate School dean and the provost when I was a graduate student at various times. But, I did not know him well, and the conversation with him was invigorating. In just a half hour or so he described his notion of where the University needed to go, and laid out his thoughts about relations with high schools, selection of students, the linkage between those things and the academic program, and how it might develop over time. He offered the position; I took it.

I had powerful personal motives to be here. I thought that in the next several years after that I would be more interested in the kinds of work that would be done here. I resigned and came here. I was very happy to do it. It was exactly the right thing in terms of the issues of the time and in terms of my own growth, maturation, and grasp of what universities ought to be in our culture and so on.

SS: What goals did he set out for you?

JC: Mr. Hereford was interested in the composition of the student body. He had been the chair of the planning committee that had proposed coeducation. He believed that there was an unexplored and large role for research in the curriculum that students would follow in any program, and for research generally. He saw that as a distinguishing aspect of the University.

He was aware that we were not making satisfactory progress toward racial equity or in any meaningful way, desegregation. He wanted to see that expanded as a University commitment. He was concerned to have a continuing faculty conscience responsible for the recruitment and selection of students. He thought that it was a way of keeping the University academically honest.

Frank Hereford was a tremendously intelligent and thoughtful and humble man. It moved me to realize the kind of personality and mind that he was. So it felt pretty natural to go to work for him. I did so, because I was grateful to have a chance.

SS: Who else stands out from those early years?

JC: Gordon Burriss and I worked together during that time—the late 1970s and early 1980s, and then he went to the University of Maryland. He came back to U.Va. in 1991. Since then, he and I traveled together constantly, until 2010. He now travels with and staffs President Sullivan. Gordon's influence on what U.Va. has become in consequence of the support, financial and other, that came in the course of the two capital campaigns of 1992

or so—2010 (and after) would be hard to exaggerate. He has worked closely with Bob Sweeney to identify prospective donors and other backers, contributed to the arguments made for U.Va., coached me and others as we have prepared for our work, and perhaps above all stayed in close personal contact with (literally) several hundred, perhaps thousands, of people. He has been the human face and often conscience of the University in daily contact. All of us are in Gordon's debt.

Sandy Gilliam had been a Foreign Service Officer. He'd been one of the undersecretaries in the State Department. He'd worked for Governor Linwood Holton in the early seventies.

Sandy simply came over, and we sat down, and talked over how I might deal with the various challenges that the University saw—but also how we could work together. Sandy is a wise and thoughtful man with a wonderful grasp of history and a lot of wisdom about how futures unfold.

Two or three close relationships developed while I was in that office. That was one of them. Sandy and Gordon Burris and a marvelous woman named Jean Rayburn, who died young, but who came into that office to teach me how to manage admissions. Her concern, also Ernie's, and probably Frank Hereford's, was that I run that function at a level of excellence, but that I remain active in the faculty.

SS: You did and taught at the same time?

JC: Yes. I taught, but always Mr. Hereford and his staff encouraged me to do and learn more. I had a little bit to do with the beginnings of philanthropy as a way to finance the University. I learned how to work with the state's agencies and personnel. There was a certain amount of controversy, and probably sometimes on the legislative side, bullying, because the University did not make improper deals with legislators to admit their children or their friends or whatever. I learned how to deal with that by dealing with it.

One legislator who became a close friend and a mentor later seemed to be a problem when I first took the job. He had a business in Richmond. I walked into the business one day and asked to see him. I said, "We need to sort this out. I don't know what to do if you and I are at odds over this." After about a half hour of talking across the counter, we seemed to have reached a point of understanding that stuck for the next fifteen or so years. That happened sometimes.

SS: You wanted students to be seen on their own merits?

JC: No, at the time, he thought that if he recommended someone, the person would almost automatically not be admitted. It wasn't going on. But in any event, I had to say, "First of all, we're not going to be pressured to admit students who are not qualified to come here. On the other hand, we'll certainly listen to any enlightened advice about what students may accomplish while they're here." It's just a matter of getting to a level where he could offer what turned out to be often very good advice, useful advice. Sometimes we could follow it, sometimes not. But the lesson was to listen, to encourage

people to share whatever information they had, and then the committee or the dean or whoever's doing the reasoning can decide what to do with it. The first step was to listen to the critics.

SS: What were some of the other controversies?

JC: There was a running controversy about the Virginia Plan for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. Virginia was a defendant in the case of *Adams v. Richardson*. Adams alleged denial of constitutional rights in Virginia's former *de jure* system of segregation in its colleges. Richardson, as well as others, was the U.S., probably originally HEW and then Education Secretary.

The litigation was against the U.S. Department of Education, saying that it had not carried out its responsibilities. The case perked along for years. On one side, on the extreme edge, racism played a role: Some objected to any efforts to bring in minority students. On the other side, all the way at the extreme, there were obvious reasons to doubt that the University was committed to real diversity. We had to recruit the students—to go into their high schools, their churches, the places where their parents worked—to identify students who wanted U.Va. and were qualified.

We had to work with the schools, because schools have to offer the right courses and provide adequate academic challenges, as well as support, for students to become qualified. That led us into engagement with the curriculum.

Students who have not studied mathematics don't have the tools to study science. We had to generate a normative notion of what a high school program ought to be. I wrote about it and published periodic newsletters that went to school people and so on. We got engaged with the College Board, which had a major project that lasted about twenty years to encourage schools to stop tracking students out of the academic programs and to open up the mainstream. It was a successful program, eventually called EQuality, to argue that academic quality ought to be the common property of any student going through a school.

We had to maintain good relationships with the prep schools, because in addition to preparing our students, they were functional models of excellence in their curricula in a lot of ways. Toward the end of the time when I worked in admission, I got engaged with the public school districts to have advanced placement courses developed so that students in the public schools, the common schools, would have access to the fast track programs, for the content of the courses, and for what the preparation for those courses would do to students' programs otherwise.

A student who anticipates doing an AP physics course after regular physics has a motive to stay with mathematics beyond the first math analysis course. So you work to sequence the curriculum and to get students to see enlightened self-interest in taking the tough courses. Students do a better job when they see a reason for themselves to do something, not simply when they're told. That's probably true of the human race generally, but in any event, that was a factor in the way we thought.

We worked with school boards. We held community meetings, sometimes with some hostility. I remember one night holding a meeting in a bank's public meeting room. The school was closed that night or we'd have arranged to use a schoolroom. It was probably a Sunday night actually. We did a lot of these things on Sunday night, because we could get to families then. People who were hostile to our recruiting black students came, as did parents and the children who came, both black and white. It was a mixed group. The common thread was that the school counselors had identified these students as academically talented, as needing financial support, and as needing their parents to be engaged in their preparation.

We did similar things in other places. A Baptist church in Norfolk allowed us to meet with a men's Sunday School class and explain to fathers what we were trying to accomplish and seek their support. The YWCA in Roanoke was a regular stop. We'd go there and set up a table. I think that was Sunday afternoon too. I'm not sure why Sunday was a good day, but it was. We'd set up a table. We would talk with anybody who would come.

Then there was the regular school recruitment work. It was not something I had ever seen before, not something I'd ever engaged in, but good work in terms of the challenges and the rewards of doing it and the students responded. We blanketed, obviously, Virginia, but we would also go into our constituent neighborhoods and other places where potential students came—Washington, Atlanta, Philadelphia, New York and elsewhere.

We had good representation in Saint Louis, Houston, Dallas, Austin, New Orleans always, and Atlanta. Over time, admissions has become a global operation and now recruits everywhere. The recruitment is a little bit odd or at least it's not intuitive. It's not that you go in and say, "Apply to us," although you do eventually say that. Initially, you say to the school, "Teach these courses." To the students, "Take these courses." Then to the whole school community, "Demonstrate success in these courses." We were convinced that the curriculum was the key to improving schools. U.Va.'s school population, the K-12 schools from which our students come, has been over time, excellent.

Now, not every locality in Virginia has had the means to keep up. One of the reasons I am suspicious of No Child Left Behind and the way the state complied with it is that many localities no longer offer the full college prep program. There are localities where students have to choose between taking a foreign language at a certain level and taking advanced mathematics or an advanced science course. The curriculum, itself, has suffered.

The defense of that kind of program has always been that the schools have to deal with the minimal levels of competency. I'm sure that's true, but in the end, the great strength of public education has got to include optimal levels of competency, especially in high schools, because the dates of enrollment coincide with the most dramatic events in growing up. To go back to your question, not just I myself, but also the people who worked with me, including faculty members and certainly admission committee members

and deans and so on, became engaged with this process of building a rich and diverse pool of students.

We found a lot of collaborators. Virginia Tech was interested in the same sorts of things. We worked with them. At various times, we worked with the College of William and Mary. We worked with everybody on the Virginia Plan that I mentioned. We sought out collaborative ways to work in schools with other colleges. Faculty members here were always responsive to the need for—to take one example, there are other examples—successful teachers of the courses that are built on the AP courses, to work with local schoolteachers in constructing the AP courses.

The work that we did was driven by the faculty culture. We focused on student competency and performance. It also was responsive to what the state needed and was willing to accept. I wrote newspaper pieces throughout that period. In one instance, I wrote a discussion piece for the Southern Regional Education Board, which is a consortium of political leaders from throughout the Southeast, and some newspapers reprinted that. It was aimed at parents. It said: “These are the courses that your students need to take. This is the payoff for dealing at each age with it.”

We were tracking other people’s work, and some of what we learned was useful. It turned out that if students did not complete the first algebra course by the eighth grade—sequencing the courses that had to be taken in order to prepare to take higher-order courses—in the end, that choice was the choice not to major in a science. Regressing

from ultimate results to earlier experiences to predict results, we learned to focus on the middle school, the junior high school period, and get parents engaged at that point. That taught us that we had to engage in prepping our prospects over several years, not just during the twelfth grade.

SS: That's remarkable to me.

JC: We weren't the only people in the field. There were a lot of people thinking the same way. We didn't have the pressure of No Child Left Behind and whatnot. We had a much broader community consensus about what we were doing. We had really stunning African-American community support. Just wonderful school people and clergy and so on in towns like Martinsville and Portsmouth and several places around Richmond and so on.

SS: That reminds me, I wanted to ask you about that meeting where there was some vocal resistance.

JC: It was just angry people.

SS: How did you handle it?

JC: I heard them out. There were other people engaged who had different reactions to it, including some who were very much alarmed. In the end, it ended peaceably and we

moved on. We also went back. We weren't backing down because somebody had come to object to the fact that we were seeking out these students. I think one of the motives was always the fear that by seeking new populations—children of blue-collar workers, African-American children, and women—we were threatening the interests of prior populations.

For a lot of reasons, that wasn't the case. The best thing that ever happened to this place, in my view, was the coming of women. It recreated the classroom. Within weeks after the first women appeared in the classrooms, this place was a different place.

SS: How do you mean that?

JC: Women did not come to sit in the back and have a morning cigarette, read the *Cavalier Daily*, the student paper, and look out the window. Women came to sit on the front row and make As. The whole atmosphere of the classroom was rebuilt. When I went to Berkeley, the obvious benefit of a diverse classroom hit me almost immediately. I was just fascinated by the way people could work across whatever human boundaries you might assume, walking into the room, and together generate much better results for everybody.

All boys was not a great environment. The curiosity, the intellectual aggression, in a good sense, the constant ferment of the more diverse classroom hit me immediately when I came back. I really liked it, whereas before I'd been very doubtful.

SS: About teaching?

JC: About coming back here. There was a lot of talk when I was a student—the student newspaper would carry pieces written by people who said, “creeping State U-ism was destroying the University.” The response to that is: It is the State U. That’s where it came from. That’s exactly what it is. (Laughter.) There are other responses to it, also, including that an American university really cannot be a bastion of privilege, and the notion that in prior times there was an old university where let’s say privilege was protected—but it’s a more complicated concept than that—is foolish.

When women came, because the numbers were so dramatic in the first several years, and because they didn’t buy the old prejudices, things changed almost at once. It was so quick and so painless that nobody even realized we had changed. The overall quality of the student body tracked upward very quickly from the coming of women.

SS: I never realized that women coming to the University had been an engine of excellence.

JC: They were, and frankly the coming of larger numbers of African-American students and in more recent years, Asian-American students, and Hispanic students, have had the same effect. Enriching the human mix, makes the intellectual culture and the moral culture better for everybody. I can remember hearing people telling me that if we admitted larger numbers of women or African-American students they would come here not knowing the honor system. Therefore they wouldn’t contribute or benefit or whatever. If you look at

where the leadership comes from for the student institutions that embody the culture, African-American students and women and other newcomers have become the shapers of the student culture. That's exactly what should have happened to it.

SS: I don't want to derail us off your chronology here; however, I can't help but bring up an article from the news today about the Supreme Court rehearing the case on equal opportunity, *Fisher v. Texas*.

JC: I saw that. It's an unfortunate choice of cases. I don't have any idea what's led up to the court's decision to redo it. The Texas case that's in question uses a principle of selection that we never used here; it always seemed to me to be wrong. As I understand it, it involves a numeric weighting of students' credentials, in which I don't know what else they weight, but the issue in this litigation is giving a numeric value to race. It never made any sense to me. It's not necessary, it's an excuse for bad recruiting, and for failing to motivate the schools to teach the courses that students need, and to, in a way, crowd students toward taking them.

Effective school counselors aren't necessarily students' buddies. They're often people who communicate—to oversimplify it—standards and expectations about academic preparation for later life, information about the way academic accomplishment builds success in later life. I think the Texas case is testing a principle that nobody's defending.

The Michigan cases, which have been in and out of the court, and the current rule of law is in one of the Michigan cases, are better cases. The selection methodology that Michigan uses, involves proactive recruiting, and not restacking the cards because of students' origin. Michigan cases might make a better test of law, but they've already been to the Supreme Court, or the undergraduate admission case has.

SS: Thank you. Well, back to your admissions work, there've been a lot of stories that I've read about you traveling around the state, and going into not just schools but African-American homes. Can you tell me about that?

JC: I told you yesterday about Marvin Perry's visit with my parents. It was that I'd seen it in my own life and I thought that's probably the way to engage parents in this. Getting my parents engaged was never the issue. And it wasn't just seeking out African-American students. We felt that we had an obligation to the state's schools.

Jean Rayburn, Lloyd Ricks, who died in the nineties, and others of us who did that work were simply putting into practice the theory that the whole family raises a child. That engaging the parents at the point when the child is leaving home, defines a good strategy for the child. It was nothing more complicated than that. We found that parents were interested. We learned that they could make the difference in success for their children. We learned that they had a tremendous amount of interest in what was going on, in the period when students move from high school to college. So we worked with that.

SS: Did you find something in your experience during that time that led you to want to be more involved in administration?

JC: No, not per se. I was at a convention in Dallas one night when Edgar Shannon called me. He said that he thought I should talk with the recently elected governor, Chuck Robb, because the Governor had read some of these newspaper pieces, and thought that I might have some things to contribute to what he wanted to do as governor. I took a leave of absence from the faculty.

This post gave me a chance to practice on a larger stage what we were learning about schools. It was the period when the Virginia Plan, which was an issue in Virginia education for twenty-five years, and the legal case, the Adams case, were being moved toward resolution. I was very interested in the chance to write a new Virginia Plan and to get it done and get the courts to agree that Virginia had completed its remedial obligations, which actually happened. Although it took longer than I would have guessed it was going to take. It was a very slow process to get all of it done.

It wasn't administration per se; it was the chance to have a role in public policy formation. I'd gotten really interested in the public process, as I had watched school boards make choices about the kinds of programs they could offer to the children of a district. Virginia was not doing a super job in those days with vocational education, and in much of the state, that weakness was damaging students and local economies.

It was the period when Virginia's community colleges were getting stronger and it seemed the potential, which nowadays is taken for granted, for the community colleges to be the lower division freshman and sophomore years of the universities was emerging. In some cases, at NOVA and at PVCC here in Charlottesville, there were community colleges that were more academic preparatory in the sense of moving people to four-year colleges to graduate. They were more that than they were general or vocational.

I thought also there ought to be a common forum, where people would know one another and grow up together or grow into adulthood together, regardless of what they were studying or where they were going. It seemed to me that the resegregation within the population as people sorted themselves out by those who would become apprentices in some business, those who would go into enlisted corps in the military, those who would go to highly selective colleges, those who would go to the community colleges, or whatever, created artificial distinctions among people.

There are certainly natural distinctions that had to do with who excels in what and probably other things, but that one is not a natural distinction. The community college it seemed to me early on to be a powerful public instrument for change, to benefit people in a broad way.

The community colleges in Virginia were created in the late sixties, largely as a result of work done by Governor Mills Godwin. By the time I went into state government in 1981, they had been around long enough that every locality knew what its college was

and where it was. Most of the campuses had been developed out by then, to some extent. It was a chance to work on a broader stage, not only the highly selective powerful academic enterprises that California at Berkeley and Virginia were in those days, but also to work across the board with regard to the public interest in education.

There's a lot of foolish controversy that goes on in politics about, for example, whether John Dewey was right in his observation about the common school as the shaping institution of American democracy. He was right, obviously, and the quarrel over that is stupid. I was influenced by the way Dewey and others thought about the shaping of an open American society.

I was influenced by James Bryant Conant's book about Evanston Township High School, *The American High School Today*, in the fifties. The notion that Harvard's president would take a year out of his life to study a common high school, a high school that was mixed and open—"common" in a good sense—and then generate from that, advice to the nation on how to raise its children, I thought was wonderful. I believed and I still believe that public policy for education, whether it's public or independent, has to be driven by a populist conception of participatory democracy.

SS: Were you able to put into practice some of those ideas?

JC: A lot of them, yes. For a while we had materials in the hands of every family in Virginia on choices that are made by students or for students and what they mean and how a

student can—if a student gets into a track that is not producing the benefits that are desired—re-track and get headed in whatever direction is more productive.

We worked with teachers. One of my concerns about what passes for educational reform in national dialogue now is that you can't reform schools if you start by attacking teachers. Schools reform from the inside out, and teachers are the core of what goes on. Our society should pay teachers competitive wages for what they do. And the notion that turns up occasionally in popular and politic rhetoric right now, that you can just replace all the bad teachers, does not work in the real world.

I liked the work with the teachers. I enjoyed the work with the school boards and with legislators. The public process I found then and still find invigorating—the process of give and take by which public policy is turned into actions of government.

SS: It sounds like, and you probably said this, that you took your experiences as dean, and then took it to a broader level.

JC: Yes, I guess I did.

SS: Did you feel like you wanted to go further in politics?

JC: No, not really. My wife at the time didn't like it. It was an intrusive existence. We, and certainly she, were trying to raise relatively small children in a very busy environment.

The way of life did not support the kind of family life that we wanted. So without any hesitation, we were ready to move out of it when the term was done.

SS: Had you missed teaching, as well?

JC: I actually taught all through that. I was a volunteer adjunct faculty member at VCU in Richmond. I was teaching writing courses aimed primarily at adults. I think they did count it as VCU curriculum, but the audience I was getting was, for example, people who would be in the state's penal system and would be able to take courses in the year before they were released as part of their transition back to civilian life. There were not a lot of those, but enough that I was aware of them.

It seems to me they gave me one or two literature courses, but since I needed to teach after normal work hours, the courses weren't in their mainstream program. I enjoyed the work. I think I did a decent job, and I got to know different populations of students, people I wouldn't have seen otherwise. That was good.

SS: What was it like working with the Governor?

JC: The Governor was very disciplined. He had an attitude toward work that I found instructive and exciting. He had surrounded himself with splendid people. Newspapers at the time said that he had taken the notion of a cabinet, which was a fairly recent innovation in Virginia—it was no more than a decade old when I went to state

government—more seriously than anyone before and that it was a talented group of people, and it was.

I made a lot of friends, and admired what people did in different functions of government. In a state cabinet, you do a certain amount of covering for your neighbor, because people are stretched too far. For example, there was a chance to work on the Governor's budget, with a lot of interaction with the General Assembly, which always has been good work for me. You see things in state government at that level that you can't really experience otherwise.

I was with the Governor—I can't remember where but somewhere way off in the Northwest or possibly actually in the Midwest—on the morning when six prisoners from death row at the state prison in Mecklenburg rode a laundry truck out of the prison and escaped completely. Watching the Governor deal with that and getting instructions on covering the piece of his interest that I was involved with was invigorating.

I had a chance to work in the interstate compacts, the National Governors Association, the Education Commission of the States, SREB [Southern Regional Educational Board], and so on, learning the rhetoric, but behind the rhetoric, the intellectual preoccupations of governors and legislators from across the country. I had chances to influence policy documents. I got to work, a couple of times actually, on projects of the National Academy of Sciences, which was doing the kind of work I had done with regard to the curriculum. The argument that the courses were the key to the whole thing made sense to

people there. So activities of that sort were appealing. On the other hand, it was not a permanent way of life.

SS: Too much travel?

JC: No, it wasn't just that. I'm just not a political groupie. I was a participant. I wanted to be engaged in the process, but I wasn't there to hang onto a position for the rest of my life. I was there to get a job done and move on.

SS: It sounds like you've liked every job that you've ever had.

JC: I've been very lucky. Fate has been good to me, and I've stumbled into good things.

SS: Well, tell me about the next transition.

JC: I had been interviewed fairly extensively for a private college presidency, and in the end, it just wasn't the right thing for the college or for me. I got a look at it, and got to thinking maybe that's something else to do.

Then one night—ironically, there's a photograph of that night—I was in the kitchen with our two small children, while my wife was probably working on dinner. The phone rang and a man I'd never heard of told me he was the board chair at the University of Connecticut and that they were conducting a search for a president. He had gotten

information on me from somewhere and said they'd really like to talk to me. So just out of nowhere, this thing turned up.

I went to LaGuardia and spent several hours with him and the board. I came away admiring the disciplines that they followed to do a good job in the public interest and their aspirations for the university. My wife went up there and visited and studied it some. They offered the position, and I took it. I didn't really look back. It was intuitively the right thing to do, and so I did it. It was very different from the places I'd known before that.

UConn, in those days—it still does to some extent, I suspect—served populations that were multiethnic—Lithuanian-American people; people whose families had migrated from Poland after World War II; Irish families who had moved back and forth across the Atlantic. In those days, Cuban and Puerto Rican families were moving into the Northeast in large numbers, and they would turn up in the mix. I really liked the multitude of that population.

And there's another part—the tool and die makers in New Britain, the millworkers in the Naugatuck Valley, and a lot of New England farm settlements. I just thought it was a fascinating place to go. It had its own sets of academic and other issues. It was very poorly financed. It sorely needed points of distinction that it could rally around. The most obvious things that we did were, for example, figuring out that the key to prominence was going to have to include—although not necessarily to be—nationally

prominent basketball programs for women and for men, and then going out and finding the people who would build those.

SS: That was successful.

JC: Yes. It was a good time. We were doing a lot of other things, too, but obviously the people who read the one-fourth of the newsprint in the world that covers sports know basically the basketball piece.

In any event, it was a place that had no privilege in its background. It had no prominent founder. It had no dominant consciousness of the kind that Jefferson invested in this place. It was a creation of language that was used in the early documents of farmers and mechanics who wanted their children to have a way up in the world. It was a very egalitarian, no nonsense, good place.

SS: It must have been different for you.

JC: It was different. We lived in Storrs. Storrs was just a little town, off on the edge of the campus. We lived in the little town. The children prospered in those schools. All three of the children were in the schools up there. It was a great existence. I'd never met anyone quite like the Governor at the time, and I became really fond of him. He had large aspirations for UConn.

SS: Who was the Governor?

JC: His name was Bill O'Neill. He had been a staff member to Ella Grasso when she was the governor. I think Governor Grasso must have died shortly after being reelected, and he had run as lieutenant governor. He became governor at about the same time that there was a major collapse of an interstate highway bridge across the Mianus River in Southwestern Connecticut. He was personally afflicted that the public infrastructure was dangerous to the people of the state.

Connecticut nowadays has a quite good highway system. There's never going to be a really good highway along the Gold Coast from Greenwich over to about Bridgeport, because there's just too much traffic, but even there, the state made major investments under Governor O'Neill. He had similar aspirations for UConn. He saw it as essential to the wellbeing of the people of the state.

