

Miss Farmer: As a member of the celebrated Law Class of 1927, an able and popular professor since 1931, holding the distinguished James Monroe chair since 1938, the Dean of the Law School from 1963 to 1968, you have had a continuing role in the School's history. Your retirement in 1968 was followed by your appointment in 1970 as the United States Judge to the International Courts of Justice at The Hague, where you served until 1979. It is a source of considerable rejoicing at the Law School that you are back in our midst, where we continue to enjoy your presence as a counselor to all and sundry, and hear you speak with humor and eloquence. We are certain that you will both acknowledge and deny in your own inimitable manner, the popular accolade that you are "the Law School's own Mr. Jefferson of the 20th century." And now as you so often say, may we proceed to have you "elevate the dialog."

Judge Dillard: That was a characteristically gracious introduction, Frances. Obviously I must interpose a more than honest disclaimer linking me with Jefferson, I find it extremely agreeable , but somewhat over emphasized. I feel a little bit like quoting Max , he is supposed to have said "I was an unassuming lad, it was Oxford made me insufferable." Now, if I took seriously what you are saying, I would become insufferable.

Miss Farmer: I doubt that anyone would ever comment to that point about you.

Judge Dillard: I must say that I don't think that I'm a very good subject for this series, for two reasons. One, I have a very poor memory for dates and statistics and things of this sort, but more importantly, I so cherish my long association with the Law School that I'm not sure that I can be objective. In other words, I'm not too much dismayed by this, but you know they say that complete objectivity is an attribute given only to corpses and angels. Now no one has accused me of being an angel, and as to the first, I'd like to delay that indefinitely.

A judge on the high court in England once said that complete objectivity is revealed only when he understands neither side of the case. Of course, he was not serious--he was trying to say that he must be objective as to the parties, but not as to the law. As Walter Hamilton once said, "We are subject to our own universe to affect prejudice and conviction." So, obviously you can be objective as to persons, but your concepts, your philosophy, is bound to come out whether you are a professor or a judge.

Miss Farmer: Irrespective of all of those disclaimers on your part, I would like to say very sincerely that we are very grateful for your being willing to do this for us, and secondly, I am sure that whatever you say will be things that will be

highly regarded because there is no one who is connected with the institution that is so widely regarded or highly regarded as you, and whether it's objective or not, we would like to hear what you have to say.

I'm going to refer later to two articles that you have had published recently, but in the most recent of these two which appeared in the Virginia Bar Association Journal and to which I hope we can refer later. It was an article entitled "The Battle Image of the Lawyer, a Modest Proposal" it appears in Vol. 6, No.1, 1980 of the Virginia Bar Association Journal. Among the more serious things that you said on this occasion, you spoke about the fact that it was in the interest of history and organizations generally to keep a running record of the activities as they happen. It's rather interesting that you referred to taping on that occasion, when just now we are asking you to tape this interview that will be a part of the record of the second century of the Law School. I trust that in your opinion these series of interviews are worthwhile, and the fact that you are participating indicates your interest in them, and conviction that they may have a part to play. Would you be willing to comment on that?

Judge Dillard: Yes, I'm glad you picked that up. That was a speech I gave that was just from notes, actually I gave that speech ten years ago, at the ALI/ABA Conference in Chicago and it was related to continuing legal education. I repeated part of it at the recent Bar Association. My idea there was somewhat different from what

you have here. What you have here is history, in that I was more concerned with functional matters. I had in mind any number of people, not only in Virginia but elsewhere, it seems to be a pity that they should die without ever having put down some of the insights that come to them during the course of their practice. Now I wasn't concerned so much with anecdotal , but just talk about the cases they won and not mention the others, of course. But I thought there was something being lost here, and we now have the facilities for recording these things that we didn't have in the old days. Now of course this oral history business is not new, John W. Davis himself has an oral history, and I was impressed by certain things in it, but the point was functional rather than historical. Now I congratulate you on this for your foresight and characteristic energy in pulling this thing together for the records. I think it's a tough job you're doing, and I know you will do it with imagination, so I just congratulate you on this. Inevitably there is a little embarrassment when you are taped, and especially if you try to link your own experiences with the historical narrative. No one wants to project himself I-I-I, yet in order to make it a little vivid you may have to do that. This makes it a little difficult for the subject. But I think this a very farsighted thing you are doing.

Miss Farmer: Well, the cooperation of everyone I have spoken with has meant that we could go forward with it, and I hope that in time we

can put together enough of these interviews to feel that we are reporting something that is worthwhile. Let me proceed now with one of the questions that I would like to present to you.

Judge Dillard: You go ahead--shoot! I haven't done any homework but I'll play it by ear.