Connecticut tumbled into a recession in 1989 or so. We had run a little capital campaign successfully, but it was obvious that it was going to be a good while before UConn would be self-sufficient, if ever. What I had done was write the plans that UConn has, in fact, implemented to become a much different and stronger university. If you think about it, UConn is the only consistently prominent research institution, public university, in the Northeast. It's different from the parts of the world where you've lived or I've lived, because the drivers in the Northeast are the great private universities: Yale, Brown,

Harvard, and go through the list. They are the places that shape the region's economy and so on.

Governor O'Neill was a creature of the eastern end of the state. I don't know everything he'd done before, but he told me that he'd had the local bar in the town where he and his wife had lived. He had a very solid set of blue-collar Yankee values, which I admired.

One night I was doing something and the Governor called and he asked, "Would you like to have dinner?" "Sure." He said, "Well, come on over to the mansion and we'll have dinner in the kitchen." "Fine." And he says, "There's some peanut butter." The Governor, his police officer, and I sat at a kitchen table and we had peanut butter sandwiches. (Laughter.)

SS: (Laughter.) That's a great story.

JC: He was a very approachable and decent guy, and anything but a dummy. He was a very bright man, but he had a natural modesty that was always in any discussion of what he wanted to do. He always thought about it in terms of what he saw as the need for collaborations with other people. He was always looking for allies to take on projects that he felt were important to the state. I think he served a total of eight years, but he may have served three terms. I'm not sure.

I worked with him for five years and was in touch with him afterward. He was just somebody to admire. There were others. John Dempsey, who was a retired governor of Connecticut, was a friend. He was a similar man. Both John Dempsey and Bill O'Neill were creatures of Irish-American politics. We don't have that in Virginia. I hadn't seen it before; it was a chance to learn something new and different.

SS: So you helped set UConn on the course that it is on now?

JC: I worked on the planning. UConn had had a long dry spell with regard to building construction. We began to get funding for what had become the major research ventures at Storrs with pathobiology and so on, but also at Farmington. UConn always had a vigorous research program that was basically a land-grant college program. Farmington, where the health center is, had been developed with the intention of more research and less clinical care. It doesn't work economically. The arithmetic doesn't work.

It's still an issue in Connecticut. It's very hard to run a major research program without a large clinical base for it. So the issues that we worked on with regard to the health center were important and good issues that resembled issues that we had to deal with here later on. We had to find a way to finance the hospital in the context of state regulations that made it difficult to get such things as consortial agreements on purchasing to cut the price everything—bandages and whatever you might buy.

We were paying more than the market, because we didn't have a consortium. We had to learn how to create the legal structure to make the hospital function in the real economy. Healthcare in any major city and certainly in the area around Hartford has been in flux all my life. That aspect of the university required constant flexibility and rethinking of the relationship to the state.

UConn had branch campuses in various places. Two are probably worth discussing here. At Stamford we had a campus that had served a lot of adult students, but there was a demand for a more substantial campus there. So we did a master plan for a replacement for the old UConn campus and for the development of a significant Stamford downtown presence. That has happened.

I've gotten to go back there several times to attend events where they've celebrated achieving one or another of the goals they had. The little campus up at Torrington, which is in Northwestern Connecticut, is in an area where the population is not dense. People have to drive a long way to do anything. No private provider was available. There were lots of opportunities to close that campus. I learned recently that it's actually still in business. The reason not to close it is that there is no other provider. The public university has a job to do in that place.

Torrington is, nowadays, prosperous. It's a center of regional new tech business. It was not in those days, but it was worth the decision to keep Torrington going. The whole

experience of that place was learning how a strong state university system is integrated into a state's social and economic life.

SS: And you brought that with you?

JC: It definitely came back here with me, but some of it I learned there. I had seen other aspects of the public mission, but in that place, I had to learn that one, or those. It was multiple aspects. UConn research took a lot of learning. Both UConn and Yale have pieces of the Connecticut land-grant funding. Yale has the forestry school. The forest is over in UConn's part of the state, but the forestry school is a New Haven operation.

There is an agricultural experiment station at New Haven in which faculty from both schools worked. I guess it's still there. Faculty members are ingenious about getting the research done. And in this ag experiment station, there were people working on human medicine. There were links between faculty there and faculty up at the Institute for Living, the psychiatric institution in Hartford.

The ingenuity of faculty members in accomplishing their research purposes in land-grant institutions, where the research drives so much of the institution's function, you see that. U.Va. is not a land-grant college. It's a different kind of place. I'd seen some of the land grant culture at Berkeley, but at Connecticut every department lived it all the time.

SS: What skills do you think that you brought with you?

JC: Probably a fairly large sense of my own ignorance, learning to listen to people carefully, and trying to understand what they were trying to accomplish. It was not an easy place to be president, but it was a good place to be president. They treated me really well. When I've gone up subsequently, I'm always surprised that people seem to remember and understood the things that we were trying to do.

They invited me up there seven or eight years ago, when they finished out the last phase of building out the plans that we'd done. They pretty much had it right. They understood what we tried to do. So skills of mine? I don't know. It was probably a general capacity to manage or administer something. I certainly had an awareness of how dependent anyone in my line of work is on the quality of academic and fiscal and other management.

Perhaps I learned at least a version of what it takes to find really good people to take on hard jobs, and probably some of what it takes to persuade people who are not producing to move on, without having to go in and crush them. The way a president has to be engaged with the people who support the university's functions requires some learning. It's not intuitive.

It's not like being the president of a corporation, where you reshuffle the executive group to be exactly what you want it to be. It's much more focused on teamwork. Corporations are obviously much more team oriented now than they were twenty-five years ago, but university leadership, by definition, suffers if the president attempts to impose the

president's perspective and will on every single function. It doesn't work well.

Governance is always shared inside. People don't just talk about decisions; they make them distributively.

SS: Was that difficult for you to learn?

JC: No, it made perfectly good sense. You have to have a fairly high capacity to live in a condition of uncertainty. But that's not something that is true only at universities. It's probably characteristic of institutions where authority is shared. Anyhow, I went there somewhat unprepared for what I had to do. I learned, I think, quickly enough, and the place was uncommonly good to me.

SS: Is there anything else you want to share about that time period?

JC: I don't know what else you might want to know. The individual jobs that we had to get done are probably more interesting in that context than in this context.

SS: Right, we should dwell more on the University of Virginia. This might be a good time to take a break.

JC: Okay.

SS: Well, could you tell me about how you became president here at the University?

JC: When Bob O'Neil resigned and the Board began its search—I wasn't involved in it—there must have been quite a discussion of the different futures that were available to the University. The Rector, Board chair at the time, was somebody I knew and admire a great deal, Josh Darden. The search reflected his perspectives on what was appropriate and good. It was also anything but a search for a traditional leader. The University was systematically looking at all kinds of options.

I was contacted early during a time when I was trying to find something different from being a university president. I was looking at going into business, probably in Maine. I found a business that was interesting and was learning how to finance the acquisition and so on. I'd been nominated, and I don't know if it was a call or a letter originally, but there was some communication. I responded that I was not looking and didn't hear from the search for quite some time.

SS: Can you tell me what kind of business you were thinking about?

JC: It was a company that rewinds large industrial electric motors. The kind that are used on ships to lift cargos up on the booms that in those days were more common than they are now, because of the technology of on-deck cargo. What I found interesting about it was that it was a very specialized, stable business that I thought would be something to grow.

It's not been influenced much by new technologies, but I thought that in Central Maine, where the business was, there was a stable labor force of people who could do that kind of work. And I thought it would be a good place for the children to grow up.

SS: Did you already have your house in Maine?

JC: A different house.

SS: That's remarkable that you considered leaving academia after all those years.

JC: I was fairly young, and I was looking for different options. However, subsequent to this initial contact with the search committee, I had a call from Josh Darden, the Rector, who told me that there was a pretty serious interest in talking with me. They also wanted to talk to me about the conduct of the search, because they needed another perspective on the kinds of people they were seeing as applicants and so on.

I spent one day in a conversation that was really about their search purposes and then subsequent days, several of them, that became more and more focused on the prospect of my becoming the president. My wife was very interested in doing it at that time. So, after some discussion and some conversation within the family and so on, it was the right thing to do.

The chairmanship of the Board had changed before that was all done. Josh, I think, remained the chair of the search, but Ed Elson, who subsequently was U.S. Ambassador to Copenhagen, became the chair. From the beginning, the Board had the practice of describing its large goals to me in discussions that took place in the planning retreats and then expecting me to produce several things—sometimes alternative sets of goals, but more commonly the implementation plans for the goals that they had deliberated. In those days, the Board was very much engaged with its faculty mentors, faculty members were important in the Board's process of deliberation. Nowadays, that's more institutionalized. In those days, it was simply that the Board sought out these people. Now there's an advisory position on the Board for the chair of the Faculty Senate and so on. That structure was not in place at that time.

The big issues were the aspiration to become by consensus a great national university and the aspiration to find additional sources of revenue. At the time, the state's funding base was 29 or 30 percent of the operating budget, and that was thought to be predictable.

It would be hard to imagine better chairs than some of them, and there was not a weak one in the bunch. They were all first-rate. The same is true, by and large, of the Board members. A Board of this kind ought to be diverse, and it ought to have some internal tensions as to what its purposes are. It's a way of construing the public purposes in the university. The Board is appointed by the governor. And it's a staggered term because governors serve only one term, four years. So you often have boards that represent opposed political views of what universities ought to do in our culture or what this

university ought to do. That hasn't been a characteristic that immobilized the Board. It simply sometimes made consensus difficult sometimes. More generally, the Board has operated from a consensus perspective and certainly was willing to deal with the realities of what we were seeing.

When the state missed the coming of the recession of 1990 to '93, it was a terrible event in terms of the state's capacity to do its job. The Governor did not have first-rate financial advisors.

SS: Who was the Governor then?

JC: Douglas Wilder, who was a state senator from Richmond before that. He's a friend. I had known him for years, enjoyed him, but he just did not get first-rate information on the buildup of that recession. When he had to find money, he had some choices, but he elected to cut what nowadays is called the transportation budget (not transporting people—it's highways, basically) the budget that supported public services, which were many different things: public health, welfare, and so on; and the budget for higher education.

At the time, received political wisdom was that the K-12 budgets could not be cut. That has to do with the politics of how the state's share of the public schools' budget comes about. Subsequently, the General Assembly did cut K-12 education, but in those days they thought they could not. The higher ed cuts were dramatic. They came overnight.

They didn't solve the state's problem, because in the end, the state's problem was that it did not have a sophisticated way to track the economy on whose prosperity the state lives. As a consequence of that, the state kept coming up short.

The politics of the time were challenging. The Board was great, but the politics of it, especially as the Governor chopped away at the budget, and ultimately had to say something other than, "This is temporary, and we'll put all the money back." People's incomes were reduced and there were many other cuts. It was a terribly mismanaged recession on the state side.

We knew the Governor would turn on, not U.Va. specifically, but on higher education generally. He was predictably going to have to attack the faculties and claim that there was waste, fraud, and abuse. There were some unfortunate elements of his grasp of what public education was all about. He wasn't in the end a creature of public education. He came here to my inauguration in October 1990, and addressed his remarks to the faculty and told the faculty that it was to stop conducting research. The job was teaching, public service, and advising students. He didn't register that the third part, research, drives the other two parts and so this is what came out.

That was a polarizing statement. I don't think the Governor really understood what he had done or how foolish it was going to look as new technologies came down the path and Virginia's universities were simply not ready to provide what the state needed in the mid-nineties. Yet his truculence served to spell out several important points, and the

Board and the faculty got them. To use a term that belongs to another period, really, intellectual property drives universities, the capacity to generate new knowledge or a new technology is the capacity to teach them, the capacity to refine them and apply them.

Virginia missed it. The Board here didn't. We were working at the time on the development of the two research parks. We were developing alternative ways to finance buildings that the state couldn't or wouldn't buy. We moved very quickly into planning for a different kind of operating budget in which the core responsibility would devolve away from that part of the budget that was the state's. It declined steadily—it's down to 6 1/2 or 7 percent, I think, now.

We were looking for a different model, for different ways to do things. Initially, it was a matter of how to finance it. Then it was a matter of how to operate it in a partly regulated environment. The state had regulations about some things, not about others. Ultimately, it became a matter of how to get the law and state regulation to acknowledge that in this university and several others in Virginia are actually instrumentalities of the state, rather than simply agencies of the state. Instrumentalities act on the state's behalf. They have public functions, regardless of ownership or finances. The incremental cost of complying with multiple mandates—the state, the market, employees, and so on—led to the restructuring legislation in 2005 and 2006.

On the way, to go back to the beginning, one of the strategies that we used to keep the John Dempsey Hospital at Farmington, Connecticut, viable was creation by law of the

John Dempsey Hospital Finance Corporation, which was the first of the quasi-public governance structures that have evolved over twenty-five years as national models.

Other elements of the UConn experience that turned out to be very useful here also, as we began to deal with the need for the University to change fairly quickly, despite the lack of state funding or even support in more abstract ways, to build a more powerful research enterprise.

Ultimately, we have found ourselves in partnerships with the state on the most fundamental kinds of economic strategies for the state. The location of the Rolls-Royce aircraft engine facility near Petersburg was a U.Va.-Virginia Tech collaboration to do for the state something the state couldn't figure out how to do for itself.

In Connecticut, I had learned that the public university is really fundamental to what the state does to keep constant turnover in industry, to assure new jobs at diverse levels within the economy, and so on. The businesses generally were smaller, usually, although we also had dealings with United Technologies, which is the biggest employer in that state and similar companies. The ones that were helpful in thinking about Virginia were companies pursuing new technologies and learning how to do things from scratch.

There was a wonderful little company that was the original producer of digital readout devices for car dashboards. A man in Eastern Connecticut had a bright idea—his town had an empty mill building. He came to UConn for help in taking a theory about liquid crystal diodes and turning the theory into practical products that were printed on pieces of

what looked like plastic, Mylar or something, and insert it in dashboards to make the digital displays work. I wouldn't have thought of that as something a university would be deeply involved in, but we were, because it was necessary for the state's economy to move forward.

In the early nineties in Virginia, we had shots at the BMW manufacturing and design facility that's in South Carolina. The state passed it up; they didn't understand that BMW wanted a university collaboration. BMW got it with Clemson and the University of South Carolina. The same thing happened again about a year later with Mercedes, when Mercedes ultimately decided to build a facility in Alabama. It was very frustrating. By then we understood what was getting away from us, but we could not get the appropriate state officials to pay attention.

SS: It must have been very frustrating.

JC: Well, the constraint on the state side was partly that the state didn't have a way to invest state industrial development money in appropriate places. The state's practice was to offer free sewer connections, no real estate tax for five years, and so on. What BMW spelled out in its request for proposals was CAD/CAM support for the design facility, ongoing research in relevant areas, including vehicle design, to be conducted in the state universities' research labs, and a commitment to provide startup training for new workers through the community colleges in perpetuity.

For South Carolina, making those commitments has been a gold mine. It's become the biggest event in South Carolina's economy ever. If you drive down Interstate 85, I think it is, and just watch the South Carolina industries—you can just look from side to side to see what South Carolina got for understanding what was required. Virginia just did not understand it.

SS: That was new at that time?

JC: Was it really new at that time? I don't know. Rolls-Royce at that time was probably already in the relationship with Indiana University at Indianapolis and with Purdue. There were probably other states that were ahead of us, but we didn't have all the pieces together. So it would not be fair of me just to go back and say state officials didn't get it. We weren't learning at the same pace.

What we did here in response to it was, with the Board's support, develop ways to attract appropriate, research-driven industries. There's a company that came in the early years, and it's still here, that makes precision tools for brain surgery—MicroAire. There's one that's doing research having to do with orthopedic surgery and accommodations and so on. There's one that came, and I don't know that's it's still in a U.Va. facility. I think I heard that it's moved to its own campus east of town, but it is an association that devises training and software for financial planners.

Then a kind of culmination occurred, in terms of the collaborations of the state, when the Rolls-Royce option turned up. It turned up because a faculty member here realized he was seeing something in some work he was doing and alerted someone. I don't know if it was his dean or who it was. It came up to us through the faculty, which is probably what should happen.

The University of Virginia is a part of the same movement in public policy that created the corporate entities of a number of the colonial establishments of universities—Yale, Harvard, and so on. It is very similar in its origins to Cornell, a little different from William and Mary, which, as I recall, is not by law a corporation. It was an acquisition. The state bought it sometime after the turn of the last century, in a time when the Episcopal Church decided that it couldn't afford to keep it going.

I think a couple of our governors had probably thought that they could muddle through their terms simply by making strategic raids on our budget and others. There's not enough money in the budgets to do that. The state's responsibilities and its revenue sources are just larger and more complex. After a while in the 1990s, raiding university budgets becomes a self-destructive adventure, if the state needs to stay alive economically.

I was motivated to come here, in part, by the realization that U.Va. and Virginia had huge potential, which I think in some respects both the state and the University have realized. I knew it was a big job. I understood it, largely, because of conversations with the Board

that initially appointed me. I understood it to be about a decade's worth of work. I understood it to be a much more constrained job. I didn't have any idea that we needed to raise whatever it was—three or four billion dollars—or that we needed to find a way to refinance completely rather than on the edges.

I don't think anybody did. Since the purpose from the start was to refine and improve a public treasure, the periods when there were difficulties to be addressed didn't pit the Board against the state or the University against the state, except occasionally in the minds of whoever was writing newspaper columns.

Instead, the challenges helped define what the public purposes actually are, and in the process, attracted extraordinary faculty members and donors and students and so on. So it was an exciting thing to get into. At the very beginning, when I took the job, I don't think anybody had a vision of what would be involved in doing it. I certainly didn't have the intention of spending until 2010.

SS: Had you known, do you think you would have accepted the position?

JC: I don't know. I don't know how you could know. I was being asked to sort out matters of mission. Does U.Va. belong in Northern Virginia? Does research have a role here? Those are the kinds of issues that floated up in 1990 and '91.

SS: Those are huge.

JC: Yes, but what you find as you start peeling that onion, is that each time you peel away a piece, there's a lot more underneath.

I had a relationship with Leonard Sandridge that went back to the late sixties. At that point, it was just admiring the way he worked, that he got the job done, and he did it with minimal destruction in the process of achieving whatever purposes he was to achieve.

SS: So that was when you were a graduate student?

JC: I was, but in addition to being a graduate student, I was an assistant dean in the College.

SS: You were? I missed that. I'm sorry.

JC: I think it's still organized this way, but the College is organized into what were called "associations," and I had one of the five or six associations. I was the dean's assistant also. They didn't know how to appoint a graduate student to be an assistant dean, so they made me assistant to the dean and then de facto assistant dean.

Later, when I was running the admission office—that's probably the wrong verb, Jean Rayburn really ran it—Leonard was essential. When I went to Richmond, Leonard was right in the thick of what we did with the recession in the early eighties. He had extraordinary intellectual tools for the kinds of quantitative analysis that are necessary to make a state work.

Then when my coming here as president became an issue, Leonard was involved in explaining to me what was known at the time about the University's issues and needs. So were others—Sandy was. There were a lot of people who weren't involved in selecting a president, and were probably not involved in trying to persuade anybody, but they were making sure that I had a clear grasp of what was understood at the time. Leonard and I sat down in probably April, well before I came down here.

SS: April of 1989?

JC: April of 1990, I imagine. He may know the exact day, because Leonard is great at capturing precise details. We had had a conversation about his perception that Virginia was headed into the same recession that Connecticut by that time was in, and that the recession was going to force us toward finding different ways to run the University.

SS: Is this the meeting that you talked about in our December meeting—the meeting that happened at UConn?

JC: I may have. Yes, Leonard came up, and we spent a day. We just sat and went over everything he knew and everything I knew. I contacted the Governor as a result of that meeting to tell him our judgment. He didn't want the advice. He was convinced that his people had it figured out and that Virginia was bulletproof. I don't want to pick on him, but he was the person in place at the time when, for better or worse, Virginia didn't have what it needed to deal with its economic realities.

I came in with the good fortune to have really superb people who were willing to commit to the vision. It wasn't that I walked in the door with a vision of what could be done. It was that the vision evolved very quickly as circumstances changed.

At the beginning, in 1990 and the two or so years when we worked on the basic plans for the following two decades, I had the benefit of excellent colleagues. Leonard Sandridge, for example, was the strongest and most effective chief financial officer (eventually, chief operating officer) in the country. He had uncommon natural gifts (a splendid mind, the capacity to sympathize with every kind of essential work done within the faculty and staff, sound political sense) as well as the capacity to learn quickly and with considerable subtlety and to inspire the women and men who worked with him. He hired excellent staff, including several who have gone on to do major work independently, and he had a knack for varying assignments so that people who worked with him grew quickly.

Leonard also had a rare capacity for enabling our provosts to perform well during perfect storms (such as those occasioned by Virginia's progressive defunding of its colleges) and in the best of times. The provosts, especially Peter Low, learned both to plan well for the whole and to delegate effectively. Leonard enabled that: He found ways to deliver funds to the University's top academic priorities. During the period when we were building the endowment and concentrating operating funds to benefit the schools, Leonard's relationships with the provost made things work well. We needed stability in the University's operations. He supported that. We needed collaborative relationships with governors and the legislature. With others, he managed that. And we needed financial

integrity: He oversaw systems that provided that. Business leaders talk about key men or women. During these twenty years, Leonard was our key man. And as he left office, he left in place a generation's work of key people, including remarkable numbers of successful women in key roles.

By the time that I became president, the people I had known as, say, committee vice chairs in the legislature, were the chairs of the committee. The provost when I came was someone I had known previously because we'd served on faculty committees together. He was quite sick, and he died not too long after I became president.

SS: Who was that?

JC: His name was Hugh Kelly. He was a physicist. Hugh and people who worked with Hugh were available, they were generous, and they had background and knowledge. Plus, we had in the Board and in the University's central administration an awareness that we were going to have to evolve in a corporate sense pretty fast in order to stay afloat as the state sank.

The early hires were fortunate hires. We found people who turned out over time to be the best people in the country at what they did to come here and give us five years, ten years, whatever it might have been, as we developed a modern university structure. I had also the benefit of knowing and being able from time to time to hear from all three of the predecessors in office who were still living at the time.

SS: Oh, good, I was going to ask about that.

JC: I had less contact with Bob, because by that time, Bob was deeply engaged in the Thomas Jefferson Center.

SS: His tenure here was very short.

JC: Five years. U.Va. has really wanted presidents to stay between ten and fifteen years, as a rule. So five years felt short, but I wasn't here at the time, so I don't know what went on.

SS: You can't provide any insight?

JC: No, the only ones who might are Sandy and Leonard. Bob left the place in good shape. It was a seamless transition. I simply stepped right into the place he had occupied and kept going. The relationships with both Frank and Edgar were very warm, very personal, but with different points of emphasis.

I'd been more involved with Edgar in prior years. Edgar was president of the national chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, in addition to being the leader of our local Phi Beta Kappa. I'd been the local secretary for several years and I had interacted with Edgar in that work. Edgar's wife Eleanor was a great friend and was able to explain pieces of the development of the place that I wouldn't have seen otherwise. She told me one night that Edgar and Marvin Perry, the admissions person I had known, had been sitting at a kitchen

table trying to figure out what it would take to get the University started on an upward trajectory. This would have been in 1959 or '60.

They had known each other at Washington and Lee. Edgar's father was a professor of English there. Marvin was a professor of English there, too. At some point, she said that Edgar sort of got excited, threw his hands up, and he said, "You know, the key to the whole thing is admission, we're not doing the job in admissions. So we're not influencing the schools, we're not spreading public benefit of what we're doing." He asked Marvin to come and run the admission program, which Marvin did.

That insight is very important in the modern development of the place. The realization that the University has to have this constant engagement with the world around it and that it's not simply idealistic and a matter of pursuing goodness, it's a matter of the most enlightened kind of self-interest.

Only a handful of public universities in the country have the same operating imperative. It's this one, it's Michigan, arguably Texas at Austin, arguably Berkeley. It's a small number of places that have the same engagement with the surrounding state. It's not the same as necessarily training teachers. It's not the same as constructing barriers against under-prepared students. It's a matter of actively and affirmatively informing the public process to make sure that people benefit by that. Informing in the sense of "forming from inside." The university can't sit outside the system and snipe at it. It has to be in the thick of it, making it happen. It's true of economic development. It's true of the schools.

It's certainly true of health policy in our time, as universities have become increasingly the providers of last resort.

SS: I was very touched when I read about Edgar Shannon's speech during the Kent State protest.

JC: Yes. Edgar was a man of tremendous conscience. He was way ahead of his board on that. The Board didn't get it. I don't know if Edgar at the time was a naval captain. I think before Edgar left the Navy Reserve, he may have been an admiral. There was a lot of U.Va. engagement with the Navy in those days. Several of the deans and so on were Naval Reserve. They were World War II people who had stayed engaged with the Navy. Edgar spoke to the moral foundations of citizenship in those remarks, and he was wonderful.

SS: You were there?

JC: Yes, I was there, but I was way off on the edge of it. I wasn't totally clear on what was going on the whole time. Later when I saw a transcript of his remarks, it reshaped my perception of what had happened. This place did not have a particularly vigorous protest culture in those days. I don't think there was ever a student consensus about what was going on. It wasn't really an activist faculty. Faculty leaders were often people who had become professors after having served in Korea or in World War II. A lot of them had national security, maybe intelligence backgrounds.

One of my favorite faculty members, a man who never taught me, but who was a friend from beginning to end, was a man named John Graham. I don't think I ever knew what John's affiliation with the military was, but he was very critical of national policy, especially in Cambodia. He knew exactly what was wrong with it. He had a personal stake in citizen service in the military and at the same time he was an active faculty member. He wasn't a demonstrator so much as he was a thoughtful and from time to time a fairly important participant in national dialogues.

Edgar was much closer. You'd have to look on the web to be sure of which commissions he was on, but I think he was on the CIA Commission. He was not somebody off on the edge of things; he was right at the core of national life and policy formation and so on. Ultimately, you can't reconstruct history, but a lot of us thought at the time that he had left being president too soon. It would have been good for the University for him to stay another three, four years, anyway, maybe longer.

SS: Did he stay ten years?

JC: Fourteen years, I think, maybe longer than that. [Looking at iPad] I'll see if I can find it for you. Frank served eleven years. I remember that. Anyhow, the model was what seemed to be Mr. Alderman's endless service.

SS: Right, but you've gotten close to it.

JC: Let's see, Edgar Shannon. Let's see if I can get him on Wiki and tell you exactly. I think he became president in 1958. Frank became president in 1973-74, I think, so Edgar served longer. He was president from 1959 to '74. I guess it was a fifteen-year tenure. He had been so important in the life of the faculty and had done so much to create the research culture and so on that a lot of us felt profound loss when he left. Actually, he didn't leave; he went to Oxford for a year and came back. I thought I might be able to spot this reference to his military service, but I don't see it.

SS: Do you know why he left?

JC: I never asked him. When you're a graduate student, maybe a young faculty member, things are pretty stark. You know exactly what's right and what's wrong. The world's more complicated than that.

Let me see if I can find this. I know he was a captain, whether he was ever an admiral, I don't know. You know, Wiki is not doing a super job for us here. You may have to ask Sandy to pull out more authoritative information. Whoever wrote this entry on Edgar, doesn't know the whole story. Let me see if it was the CIA Commission he served on. It was the CIA Commission.

Like most great leaders, Edgar was a selfless man. The goal was the work, rather than some kind of ceremonial recognition or something. He had a completely generous and selfless attitude toward the work. He was very, very diligent.

The state was a simpler enterprise in those days, smaller. Ray Bice told me about going on a trip with Edgar. They were passing through Richmond, going somewhere else, and Edgar had an extra twenty minutes, so he stopped and went into one of the state office buildings just to see who was around, just to say hello. (Laughter.)

SS: That is commitment.

JC: Well, no entourage, no appointment, very direct, a one-on-one way of doing that part of the job.

SS: What do think his greatest accomplishments were to the University in a nutshell?

JC: Almost certainly it was the creation of the modern graduate school. Also he had to break with that part of Virginia's political leadership who were mired down in Massive Resistance in order to create the university that it was capable of becoming, eventually, a more diverse place. He brought a human face to the University's leadership that was very valuable. He and Eleanor raised five daughters, largely at Carr's Hill. The girls were always very visible, all striking little girls in bright cotton dresses. We admired them tremendously. The same was true of the Hereford family. It's just it happened that the Shannon girls were close enough in age that they were all there at the same time. The Hereford children were a little older when he became president.

SS: What about Hereford's accomplishments?

JC: Well, one of them was simply the formation of the financial model that eventually saved us, when the going was rough in the early nineties. Let me back up. Frank really carried out the processes, for example, of the coeducation committee that he chaired, the decision that the student body really had to look a lot more like Virginia and more like the nation than it did, with the progressive steps toward diversifying the student body. Frank, from the beginning of his career here, was engaged in that. Plus, from the late forties when he was a Manhattan Project physicist, he was always engaged in the national research culture and brought that here.

But he was also involved with the financial changes and the beginnings of the modern building and construction programs. When I was president, we built a lot of buildings and gutted a lot of buildings and recycled them and so on. The principles that we used were really laid down in Frank's time. We were going to build for the long durability of a building and not on a twenty-year cycle. We'd made a conscious decision probably in the late seventies that we were going to put more into what was called at the time "just face" in our buildings. We were going to build buildings that would have more amenities than you might have if the buildings looked like factory buildings. They were to be built to be comfortable for the human work done in them, that notwithstanding the heating system in this room, which will freeze you if you work here long enough. It'll freeze you summer and winter; it's a very adaptable heating system. (Laughter.)

Frank had directed us toward buildings that would meet actual needs that students or faculty members had. This library over here, the one through the window, is one of

Frank's. That building was intended to make the library accessible, ideally twenty-four hours a day, to undergraduate students so they would develop social and intellectual habits that had to do with working as students in the library setting.

SS: Is that part of Alderman?

JC: No. It's the Clemons Library. It's named for the librarian who developed the Alderman Library. It was the first time we had filled in a blank spot on Grounds in order to create more density of settlement. It was, for its time, a very expensive library. It was not intended to be the sort of research and storage facility that the Alderman Library is. It started a process of change in the way the University did things. It wasn't the only building that did that in Frank's time. The modern face of the University is very much a building out of his intention.

SS: That's interesting to hear your perspective on other presidents.

JC: I may have run through with you the other day, but my perception of those people is that each one—for better or worse—was superbly fitted to a specific set of issues, not always the same issues as the president served out the time, but very specific issues which together added up to the University's agenda.

Mr. Darden was a program builder, with regard to the establishments of the Darden School and the McIntire School. Mr. Darden had that vision, and he made it happen.

Alderman had the vision of substantial professional and graduate schools embedded in a more traditional American university. Alderman had thought pretty deeply about the influence of the German models on American graduate schools. For good reasons, each one had peculiar kinds of influence.

SS: I guess the rest of our interview time is going to be spent talking about your vision and impact.

JC: The vision evolves from day to day. You have to have principles. I haven't looked at the speech I made when I was inaugurated in about twenty years. I suspect that if one looks at that speech, it's pretty much predictive of what we did. I worked with other people—it wasn't just mine—to find a set of principles that could be applied over the decade or so that we imagined at the time. I think that President Sullivan has done something very similar, in connection with her inauguration. The University had symposia and other events that were ways of asserting a kind of direction and pattern for the years when she'll be president.

Edgar Shannon did that. Somewhere I have a copy of his inaugural address that I suspect he gave me at some point or maybe Mrs. Shannon did. It's something I've kept around my desk for years, because I admire the self-consciousness of what he had to say about what he would do or what the University would do in his time.

I always admired Mr. Darden's bravery, taking on the fraternities, taking on the state. He really was not averse to a fight. He spelled out his principles very clearly, and his principles became the University's personality in subsequent years as he finished out his program.

SS: Did you have to go through some fights as well?

JC: I'm not sure I did. I don't give up quickly, but I was always struck by the fact that the most difficult issues seem to be resolved if you simply kept listening to and talking to the people who affect the outcomes. I wouldn't describe it as a particularly beleaguered period.

SS: Well, some of the things I've read said that you never had to fight for your job. Is that true?

JC: Never had to fight for my job?

SS: Yes, as University president.

JC: That's probably true. Not that everybody wanted the job. (Laughter.) I feel about that as I feel about the years at UConn or the years in state government. People treated me pretty well. Each of the places where I have worked has been ripe for change at the time

when I was invited to it. While the changes aren't necessarily things you can chart in advance as a master plan or vision statement, the changes have happened.

SS: I have looked at your inaugural address, but the thing I looked at this morning was the last address.

JC: You mean the graduation speech?

SS: The last State of the University speech.

JC: What I was trying to do was prepare ground for the next president, to make sure that the University's various publics understood where she began and where she might go. I remember working on that speech with a group of people, all of whom were convinced that it was crucial not to try to constrain the new president. That the point was really to give her a point of departure rather than to say this is it. You do need to say to the people with whom you've worked that they have done things very well, at the point of departure, and I did intend that speech as an acknowledgment of that.

There's a more personal kind of statement on life in universities and the points of contact between the university and the larger society in the final graduation speech that I did. I saw it online the other day. That one is recorded online. I don't know if they all are. Someone wrote me the other day and mentioned it and put in a link to it. I clicked over to see what it was and it's actually the digital recording. That was the speech where I had

to figure out what students should take away about Yeardley Love. There's another speech about her death that was specifically about that topic.

The public discourse, especially appearing in front of the people and speaking, is fundamental to what one has to do to lead a university. I don't know if the websites have them, but I also wrote letters once or twice a year to students, families, and alumni, general letters about the University.

SS: Well, this brings up how to structure the rest of our interview. In fact, we'll just stop here today.

[End of Interview]

**The University of Virginia Oral History Project
Interview with John T. Casteen III
Conducted on February 23, 2012 by Sheree Scarborough**

SS: This is Sheree Scarborough and this is the third interview with John Casteen for the University of Virginia Oral History Project. Today is February 23, 2012.

John, we ended last time referring to your speech to graduates in 2010. I've had a chance to listen to it.

JC: I was trying to remember just now whether that speech was the second time or the third time that I actually addressed the graduates at Finals. The background of it is that at some point in the early nineties I had realized that the graduation exercise—not just here, but in most universities—did not include appropriate farewell words from the university to the graduates. I had written, and then modified each year, a four to five-minute set of departing words, a charge to the graduating class.

In the earlier year or years when I did the graduation address, itself, the decision that I would do it came out of the Rector's, the Board chair's, thinking about avoiding having the speech used as a political platform. It happened that in the prior time or times, I'm sorry, I can't remember if it's once or twice, there had been a possibility that that would happen. After some discussion, the Rector said, "You just do it, and no one will notice that you're doing it."

This last one was an outgrowth of the charge to the class, but it was an attempt to speak to a graduating class on fairly personal terms about what matters in life. It's really a speech that I understood as a set of suggestions about what you take away—all the way through the last exhortation to the class to remember the name of Yeardley Love.

Safety and security, explicitly for women, but also for other people who may be vulnerable, is more than just a matter of comfort; it's a fundamental civil right. People have the right to live free in a community of this kind or in any American community. I was trying to get at the values that are imbedded in that concept. That's the broad background of the speech.

I worked on the speech for a month or six weeks, largely with Jon Bowen, who often drafted for me, a staff member of the president's office. Eventually my wife became involved in it, and a couple of the vice presidents assisted with it.

The other option for that speech would have been to talk to the world generally, talk to the nation. The problem with that is that the business of a university president is to embody the university's values and to use them as a platform for the university to be a better place, a more effective place, an environment where students and faculty members and so on can enjoy the privileges of membership or citizenship and grow, thrive, intellectually, socially.

It was very much in the context of my remarks about Yeardley Love at the student candlelight vigil. The audience was aware that it had to be. After the speech was done, I don't know what you can tell on the tape, but no one said anything. I don't know how many people attend those events, but say there might be as many as 25,000 people who were standing or sitting silent.

SS: All I saw on the recording was a standing ovation.

JC: That came after this period of hesitation. I watched the audience because I wanted to make sure people had gotten it. I had some reserve words in case they hadn't understood that the memory was intended to protect the community. The speech, all speeches, live in a very transient time, they're not perpetual statements. Because that particular one has been on the web, and has been replicated on the web and passed around some, I hear about it.

I hear occasionally about that State of the University speech, which I think the University at some point must have put online too. I was trying to provoke the community to, in part, reexamine its values; but also, in part, be a functional community despite the annual departures of students and the probably inevitable periodic catastrophes of the kind that Yeardley Love's murder was. I was determined to give her a place to live in permanent time.

SS: When you spoke at the vigil, reminds me of something you said yesterday about the role of a university president and public speeches. Who was your model? I'm not familiar with that role for a university president.

JC: Edgar Shannon is part of my own background. You mentioned yesterday the Cambodia speech. Edgar was not a frequent public speaker, but his willingness to assert the community's values and core rights of citizenship mattered to me, as his willingness to express his own disagreement with government policies that he saw as profoundly destructive did. Those stuck in my mind.

Clark Kerr, especially his essays and articles during the period when Governor Reagan was wanting to throttle speech within the University of California. As everyone in education is, I was aware of the annual reports of Harvard's presidents, but those annual reports were ultimately directed outside the university.

My goal was to carry on a dialogue *with* the University, and to use the dialogue to provoke it to become a better, more effective, more substantive place. To the extent I would judge satisfaction or dissatisfaction on my own side; I think the University responded extraordinarily well. It wasn't necessarily that whatever ideas I was arguing at a given time were new or different, it was that I had the role of setting the mark a little higher each time, of challenging a community that was ready to be challenged and to perform.

The situation in the early nineties was very threatening because the great public universities in the country, including Berkeley, were plundered of their prior public funding to such an extent that all except U.Va. dropped out of the top twenty-five in the popular rankings. We were able to find new resources, not least devoted and willing alumni, to make U.Va. stronger, at a time when the field in which we worked was actually sinking.

SS: I'd like to ask how you did that, but I don't know if you can actually detail the steps here.

JC: Well, it was partly a matter of a dialogue, and not just the internal one at that point.

There are several external dialogues. One is with persons who have the means to give, to support the University. We had to make a case, without a clear policy basis, for long-term financial support measured in billions of dollars, at a time when no one here quite understood that that was possible.

In the first capital funds campaign, I don't remember the target when we first set the target, but we went through a series of ratchetings-up. I think the original target was maybe \$250 or \$350 million, something like that. At one point, when we passed a billion dollars, there was a very serious discussion in the University's Board about cutting it off because the University was at risk of becoming sufficiently wealthy.

SS: It's for the endowment?

JC: Well, a lot of it was endowment. In any event, there was a political discussion within the Board about not letting the University become self-sufficient. Within weeks after that discussion, Virginia's governor and the money committees in the General Assembly told the University to become self-sufficient. So finally, with some pressure from the Board members who were concerned about raising too much money, we set a date. I think it was the last calendar day of 2000. That would be the last day for counting dollars committed. If we'd run it another two or three weeks, it would have been \$1.5 billion but it was, I think, \$1.43 billion.

Then, in 1996 or 1997, I chaired Duke University's visiting committee and got interested in Duke's financial management structure for its endowment. We had the problem that state law properly put responsibility for the private resources in the Board's hands and, in particular, in the finance committee's hands. But the finance committee was really a budget committee; it wasn't a finance committee in the sense of generating revenues and managing an endowment. The management record had been pretty spotty, up and down through the years, and we were starting to raise a good bit of money.

Leonard Sandridge went to work on the concept. Over the course of about a year we were able to demonstrate to the Board and to the General Assembly, which had to pass enabling legislation, that this was really the only responsible way to manage a much larger endowment. I think when I started out in 1990 we may have had \$400, maybe \$440 million under management. I saw in the paper the other day that it's up now to \$5.3 or \$5.4 billion, without a great deal of new money put into it in recent years.

The creation of the University of Virginia Investment Management Company was critical to our becoming capable of managing money on that scale. Leonard, Yoke San Reynolds, who has been the finance vice president and is retiring this spring, and the professional managers found strategies that are common in private universities; but strategies that could be adapted to our more restricted means, that would allow us to invest in markets that produce much higher total returns, at least in modern times, than the stock market or the bond market. The net of that has been that the endowment has largely been grown internally.

The subsequent campaign, the point where I ended service as president, that second campaign was in the range of \$2.3 or \$2.4 billion raised. But in any event, we knew that the large, relatively stable investment, with a complex set of investment strategies that would take advantage of wherever there was growth in the economy and be able to damp upswings and downswings, was critical to the University's larger goal of becoming self-sufficient. That issue is also tied up with the whole discussion of public purpose, public functions and so on.

When that discussion heated up in the early nineties—it has always been a discussion in Virginia—people around us mistakenly thought that universities like Penn State or the University of Michigan or California were agencies of the state rather than self-sufficient corporate entities receiving state support in exchange for services rendered to the state. The concept is quite different from what probably most people thought at the beginning of the last round of that discussion.

We haven't talked much in these conversations about Thomas Jefferson and his concepts, but there are ways in which his thinking about American public education is critical. Part of that thinking was that the University was to be a corporation subject to the same constraints and empowerments that belong to any corporation. In modern days it would have been assigned to the State Corporation Commission, if his concepts had held.

The Board was to be, ultimately, a board of auditors. The term "board of visitors" is very misleading because the term doesn't mean the same now that it meant in the late eighteenth century, when he first began to use it. The purpose of the Visitors was to come and verify that the University was, in fact, conducting its business.

The corporate entity of the University is nearer in structure and capacity to the corporate structure of the older iterations of the British university—Edinburgh, Oxford, Cambridge—and to the structures of the earlier generations of American private universities.

Because Virginia has no world class or national private university, it differs from states that established their public systems in colonial times or shortly after that. In Maryland, the alternative to the University of Maryland is Johns Hopkins. In Pennsylvania, Penn State is in fact not a state agency; it is a corporate entity. The University of Pennsylvania, a private university, that's what people would think of as the great university there. Although Penn State is a powerful place, and in many disciplines, in the sciences, it's stronger than Penn. New Jersey, it's Princeton; New York, it's Columbia

and NYU; and we can string that out—Connecticut, Yale; Rhode Island, Brown; Massachusetts, Harvard.

There is nothing like that in Virginia, you come down this far and you're in a different climate. It's much more like the Middle West, where the state universities tend to be the dominant entities, until fairly modern times with the growth and stature of Emory. In the case of Vanderbilt, growth and stature occurred a hundred years ago, so Tennessee's a little different. Anyway, that's the large background.

In the early nineties, we had to work with governors, legislatures, and the general public to define our public functions and obligations. They clearly include educating daughters and sons. They clearly include the relationships with the system of education that we talked about yesterday. They clearly include the generation of intellectual property that enriches the state, the research function. Then they include a lot of other things.

Universities of this kind are responsible to generate other types of intellectual property, such as population analysis, analyses of the economic trends, analyses of medical issues and conditions.

In more modern times, with the restructuring legislation, we have responsibility that's quite focused on public health mechanisms; for example, in Southwest Virginia where the state never established a genuine public health department. We have economic development responsibilities on the south side, where there was no cognizant state entity

that could deal with the financial disaster that came there after the collapse of cotton, tobacco, and milling. The traditional occupations collapsed there.

Over the course of the two decades, public policy evolved in the direction of a great national university that would drive the state's interests; a much closer collaboration with Virginia Tech, which is a major part of the story of the two decades. The realization and then implementation of the common interests between the two universities is very, very important, and I think promising for the state going forward.

Virginia Tech's trajectory is not straight up, but it's very close to it. It is a sophisticated, global university with campuses in places where I'd love to have campuses—Switzerland and India for example. Virginia Tech has a vision of a future that is inevitable, and the choices of where Virginia Tech goes are very strategic and good. I've admired the way they did what they do.

Anyhow, that, I think, is the context that I can give you for the way we shaped the vision in the early years. I tried to say yesterday that there's a sense in which the times—and it's a much shorter time than two decades—but a period of a month, a year, two or three years can be the horizon for planning. Large themes are more continuous.

In a place whose founder was so focused on the personal values of learning—knowledge is power, knowledge is happiness, and the different formulations of that—you don't walk away from the individual rights. Jefferson, whatever the limitations of his vision and of

his age, had a tight focus on the link between political empowerment in a personal sense and learning. In this place you don't walk away from that. That's what it's about.

SS: That leads us into your inauguration speech. You mentioned yesterday that principles of the institution guided your vision and goals for the University. In this speech you talk about the University as a training ground for "We The People." Talk to me some about the uniqueness of the University of Virginia.

JC: Well, it's really a piece of the fabric of the American republic. It's certainly not the most prominent university in the sciences in North America. It has not rivaled Stanford, Yale, and so on at the very top of the research ladder. It's not to say that it cannot. Part of the reason we focused on investing in facilities for the sciences toward the end is the realization that faculty members—both the ones here and the ones who wanted to come here—are at this point capable of competing for the highest honors and for the top research support and so on.

But in the early nineties the piece of the American dream that U.Va. could claim as its natural province was the piece that had to do with the education of citizens. There's a line of talk here that I hear everywhere in which the notion is that university education is to train leaders. I'm sure there's something to that, but the word doesn't appear in Jefferson's descriptions of what he was trying to do.

He was concerned about preparing individual persons to be independent. His definition of personhood would offend most of our modern sensibilities. He was not thinking in his time about women, he was not thinking about black Americans. The concepts fit women and black Americans in our time as well as they fit anybody else. They define the broad purposes with regard to individual benefits of education, the broad purposes that are American purposes. So that was part of it.

Part of it was dissatisfaction with the way things were, the understanding after the months I'd spent with the University's Board, with faculty members, with students, that the aspiration level was much higher than simply the status quo. By the fall of 1990, we knew that the state was in serious economic trouble. We had even begun modeling to such an extent that we had a notion that they were going to have to cut funding. Not just because of absolute economic necessity, but also because of the priorities the Governor and the legislature were establishing, and that in the end the colleges would suffer. We'd estimated within a reasonable tolerance what the reductions were likely to be and we knew they were bad news. We also knew that the community consensus was going to be to build self-sufficiency on other resources. So that's what we set out to do.

I was dissatisfied with the nature of the University's engagement with its past. There was a sort of blasé assertion that this place was wonderful, a constant rhetoric of the best. We didn't live up to it. We talked about it a lot, but we weren't there.

SS: In the early nineties?

JC: Maybe at any time, and maybe universities compulsively and always talk about their excellence, but bottom line is, we weren't there. In order to effect change, faculty leaders and alumni who cared about this, Board members, and I had to define goals that included remedying deficiencies or problems or dysfunctions.

SS: Such as?

JC: Well, such as the lack of meaningful progress in the sciences. We made some false starts in that period. Everybody seemed to be and we were for sure convinced that there was a linear relationship or an arithmetic relationship, between square footage for science, laboratory and research productivity from the laboratory. The measure of productivity in the U.S. is, at best, a proxy measurement because it simply looks at how much grant money is flowing through a department. That doesn't tell you where the Nobel Prize is going to be won. It really is just a measure of input.

But, believing that, we built a substantial annex with funds that we acquired, I think in 1992, to the chemistry building. We certainly saw some results of that, but nothing like the linear progression that was expected from the construction itself in those days. We realized that we had to have better concepts for the development of science.

Now, the development of cross-disciplinary scientific research has taken different shapes in different universities, but here one important shape was an alliance between engineering and medicine, which in the early nineties was not intuitive, and it was

certainly not something I came up with. It happened because of faculty work. In building a research culture in a university of this kind, you build where faculty members are prepared to work. Their work includes attracting others. It's not just that you invest in what's already there; you invest in projects that will be coherent bridges to a future.

That work with medicine and engineering became a defining characteristic of what is ultimately a very small engineering school. Quality in engineering is in part a function of mass. You have to have large enough numbers of researchers, technicians, and so on to make a difference in the whole face of an industry, and tiny places don't do that as a rule. We didn't have the kind of blended basic science and technology platform that, say, Caltech has. We were a different kind of place. The linkage with medicine brought the digital technologies; mechanical research related, say, to orthopedics; systems engineering that has to do in some dramatic ways with both medical and medical support activities in a school of medicine.

SS: So how did that linkage happen again?

JC: It happened because of faculty innovation. We saw it happening and eventually realized that it was important, and that it was a better way, at that time, to support progress than simply investing in the conventional disciplines. Now, the new buildings, which are being finished this year—there are two of them—are the largest science buildings we've ever built by a great deal. One is intended to link engineering more closely to a lot of

other disciplines, including medicine, but is a building that was conceived as a place for interdisciplinary research to take place.

SS: Which building is that?