Miss Farmer: You're always good, but you're extremely good when you're playing by ear. It would seem appropriate at this point to ask you what, in your opinion, are the components that distinguish a great law school from one that is perhaps good, but not really great?

Judge Dillard: I'll be glad to respond to that, but it will have to be in the form of a generalization. I would say that the chief components are first, the quality of the faculty; second, the quality of your students; third, the quality and character of your library. Now those are three basic things. Now every law school has all three, but what distinguishes a great from a good is a little more difficult to analyze. There are other ingredients, the relationship the law school has to the Bar, the relationship the law school has to its alumni, which is very important particularly with respect to its resources, fund-raising. Now when I say quality of the faculty, what I'm trying to get at is a kind of tone that the faculty gives. The thing that distinguishes a great teacher

from a good teacher is that a great teacher manifests the fact that he is always searching, not passive. A lecture ought to be an experience for students, not simply dispensing a little knowledge. As I reflect from my own experience, the great teachers I knew, they had this quality that made you feel they were searching for things. A test of a great teacher is whether you leave that lecture wanting to know more about that subject. I had a great professor in Paris, International Finances, now that's not a very exciting subject, but I never left his lecture without wanting to know more about international finances. By quality faculty I mean faculty that does more than simply spout knowledge, it's a faculty that generates a sense of constant searching and that it's exciting and interesting. I think that factor that makes for a great teacher is his capacity to emphasize or stress so that he doesn't sound like a monologue. Remember that now abidith faith, hope and charity, these three. But the greatest of these is charity. Charity meant love is those days. Well, as for the students, when you say the quality of the student body, I'm not talking just about LSAT scores, academic records, although they are important; I'm talking about a sense of verb there too. I think students ought to be serious but not solemn. They should be animated by a sense of vitality. We are very fortunate here in the quality of our students, have been right along. Much more so lately than in the early days when I was a student. This is

exhibited in many ways, in their activities, in their zeal, and the sense of something vigorous going on. So those are the two main things that characterize a great law school as opposed to one that may be good.

Miss Farmer: Let me ask you, do you attribute the fact that we have such excellent students, even though we have the LSAT scores, you say that it's not necessarily how they come out on the tests but that they have a vitality and an interest and a vigor. As I understand it, this school has been very conscientious about seeing to it that personal interviews have been conducted through the years, whereas in many of the larger schools they have gone to computers and it's a rather cold, impersonal kind of way they have of selecting the entering students. I have had comments from students who have come here in recent years to the effect that they felt a personal interest in them, as compared with other places they were interviewed when they were looking for a law school to choose.

Judge Dillard: I'm not really qualified to talk about that, Frances. I think think you ought to have Al Turnbull discuss this.

Miss Farmer: We will.

Judge Dillard: Let me say this, there was a time in this last half century when we didn't have sectioning, every student was subjected to every professor in the first year in particular. We had at that time Charlie Gregory, one of the finest individuals

that ever graced any law school, was a great teacher even if it was property. I wasn't supposed to be too bad in contracts, and I think McCoid was supposed to be very good in procedure. Well, the point is this, we really were good teachers. The students would come from Princeton or Yale or Harvard, and I talked to so many of them about the comparison of their under-graduate and their law school quality of education, and they were all emphatic in saying how delighted they were when they came to the Virginia Law School. Now, they write that back to their friends, and that's how you get your student body. There is a relationship between the quality of students you get and the quality of instruction you offer. We've always been high on not letting down the teaching side of your effort.

Miss Farmer: I think that's fine. Let me go on to another matter now, about which you may have to speculate in this instance. Jack Ritchie, whom we interviewed recently, corrected a statement that we made that the Law School became a member of the Association of Law Schools in 1923, that was an error; we became approved by the American Bar Association in 1923. I have searched the records since the interview with Jack, and have discovered that actually the University of Virginia Law School was invited to attend the first meeting of the Association of American Law Schools when it was held in 1901, but they didn't send a representative. As it turned out, as I searched the continuing

series of reports of the Association of American Law Schools, I discovered that the entrance requirements among the standards they required a three-year curriculum of member schools. Virginia did not appear to have a three-year term of study, according to the catalog, until about 1910 and then the records show that the University of Virginia Law School did join the Association of American Law Schools in 1915. Do you have any speculation or recollection to enlighten us as to why the Law School didn't send a representative to that first meeting?