JC: If you walk through the engineering school toward the stadium, it's the structure that'll be in your way when you try to get to the stadium. Adjacent to chemistry is a new building that was intended to make the basic sciences in the College and the Graduate School competitive nationally for research funding and so on.

In order to do those buildings we had to have the concept that's built into the restructuring legislation of 2005. We didn't have a way to finance them before. We've had to finance the construction here one unit at a time. One of the reasons Leonard has been so valuable to the provosts—and Peter Low is your best source on this kind of thing—is that Leonard could take an academic purpose, such as building the independence and national stature of the Darden School, and deliver a funding mechanism that would let that happen.

In the case of the Darden School, he was able to generate both a funding concept for capital construction and a funding concept for an endowment to support the Darden School in the future. Both of his strategies have worked. The two are tightly related.

There was a different strategy for the School of Law, which needed to expand and modify its facilities a lot, because by the early nineties, law schools were not simply libraries with faculty offices and lecture rooms gathered around them. The faculty is more complex. I happened to be looking at the faculty list in the Law School the other day. There are medical people and there's a professor of Spanish on the list. It is a complex community of people with disciplinary bases in other fields who, in some aspect of their work, contribute to the ongoing study of the law. So a lot of the schools have developed in that way. I think it's true that every school is in new or radically modified quarters now, and the strategy for each of those is different from all the others.

SS: You've talked a lot about systems and plans for fundraising and investing, but what about your own ability to speak with alumni or your own fundraising abilities. Did that play a role?

JC: You know, it probably does, but basically what we had to tell was the story in which we, first of all, defined large aspirations; second, identified strengths and weaknesses in the direction of those aspirations; and then laid out plans to get there. Then there was an accountability loop for having found the resources and carried out the work. We went back, and we reported out assessments of what we had done.

So it's a little bit complicated, but it's essentially: Where are we now? How did we get here? Where are we going? How are we going to get there? Then you repeat it. Where are we now? The cycle is very basic to collegial planning, to the kind of planning where

people have to agree individually to participate in the larger whole. It worked for this place.

Our people—alumni, parents of our students, friends—tend to be idealistic about the University. They tend to be prepared to put their resources, whether it's money or personal work or whatever it might be, behind their aspirations and their ideals; and they certainly have been, in these two decades, people who were purposeful about the well-being of the next generation, about young people. There's a lot less self-valuation in the behavior of U.Va. alumni than I have heard is the case nationally, and a lot more selfless commitment to an ideal.

The Harrison Institute and the Special Collections Library are good cases of that. There were two substantial backers of that project, one, David Harrison, for whom the aboveground institute was named, and the other, Albert Small, who the underground facility is named for. Very different men, not working together, but working toward complementary purposes, and willing to merge up their purposes in the direction of accomplishing a large University purpose.

Everybody wants libraries of that kind. Any serious research university wants one, and certainly in wealthy private places they happen. There's a very fine one, for example, at Cornell that I went to study, because we knocked off a lot of their ideas, we imitated them. Which, by the way, is something that we decided as a matter of principle; we'd imitate anybody. We were looking for the best ideas, and not for proprietary ideas.

We found a few models, and no one who realized that that type of library is critical to the digital revolution in humanities and social sciences scholarship. People here did get that. Faculty members got it. In thinking about that building and how we would design it, use it, and so on, I listened to, for example, a faculty member named Jerry McGann, who is retired now, a professor of English. He was one of the first people to realize that you could do with digital editions things that you couldn't do with paper editions. It wasn't a matter of finding cheaper or quicker or longer distance, it was a matter of doing better work in editing a text, and making the text more accessible.

I listened to Jerry a lot, and realized that there was a point of contact between the kind of pure scholarship that you associate with manuscript libraries and this imaginative, visionary concept of the world of knowledge, borrowing a commercial phrase, "floating in a cloud." Jerry had that concept before Apple ever talked about it. He believed that that was where knowledge could be stored because it was a better way to do it, not because of anything else. So, we listened to a lot of people like that describing the directions for scholarship, and in some cases I guess we got it right.

SS: I bet that that building, the Special Collections Library, has special import for you, having worked in the library as an undergraduate.

JC: Yes, that was actually the unit I worked in, but that was almost accidental. I guess the only thing that I would link to that is simply that I understood what the librarians and the

faculty were talking about, quickly. It took a lot of explaining for our Board to understand that, and for others too. I guess I had a little bit of a head start.

We used to think there was a big distinction between what was called primary or basic research and applied research. That distinction probably doesn't make sense to a lot of people anymore. In the sciences that meant research with no clear application; in the humanities it meant everything.

SS: Everything's merging?

JC: Well, it's merging, but also one of the effects of the digital age on scholarship is the capacity—it's a function of merging—to make large-scale comparisons, to calculate processes of change with subtle variables. It's an enabling tool of a kind that one didn't imagine until the tool existed. It had been created for another purpose, and was then available for these purposes. Faculty here had an early realization of the value of digital platforms for research in the humanities and the social sciences. This part of the library is full of enterprises of that kind. They exist because faculty members saw the use of the tool. I think that answers the question.

SS: Yes. In talking about the principles of the university, specifically the University of Virginia, in your inauguration speech you talk about Jefferson. That feeling, that vision, does seem to inhabit the atmosphere around here.

JC: Yes.

SS: And you've brought it to the fore, I think, in a lot of your speeches.

JC: I hope that happened, yes. Most of the discourse that comes out of American universities has a defensive edge to it. There's the notion that the function of universities is to defend higher education. The function of universities is to be great universities, one by one. If there is some large affiliation or coincidence of ideals and strategies and so on, that's fine. The work is the daily work of building effective and responsive academic structures to serve a society, our society.

The speech was an attempt to get away from the defensive. We were also in a climate where the economy was pushing everyone toward defensive postures. So working on that speech, we had the conscious goal of posing affirmative and aggressive remedies, and spelling out affirmative visions of opportunities.

We were deliberately trying not to make some kind of large philosophical statement about higher education that would, in the end, prevent somebody from doing something bad to us. We wanted instead to say that there are these provinces—areas of function and of responsibility—that belong to great universities, and these are ours. We will take these as our agenda, as our mission.

SS: And the role of the university, from reading your speeches, seems to be to educate the young.

JC: Well, that's certainly a piece of it, yes. That's simply an acknowledgement that American universities are, by their nature, almost inevitably, built on large undergraduate enrollments. The realization that two-thirds of your students are on your campus to complete the process of growing to adulthood, and that the University has the opportunity to shape that growth in the direction of responsible citizenship.

SS: Yes, I was very impressed.

JC: That's the peculiar piece of the larger mission of the universities that belongs to this one, and probably to any university that focuses on what really is going on with its undergraduates. Universities are as various as people are. Some universities are highly selective, almost cloistered—Yale, for example. Others, George Washington, sort of trail off into their communities and don't have the cloistered environment.

This one is suspended, in a sense, between two schools of thought about what universities do in relationship to their communities. I don't know the source for it, but architects will sometimes generalize that Jefferson's architectural vision was to open the University up to its surroundings, and not to have it enclosed within its walls, to belong to its environment and not be separated from it. I don't know if that's ex post facto reasoning

based on the fact that that's the way it is or at least was before we started building hospitals and so on around it.

SS: I've wondered about the effect of the architecture on the community.

JC: I don't know. The architecture is a wonderful part of existence here. When you live in an environment where the kind of intellectual and moral ferment that goes into Jefferson's adoption of the neoclassical as the style for American public architectural discourse, it's in your head all the time. A great challenge is to build new without either destroying the old or simply imitating it in a slavish or silly way.

The fundamental concept for the Harrison Building, to the extent that I was involved in it, grew out of a villa that I happened to see. I want to say it's somewhere within the confines of the city of Florence. You see this more readily in Bologna, where the city has miles and miles of covered walkways, but I was thinking about the value of the exterior covered space. We'll call it a porch of the Harrison Building. In an idealized academic world, that would stand for a place of public assembly that was, in a sense, protected because it was not directly exposed to the weather, but integrated into a neoclassical shape for a building.

Now, I'm not an architect. I didn't do much other than kick out that idea as one way to think about this building that was intended to be a place of discourse, a place for people to expose ideas, to trade them around, to conduct intellectual contests, to differ. After

that, the architects and other people made it a very different reality, except that that symbolic shape is still there. The University has the covered walkways as part of its architectural tradition.

We've struggled to find modern forms that are entirely functional, and yet are complimentary to the historic forms. I really like what's been done with the School of Architecture in the last couple of expansions. It is progressing toward being a statement of contemporary values in architecture. We didn't intend it to harmonize; we intended it to make its own architectural statements.

There are things about that building that probably no one other than I will think about. I was sitting there as the architects argued out how to accomplish their purposes. I know where the slots between buildings are that let you see what they were attempting to do. One of the things they were trying to do was live within a confined setting, because by the time we did that work, we understood that we could not continue building one structure on each hilltop and march on to the Valley of Virginia. It's a silly way to occupy the land. So that the contained perspective is an important part of that building's message.

There's a sense in which the Lawn side of the Rotunda is a contained perspective too. It is space that has been given shape by the buildings. My personal engagement with the buildings varied a lot depending on whether they were part of a series, as most of the dormitories are, or whether they were stand-alone structures or whether they had

independent sponsorship as the Darden School did or whether they were products of the University's central thinking about what it would do. But that part of it was always a tremendous pleasure. I really enjoyed the part of a project where the core philosophy of the structure and its function within the academic program was at issue.

Karin Wittenborg, the Librarian, took some very sterile space over in Clark Hall, which was built to be the law school. Parts of it have been occupied in more recent times by environmental science. Karin used a large gift that was a central University gift and was designated for the library to build the Science and Technology Library, which is a user's library for students, basically, in space in that building. All I did was admire that. But the concept from the beginning was that in one house of the school of learning—but using the metaphor in “a place for learning to occur”—there ought to be an environment that said something about the quiet pleasures of the mind. It's a wonderful space.

SS: I haven't been there.

JC: It's worth a walk in there. It has a gas fireplace that students can turn on and off. If students want to pull couches up in front of the fireplace they can, and I suppose they could take naps if they wanted to; but what they will do is sit there and talk in small groups or they'll read there or something. The environment was supposed to be, literally, warm and inviting; and it was the Librarian's concept. She understands the value of certain kinds of physical comfort in a place where independent, quiet learning takes place.

SS: There seems to be a lot of that at the University.

JC: That's her doing. She's terrific. The coffee shop in the lobby is her creation. She took one of the most sterile and aggressively silent spaces in the world and turned it into a place where there's a gentle buzz that goes on all the time because people are doing things there.

SS: I think she did it before it was popular.

JC: She was the first I ever heard of doing it. Maybe somebody else has done it now. This thing became a topic of imitation very quickly after she did it.

SS: Her annual reports are amazing.

Well, another way that the University of Virginia differs from other universities is the honor system.

JC: Yes. My engagement with that, other than what is probably the typical student engagement, which is a combination of fear and pride—the fear that you would stumble into some kind of offense and pride in the fact that the community is able to deal with its internal dysfunctions. Then, in the year I spent working as an assistant dean in the College, I got interested in the impact on students who, in one way or another, did not

warm to the notion that the community really was responsible for its own internal discipline and order.

In the early seventies, Ernie Ern worked a lot on the concept of student self-governance. We talked about it forever, but Ernie took it seriously and worked out institutional assignments of responsibility that took things to the students that historically had been in the dean's office or whatever. So the modern system of student self-governance is not ancient. Students imagine that anything that happened before they got here was done by Thomas Jefferson. But, you know, it's not true.

SS: (Laughter.) I'm afraid I've had that impression as well.

JC: Yes. It can debilitate you. Ernie's great contribution to student self-governance was trusting students enough to let them do what they said they were going to do. He's been very good at shaping their discourse by listening carefully and asking the right questions, and is a practical and idealistic man at the same time, so that combination of qualities made that work.

When women began to come in larger numbers. There had always been some women—but when women began to come in larger numbers—there was a lot of talk that women wouldn't accept the responsibility of the system. I remember being told that women did business in cliques, and that women would not accept the responsibility to report and to act on offenses. Well, that ain't so. (Laughter.)

Even more dramatically, when we were beginning to see larger numbers of African-American students—not so much because they were African-American as because they were visible because of skin color—there was talk that African-American students came from a different culture and they wouldn't understand. Well, the best-disciplined places in the world are schools in which African-American school administrators are in charge. They're beautifully run places, and the personal assumption of responsibility that was characteristic of the former historically black segregated public schools, was really instructive for me. Getting to know school people and understanding that the culture, in fact, did exactly what people here imagined African- American students would not do.

SS: Was that when you were dean of admissions when you saw that?

JC: That job was a daily education in the reality that any community that projects and announces its values gets them wrong. There's something self-righteous about the talk. The responsibility, if you want the institution to succeed in various ways, is always to listen very carefully to the people who don't share the assumptions, and internalize the lessons that they have to teach. So the realization that not only was the honor system not at risk, but that it stood to be strengthened and improved as people of different backgrounds came to own it, was important.

Then the third thing is the realization that students have to own it, that the University can no more direct student ownership of their own system than it might direct faculty ownership of an academic discipline. You don't tell faculty members what to study, what

to write about. You watch them do it, and periodically you may be able to provide some resource that helps. Frequently, you can simply applaud when it's done. A fair amount of the time you sit with people whose dreams or visions have not produced the results they wanted, and try to help them think what the next strategy might be. But you don't tell the faculty member who is working on some form of vicarious reality in computer science what it's to be. Your job is to foster the research, not to direct it.

The same is true of student life. You certainly set standards. And to go back to the matter of Yeardey Love—you can't back away from the public denunciation of evil when it appears. I found it rather hard to learn that evil does appear and that quite often it looks very innocuous when it comes in the room. It's not evil of a theological kind, it's a kind of evil that threatens, in the most extreme cases, human survival.

There was a student whose last name was Baltz, who died as a result of probably an unintended episode of binge drinking. She was given a punch containing straight grain alcohol after she had taken part in a foot race, and was left by her friends to sleep off intoxication. She fell down a staircase and died in the fall.

Like, unhappily, many terrible incidents that have involved students over the years, this one occurred off grounds on private property in someone's home, a student's home. But you can't just say, "That's it. We're not responsible." What you have to do is work to redefine community standards and values.

In that case, I went to see the student's parents shortly after she died, and spent some time with them trying to understand what they could teach us. They were noble people. Her mother became a member of a state task force to look at substance abuse among students that generated a lot of the ideas that we used in reforming alcohol education. I don't know what comes, in the long run, of this most recent case; but there's a case where a wrenching loss to a family—and one without a clearly demarked villain—there was no one to convict in that case.

SS: The Baltz case?

JC: Yes. In the end, it appeared to be a series of miscalculated efforts to be supportive or kind. So students are now taught if your friend is intoxicated don't leave her. If your friend needs help you stay right there and call the cops. We've taught students over the years, if we've gotten it right, to see the authorities, including police officers as allies, and to work with them affirmatively to provide protections for the community.

Going back to the honor system, in any given year there's going to be talk about whether the system of sanctions is appropriate. That talk often reflects a kind of hysteria. The students decide what the sanction will be. They're perfectly capable of deciding. They make essentially the same decision every couple of years, when they have a referendum on it. But if they change their minds, they are the parties who live with the system. They are responsible for enforcing it. They use it to define the rules of their community. If one believes in self-government, that's the bottom line.

SS: I was really struck by self-governance coming up in your public speeches, especially at the vigil for Yeardley Love. You didn't just say call the police. You give a specific phone number to call. I was very touched by that, struck by that.

JC: Yes. By and large, students are very self-sufficient. And by and large, when what I was calling evil, which is a euphemism, appears in the room, first of all they assume that they have the capacity to deal with it and second they assume that they ought not to seek external support or intervention. Certainly you want them to be self-sufficient people, but you also want them to be safe in ways that let them be what they are.

There's a big change that occurred starting in, I guess, the sixties, in law that has to do with the university's relationship to its students. The law used to put universities "in loco parentis," in the place of the parent of students. The law doesn't do that now, although it has swung away from a kind of laissez-faire attitude towards student life and back toward a more parietal relationship. The Clery Act and similar laws define that. We were actively involved in the dialogues that led to the adoption of, for example, the Clery statute.

One of my responses to the Baltz death was, candidly, the realization that that product shouldn't be on the market. I got crossways with the liquor makers and the distributors because the volatility of the straight grain alcohol that was in the punch that she drank was bizarre. One of the defenses from a lobbyist who showed up at a hearing on lowering the proof content was that it was necessary to tan leather. I thought, "God help

us.” Let’s not worry about tanning leather. Let’s worry about students staying alive.
The legislature brought the proof content down.

SS: Really?

JC: This lobbyist literally showed up in a committee hearing and said it would be a handicap to the shoe tanning business if we didn’t have this stuff. (Laughter.)

Once we understood what that student had consumed and that she had come in dehydrated, needing just to relax with her friends before a football game, she’d done the foot race. She was in to relax. She drank this stuff that didn’t taste like it was immobilizing her, but that’s exactly what it did, very quickly. The whole episode didn’t take more than an hour or so.

I remember being told a couple of times that we were really shouldn’t discuss drunkenness like that in public, that it would offend students and also that it would frighten people. Part of my goal was to frighten people. Nineteen, twenty-year-old people are, in a way, in a kind of middle ground between total autonomy and something else. The university does not have the relationship of a parent with them, but it does have the relationship of a community in which some people have lived a little longer and seen a little more of the world, and want the students to live to do the same.

SS: That age group also don’t think they can die.

JC: Some don't. It is hard to generalize about students. They are very, very intelligent people, notwithstanding a whole lot of political dialogue about the quality of schooling. These are the best-educated young people I've ever seen. They are easily comparable to the best I've seen, for example, in the U.K. They are competitive with anybody, and not doing things that people charge them with—not necessarily testing limits, not necessarily trying substances—but leading individual and discrete lives. But one can generalize about their value as human beings, and the necessity that they be able to thrive in this part of their lives while they prepare for what comes next.

SS: Yes, your respect for students really stands out in all the things I've read, your speeches and such.

JC: Students live in your head after hours. I remember students I taught in Berkeley in the early 1970s. I remember some from that year I spent on the Eastern Shore. I remember the UConn students. Each individual and then each group has its own character, values, standards, and behavior. I can't think of a student culture that was not ultimately sound or valid.

Fraternities or sororities never caused great problems, but occasionally I had to take on one of them for some kind of misconduct. Once they understood that I wasn't going to make jokes about their bad acts—tell them “they were going to shape up or else”—and realized that I understood what they were trying to accomplish, which is quite often muddled when organizations have problems, they worked their problems out.

One of the reasons students govern themselves is that they *can* govern themselves. They really don't need proctors, monitors, and so on to regulate their conduct. They want freedom. As I suspect, everyone wants personal independence. But they want it in social structures that will support them. Candidly, so do their parents. There's an interesting coalition across generations between the students we're talking about here and their parents. Or so I think.

[Student walks in and small break taken]

SS: Speaking of students, we were talking about your respect for students, when a student walked in unexpectedly and you were very kind to give her a tour of your office.

But what I was going to say is that, in reading through some of your papers, I saw e-mail exchanges with some of the *Cavalier Daily* editors, and I was struck by how personable and friendly you were, and detail-oriented, you gave them a lot of information in your e-mail.

JC: Yes. Well, I'm not sure which ones you have, but I hope that was the case.

SS: The one I was referring to specifically was with Rakesh Gopalan, I believe.

JC: Probably there would have been times when we were very busy, or when there was some kind of crossed-purpose with them that would've influenced the kind of notes.

SS: It was equal opportunity admissions in 1999.

JC: The only way to maintain the schedule of events away from Charlottesville, and at the same time be accountable to the student press, was with e-mail. The ones who were willing to do that probably had a good experience with us. Over time, Leonard began working with them by e-mail also, because he was having to spend more time away from here, especially in Richmond. E-mail probably made things work better with them and for them. If in the process, I was also cordial and so on, good.

SS: It was nice to see that.

JC: Student press here has been quite good. They've been conscientious, very talented, and systematic about putting substance into their stories. There are recurring issues in any university community on which student press need a certain amount of background. In addition to whatever you might have in a paper record, we had the custom of meeting with the student press prior to board meetings and going over the agenda. Walking into a board meeting and not understanding that committees have already chewed over the material could be confusing. Also, it's not always clear what the legal or other basis for some action is.

The student press would generally bring questions about those things and if we didn't know the answer we'd get it for them. The press officer would sit, generally, with the student press people and me, and we would try to make sure they were prepared to report

whatever might happen. In the earlier years, we had three different student news organizations. As time went on, the lesser and less wealthy student publications pretty much disappeared. But I enjoyed them a lot. They were good at what they did.

SS: What other aspects of your position were hard to fulfill with your traveling schedule?

JC: Scheduling the on-Grounds events was a challenge, but they were great fun, so I got them in. Carr's Hill is the community's gathering place for celebrations: noteworthy retirements, if there was not some other venue that makes better sense; funerals, people would gather there after a funeral for a reception; donor events; parents events; training programs for students, employees, and others entering into some period of responsibility, for example president of some organization.

It would be hard to overstate the growth of Carr's Hill's role in University life during the years when I was president. The house and the women and men who work there seem to me to have served everyone well, as they continue to. In 1990, we needed a place, a venue, where University people and others could gather. So we began to build on the longstanding tradition of hosting groups in connection with major events of all kinds—sports events, holidays, memorial services, awards won by faculty members and students and alumni, events for local leaders, for clergy who serve students, and many others. Barbara Jett, the head housekeeper throughout almost all of my years at Carr's Hill, frequently served as host to our groups. She knew essentially everyone in one sense or another, and she watched out for everyone. Along with others, she also watched out for

the house and its grounds, places that need constant attention (and investment) to keep them functional. Several events planners and household administrators worked with architects and landscapers to make sure that the interior spaces and the several gardens worked for groups of varying numbers, with different reasons to be together, and with different needs. Murray Howard, Nargie Cross, Pam Higgins, Marsha Lemons, Nancy Ingram, John Sauer, Violet Baker, Peggy Jarino, and (with wonderful ingenuity and attention to quality, plus stunning results) Peter Bowyer (the chef), and others deserve credit for their contributions. And of course Lotta in her time and Betsy since she came have put their own stamps on almost everything.

The Carr's Hill book that Meg Klosko and Peggy Harrison worked to make with Betsy is a kind of love story about people working and living in a great house. In first imagining the project, Betsy wanted the book to do exactly what it does—tell a story with many heroes, and give people who care about Carr's Hill and U.Va. a kind of souvenir of what the place is.

It's a busy place. For the house to do its job right, I had to be there when it was open to one public or another. So we always had to work on containing everything in the calendar. That probably is no different from what any other president would have to deal with if the house had the role that Carr's Hill has here.

But there was also the fact that we were running large capital funds campaigns that were global. There were plenty of weeks when it was necessary to, say, run an event in

London, speak to some group in New York, do something in Houston, and be here for a football game. That sort of mobility is simply part of the way of life. It's one of the challenges of doing the work.

I think that someday, maybe now, the University may be able to sustain the momentum that it needs with the general public, with the legislators, with donors and prospects, and so on, without the president having to be the central figure in each place. Our problem was that we had to develop those capacities very quickly because of the state funding reductions in 1990-91.

We—when I say “we” I’m almost always talking about this group that included Leonard and the Rector at a given time and so on—made the judgment that that was going to be necessary for some period of time. I was convinced that letting that first major capital funds campaign die after the fundraising period was done posed a danger to the University, so I was pushing very hard to get the second one into motion.

And the second one, I believe, I heard somewhere that at this point the total is at something like \$2.4 or \$2.5 billion. So in whatever time the University is allowing to complete that, it'll end successfully. Maybe the presidency will change as a result of the transition from the intense period of work that we had to do. It actually went on for twenty years.

SS: How did you do that for twenty years?

JC: You stay in good shape and you run hard. It's a hard thing to do, at least for me, probably everybody's physical and mental stamina is unique to each person, but it was a challenge. It was something that we felt had to be done because we believed that the alternative was a lesser and less effective university.

Any president, anybody who has responsibility in a university, especially a public university, is an officer pro tem, you're serving for the time you serve. Change is absolutely essential to the survival of the place, to its vitality. You do your part in the time when you do it, and you mark whatever successes or failures you see, and you move on.

SS: You must have a very strong constitution.

JC: Well, maybe. I was very conscious when we were deciding when the change would occur, that I was worn out. As, I was.

SS: After the first campaign?

JC: No, in 2009-2010. I was exhausted. The discussion that we had was whether it made better sense to have the end of that campaign be the beginning of the next phase or whether it really ought to be the end of something. Continuity, I think, is worth a lot more than terminal points. But the wear and tear definitely had a lot to do with my personal reasoning about it. There were other people in that conversation, obviously, but

it just seemed to me that at a certain point you really have done your part and someone else takes the job.

SS: So your decision to retire was based, in part, on how tired you were?

JC: It was fatigue. It was that I needed to have a series of orthopedic operations, and I was aware that I was aging quickly enough that it was going to be a problem to have them done. I didn't realize then how slow recovery is, but if I'd waited longer, especially for my foot, recovery would have been a real problem. Also, you know, you get to where you can add up what's worked and what hasn't worked. In my case, there were things at which I failed that somebody else can do better.

SS: What are those things?

JC: Well, the most dramatic failure with regard to academic programs and the evolving vision of what it is to be a world-class university, was our Board's decision that it wouldn't go forward with the agreement to establish the U.Va. campus in the Arab state of Qatar in the mid-nineties. This was a tremendously important opportunity that other universities such as Cornell, University of Texas, and others have picked up. We didn't. Our Board, I think, gave it about a year's worth of really intense scrutiny and then walked casually away from it.

Sad, but it was the way it was. It was a big disappointment, because in the course of working on the proposal, we'd realized that there was a vital U.S. interest in that region that coincided with what we saw as our opportunity to become—at least with regard to a major chunk of the world, the Middle East—the dominant American institution.

The Board members who actually went and studied that opportunity up close were on one side of the issue. Others did not go. Some were probably opposed to it from the start, but as that played out, the Rector had made a decision that it had to be a unanimous decision of the Board, so it wasn't a matter of arithmetic. Key Board members were never convinced that it was the opportunity it turned out to be for other universities.

I'll give you another one. There were large capital projects that we knew had to be done—buildings. The stadium had to be rebuilt. The Special Collections Library had to be done. The Darden School had to be relocated and so on. Then there were other projects that were part of the vision of how the University should develop academically.

We are unusual among fairly large universities in having no major concert hall. When we started working on that project, which was a failure, we never got it done; we also did not have a major performance program in music. The concept was that each would complement the other, that we would make musical performance a central part of the student experience.

Once we understood that that wasn't going to work, other projects moved up into place. With substantial donor support, particularly from Carl and Hunter Smith, we developed a really splendid performance band, a concert band, a marching band. The practice facility for that band is a great building and donor financed largely by Mrs. Smith. We had the notion that some facility of that kind was really essential to the Department of Music; and it is in the Department of Music, but it's dedicated to a function rather than to the whole range of music activities and it's much smaller than the whole department program would have been. We didn't get that done, either.

That we did not get a major concert hall financed and built has academic implications for how programs develop over time. Some of them took longer than estimated. We realized in the early nineties that the absence of a dance program was a limiting influence on students' ability to develop as performers. I thought since dance theaters are not horribly expensive that we might knock that one off in five years. I thought that we'd find the donors and get it done. That project is in construction now. We did the groundbreaking just as I was finishing up as president.

SS: Is it a matter of finding donors, is that why those projects didn't happen?

JC: Partly, but you also have to wait for the academic program to evolve to the place where the need for the facility is clear to everybody. If you don't have a dance program, you also don't have faculty members who are agitating for the creation of a proper facility; so that there are different lines of motion that have to coincide at a certain point. For a

facility that serves a new curricular commitment, it takes a good bit of time. Until the academic use is well defined you don't go ahead with the building, because you produce something that's not functional.

With regard to music and performance, when we started doing the design work on the John Paul Jones Arena, there was another issue in the community. For probably eighty years, maybe a hundred years, there had been what were called "dance weekends" here, and I guess dancing was done, but typically there were three in the course of a year. When it was a boys' school, the girls would come in on buses. I had girlfriends at various places who would come and stay here through a dance weekend. There were families in town who had extra bedrooms and they would provide space for the girls to stay for something like four or five dollars a night and provide breakfast. That was just part of the culture.

SS: That was when you were an undergraduate?

JC: Yes. They were fun in those days. One of them survived the other two, it was called Easters. It didn't have anything to do with Easter. But Easters devolved into a drug-driven brawl. Ernie Ern, when he was vice president, finally made the decision to shut it down because it was attracting dealers and users, and producing an environment that was just dangerous to students. There were injuries; there were bad things that happened then.

So we had a long period in which performance—the big concerts that would be held in connection with the dance weekends—did not happen. When I was a student, that building over there, Memorial Gymnasium, was the site where we went. I remember sitting on the floor one Saturday and listening to Ray Charles who played on a low platform that was set up on one edge of the floor. That was the site for the big concerts. It's far too small for a student body the size of ours, and it was not built as a performance facility.

The John Paul Jones Arena was designed to be the best music house of its size in the country. There was a lot of elaborate electronic tuning of sound and so on, in the design, and it was designed to accommodate other types of performances. So you get the big bands who come in there and play. I've gone over there to listen to performers who were popular when I was a young man—for example, James Taylor. I've gone over there to touring Broadway shows. They can configure the house for different sizes of audiences. One of the specifications for it was that it had to have an entrance large enough for a tractor-trailer or an elephant to come through.

SS: So the circus comes there?

JC: Well, yes it does. But the reason the spec was there was that the arena that we built at UConn when I was president doesn't have the entryways necessary for big concert bands to come in and set up. They travel with tractor-trailer trucks and so on. We actually had a design glitch occur over here, where the necessary entrance for that kind of use had not

been properly integrated in the design. I just had to draw a line in the sand and say, “You’re going to fix that. That was in the specification. We’re not giving that up.”

It’s a location—in the trade now they call them venues. It’s a venue where every kind of performance can be accommodated. I drove down to Roanoke the other day with a satellite radio in the car and listened to a bunch of stand-up comedians describe coming here during the preceding week for a stand-up comedy night with Larry the Cable Guy and people like that performing.

We needed a facility that would do that, not just for students, but definitely for students, that’s where it started. The question was: What can we give students that is a suitable venue for the kinds of performances that were major events in student life in prior times? It houses home and garden shows. It houses Broadway shows, which don’t appeal to students as much as they do to older people.

The city has a smaller theater. I don’t think it was truly a vaudeville house, but the kind of theater that you associate with vaudeville, has been restored and put back into service down on the Downtown Mall. We knew we didn’t want to be in competition with them. We needed a different kind of facility. I have gone over there to hear somewhat more serious music, but it doesn’t—to go back to this project that we never got done—fill the space of a serious concert hall. I hope someday it may contribute to a realization that we don’t have that, and maybe to something else that would meet that need.

SS: You've made me think of a question that I did want to ask you. What was the town-gown relationship?

JC: I think it's been quite good. The truth is that in any university town the obvious political issue, if someone's running for office in the town, is to complain that the university is doing something wrong. In this town, the University is a very big presence. It is, by a long shot, the largest employer, the largest wealth generator, the students are the largest population, and so on.

The chief areas of town-gown friction have to do with University construction projects. There was a tremendous upheaval in the neighborhood directly across Emmet Street about what's called the Newcomb Hall Garage, and it had to deal with where the entry roads were. We modified the plan quite a lot because the neighborhood made a very good case that we were wrong.

There's a parking garage at the intersection of Emmet Street and University Avenue or Ivy Road that was also the target of criticism from the same neighborhoods. In that case, after a lot of digging around, we simply came to the point of believing that the damage to the neighborhood that they thought they saw was exaggerated. In fact, it hasn't occurred. It remains a very stable border. The neighborhood, itself, has evolved for a generation.

I lived over there in the sixties for a while. In those days it was a relatively homogeneous faculty neighborhood. It hasn't been that for twenty-five years. But we don't want to,

obviously, push our neighbors into some kind of economic distress. In addition, a lot of the people who were concerned about both projects are people we know. They're credible and good neighbors who have reasons to raise the issues they raise.

That type of issue was the most significant single town-gown issue I saw. There was always concern about expansion of large facilities that will bring traffic. There was always concern about the fact that as student neighborhoods moved east—and nowadays it's basically east and somewhat north of the central campus—students become competitors with local families for housing in a given area and so on. What we've done is expand the pool of University-owned student housing to try to stay ahead of that but the pressure on the neighborhoods is still there. The issues are real.

Students in one period will have a greater preference for living in town, and in another, greater preference for living in University housing. I've never found a way to predict that. Leonard worked out an algorithm that allowed us to spot growing demand for student housing. It had to do with the vacancy rate over the course of a year in existing housing. When the vacancy rate dropped below a certain proportion we would know that it was time to build a dormitory. When it exceeded we would know to hold off on the construction.

What are called in town the student neighborhoods are constantly undergoing redevelopment. The types of apartment complexes that have turned up over there in recent years were unknown until fifteen or so years ago. They have sports clubs and

elaborate recreational facilities in them. A couple of landlords in town have tried to set up shuttle bus service to get the students to live farther away. I don't think that has worked out well, but I don't follow that closely. Students really like to walk back and forth or they want to live on the University's bus lines. You don't add bus lines to go out in the country somewhere where developers put something just to help them get renters. I guess you could, but it wouldn't make very good economic or social sense.

There were not really very many awful conflicts. There have been a couple of missed opportunities. We offered, in the early nineties, to try to develop the arena as a downtown location at a time when the city was concerned about the loss of its downtown business community. There are some cases of construction of major arenas in center city regions. It did not make great economic sense for us. We didn't have the same financial capacities that we had twelve or so years later when we built the new arena.

SS: That was after the downtown was made into a mall?

JC: Yes. The Downtown Mall struggled for a while. It was during a period of struggle. We talked to city officials and county officials about the need for some changes in the road grid to allow enough cars to move in and out, about different ways to use existing downtown parking that's under-used, garages and so on, to make the parking facilities profitable for the city. In the end, it wasn't adding up on any side, so we regrouped and did the project down here. I don't remember any hard feeling about it, it was just the way everybody looked at it, and in the end we said that it's not going to do it. There were

always issues about student cars—too many student cars and not enough off-street parking facilities.

SS: Right, that's always an issue.

JC: We have built parking garages in several places to try to take some of that pressure off the streets—three within a couple of blocks of right here. So long as enrollments increase, and so long as personal automobiles remain so important, it's really a student issue. The employees have not been a topic of conversation with local leaders. As long as the pressure is there, the problem will be there in some form. In addition, of course, if you build parking garages, they have to be paid for, and the people using them have to pay for them. Any motorist who is trying to watch cash flow has a good reason to avoid paying the bill, and therefore will park on the street or whatever.

In general, the process of consultation has made our projects better. I think they've been beneficial to the community, the Newcomb Hall expansion, the bookstore, for example. Some commitments we've made to city planning. We paid for the Charlottesville Main Street master plan and brought in Rawn Associates from Boston to do the work. There are some differences among city leaders about the plan. They don't have to do with us; they have to do with the plan.

I remember at one time there was a mayor of Charlottesville who wanted to mass up urban frontage along Main Street and have it be a street of front-forward structures. He

had some really interesting ideas about mixed-use commercial and residential buildings in downtown Charlottesville along the mall. One part of the strategy to make the mall profitable for the city has been to encourage developers to put apartments in above and behind the commercial buildings. The idea was to try to do that along Main Street. I don't think that's currently what the city's doing, but I'm not close to what they're thinking.

We had a plan once that we thought was beautiful. It was to use what was in those days idle train trackage. We'd found a way to run street level, fairly low cost passenger trolleys from the other end of the Mall out to where you'd get off to go over to the arena, going east and west. There is, oddly enough, a way to configure the north-south routes to do the same sort of thing up to the other end of Charlottesville on the north side.

Well, it didn't happen because the train companies were smart enough to know that their trackage was worth a lot more than Charlottesville or we would ever be able to afford. We had conversations with the companies and got nowhere. As small as Charlottesville is, it was a lesson in the fact that infrastructure in cities is a creature of competing profit motives and political motives.

I thought at the time—and I still think—that that model of really good street-level rail transportation that would be noninvasive and wouldn't compete with pedestrians for street space would be really neat. The trackage that was of interest is actually below street level most of the way. In some cases, including coming around through the Corner,

it's above street level. That railroad bridge down there would have been where it would have come. But as the route has developed over time, the railroads are using that track, for example, for both freight and passenger service. So the idea in modern times makes no sense; twenty years ago it was a pretty sharp idea. (Laughter.)

SS: I diverted you. You were going through a list of some things that you see as your failures.

JC: Well, Qatar, that's the single biggest one. The fact that U.S. interests in the Middle East have become so strategically important, and that other universities are doing what we didn't do, is a constant reminder to me, at least, of the importance of a much more sophisticated and global vision than we were able to bring to bear on that issue back when it was on the table.

I mentioned the concert hall issue. I have suspected for years that somewhere there is a commonality of interest between U.Va.'s two business schools, and we never got off the nickel on that. We have a school that was created originally to be an undergraduate school largely of accountancy, the McIntire School, and the Graduate School, the Darden School, which is fundamentally an MBA-generating school. For a lot of reasons that are valid on both sides, they've never found common ground to bring those two together. It would be a matter of trying to displace the Wharton School as the national model of an integrated undergraduate-graduate business school.

Some of the reasons are good reasons. The McIntire, for example, has been rated above the Wharton School several times in recent years. So the McIntire School doesn't have a motive to try to be more than the Wharton School—it's done great being the McIntire School. The Darden School is living in the environment of the Harvard Business School and so on, where the MBA is a self-contained unit. Sometimes, over the twenty years, faculty members from both schools have come around to tell me that they thought it was time to work on some kind of a joint school or something like that. I don't necessarily see that as a failure, it's just that the time for that has never been quite right. The momentum to change that structure would have to come from within the schools.

We've had very slow progress on the sciences. After including the time at UConn, twenty-five years of wrestling with the cost of science facilities in public universities, I'm perfectly clear that you can't make it happen overnight, that it does take a long time. But in the doing it feels like a long, long time. It feels like a lot longer time than anybody could picture as you go into it.

Every large medical center wrestles with how best to integrate the clinical program and the academic or research program. We do too. There's a notorious case involving babies switched at birth over there. I guess what I can say about that situation is that I was on vacation with my daughter in Colorado, and heard about it on the radio news.

SS: Oh, my!

JC: You learn a lot when a real crisis develops. But one thing we learned immediately was that our control systems, in every sense, including the risk management systems, simply weren't sufficient. That no one thought it was important to let Leonard or me know what had happened until the problem was a couple of days along, told us that we really had to intrude in what had always been treated as the medical school's province over there.

So we used different strategies at different times. I think in the end, at least for the time in which I was working, it was a matter of developing—not in the sense of regulation of conduct—but control systems that would let you see what was happening and that would make the organization be responsive to standards of accountability and so on. We did that.

Financing a place like that is always a challenge. At one point, Leonard took over the job of administrator of the medical center, for a couple of years. Not the medical school, but the clinical parts.

The medical center does have an educational mission. Part of the struggle is that the educational mission includes the education of residents and fellows. So you have to find some way to reconcile the clinical purposes of the medical center with the special educational purposes. Then you have to both protect and foster the nursing enterprise, which has been a great success here because of a dean and faculty who saw the opportunity for nursing research back when nobody else did, and took the school from

being one more state university nursing school to being a top-tier national school. Over the course of about a decade of intense effort, they did this.

The medical school on the other side is very dependent on the clinical venture in several ways, as the clinical venture depends on the medical school for distinguished practitioners. But the medical school also has a very large and vulnerable research program that has to be cared for all the time. It's vulnerable simply because research funding is a matter of external or extramural funding. The medical school has to work to find the funding and deploy it properly. Medical funding, like most research funding in this country, is awarded to individual faculty members rather than to the school. So the school has constantly to cultivate its faculty to be superb at what they do, without controlling their research.

SS: Through the National Science Foundation or National Institutes of Health?

JC: NIH is the big factor over there.

The restructuring program at the moment is a success. It depends on a tremendous amount of good will and active historical memory on all sides to stay successful, but for now it is. The refinancing has been successful. Either we need to recapture some of the state money or we need to find another couple of billion dollars in core endowment.

SS: For the medical school?

JC: No, for the University in general. I'm sorry. I shifted topics on you. I was thinking about failures and successes.

SS: It's okay. I'm with you now.

JC: I don't think in our culture and economy universities are ever finished with building their financial base or bases, but a transitional condition between relatively large public support, 29 to 30 percent of the operating budget is a big deal, to modest support creates needs that, I think, Bob Sweeney and other people who worked in that period of the time when I was president, found ways to meet.

Our schools grew stronger. One of the reasons the McIntire School and the Darden School don't find common interest in being a joint program is that both have been so successful in self-financing, which is a good problem to have.

JC: The athletic programs—candidly, we always had higher aspirations than football and basketball quite achieved. But both on the side of athletics and on the side of the University's and academic community, we never dealt with pressure to win at all costs or to go out and compete with Ohio State every year, it just wasn't the way it worked.

SS: Really, no pressure from the Board?

JC: No. Definitely we liked to win. I don't like losing. But the trade-offs seemed to me to have been pretty well understood all through that period. There's probably never been an athletics department that got everything it thought it should get from the university. There are plenty of cases of great universities that support consistently first-rate athletics programs: Duke, basketball; Stanford, everything; UCLA, most things most of the time. There's no reason why U.Va. cannot compete, except that historically, in some fields, in some years, we've had trouble competing.

The development of the women's programs has been very good. A generation of coaches, great coaches like Debbie Ryan, moved through in the period when I was president and just before it. That was always exciting to watch.

SS: Is that because you were more open to women's sports?

JC: I think that was just the people we had onboard at a given time. Soccer, field hockey, women's rowing, tennis, had first-rate coaches. Swimming is generally run here as an integrated program by a single head coach with assistants for the whole program. Swimming has a superb coach, but that's true of any winning program.

Something I admire a lot is that, largely by student initiative, there is a healthy club sport program where students who, in a way, are more students than athletes in their own thinking, carry on parallel programs. I'm not aware of a club program in football, but there always has been a pretty active, in my time, rugby program, and much of the time a

women's rugby program. You get parallel club sport activities. I haven't been to club soccer in several years, but I suspect it's still pretty vigorous. Lacrosse and polo are club programs. These are good programs. The characteristic of successful club programs over time is that they are open to all students and they're social venues. Students who play lacrosse at the club level—the women go to the men's games and the men go to the women's games. They socialize together. It's probably a culture that's somewhat analogous to the varsity sport, but it's a different culture.

It's been a good period for student theater and things of that sort. It's been a time with a lot of vigor in such programs as studio art. Betsy and I had been very much interested in the development of a precinct on the University's grounds that would be an arts precinct. We're still actively engaged in helping that to happen.

SS: Wasn't there an arts district named for you recently? Is that what you're referring to?

JC: Yes, it's up behind Carr's Hill. It's not large enough to accommodate everything that needs to happen. There's no footprint there for a major concert hall, for example. Other functions have intruded amply on Carr's Hill, itself, so they can't snip away at Carr's Hill. Well, when we made the decision to develop the field down here, where the band practices and a lot of the club sports play, we gave up one piece of the footprint that might have served those programs.

There is a possible footprint across the train track for more arts buildings. We once looked at putting a new museum up there. So far, the right thing hasn't come along. Oddly enough, modern construction and design techniques let you run a major music hall right on a train track. You don't have to isolate yourself from the trains. The practice facility, actually one wall of it is right on the setback line for the train track.

SS: Trains are a matter of life here, aren't they? I've enjoyed being here and listening to the trains.

JC: Yes, I get to ride a train to Washington tomorrow. It's a big deal. I hate the drive up and down, because it's lost time where you spend a lot of your energy on traffic. For the moment, I'm believing that the train will come on time in the morning and I'll get to Washington on time for some meetings. (Laughter.)

SS: Talking about your accomplishments, we've talked some about the restructuring legislation. But we haven't really talked about restructuring your administration. In fact, maybe we should talk about that now, the fact that Leonard Sandridge was your number two. Some people have told me that that is a different model than the provost having the number two spot.

JC: Oh, it is. It reflects the realities we had to deal with in 1990-91.

SS: Financial?

JC: Well, it was financial. It was squeezing the most out of the resources. It was the realization that whatever support base had been there in the past and the state agencies, the administrative support base, was not going to be there in the future. Therefore, we had to find other ways to do it. It was partly the decision to operate the medical center as an integral part of the University.

We'd always had someone who was the de facto chief operating officer. I felt, in the early nineties, that it was time to acknowledge that.

One of the reasons Peter Low is such an important figure is that Peter devised a model for the academic program that let it prosper despite the profound changes in state financing during the early 1990s, and in the process collaborated with the deans to make the University's separate schools stronger and more independent than ever before. Our structure is odd—most public universities give school deans less autonomy than Peter gave our deans, but it works, and it has space to change or grow in the future. As Peter developed the administrative structure for the schools, he reflected the quality of the deans and others available to run the schools. Within what I think were reasonable limits, he freed up the schools to do the best they could imagine and plan.

Managing or overseeing disparate operations where people carry out different kinds of work for different constituencies or publics always involves managing risks as well as capitalizing on opportunities. Obviously, in addition to whatever else the terrible event known as the baby switch may teach about patient safety and security generally, it flags

the prospect of a problem in the medical center. When that report first appeared, everyone knew immediately that the risk existed and that it was not tolerable.

Analogously, the departure of a large percentage of your state money tells you there's a risk in dealings with the state. In a way, governors' or legislators' personal assurances of support (personal or institutional) are good for only a short time. Things change, and in our time fundamental changes occurred in the state's ability to manage its finances (less ability now than in less-challenged times) and in the state's willingness to ante up for education (at all levels and in all schools and colleges), for health care, and for its highways—to name only the most obvious areas.

There were those and other issues. The realization that we had the opportunity to do the kind of complimentary construction of academic facilities, such as the South Lawn project—projects that you can't do without the sort of robust administrative structure that Leonard provided—those recognitions pretty much defined the field.

The restructuring of 2005/6 was a consequence of two things. One is very simple. The net effect of the restructuring, in terms of state law, is to take the University back to the law as it existed all along. The restructuring legislation is actually page after page after page of lining out of accumulations of regulatory language in the code. A lot of it never belonged in that code in the first place. In any event, it wasn't controversial. By the time changes got made, it seemed that the underlying statute—the statute that's a derivation of

the one Jefferson wrote that was passed in 1819—is a very sound statute that describes an enterprise that serves the public interest well.

The other piece of it was that beginning in the early nineties, I think the first one was in 1992, we got a series of relaxations of state regulation for functions that the state wasn't paying for. It was simply an acknowledgement that we were doing business in a sector where the marginal cost of the state's processes didn't have any benefit. Again, it was not really controversial.

The state agencies were under pressure to reduce their employment levels. The legislature wanted to cut the cost of administering state government, centrally. We wanted to get the most out of the dollars that we were able to invest in purchasing and personnel transactions and so on. The state's model for employee benefits did not work well in this market. There were not enough competing providers, not enough people to make this health care market work the way Richmond, Tidewater, Northern Virginia, or Roanoke does.

The legislation was sometimes called deregulation. There were other names for it in the early nineties and through the nineties. That legislation got rolled up in the restructuring legislation. There was a certain amount of chatter about the legislation. I think most of it was pretty well-intended, but there's always fear that any institution, including this one, is trying to get away with something when it proposes a change of that sort. We put probably three years into discussion of it, and in the year when it was enacted, 2004-5,

had a series of public meetings in different parts of the state to explain the purposes, to show people the language, to ask for support.

I had been on the road, in one sense or another, for a couple of years before that. There was a time when Gordon Burris and I did a statewide blitz to get to eight or ten different places where we needed to tell the story and ask for support.

There was someone here in Charlottesville who was trying to get state employees to organize into labor unions. Virginia has a right-to-work law that makes organizing public employees a great challenge for the unions. She was persuaded that the effect of the law would be disadvantageous to employees. In fact, we designed it to be beneficial to employees. It includes better benefits programs and far better options for health care and so on. We had to work through that slowly, because no one wanted to do anything that was going to be adverse to employee interests, because in the end we believed that it would be, as it has been, beneficial to employees.

The legislative votes on it were all but unanimous in both houses. I think there may have been three or four negative votes in the House of Delegates and one or two in the Senate. I talked with those who voted against it. One of them told me she just hadn't had time to read it and she wouldn't vote for something she hadn't read, which I think was probably the mood of people who didn't favor it by the time it was done. But there was a lot of give and take. We amended the proposal repeatedly, as the governors and legislative

leaders developed their positions on it, and we were able to use their perspectives to make the law a better law.

What it does, in the end, is get back to the general principle that this is a corporation that serves a public purpose, and that it conforms to public standards of accountability. For example, it clarifies for Tech, William & Mary, and this institution, which were the three original participants, that the state auditors have access to every scrap of paper you've got, every bit of records you've got. The auditors have the capacity to go into the foundations. They audit athletics. It's the only place I know where the state's auditors do athletics. It's a Sunshine Law. It puts the appropriate paperwork right into the public domain.

SS: Transparent is a word that gets used a lot.

JC: Yes, it does. I've never seen transparency as a hindrance to getting things done. Years ago, before you could just go online and find the budget, we used to take a copy of the University's budget over to the reference room in the library and ask them to keep it at the desk. Anybody who wanted it, we'd tell them they can find it there.

Then, as different Sunshine and disclosure law issues came up, we never found a reason to be opposed to them. We had to do a great deal of long-range planning in order to do the capital fundraising we were doing. To get that right, you have to have effective strategic planning programs that are time-constrained—usually three to five years—and

resource-constrained. A strategic plan can accomplish its purposes if you can do the job within the resources you've got to do the job—the money, usually.

I don't know why we came, initially, to this conclusion, but we decided early on that drafts of plans ought to be public too. There was a practice of keeping back drafts with the notion that somehow a draft would get loose and cause problems. As soon as the web became available as a general posting system, we started putting our drafts online. I never saw a bit of trouble with that. You got a lot of help from doing that. People would send notes or call you or whatever, and have their own takes on how you should try to do whatever you were doing.

SS: Interesting.

JC: There was a lot of interest in the proposition that a university would be as ambitious and as aggressive about achieving additional global prominence, as we were, in the early nineties. We got help from people who just picked up clues online as to what we were working on and started sending us their advice, their thoughts, models they knew about, things they'd seen elsewhere. It was a functional form of commentary that gave us useful information.

SS: That was really early in terms of the web.

JC: Yes, it was early. I don't know exactly when the web became a functional system for that kind of disclosure of information. By the time it became that, we had been riding along on it for several years.

SS: The fundraising, the financing, the restructuring, and the building are all cited as achievements during your administration, and also the increased diversity.

JC: Diversity, yes. I feel good about the growing academic prominence of the faculties. You don't anymore cause faculty prominence than you cause any of these other things. Faculty members, from start to finish, were the best architects of what the future ought to be. Very few faculty members, or people generally, are going to throw themselves wholeheartedly into finite chores that the daily business of actually carrying out plans demand—but tremendous ideas come in, tremendous criticisms come in.

We were able to collaborate with a series of gifted and productive Faculty Senate chairs. This place has a Faculty Senate that is effective in ways that none that I know of elsewhere is effective. In bad times, maybe it's what you might think of as loyal opposition in the English political sense. There weren't that many bad times. But in good times, the Faculty Senate has been a really powerful planning instrument.

SS: Are there faculty members you want to mention?

JC: Well, the ones you think of are the chairs. It's people who are universally gifted and talented. A man named David Gies, who has been chair of Spanish at various times, and a man named Michael Smith, who's a political scientist. Faculty members from various schools, actually, who, for one reason or another, saw the Senate as the vehicle for what they saw as appropriate university service—really good people.

In the early nineties, I worked with a small group of writers who came in at a time when we didn't have the capacity to generate the planning documents. They took on the job of listening to the discussions that informed the planning and producing documents that we could distribute. We were trying to figure out once how to get a draft document into the hands of every graduate, faculty member, and parent of a student. One of our writers was somebody who had a newspaper background. She said, "That's simple. Print a newspaper." So we put out a tabloid paper, containing the planning document, and put it all in there. It's amazing how much stuff you can put into dense newsprint if you have six or eight or ten pages. That method of getting the information out there and soliciting responses came out of that writing group. The people in the writing group had tremendous influence on the University, simply because their construction of the ideas and of the programs and so on was the one that was in front of everybody—legislators, alumni, students and so on.

We have not covered such things as the contributions of various Board members. That's an important topic here, because the Board was so good. I hesitate to launch into that

kind of thing, just as I would in the names of faculty members, because I don't have any way to make sure I'm covering everything.

But, the Board members are some of the most talented executives in America: Charlie Brown, who was the CEO who broke up AT&T; Lee Brown, who was the CEO of Brown-Forman and eventually was U.S. ambassador to Austria; Ed Elson, I mentioned him the other day, who was the ambassador to Denmark; Gordon Rainey, who was the lead partner of a prominent law firm in Richmond; Tom Farrell, who's the CEO of Dominion; and many others. Those people brought perspective and knowledge that you couldn't have bought. They really threw themselves into serving the University.

Charlie Brown, in that first campaign, took on the job of cultivating and delivering the large gifts. Charlie was operating as though he were a senior development officer. He was amazingly good at what he did. A lot of members gave that kind of distinguished service, but also had very unusual backgrounds for a public board. They made the University conspicuous in good ways in parts of the world where maybe most people wouldn't have thought about looking for a public university.

SS: And your relationship with them was as colleagues?

JC: In the best cases, yes. There are always members of boards, public or private—I sit on and have sat on a lot of them—who get confused as to what is the board's policy province and what is the province for direct action. In Charlie Brown's case, he took on

this lead donor function as he left the Board. Charlie had a wonderful sense about the difference between the Board's policy and governance functions, and this key volunteer function he had as the person doing the principle gifts solicitations.

In other cases, you'll get Board members who think that they should be personally in charge of planning or something like that. It never comes to very much. You try to make sure that people understand that there's another way to get certain jobs done. There are ways to be an engaged member without trying to run something directly. Sometimes you don't succeed. Those ventures, in general, don't do much harm. Sometimes they generate good, but you can't predict from experience or whatever you know about other ways to get the jobs done. I mentioned yesterday that we were lucky in the quality of mind and the sense of responsibility of our chairs. That's been an asset, from start to finish.

We've had very solid athletics directors. You can spot athletics directors who don't perform as well as our guys do, because their universities wind up in the newspapers with NCAA violations. These people have been uncommonly good. A couple of them are the equal of anybody in the business.

The same has been true of the deans. There were very few deans who did not develop effective and coherent programs for their schools. Those who don't do that, in general, stay two or three years and go back to whatever they might want to do.

SS: What was your role in developing the faculty?

JC: Basically, hiring the deans is the president's job here. The provost almost always was the search agent for the deans. The provost is the chief personnel officer for academic people. The provost has to be the lynchpin. There were a couple of cases where the provost was overloaded in a given year and I would take on a search, because we needed to distribute the load. I can think of one instance where a search just didn't go well and the provost finally said, "I think we need a different person to try to run this thing." In that instance, as I think about it, the shift of people to have me run it did work—not because of me—but because we just needed to recycle the search and get it going on a different basis.

SS: The excellence in faculty and chairs and deans, yes, but also their diversity was increased greatly here by your administration.

AG: Well, that's a matter, in part, of the way we oversaw searches. We almost always insisted that a search had to produce more than one name, and that the search had to include a demonstration that the search had sought vigorously for non-conventional or untraditional candidates. Our search committees did a good job.

Sometimes, if we were working under time constraints, a dean might leave in the middle of a semester or something. I don't recall exactly that, but there would be some reason

for quick action on a search. Rather than risk having a search drag on, and thereby debilitating faculty, we would push for a single name and for early closure of a search.

I didn't do department chairs. That's always the dean's or provost's function. I didn't do them either in the academic faculties or in the medical faculty. The dean has to do those searches, but the provost and the dean have to agree on what they're doing. The provost handles promotion and tenure reviews. Different provosts have done that in different ways. The most effective ones have actually done it personally. That's the key element of the provost's authority within the faculty. It works well when the provost does a superior job.

SS: Was the provost that you told me about earlier Peter Low?

AG: Peter Low is the best source of information on how that sort of thing's done. He certainly knows key decisions inside now. We had disclosure of NCAA violations that came in, I think it was late 1990, but maybe 1991. I got to know Peter Low really well, because he was one of the law faculty members who conducted the investigation into the violations. His service as provost came following the death of a provost in office. Then we had a provost who took office and left rather quickly. He became president of the University of Rochester about a year after becoming provost.

SS: Who was the provost that died?

AG: His name was Hugh Kelly, a physicist. The one who went to Rochester was Tom Jackson. Tom had been law dean. Peter was the associate dean in law, who ran the academic program. When Tom Jackson went to Rochester, Peter stepped in and ran the provost office initially just as an interim. But faculty leaders and the deans and I felt that he was exactly the right person and he stayed, I think, eight years in that job. That's a huge, brutal job. We were talking about stamina earlier. The provost has got to have an amazing kind of sticking power to make things work.

SS: Coming from you, that's something.

JC: No, it's true. That's the quality assurance function of the university. If the provost were to slip up on the quality assurance piece, the university would follow after it in bad ways.

SS: Excellence is also a big theme in your inauguration speech. When you said, "fulfill and extend the vision of Jefferson," is increasing diversity of the student body and faculty what you meant?

JC: It's certainly a piece of it, yes. The reality of living in Jefferson's shadow and of having constantly to gauge his words and his creations against current reality is a challenge, but it's also an invigorating thing. It's difficult, I think, to build a culture of the quality of this one if you don't have something of that kind in the works.

It reminds me of the influence of John Henry Newman on Oxford. Cardinal Newman dominated—I don't want to overstate it—but he was one of the major voices in reshaping Oxford in the nineteenth century, as it became a modern university. The only case I know in America of that kind of influence is—well, not quite the only—Jefferson is a rare case of that. Sproul and Wheeler together at Berkeley probably had that kind of impact on the University of California, and on the big land grant research universities. There was a president at Indiana who had that kind of impact.

Jefferson's different from the mainstream in that he's not out of an academic origin. He came out of the part of the tradition in which citizens defined their institutions and commit to make them happen. Crevecoeur has a discussion, I think in the *Letters from an American Farmer*, about what he sees as the difference between European and American ways of accomplishing large projects. He says that in Europe—he may even say England, but I think he says Europe—"Great men," his phrase, "envision great projects and become projectors of the projects. As projectors, they make them happen."

In this country, we form associations instead of having a projector who has a single vision of whatever is being created. We form associations. We talk among ourselves. He doesn't use the term ferment, but we go through a process that's something like ferment. In the end, the great advances are consequences of social action where people do things together. By and large, universities in this country are associational. This one is, but with the oddity that there is a projector in the background who has spelled out all these large principles.

SS: If I may say, you were the perfect person, because of your background, to put some of that vision into practice, into reality, because of your believe in the text and you believed in citizenship and rights, so it seems to me that there was a convergence.

JC: Well, I hope so. It was certainly the case that when I became president, there was a real risk that the University was going to be homogenized into being just one more public school. The Governor's advice in 1990-91 that we downgrade this university and the other colleges and universities in Virginia, and set the target of being less, and his assertion that the private universities would meet needs in the future did help to define what we could do. It's not what I could do; it's what we could do within the team structure we had. Somebody had to be the visible face of the work that we did together. It's really a matter of the function of Occam's razor that it's easier if the president is the face.

SS: And you didn't do what the Governor suggested?

JC: No, we didn't. It did not, in the end, make him a personal enemy. We didn't do what he said, though. (Laughter.) We couldn't. His idea would've been destructive of the public interest. We did not march around and carry signs. We simply, quietly—Leonard's phrase—did the right thing.

SS: The University has just gotten better and better since then.

JC: Any institution suffers some setbacks here and there. There's probably no such thing as a perfectly linear upward progress.

SS: Right, but according to *U.S. News & World Report*, it has been number one or two in the list of public universities.

JC: Yes, for a long time. It was nice to be there. It was a validating thing. It would not have untracked the University if those rankings had been different. It would've been a little harder to explain that the University's purposes were right and credible. I don't think it would've been the end of the world.

I should say, too, that the fact that we did not have balanced strength in the sciences, always made me a little skeptical of the rankings. The rankings really have to do with the issues that undergraduate students care about in choosing their colleges. To know world universities is to recognize that Berkeley and Harvard and Yale, and a handful of others, are indispensable resources that the global community of learning doesn't function without those places being top tier.

When the ranking methodologies dropped Berkeley out of the rankings, okay, so they did, that's their problem, not Berkeley's problem. Berkeley's problem was to get the state of California to come back to the table with its checkbook, which is a recurring problem. Public universities, as the UC is struggling now, constantly struggle with the ups and downs of public finance, especially as universities have become more complex.

There have been periods in our history when we were at least equally research-driven, but in modern times, more research-driven.

Universities did a tremendous proportion of the necessary research to bring the U.S. through World War II, and then after World War II to establish the post-Depression industrial economic base. We did not, as a university, do a great deal of that because we were primarily an undergraduate teaching institution with a good law school. Nowadays, we are very actively involved in research in the national interest, much more so than we were twenty-odd years ago.

SS: But is there a tension between being a public university, fulfilling the public role, and actually being a world-class university?

JC: I don't think so. Outside the U.S. every important university in the world is public. We live in fantasyland with the distinctions that we make between private and public in this country. The truth is that while we are very, very good as a system of universities, we are not advancing as rapidly as are some in Europe. After a period of decline, the British universities are back with a vengeance.

China has developed, so far, half a dozen really spectacular universities. Peking is the best of them, but there are others such as the National University of Singapore, and several others are at least equal to anything we have. The big difference is, generally, that we are better financed. We have larger resources in the U.S. In anybody's fully

informed list of, say, the top twenty-five, the time when three-quarters or more of that list would've been American universities has passed. We're now better than half of a consensus top twenty-five list, but no one imagines that that will always be the way it is.

You can define the investment in different ways, but the national investment in universities is, in the end, an investment in what they generate in intellectual property, human minds, and scientific learning. We don't invest in a way that's proportional to what our chief national competitors do in Germany, and arguably in France. France is a little bit hard to nail down. Certainly in the U.K., with three blockbuster universities—Edinburgh, Cambridge, Oxford—you can see national priorities and the net investment in those places. It is not that the government's appropriating a bunch of dollars per student, necessarily. It's that the national policy and national behavior see to it that those institutions deliver their necessary products.

SS: That's too bad.

JC: We have a very undisciplined way of investing in intangibles in this country. Universities are at the top of the list of intangible investments that have to be made. The cost of science, post-digital revolution, is several times what anybody ever thought it would be in this country. There's also the fact that after you talk about the oddity that only America has this distinction between private and public, there are also governance differences that we haven't fully understood. Some Chinese universities belong to cities.

Some belong to companies. Some belong to the Chinese army. It's just a different world from what we know about. India's quite different.

In addition to this matter of where the investment actually is and this infrastructure for human talent or intellectual property or whatever one calls it, there's the fact that we're not as engaged with the rest of the world as we used to be. I am very discouraged about American intentions and products in Africa. I'm afraid what I see emerging there is a pattern like the Middle East, where we fall outside mainstreams that we might be able to influence if we were more engaged.

A half-century after the African nations shook off their European owners, still no more than two internationally competitive universities are in South Africa. There ought to be a half-dozen or more. Those are not adequately financed. There has been some effort going on, since I was first here, so twenty-one, twenty-two years ago, to provide education and training for presidents and some of our leaders in the African universities.

It's a matter of going back to the first point on the outline every two or three years and recycling the outline. There is a lot of effort, a lot of good intentions, and not the kind of progress that would really benefit Africa. That kind of progress, I think, is in the U.S. national interest and it's in the interest of U.S. universities. There are universities that are actively engaged in Africa, but by and large, it's been pretty haphazard engagement.

SS: When you talk, it shows me how involved and engaged in the world you are. In fact, that's another milestone of your administration, the student body and the faculty became more international.

JC: Well, it had to. You couldn't build a great university on an introverted community in Charlottesville. Because there is such intense in-state interest in enrollment at U.Va., you don't build the international programs by admitting international students in huge numbers. It's going to never be more than 7, 8, 9 percent of the total. So what you have to do is send the University out into the world.

There are certain big issues in Africa that some of our faculty work on and have for years. There's a problem in much of the world, and in some parts of the U.S., with sufficient safe or potable water for urban areas. It's a huge issue in Africa. Every major city on the continent has some kind of water issue. Environmental science, public health, and similar disciplines have a natural field of engagement with Africa because of that. There's some fascinating stuff going on with digital infrastructure in Africa with the development of reliable and not terribly expensive wireless communication systems. We're not there yet, but you can see the possibility of a functional digital spine that would support African commerce and so on.

As you know, one of the reads of the meaning of the Arab Spring is that digital communications, wireless communications, made it possible for it to happen. That's going to be true someday of Africa. My instinct is that academic learning, intellectual

competence, and the necessary ingredients of personal independence, that all of those things are parts of an equation that produces appropriate kinds of wins for Africa and for the U.S. We have had, over the years, really fine Middle Eastern Studies faculty. The single-most significant study of the Persian world has been done here.

SS: Oh, really?

JC: Largely by a man named Ruhi Ramazani, who's retired, but he's still active and around. The non-Persian parts of it, especially having to do with the Gulf Cooperation Council and similar multinational organizations in the Middle East, have had a lot of links to us. A retired faculty member named Nat Howell was the ambassador in Kuwait when the Iraqis invaded Kuwait in the early-nineties and still remains aggressively involved with the U.S. interests in the Middle East.

That's the context in which I found the fact that we could not engage with Qatar so frustrating. I'd far rather have U.S. linkages that are mind-to-mind and person-to-person as academic affiliations are when they're effective, than imagine a future where we endlessly send troops into one country after another. U.Va. is going to have to wait for another turn at doing that.

American universities, in general, have struggled to become engaged with India. India's a complicated territory. It has many universities, few resources, and vast numbers of students who want to study outside India. The best we have done is the Darden School

dean is actively involved in India. We tried various approaches to get the University engaged with India, institutionally, and none has quite worked yet, so that's still out there to be done.

SS: Well, we haven't really spoken about the College at Wise.

JC: Yes, that's a nice story. That college is, at least in Virginia, unique in that it was a locally devised solution to regional needs. A group of citizens—I forget if they were from Wise or from Coeburn, but they from one of those towns in Wise County—formed a plan for a regional college. This was before the community colleges. It was before the expansion of the public universities that produced George Mason, Old Dominion, VCU, and so on.

They made approaches, or so the story goes, to various universities, ultimately to this one. One of them, I believe, knew Colgate Darden when he was governor. He put the proposal that U.Va. should be the founder of this college to Mr. Darden, and Mr. Darden did it. It was a two-year college, then a four-year college, and now it's a much more complete institution than just a college. It has professional programs and it has graduate nursing and so on.

The founding chancellor of that college is still there. He's quite an old man, but I've seen him in the last month. That has been beneficial to the College and to U.Va. because he worked out the original affiliation. He understood the College's value to its region. The

chancellors have been all very talented, but different talents were relevant at different times.

David Prior, who died last winter, was a wonderful leader for the College. He started life as a research scientist. He was a neurologist and biochemist, and had gone through a first career in which he was professor of both neurology and biochemistry at Kentucky. He backed up and learned the administration of smaller institutions, went to Arizona, went to Michigan. He was at Wisconsin when we hired him. And he had worked at each of the major assignments within a college.

He found that he really loved the small communities. He loved the colleges that were directly engaged with local government, with families, and so on. When he turned up as a prospect there, the chair called me and said, "This guy's too good to be true." The way it works is that the College board there acts as a search committee and the president here appoints the chancellor. I listened to what he had to say and thought about it. I said, "Well, I've never heard of anybody quite as well suited as this guy is, but if he's what you think he is, obviously we want him."

He was just perfect. He was a visionary with a very modest way of presenting himself. I read the eulogy down there. The best I could figure out, to represent this man was simply to read his words back to them, because he was so much engaged with the evolution of this place without the need to be controlling every, single lever. He saw it as almost a

communitarian way of developing the College. And he was a thoughtful reader with a very sympathetic and broad imagination.

SS: What a loss.

JC: David used to write to me about his personal reading. I'd get a note from him saying, "What are you reading?" I'd tell him whatever I was on. Then he might react to that or I'd get a note back and it'd say, "Okay, I'm reading this or that." He'd pick something from the list and he'd read it, or he would direct me to something from his own list. And then I'd get a note saying, "What do you think of this thing on page forty-nine, where he says so-and-so?"

Last summer, I don't know why I was doing it, but I was reading something of James Joyce again, and David said, "Where's a good place to start James Joyce?" I was in Maine. He was in Virginia. I said, "Start early. Read *Dubliners*." David read the stories in *Dubliners* and he wrote notes for me—biologist's notes and husband's notes and father's notes, each one in his own context.

David said he thought he'd like to read *Ulysses*. I said, "Well, look, start with *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, because that's where Joyce started." David got started on it.

Once he wrote, “I’ve realized that this is about the difficulty of growing up in a family.” I thought about it and said, “Yes, it is. It’s about dysfunction between Stephen and his father,” and then David sent notes and eventually talked about unhappiness in childhood and what that experience seems to cause in adults. He used his reading as a kind of contact point for life itself—always thoughtful, always gentle, and always introspective.

He had quiet amusements. Last year, to see if he could build a boat, he built a model boat. He built it from individual sticks, so it had all the components of a boat in his model. He wanted to build a rowing dory this winter. He couldn’t figure out how to build it in his basement. It was too long for the basement. So he didn’t build his dory. But he wrote me neat stories about what he would do when he got his dory done. He knew where he was going to row it and which way he was going to row it. (Laughter.)

SS: It sounds like his loss was a personal loss.

JC: Well, it’s a loss to that College, but he left the College far stronger than it was when he went there. He left it with splendid buildings and he left it with money. He would call me and get a general sense of how he might approach one prospective donor or another, and then he’d go do it and he produced the money. At a time when U.Va. was lagging in its capital funds campaign, that little college went over the top on its campaign early. It was David’s personal work with his donors that did it. He had to raise money for things that we would finance using fees and bonds. His population base was too small, so he had to find other ways to do it.

In the old gymnasium at Wise, they're building a regional public health facility to take the place of the state entity that's not there. I guess both the stadium and the new arena were his projects. He was concerned because the region did not have places for large groups of people to gather. Eventually, they will have a new library that's his doing.

SS: That's quite a legacy he leaves. Was the name change significant that happened during your administration?

JC: It was at the time, but it was significant for about two weeks after it was done and then it was done. There was fear of unknown changes, largely here, not there.

SS: Some people were against it?

JC: There were people who thought that it was going to take away the unique identification of the College in that region. And on the other side, people who thought that it was going to devalue the University of Virginia's name. But it was the University of Virginia from the first day. On the other side, the local name that they were trying to save was actually the name of a place where the College was not. It had been originally named Clinch Valley College in the belief that a railroad company that had Clinch in its name was going to give it a lot of money, and it never did.

SS: (Laughter.) Oh, goodness.

JC: So it just didn't make any sense to keep the old name. It has become U.Va.-Wise. That's what it's called now. The old name died out in use very quickly.

SS: Was there ever a push to have other satellite campuses?

JC: There used to be. There was one in Martinsville. There was one on the Eastern Shore. George Mason was a U.Va. branch. It didn't work. The state did not fund them properly and U.Va. didn't know how to run them. Wise is the only one that survived. The one in Martinsville became the community college in Martinsville and the one on the Eastern Shore was rolled into the community college, different location. George Mason became independent. I've skipped over something. There was another one somewhere.

SS: I think that at this point, let's move toward the final questions of assessment. Before we do that, let me give you an opportunity to add anything. We couldn't get twenty years of service into the hours allotted, but—

JC: I have no idea how you're going to pull this together.

SS: It's only going to be pulled together through your words.

JC: I still think that I'm probably not a very good witness for what you need.

SS: Well, from your perspective and your experience, we've touched on some issues. I'm not saying we've touched on the best or the most important, but we've had a conversation that has revealed some things, and that's what it will stand as. If you think of anything else that you want to add, you can also add it later when you're looking at the transcript. You're so thoughtful about your life, your administration, and your tenure here. A historian will use this information possibly in the future to recreate this time period. Have you thought about your administration, in terms of epochs or eras or periodization?

JC: No, but I probably could. There's the period up to about 1994, when we made the decision to move forward with a capital funds campaign to make the University self-sufficient. There was the period in the late-nineties, when we were running that campaign, but also discovering and resolving the need for far better long-range planning for new facilities, for science, for the libraries and so on, for UVIMCO [University of Virginia Investment Management Company], for mechanisms to let us manage the resources in such a way that they would serve the academic purposes.

There was the planning period for that second large campaign, which coincided with resurgence in public universities elsewhere. It was a period in which, having been by ourselves in those lists of the top tier universities for a while, we had to see whether we would float at the same level as the others, when they came back, particularly California at Berkeley and Michigan. We did, but we didn't know at that time. We had to figure that out.

That period is also the period when we formed the strategies to build science. It's hard to have a strategy to build science if you can't afford the cost per square foot of empty buildings. That's what we were looking at in the early-nineties. By the late-nineties, we knew where the money was and we knew how to start to marshal it.

The second part of that decade, 2005 to 2010, is the period when we made the breakthrough that let us get the Batten School built. It took a long time. It wasn't just my doing, but it took a long time to get the international programs up to speed. By about 2005, they were. Faculty members and students were doing important and different work, either outside the U.S. or in connection with other countries.

There were high point events. There was a meeting in the late spring of 1991, where we tested the idea of self-sufficiency on alumni and faculty members and so on at a big meeting in the lower end of the Lawn. It was a very useful day, because we discovered that we had common purposes. We were trying to figure out whether we had time to sell the idea of self-sufficiency to our alumni and so on. When that meeting convened and people began going through the numbers about state support and so on, we knew by midday that the purpose was already there. We knew that it wasn't a matter of selling people on the idea. It was a matter of simply getting everybody into motion in the same direction.

Obviously, the restructuring legislation signals another kind of development. I understand that legislation largely in a state context, rather than in a single institution

context. It was a state decision about the whole system of higher education. It was a very affirmative decision. The General Assembly had been unable to put together the money to fix the damage done, especially in 1991, for thirteen or fourteen years before that issue became the top issue for a given session.

They knew they didn't have the money. They'd been trying for years to find it. And governors who thought they had found it, had gotten bushwhacked by fate. Governor Warner was elected governor with really brilliant ideas about how to make Virginia much more prosperous economically and more successful and so on. Then, within days after becoming governor, he received word that the state had miscalculated its revenue base and instead of having a surplus, he was in a \$4 billion deficit. He took \$51 million from us and took money from everywhere he could find it. The great ideas were still there, but the practical capacity to carry them out on the timetable he had, had been sapped away by this deficit.

There were a lot of high points involving athletics. It's good for the University for people to have the rallying point. In George Welsh's final years, there were two or three seasons that were just great football seasons. There were some very fine basketball seasons, also some difficult seasons, where they simply couldn't put together back-to-back wins when they needed to.

There was the development of a lacrosse program as a major national program. Lacrosse had four or five national championships; soccer, the same sort of thing; and then, in more

recent years, baseball and tennis and golf and so on. We've wanted sports that were developing sports or new sports. We've wanted sports that were activities people could pursue through their whole lives—so tennis, golf, and so on.

SS: That's a nice way to think about it.

JC: Well, it just has to do with the fact that for individual students, athletics is very much a part of academic life. A long time ago, universities like this had physical education requirements. You had to take a half semester of golf and a half semester of tennis and so on to complete the requirements. That's long gone. So the programs have to be able to attract students and to meet developmental needs in other ways.

SS: You were ahead of the curve on that, too, in terms of obesity issues.

JC: We had a provost, and we haven't had occasion to talk about him. His name is Tim Garson. He's a cardiologist. Tim was way ahead of everybody on obesity. He has a knack for developing ingenious, outrageous solutions to problems. I have not been in the hospital in a couple of years, but in the hospital, Tim instituted what he called a "fat tax." If you went into a place where there were snack machines, the ones that were healthy had lower priced products, and the ones that were more expensive had higher priced products. They used the marginal profit on the bad products to educate people about how bad it was to use them. (Laughter.)

SS: That's smart!

JC: He came up with many ideas like that that are outrageously practical. I know there's a political backlash now against fat taxes in food vending. People are saying their civil rights are being violated if they can't buy them. Tim got interested in Mao Zedong's idea about what he called doctors in pajamas or barefoot doctors. It has to do with developing a cadre of general practitioners who could meet the needs of a developing China. Tim hit on having grandparents in retirement become practitioners. There's a lot of grant money financing his ideas in Bangladesh and China and so on. That's what he's been doing since he stopped being provost.

SS: When you mentioned the General Assembly, it made me realize we really haven't discussed that much. You've gotten credit with being able to work very well with the legislature and with the governors.

JC: I probably could, but it was always Leonard and I, and the Richmond alumni leaders, including rectors from Richmond. It was never a one-man show. The fact that I had worked there and the relationships were good relationships helped. But in a different sense, Leonard had worked there. Rectors were presiding over the major law firms and the major corporations and so on. That made a huge difference.

It also made a difference that we were in a position, when the state got into the financial trouble it was in, to posit solutions to the problems and not just to come and complain

because the problems existed. We had an affirmative approach to the problems, rather than a defensive approach, although we were plenty defensive. We'd like to have the state money back. From the beginning, we did not expect it to come back, because we thought there was a political motive once it was separated from the universities to keep it separate. So there was that issue. There was also the general conviction that we could find ways to be and to remain excellent.

Colleges without complete facilities with relatively small enrollments in high cost areas, and colleges facing the demand that they grow rapidly, as Northern Virginia and George Mason have had to—if you can compare those kinds of threats—we've always felt that the threat to the public interest in starving those institutions is pretty serious. We would find ways to cope and that our ways of coping would not be available to them. That is simply a societal reality.

We were always in the position of advocating our interest and the public interest. That helps a lot, when you're talking to legislators who think that everyone who comes is trying to get a special deal for just one faction. We had some things in common with legislators that were useful. I'm sure they remain useful to the University, because they're the natural posture for the University in dealing with the legislature.

It has always seemed to me important that the University not be engaged in partisan activities. I've made a couple of small donations to campaign funds when the candidate was somebody I knew well and thought would be a great public servant, but not many

and never with an alignment with the person's party. It's just been a personal commitment. While president, I just didn't do it. I think I made one campaign gift to a friend of mine in California, who was running against Pete Stark. I knew he was going to lose, but I thought he should have enough money to buy some bumper stickers or something, so I gave him some money. He did lose.

The University is very much a part of the public process in Virginia. You can't be president here without being engaged in it. It's not quite the same as being involved in state politics. You don't go to their fundraisers. You don't take part in their partisan contests. But you get right in their faces when there's a non-partisan public issue to be resolved. We were aggressive about issues having to do with students' safety and security, such as this business of getting grain alcohol detuned. We've definitely been active since the death of Yeardley Love on matters having to do with how the police deal with students and so on. And the legislature has done what we suggested they do.

SS: You met with the Governor soon after her murder, right? Is that the legislation that resulted from that meeting?

JC: He definitely backed the legislation. It was common sense legislation, once we were able to see the risk. Well, we knew about the risk all along. Students live in other jurisdictions a lot of the time. But you couldn't say that the converse of that is that if they lived in the University's jurisdiction, they wouldn't have that problem. You have to address more general behavioral solutions to the problems.

You can't regulate out every hazard that students might face. You can create a community whose condemnation of abuse and violence is as important in its daily life as its honor system is. It's not the same as the honor system. It's another system of self-regulation. You can teach students not to leave their friends to sleep it off. I'm convinced that you can teach students not to wait for their friend who's being abused to speak up, but to speak up directly. As you would have an obligation to if you saw a child being abused in public, you'd report it. That's a part of being a citizen.

Child abuse is a pretty good place to focus. I'm doing some work up at Penn State. The thing that has made those issues so stark is that everyone understands that bringing in the police when child abuse occurs is a fundamental obligation of citizenship. It's not discretionary. The same is true of the kind of abuse that's associated with this case.

As a dean and as a faculty member, one sees evidences of abuse, not all the time, not in every student, but you know it's out there. You see enough of it to make you alert to it. It's hard to say how intense the student scrutiny of that trial is. That's going to mess up your purpose of writing history, because the trial is not going to be the biggest event.

SS: No, but it figures in at the time that we're meeting as a big event.

JC: Here's what I was going to say: This occurred two years ago, the Yeardley Love murder did. In a place that is graduating 93 or 94 percent of its students in six years, in two

years, half the student body has rolled over. It's different people. So you have third and fourth year students, let's say. This is all too approximate, because there are actually late second year students in this mix too. But let's say you have half the student body, older students, who were around and remember how baffling the event was when it first turned up in the press, who have gone through a process of thinking something like "There but for the grace of God, go I." In that group of students, they've all gone through the same set of realizations. Then you also have younger students. They didn't live through it in the same way. They probably knew about it from the press.

SS: Yes, from the national news.

JC: But it's different from walking down the street where it happened and knowing this is where it happened—that house, those people, known contexts. Maybe what happens as a result of a trial of this kind, with all the notoriety that's attached to it, is that these younger students absorb a sort of distillation of the experience of the crime that serves to inform their conduct going forward.

The challenge to a student community becomes how to institutionalize what they've learned. The president has a really interesting approach involving periodically calling for Days of Dialogue, where people sit down with an organizational structure. It's not everybody sitting down in the same room, but they sit down in many different settings, to figure out what it means and to form remedies. That's a promising way to institutionalize what might have been learned in this trial.

When we had Leslie Baltz's death, the situation was different because a lot of students just didn't buy that it was their problem. It's natural when there's a student crisis, for various people to see it as a sign that fraternities and sororities are at fault or something like that. It's instructive that in this particular trial, fraternities and sororities were not out there. In the death of Leslie Baltz, they weren't out there.

If leadership addresses the crisis with an eye towards future solutions, that kind of situation makes it belong more to the whole student body than just to a subgroup that becomes defensive and wants to fend off criticism. There's plenty of basis for criticizing all sorts of characteristics of student life, but scapegoating is not really a very good one. There have been people who have tried to understand this current trial in the context of lacrosse as a culture.

SS: Right, sports culture.

JC: Well, it's been focusing on lacrosse. It's a very odd one. It's a silly proposition that whether you play the game with a stick or with your boot makes a difference in the culture. The remedies that are suggested for misconduct of athletes and the national dialogue includes such things as engaging the players' families in the life of the team and the coaches opening their homes so that students become extended parts of their families and so on. That coach does all of that. He's always been the poster boy for getting it right.

SS: Well, maybe it is just what you said: There is evil in the world.

JC: Evil, madness, and substance abuse.

SS: I'm sure that university presidents get the call in the middle of the night, and maybe it happened six to eight times while you were president. This is one of them that seems to weigh heavily on you.

JC: It's a little different from weighing heavily, as I perceive it. It's really that you look at the issue. You realize first of all that you never know enough to react immediately. But you have to learn more than you can know. So you have to go through an intense process of gathering information. It's not an investigation in the sense in which the police do investigations, but you have to learn what's really going on.

Then you have to find mechanisms to convert it into some net enhancement of the student community, if it's a student issue. That is a longer-term proposition. The realization that the crisis, the catastrophe, the setback has to be managed in the direction of affirmative community action with regard to the future. That's why I like this Day of Dialogue thing that President Sullivan does. It strikes me as a wise way to address the problem.

SS: Well, what would you say are qualities that a president needs to be excellent in the job?

JC: Presidents are a mixed bag. Attending Association of American Universities meetings was always interesting. That's an empty term most of the time, but the interest in that group was that I could never spot any rule of conduct or background or behavior that would define success or its opposite, just as different a crowd of people as you can imagine.

There are people who are detached from daily reality and whose interest in their universities is largely theoretical. There are people who are big boosters of athletics and see that as being the most important piece of what they do. There are people who are hostile to students, people who are in favor of students. There's just a blended bunch.

People make the joke that in this and a lot of other kinds of work, you have to have a high toleration for ambiguity. Yes, that's true. On the other hand, that's not bad. You have to be capable of a willful suspension of disbelief sometimes. You have to wait and see how this or that could ever be true. Sometimes it is.

At least, as I've lived that existence, you have to be a *person of considerable stamina*. As the life is lived here, if one has younger children, as I did, it's a very difficult family life. I was divorced while I was president, and for everybody—my former wife, children, for me—it was a debilitating and devastating experience, partly because everybody lived out this disaster in a kind of public life. Not all the same, it was less public maybe for the children at sometimes and less public for my former wife sometimes. But you were always out there.

That kind of exposure is hard on president's and their family's self-confidence. It's difficult. It does damage to families and to people. The positions are probably too visible, too prominent. On the other hand, there are different ways to carry them out. My way of doing it is not President Sullivan's and it won't be the person after her. It's not the same as people I've known who have preceded me in the job.

In various roles now, I get asked for help in deciding how long somebody should remain president. I'm either asked by the president or asked by a board member or whoever might be involved. That's a very hard question. In the U.K. and in much of Europe, it's typical that presidents or vice chancellors or whatever their title is, will serve three to five years and very rare to have someone who serves a longer term, although it does happen. There was a vice chancellor of Nottingham who served twenty years, and one whom I knew at Oxford served ten. The guy at Edinburgh is above ten years now. There are other cases. But more generally, it's three to five years.

That's a different role in life from where you really have to stay about ten years to know where all the bathrooms are. In my own experience, around fifteen years, you start realizing that there are commitments you've made that have got to be delivered. At the same time, you are working harder to accomplish—not necessarily less—but different things from what you expected to accomplish.

SS: Can you give me an example?

JC: Yes. You get to the point where you've got a 365-day year, and you've got 180 events you have to do at home, and you've got 150 places where you need to be in the course of the year. It's very challenging to keep up with that. On the other hand, in my own experience, the vice presidents and the staff—we haven't talked much about staff, other than, say, Jon Bowen—but the staff is a very important piece of succeeding in that business.

The staff, in my own experience, got better and better at what they did. There was more turnover at the start than later on. In the later years, they were much more independent in delivering the products they were responsible for. Different people with different skills, but commonly committed to, at least in the last decade, to a set of goals that you and I have talked about. And again, they were unselfish, strong people.

It takes a while to figure out what temperament makes the right assistant to deal with faculty issues or the right assistant to deal with fundraising issues or the right assistant to deal with legislative issues. You have to test people out in different settings, see what they do well. You have to keep looking for ways to combine responsibilities to keep the size of the staff reasonable. That's a constant endeavor. There are functions that are always difficult to assign. You never know exactly where to have your press relations person. You have to just keep testing it. It's a matter of who you have in place in each position.

SS: You had long serving administrators and staff.

JC: Yes. My rationale for that was that if I had to be out of here as much as I had to be, within certain contexts, smooth and predictable handling of daily business was beneficial to the University. We kept looking for the best in the country at each function. When I first came here, Leonard and I worked on how to organize the University's computer enterprises. In those days, there were three of them. One thing that we saw pretty quickly was that we were spending money twice, three times, on the same function. There are units of volume in computing systems, or any other system, where you've got complex organizations, where some things can be consolidated without cutting into the quality of the whole and others can't. You've got to figure that out.

Then, we had a woman who was an absolutely superb inventor of university computing structures. I think we may have hired her from Cornell, and she's at Cornell now. That was a second iteration. When we went to work the third time, when she went to Cornell, we said, "Okay, we need somebody to merge the interests of the library with the interest of the sciences because both rely heavily on the digital systems."

We hired Michigan's librarian to be the computer guru here. For a while, Michigan had the computing system folded under the library. This is James Hilton. He has a depth in his understanding of what he's doing that nobody else in the country has. He was just a walk-in star, the day he got here. He followed someone who was superb. He brought a different skillset, a different set of interests, a different background.

We worried about the transition between the two, but it was totally seamless. Both of them contributed to making it work well. So there was a lot of whittling of that kind, to try to get the right people for a given time. There was a time when we really had to have the skillset that the colleague who is now at Cornell brought. Then we were ready for a different skillset. That happened to us with regard to central finance. By the time we had a chance to hire Yoke San Reynolds, we also knew that we couldn't function without someone who was essentially Yoke San Reynolds. So we had to work that out.

In student affairs, we wrestled with how best to do that. We probably had a couple of false starts. But, eventually, it came around. Ernie Ern was so good when he was the vice president in charge of that and so seamless in his fit with the University of Virginia that it was really difficult to move into the next era. On the other hand, when we ultimately figured out how to do it and the current vice president took the job, a kind of peace descended on a turbulent scene and that unit began to work on other issues, better issues.

It was always a challenge in hiring hospital administrators and medical deans. It was just a complicated business. I'm missing something that you probably would be able to use here. There are other examples of the principle that you really are looking for a person who's able to deal with today's and then tomorrow's critical issues, rather than looking for the ultimate person. People's careers evolve all the time. People come and go. You don't necessarily try to lock up everyone you hire forever.

I had a very fine executive assistant at one time. Initially, he wanted to finish his PhD. He hadn't finished it then. I think he may have had in mind being a college president. What he actually did was get really interested in the evolving computer structure, and went over and worked in that unit as the number two person for several years. Then he went off and became the vice president of another institution, running computer systems. It would've been bad to lock him down in any of his positions. He was moving from one role to another as the jobs he was interested in evolved.

SS: You certainly must have inspired some loyalty for people to stay as long.

JC: Great people, good relations, close, very personal relations. You can't succeed at the kind of work that we did or I did when I was president without that. You have to work constantly. The president's staff is an odd part of the university, because there's no obvious place on a career ladder for people to go from the president's staff. Yet, the skills that they have really do support careers that are progressive after whatever time they spend in the president's office. This may be true of anybody who heads a unit, but as the president ages, the staff tends to age. I tried to make sure that we were offering opportunities to new people regularly, so there were younger people rolling in. But in twenty years, you take some of the finish off younger people.

SS: Also, your position changed, evolved. When you started out, you were teaching and the whole idea of the role of the university president changed.

JC: Yes, it changed overnight, once the financial support crisis in 1990-91 hit the public universities. You had to make a decision. I made a decision that I was going to deal with the problems that were really there, and not simply play out the notion we'd had when I took the job. That was hard. But you had to make the decision.

SS: Did you miss teaching?

JC: Not exactly. What you miss, really, is the collegial life of a faculty, your existence in your academic department. You lose track of your colleagues, because the scholarly interests, the teaching interests of faculty members evolve constantly. If you're not there, you miss the cues as people are going into new iterations of themselves and their work. That definitely happened to me. It was part of the price, I guess, in 1975, deciding that I would do the admissions work for a while. That was a decision that involved knowing that I was giving up something that I had found very, very pleasant and not knowing exactly where I was going with it.

SS: Just trusting that it was the right path?

JC: No, it just seemed to be important. I think I mentioned the other day that I wasn't absolutely sure of the next step in my work as a faculty member or pure faculty member.

The fact that this place has changed so much over the years has made the work both challenging and rewarding in each period. The most visible internal sign of its academic

growth has been the progressive growth of the Graduate School in quality and probably in scale. It's easy to miss that if you're not really sensitive to what your colleagues are doing and what students are doing and so on.

The growing commitment to graduate education is clearly essential in the national interest. While at the same time, the PhD job market is not as well delineated as it was when I was a graduate student. You can't tell somebody that the PhD is the meal ticket if you want to be a history instructor or whatever. That's not how it works now. It hasn't worked that way for a generation.

I think we've touched on the main things that I think about. I'm sure we've missed stuff that someday, somebody's going to wish we had covered.

SS: Are there some things that you're more proud of than others or do you think you've already delineated that for me?

JC: I think we've talked about them, yes.

SS: I just wanted briefly to ask you about U.Va.'s future. Two things that I've read that you've said—if these are true and you're quoted correctly—that you think tuition will have to increase as well as enrollment.

JC: I wrote an article that was published by the alumni magazine so that the new president would have that in the public record as something I had said, yes. The tuition problem is pretty straightforward. The loss of the state revenue drives two problems. One is the loss of the revenue. The other is the constraint on in-state charges. The spread between the in-state charge and the out-of-state charge is so dramatic because any university generates more revenue from one group of students than from another, relative to cost. This is the way the economics work.

We realized back in the mid-nineties that we had a lot of elasticity with regard to the tuition charges made to out-of-state students, because we were so cheap, by comparison, to the competition. So while we didn't try to take every dollar, between current charges and what the competition was charging, we definitely drifted up into that zone in order to get the dollars we needed to run the University.

By the late-nineties, the state appropriation was covering 30 or 40 percent of the cost of educating a student. The tuition for in-state students was producing about the same amount. The out-of-state students were paying double what it cost to educate them. So they were producing the dollars to subsidize in-state students. That basic structure of finance is actually built into state law now. The legislature spells it out as an expectation about out-of-state students and the public colleges. Clearly, out-of-state students are benefitting by prior investments made by the state and people of Virginia. So you can rationalize the spread partly on that basis.

The field of comparison for in-state students is different in good economic times from what it is in bad economic times. In good times, generally speaking, our sharpest competition is with William & Mary, UNC, and other publics in the region. In bad times, the competition is really Ivy League. Students will choose U.Va. or Princeton, based on family's capacity to pay the price of Princeton. You need to maintain the price advantage for in-state students, simply as a matter of accommodation of a public goal, availability of education.

But if the spread is, as it is right now, \$20,000-25,000, you can argue, as some of the colleges have—William & Mary has in recent times—that some part of the gap between the in-state cost and the cost of the places that the students are shopping as an alternative, ought to be fed into the academic enterprise that makes the in-state place acceptable as an alternative to, say, an Ivy League school.

On the out-of-state side, I think the current all-in cost for an out-of-state student is about \$45,000. It's probably \$55,000-60,000 in the Ivies. The absolute dollar distance between the two figures is essentially what it was when my children were in college. But all the way around, the prices are too high. And with legislators and their staffers trying to contrive tuition structures that make the deficiencies in the appropriations less visible to voters, which means charge the out-of-state students more because their parents aren't voting in Virginia—with that going on—it's a precarious system.

The matter of enrollment growth, it assumes something. You don't grow just to grow. You grow in consideration of genuine demand for spaces. It's mainly an in-state demand. Whether the demand is tenable after this recession or recessionary period ends is something that the president, and so on, has to calculate constantly. But if one can grow in a planned way and grow differentially, so that let's say one school or one department grows more because there's a kind of work to be done at which growth or scale is of value, and other programs, where the cost of growing might be excessive because of a need of buildings you wouldn't need otherwise or whatever. In that situation, planned growth can be hugely beneficial.

Princeton and Yale used coeducation to build enrollments, and programs like the drama school at Yale, programs that existed before but were not the strongest programs. They controlled enrollment in other areas. The controls can, themselves, be good as academic discipline. If, for example, there is a grade point average requirement to become a math major and if the requirement is driven off some consideration of the scale of the department and what the department is able to do for its students. And if on the other hand, let's say you want to build in civil engineering, you might be able to balance up the enrollment in such a way as to increase overall, without simply bloating overall. Get better by getting bigger. That's what the argument I've made is about. Plan the growth systematically and hard-headedly and use it to make the University better, rather than just bigger.

SS: Is there any other outstanding major issue that you see coming up?

JC: There are always issues having to do with how the faculty maintains academic discipline. With the demise of the old comprehensive examinations for baccalaureate degrees and so on, you have discussion that goes on without a whole lot of information to bless it about whether or not students are really learning what they should. Organizations like ACTA and so on are out there. Universities have to deal with that from time to time.

The organizations don't necessarily know quite what they're talking about. There's an assumption, for example, that every student should have a liberal arts education. That raises the question: Where are the engineers going to come from? I think one can argue that a form of what we've called liberal arts education in this country ought to be the common property of anybody who goes through a university. That's not the same as saying that education that was practiced at Williams College in 1900 is the only model. It's a much broader field than that. Faculties and universities, including this one, have got to deal with those issues constantly, over and over and over.

The University has to deal with the need for additional science facilities, like the ones that we just finished. That is a challenge with regard to planning, with regard to financing, with regard to faculty discipline, to make sure that the faculties use those facilities fully. It is important to say that the research buildings, and there are several dozen of them that we've done in the last twenty or so years, are very heavily used buildings. You don't build research buildings with the intention that they will sit idly and look pretty forever. You want them to work really hard. They're like factory buildings. You want them to be architecturally acceptable in the places where they are built. You

also want them to be tough buildings and to work very hard until you knock them down and build another one, basically. That's a challenge and constant financial pressure.

There are always going to be issues in a place like this involving student life. Those issues or challenges exist everywhere. Large concentration of undergraduates with a student social tradition that can be sometimes challenging for everybody, with the fact that the population constantly evolves, those things don't go away.

I guess the technological innovation poses certain challenges, but it's been such an enabler so far that I don't worry about that. There are infrastructural issues. This library, the Alderman Building, was built without a sprinkler system. Once you know that, it's obvious that something's got to happen. It's a huge and tremendous expense. It's also an absolutely essential expenditure.

SS: It's such a beautiful building.

JC: Yes, it is.

SS: Well, what about for you? I know that you serve on boards and you're going to teach. Are you going to be able to enjoy some pastimes that were possibly sacrificed for the last twenty years?

JC: Yes, but to give you more information than you want, I had to put off orthopedic surgery that would've been fairly routine, because I didn't have a strategy to take the time out to recover. My wife and I are going through what's probably an age-related shuffling of the things that we do. I always imagined this part of my life as being one where I'd spend a lot of my time on my boat. I don't. In fact, the boat's for sale.

SS: You're a sailor?

JC: Yes, but the boat no longer really fits in the way we live. We do other things.

SS: Travel?

JC: We travel some. Betsy has her own commitments that are a pretty big deal. She's active in civic organizations that right now are taking probably eight to ten hours a day of her time. She enjoys it tremendously and she does a good job, so I encourage her to do it.

We have a place in Maine and we spend some time up there. We had both imagined spending more time there than we do. Whether that will remain permanently, I don't know. We have to think that through in the context of real estate market values.

Assuming that teaching turns out to go well, I expect to do that for four or five years.

I've got new topics I'm working on that I believe are going to be of interest to students, and beneficial to the departments I work with and so on.

I don't want to be president of anything else. I will have to phase down some of what I do now on leave that is board work. There's a period of time here when I could take on different projects that I was really interested in, do whatever I can do to ameliorate different conditions, and I'll move on. That's the way I've thought about that. It is conceivable that I may do another tour in business, but it's not a slam-dunk proposition that I will do it. It's just a possibility. I like reading and writing. They're pleasant.

SS: What you were talking about the other day—your excitement about the class you'll be teaching.

JC: Yes, those things are good to be doing. I haven't tried to plot out everything. The adverse economy is a challenge for everybody, so I have to think that through from day to day. How can we afford to do, as a family, whatever we want to do? Probably every family does that now.

SS: Well, I liked what you said in your last Finals speech. John Keats's image of the—

JC: Negative capability?

SS: No, the mansion. It seems to me that what you've done in the mansion has been pretty remarkable. Not many people do get to accomplish that much. And now with your retirement in front of you, you have a lot more rooms to explore possibly.

JC: You know, what Keats was actually working on there, the raw material of that discussion is different from what he actually wrote. He was working on trying to adapt the Renaissance concept of a house of memory or a palace of memory. Have you ever used that structure to learn something? It is amazing what you can memorize if you imagine a house and store each piece of it in a different room.

SS: That's interesting. No, I've never run across that concept before.

JC: That last Salman Rushdie novel is about a woman who is a palace of memory. I stumbled on the mechanism when I was doing my doctoral examinations. I could not believe what you can store in your head, if you have a physical metaphor like that to store it in. It's as though you could turn your head into a huge filing apparatus.

SS: You've proved that with me these last few days, that you do have a palace of memory.

JC: Well, that's actually what it's called. That's what Keats started off working on. Rushdie has the woman who is a palace of memory manipulated by a man who gets her to tell him everything that she knows. When she has told it all, she's destroyed. That's the end of her.

SS: Well, I hate to end on that note.

JC: Well, if you're interested in Rushdie, it's worth tracking down that novel.

SS: I will.

JC: Let me see if I can find you the title.

SS: Let me just say thank you very much, John. I've enjoyed these conversations with you.

JC: It's been fascinating to do it. I hope it is useful.

[End of Interview]

INDEX

A

Adams v. Richardson, 57, 67

Advance Placement courses, 58, 61

Africa

American intentions and products in, 185–186

African Americans

community support of, 62

evolution of political leadership of, 16

as students, 25, 59, 64–65, 136

Alameda, 39

Alderman, Edwin, 106

endless service of, 101

Alderman Library, 2, 105, 217

American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA), 216

American democracy, 69

American graduate schools, influence of German models on, 106

The American High School Today (Conant), 69

Americanism, 5, 9

Architecture, effect of, on the community, 131–132

Asian-American students, 34, 64–65

Association of American Universities, 205

Associations, forming of, 180

Auden, W. H., 27

B

Baker, Carlos, 51

Baker, Violet, 145

Ballahack, 2

Baltz, Leslie, 137–138, 139–140, 203

Batten School, 195

Beaurline, Lester, 29

Bernini, 31

Bice, Ray, 103

Bill of Rights, 5

Booker, James Judson, Jr., 6–8, 10

Boston University, 28

Bowen, Jon, 111, 207

Bowers, Fred, 26, 27, 29, 42

Bowyer, Peter, 145

Bridgeport, 76

Brown, Charlie, 175–176

Brown, Lee, 175

Brown-Forman, 175

Brown University, 76, 118
Burris, Gordon, 54–55, 170

C

CAD/CAM support, 90
California, University of, 116
 at Berkeley, 1, 99, 180, 182, 194
 Casteen at, 35–38, 41–42, 51, 52, 63
 public funding and, 114
 street culture and, 38
 freedom of speech at, 113
 at Los Angeles (UCLA), 164
 as public university, 182–183
Caltech, 123
Cambridge University, 117, 184
Camp Lee, 34
Carr's Hill, 103, 144–145, 165
Carson, Tim, 197–198
Casteen, Betsy, 145, 146, 165, 218
Casteen, John T., III
 in admissions, 52–56, 57–63, 66–67, 94, 136
 as assistant dean, 94, 134
 at Berkeley, 35–38, 41–42, 51, 52, 63, 141
 brothers of, 3, 13–14
 building program under, 104–105
 career choices of, 33–34
 children of, 52, 73, 205
 on control systems, 161
 creation of dialogue with university, 113–114
 decision to retire, 148
 dissertation of, 28–31, 51–52
 dormitory life and, 21–22
 early jobs of, 14–15, 18–19
 education of, 1, 4–7, 9–11, 14
 enjoyment of work, 73
 extracurricular activities of, 14
 as faculty member, 1, 23, 24–25, 55–56, 71
 family background of, 2–5
 father of, 3, 4, 11, 12–13
 as graduate student, 34–35, 53, 94, 102
 in honors program, 26–27
 inaugural speech of, 106, 108, 120, 128, 179
 inauguration of, as president, 87–88
 interest in attending Virginia, University of, 17–18
 interest in going into business, 83–84
 interview for private college presidency, 73

- issues dealt with, as president, 107–108
- language skills of, 31, 45–47, 49, 51–52
- love of literature, 10–11, 20, 27–28
- MA degree of, 23, 31–32, 33
- marriage of, 35, 70–71, 73, 74, 84, 111, 205, 218–219
- mother of, 3–4, 10, 11–12, 13
- Oakland and, 38–39
- part-time jobs of, 23, 25–26
- perspective of, on other presidents, 105–106
- place in Maine, 84, 218
- political interests of, 70–71
- as president at Connecticut, University of, 23, 73–82
- as president at Virginia, University of, 1, 82–221
- restructuring of administration, 166–167
- on risk management systems, 161
- scheduling of on-Grounds events and, 144–145
- self-governance in speeches of, 138–139
- staff of, 207–210
- State of the University speech of, 108–109, 110–112
- strategic planning and, 171–172, 174
- as undergraduate at Virginia, University of, 20–21, 26–27
- vision and impact of, 106
- vocal resistance and, 62–63
- work in Special Collections Library by, 35, 50–51
- work in Virginia state government, 67–69, 71–72
- work of, on project in Venice, 49
- writing by, 39–41, 51
- Cavalier Daily*, 63, 142
- Charlottesville, 68
 - city planning for, 157
 - Downtown Mall in, 153, 156–157, 158
 - front-forward structures in, 157–158
 - infrastructure in, 158
 - as introverted community, 186
 - Main Street master plan for, 157
 - parking garages in, 157
 - street trolleys in, 158–159
 - student neighborhoods in, 155–156
 - University as big presence in, 154
- Chaucer, 41
- China
 - universities in, 183–184, 184–185
- CIA Commission, 101
- Clark Hall, 133
- Clemons Library, 105

Clemson University, 90
Clery Act, 139
Clinch Valley College, 192
Coeburn, 188
Coeducation, 25, 37, 54, 63–64, 135, 215
College Board, 58
Collegial planning, 125–126
Columbia University, 117–118
Common school, 69
Community colleges, 188
Conant, James Bryant, 69
Connecticut, University of, 118, 160
 agricultural experiment station at, 80
 branch campuses of, 79
 Casteen as president of, 23, 73–82
 in Farmingham, 78
 health center at, 78
 land-grant funding and, 80
 in Stamford, 79
 in Torrington, 79–80
Cornell University, 92, 126, 148, 208, 209
Cradock School, 7, 15
Creative originality, 29
Crevecoeur, St. Jean de, 180
Cross, Nargie, 145
Cross-disciplinary scientific research, development of, 122–123
Crozet, 19

D

Dance Weekends, 151–152
Darden, Colgate, 188
Darden, John, 83, 84–85, 105–106
 fraternities and, 107
Darden School, 105, 124–125, 133, 149, 159, 160, 163, 187–188
Day, Douglas, 26, 27, 28
Days of Dialogue, 202, 204
De jure system of segregation, 57
Delaware, University of, at Dover AFB, 23, 25–26
Dempsey, John, 78
Dempsey, John, Hospital, 88–89
Dempsey, John, Hospital, Finance Corporation, 89
Desegregation in Virginia, 54
Dewey, John, 69
Digital age, effects of, on scholarship, 128
Dominion University, 175
Donaldson, Ian, 29

Dover AFB, 23
Dubliners, 190
Duke University, 164
 management structure for endowment at, 115
 visiting committee of, 115

E

Easters, 151
Edinburgh University, 117, 184, 206
Education, U.S. Department of, segregation and, 57
Educational reform, 70
Education Commission of the States, 72
Eliot, George, 10
Eliot, T. S., 27, 28
Elson, Ed, 85, 175
Emmet Street, 154
Emory University, 118
Engineering, 122-124
Episcopal Church, 92
EQuality, 58
Equal opportunity admissions, 65-66, 143
Ern, Ernie, 53, 135, 209
Evanston Township High School, 69
Ex post facto reasoning, 130-131

F

Faculty innovation, 123-124
Farmingham, Connecticut
 Dempsey, John, Hospital in, 88-89
 health center in, 78
Farrell, Tom, 175
Flat taxes, 197-198
Faulkner, William, 20, 41, 50
Fisher v. Texas, 65-66
Ford Foundation, 33
Fort Eustis, 3
Fraternities, 107, 141
Freudenberg, Anne, 50-51
Fry, Don, 51-52

G

George Mason University, 188, 193, 199
German models, influence on American graduate schools, 106
Gies, David, 174

Gilliam, Sandy, 55, 95
Godwin, Mills, 68, 71–72
Gopalan, Rakesh, 142
Graham, John, 101
Grasso, Ella, 76
Greenwich, Connecticut, 76
Gulf Cooperation Council, 187

H

Harris, Wes, 22–23
 as dean of Engineering at Connecticut, 23
Harrison, David, 126
Harrison, Peggy, 145
Harrison Building, 131
Harrison Institute, 126
Harvard University, 42, 77, 118, 182
 Business School at, 160
 core curriculum at, 43
Hazlitt, William, 10
Heaney, Seamus, 37
Hemingway, E., 41
Hereford, Eleanor, 103
Hereford, Frank
 buildings and construction program of, 104–105
 creation of financial model by, 104
 family of, 103
 as Graduate School dean and provost, 53
 interest in composition of student body, 54
 length of service of, 101, 102
 as Manhattan Project physicist, 104
 as president of Virginia, University of, 53–56, 98, 103–104
Higgins, Pam, 145
Hilton, James, 208–209
Hlafdige, 48
Holton, Linwood, 55
Hong Kong, 23
Howard, Murray, 145
Howell, Nat, 187

I

India, American universities and, 187–188
Indiana University, 91
Ingram, Nancy, 145
Institute for Living, 80
Intangibles, investing in, 184–185

Intellectual property, 88, 118
Interstate compacts, 72
Ivy Road, 154

J

Jackson, Tom, 179
Jarino, Peggy, 145
Jefferson, Thomas, 119–121, 128, 135, 169, 179, 180
 adoption of the neoclassical, 131
 architectural vision of, 130
 definition of personhood, 121
Jefferson, Thomas, Center, 98
Jett, Barbara, 144–145
Johns Hopkins, 117
Jones, John Paul, Arena, 151, 152–153
Jonson, Ben, 29
Joyce, James, 190

K

Keats, John, 219, 220
Kellogg, Robert, 26–27, 28, 30–31
Kelly, Hugh, 97, 179
Kent State University, Shannon, Edgar's speech at protest at, 100
Kerr, Clark, 113
King James Bible, 40
Kirsch, Arthur, 53
Klosko, Meg, 145
Kuwait, 187

L

LaGuardia, 74
Land-grant institutions, 80
Langbaum, Robert, 26, 27, 28, 29
Larry the Cable Guy, 153
LeFevre House, 21–22
Lemons, Marsha, 145
Letters from an American Farmer (Crevecoeur), 180
Love, Yeardley, 21, 109, 112–113, 137, 139, 200, 201–202
Low, Peter, 96, 124, 167, 178–179

M

MA-3, 33
Madison, James, 19

Mao Zedong, 198
Martinsville, 62
 community college in, 193
Maryland, University of, 54
Maryland State College, 23–24
Massachusetts, University of, 118
Massive Resistance, 3, 103
Matlock, 3
McGann, Jerry, 127
McIntire School, 105, 159, 160, 163
Medical center, educational mission of, 161–162
Medicine, alliance between engineering and, 122–123
Mercedes facility in Alabama, 90
Metaphors, 47
Michigan, University of, 99, 116, 194
 admissions cases and, 66
MicroAire, 91
Middle East, 185
 U.S. interests in, 159, 187
The Mill on the Floss (Eliot), 10
Milton, John, 42
MIT, 22
Mulberry Island, 3

N

NASA research center in Alabama, 22–23
National Academy of Sciences, 72
National Governors Association, 72
National Institutes of Health, 162
National Science Foundation, 162
National University of Singapore
NCAA violations, 178
Newcomb Hall, 50
 garage for, 154
New Haven, Connecticut, agricultural experiment station at, 80
Newman, John Henry, 180
Newport News, 3
No Child Left Behind initiatives, 42, 60–61, 62
Norfolk and Western Railroad, 2
Norfolk County, 2
Norfolk interim schools, 8–9
North Carolina, University of, 214
Northern Virginia, 199
Northwest Landing, 2
Norton Anthologies, 28
Nottingham, 206

NOVA, 68

O

Oakland, 38–39

Occam's razor, 181

Ohio State University, 163

Old Dominion University, 188

Old English, 31, 45–48, 51–52

O'Neill, Bill, 75–78, 83

Oxford University, 102, 117, 180, 184, 206

P

Participatory democracy, 69

Passos, John Dos, 51

Peking, university in, 183

Penn State University, 116, 117, 201

People's Park, 38

Perry, Marvin, 17–18, 66, 98–99

Personhood, Jefferson's definition of, 121

Petersburg, 89

Phi Beta Kappa, 98

Philanthropy, 56

A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 190

Portsmouth, 2, 7, 16–17, 62

Poynter Institute (St. Petersburg), 52

Prep schools, 58

Princess Anne, 23

Princeton University, 117, 214

 coeducation at, 215

Prior, David, 189–191

Proactive recruiting, 66

Productivity, measure of, 122

Public education, strength of, 60

Public health mechanisms, 118–119

Public interest, 199

Public universities, 182–183

 financial support crisis of 1990-91 and, 211

Purdue University, 91

PVCC, 68

Q

Qatar, agreement to establish U. Va. campus in, 148, 159, 187

R

Racism, 57
Rainey, Gordon, 175
Ramazani, Ruhi, 187
Rawn Associates, 157
Rayburn, Jean, 55, 66, 94
Reagan, Ronald, as California governor, 113
Regional colleges, 188
Renaissance concept of a house of memory, 220
Renolir, Alain, 38
Research
 development of cross-disciplinary scientific, 122–123
 distinction between primary and applied, 128
 industries driven by, 91
 university, 183
Reynolds, Leonard Yoke, as finance vice president, 116
Reynolds, Yoke San, 209
Rhode Island, University of, 118
Ricks, Lloyd, 66
Robb, Charles S., 1, 67
Rochester, University of, 178, 179
Rolls-Royce, 91, 92
Romeo and Juliet, 31–32
Rosovsky, Henry, 42, 43
Rushdie, Salman, 220–221
Ryan, Debbie, 164

S

Sandridge, Leonard, 94–95, 124, 143, 146, 181, 208
 as administrator of the medical center, 161–162
 as chief financial officer, 96–97, 166
 self-sufficiency and, 115
Santa Cruz, 28
Sauer, John, 145
Scholarship, effects of the digital age on, 128
School recruitment, 59–60
Science and Technology Library, 133
Self-governance, 138–139
Self-sufficiency, testing of idea of, 195
Shakespeare, William, 10, 36–37, 41
Shannon, Edgar, 67, 98–99
 Cambodia speech of, 113
 inaugural speech of, 106
 length of service of, 101, 102
 as selfless man, 102–103

speech of, at Kent State protest, 100
Shattuck, Roger, 28
The Shoes of the Fisherman, 6
Small, Albert, 126
Smith, Carl, 150
Smith, Hunter, 150
Smith, Michael, 174
Sororities, 141
South Africa, universities in, 185
South Carolina, University of, 90, 91
Southern Regional Education Board, 61, 72
South Lawn project, 168
Special Collections Library, 50–51, 126, 127–128, 149
Spender, Stephen, 51
Sports culture, 203
Sproul, 180
Stamford, Connecticut, 79
Stanford University, 164
Stark, Pete, 200
State Corporation Commission, 117
Storrs, Connecticut, 75
Strategic planning, 171–172, 174
Student neighborhoods, 155–156
Student press, 143–144
Student self-governance, 135, 138–139, 142
Sullivan, Teresa, 206
 Days of Dialogue of, 202, 204
 inauguration of, 106
 as president of Virginia, University of, 54
Sweeney, Bob, 55, 98, 163

T

Taylor, James, 152
The Tempest, 27
Tennessee, University of, 118
Texas, University of, 148
 at Austin, 99
Texas admissions cases, 65–66
Torrington, Connecticut, 79–80
Town-gown issues, 155

U

Ulysses, 190
United Kingdom, universities in, 184
Universities

- function of, 129
- mission of, 130
- research done by, 183
- University Avenue, 154
- University education, purpose of, 120–121
- Urban renewal, 16

V

Vanderbilt University, 118

Vermont, University of, 22

Virginia

- civil rights movement in, 4, 8–9
- community colleges in, 68–69
- de jure* system of segregation in, 57
- deregulation in, 169–170
- desegregation in, 54
- disclosure law issues in, 171–172
- education cuts in, 86–87
- General Assembly in, 198
- governors of
 - Darden, Colgate, as, 188
 - Godwin, Mills, as, 68, 71–72
 - Holton, Linwood, 55
 - length of term for, 85
 - Robb, Charles S., as, 1
 - Warner, Mark, as, 196
 - Wilder, Douglas, as, 86–87
- K-12 education in, 86–87
- Massive Resistance in, 3, 103
- organization of state employees in labor unions and, 170
- potential of, 92–93
- pressure on state agencies to reduce employment levels in, 169
- public process in, 200
- racism in laws of, 4
- recession in, 86, 95
- reorganization of cities and counties in, 2
- right-to-work law in, 170–171
- school desegregation in, 4–5, 8–9
- sunshine law in, 171
- universities in, 117–118
- vocational education in, 67

Virginia, University of

- academic discipline and, 216
- Advanced Placement courses and, 58
- Alderman Library at, 2, 105, 217
- annex to chemistry building at, 122

arts precinct and, 165–166
athletic programs at, 163–165, 196–197, 203
athletics directors at, 176
Batten School at, 195
behavior of alumni at, 126
as big presence in Charlottesville, 154
Board members at, 85–88, 114–115, 117, 121, 148–149, 163–164, 174–176
business schools at, 159
capital funds campaigns at, 54–55, 114, 116, 145–148, 194–195
Casteen as undergraduate at, 20–21
Casteen's interest in attending, 17–18
Clark Hall at, 133
Clemons Library at, 105
club sports programs at, 164–165
coeducation at, 25, 37, 54, 63–64, 135, 215
collaboration with Virginia Tech, 89, 119
collegial planning and, 125–126
computing structures at, 208
concert hall at, 149–151, 159, 165–166
cross-disciplinary research at, 122–123
curriculum at, 57–59
"dance weekends" at, 151–152
Darden School at, 105, 124–125, 133, 149, 159, 160, 163, 187–188
deans at, 176–178
department chairs at, 174, 178
Department of Music at, 150
devaluation of name of, 192
endowment and, 114–115
engagement of, with its past, 121–122
enrollment growth and, 215
ethnic students at, 64–65
faculty culture at, 61
faculty innovation at, 123–124
Faculty Senate at, 173–174
financial realities at in 1990–1991, 166–167
fraternities at, 107, 141
future of, 212–213, 217–218
goal of self-sufficiency for, 116
Governor on downgrading, 181
Graduate School at, 53, 103, 212
growing academic prominence of the facilities, 173
Harrison Building at, 131
Harrison Institute at, 126
hiring of hospital administrators and medical deans, 209–210
honor system at, 21, 33, 43–44, 134–135, 136, 138,

housing owned by, 155
improving, 181–182
interest in achieving global prominence, 172
interest in enrollment at, 186
investing in science facilities at, 120–124
Jones, John Paul, Arena at, 151, 152–153
LeFevre House at, 21–22
loss of state revenue and, 213
MA-3 program at, 33
McIntire School at, 105, 159, 160, 163
medical center at, 161–163, 167–168
Memorial Gymnasium at, 152
Middle Eastern Studies faculty at, 187
need for additional science facilities, 216–217
need for core endowment, 162–163
need to become self-sufficient, 115
Newcomb Hall at, 50, 154
on-Ground events at, 144–145
out-of-state students at, 213–214
partisan activities and, 199–200
potential of, 92–93
presidents of
 Casteen, John T., III as, 1, 82–221
 Darden, John, as, 83, 84–85, 105–106
 Hereford, Frank, as, 53–54, 55–56, 98, 101, 102, 103–104
 O'Neil, Bob, as, 83
 Sullivan, Teresa, as, 54, 106, 202, 204, 206
production of planning document by, 174
provost at, 177, 178–179
public policy at, 92
quality assurance function at, 179
Rectors at, 83, 84, 110, 146, 149, 198
restructuring of, 168–169, 195–196
role for research in the curriculum at, 54
Rotunda at, 132–133
School of Architecture at, 132
School of Law at, 125
Science and Technology Library at, 133
South Lawn project at, 168
Special Collections Library at, 50–51, 126, 127–128, 149
sports culture at, 203
stadium at, 149
student affairs at, 209
student life at, 217
student press at, 143–144
student theater at, 165

- student tuition at, 213–214
- uniqueness of, 120–125
- women's athletic programs at, 164
- Virginia, University of, Investment Management Company, 194
 - creation of, 116
- Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU), 188
 - Casteen as faculty member at, 71
- Virginia Plan for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, 57, 61, 67
- Virginia Tech, 61, 171
 - collaboration with, 89, 119
 - home demonstration program of, 4
 - vision of future for, 119
- Vocational education, 67

W

- Wallops Station, 23
- Warner, Mark, 196
- Washington, George, University, 130
- Washington and Lee, 99
- Web, disclosure of information through the, 173
- Welsh, George, 195
- Wharton School, 159, 160
- Wheeler, 180
- Wilder, Douglas, 86–87
- William and Mary, College of, 61, 92, 171, 214
- Wise, 188
 - College at, 188–189
 - gymnasium at, 192
- Wittenborg, Karin, 133–134
- Wulfstan, 47–48

Y

- Yale University, 76, 118, 130, 182
 - coeducation at, 215
 - forestry school at, 80
 - land-grant funding and, 80
- Younger, Edward, 33