Judge

Dillard: I haven't any idea about that, except that I could say this, at the risk of again appearing a little personal. It is true, I think, to say that Virginia has been a bit aloof in its relationship with the Association of American Law Schools. I don't recall when I was a student here of hearing anything about it, I doubt if Dean Lile ever went to one of those meetings. That changed later. I remember very vividly the first job offer I ever had was from Thurmond Arnold, when he was dean of West Virginia. I'd worked in West Virginia and I know why he came over here, due to a mutual friend of ours, and he told me, and I'll never forget it. He said, "you people at the University of Virginia are held in some disdain, but also envy by other law schools." Now that stuck in my mind, and I suspect that the reason we didn't take a more active part in early days of the Association of American Law Schools, was a sense that we didn't need to. There might be a little arrogance in that, but we would go our own way and didn't want to be subject to all kinds of rules and regulations. Now I'm not sure of this and of

course this changed. As you know, Dobie was active in the Association.

Miss Farmer: He was the representative to the first meeting that Virginia participated in.

Judge Dillard: Dobie was a gregarious fellow, as you know, among many other attributes. Dean Ribble later became President of that Association. Of course, Jack Ritchie became President, which was a great honor. And we used to illustrate the fact that we took an interest in it. We used to pay part of the expenses of the professors who attended.

Miss Farmer: I think they still do. I wonder if you would be willing to give us your opinion on what, through these first 50 years have been some of the turning points in the history of the Law School, as you have viewed it?

Judge Dillard: I guess I'd like to say something here. I think one of the great turning points in the history of this Law School was the appointment of Gerrard Glenn and Leslie Buckler, those two. That was in the early days, you see Charlie Graves had retired, I pinched-hit for a while and then I left. They were searching for someone of so much senior status. I just noticed, Frances, you better check this out in your records, that in the last issue of the Virginia Law School Report there is a write up about Dobie, it is very well done. In that write up, the author who is a librarian, said that Dobie claimed his greatest contribution

to the Law School was getting Garrard Glenn here. Now I don't know that story, I was on the faculty as an acting assistant professor, you couldn't get any lower than that. So I don't know what went on in the Dean's office, but I will say this, Garrard Glenn's coming here, and along with Leslie Buckler, was a turning point. I say that with this reasoning, they gave to the faculty and to the students a sense of professionalism. They had both been outstanding lawyers, and I'll say something more about Garrard Glenn presently. As to Leslie, you know they used to say that Frankfurter didn't teach law, he taught "lawyering" and that was true of Leslie Buckler. David Owen, one of my most illustrious graduates, he told me once that corporate finance by candlelight was not a course it was an experience. I found this out very early after Leslie got here. This is a little bit of a long story. Now Billy used to have us write briefs when he was here, they were pitiful briefs, because he had us have a legal proposition, just a couple of sentences of a law, now write a brief about that, have facts and law separate. Well I inherited legal bibliography, incidentally, a great course, if you infuse it with some personal experiences, and I had so many disastrous ones. Leslie got across the idea that he had in his corporate finance course brief writing, they had to write briefs on regular cases. When I first read these I said my goodness this is really professional work.

Justin McLester was in that class, he was Editor of the Law Review, and when I read that brief I said now this is the sort of thing that we ought to have, not the kind that we've been used to. That's what I mean by professionalism. Also, both Leslie and Garrard were very cultured individuals. I must say that I have written so many tributes about my colleagues that my wife says that you professors spend half your time bestowing tributes on each other. There's some truth in that. Now Garrard was not just a great scholar. I'd like to tell you a little story about him, he was a man of wit and learning, read some of his reviews in the Virginia Quarterly, I remember one in particular where he lambasted Thurmond Arnold, who was writing all these wonderful books, but his books were designed for the lawyer rather than the law student and they were and are used by lawyers. He was a scholar in the best sense, a broad scholar. Of course, he had strong convictions. You know you don't have prejudice any more, you have strong convictions. Well let me tell you a little story about Garrard that I told the New York Bar when I had to go up there with our alumni to raise money. Again this is a little personal, but I won't keep apologizing for that. Incidentally, would you mind if I say to the screen that this is water, not a martini, just plain water. After World War II, I became fascinated with jurisprudence, legal philosophy, as a matter of fact I dropped international law in order to spend all my time on legal philosophy, when I wasn't teaching contracts. I got

absorbed in it, and I went out to Spring Hill one day and I was talking with Garrard, whom I admired so much, and I said, "Garrard, I've been reading a lot, and I would like to know what you think about these fellows like Jerome Frank, Carl Lewellyn, Bill Douglas, what do you think of these fellows?" He stopped right in his tracks and turned to me and said, "Hardy, that's all a bunch of bunk. I knew all that over a century ago." It happened about a month or two later that I ran across an article that was Jerome Franks and in that article he had a whole page or more in which he said that there is a chap named Garrard Glenn who is really the precursor of American legal realism, and that his book on creditors rights was so imaginative and broke such fresh ground, that it's a classic. Well, now I didn't put my name on any thing, I put that on Garrard Glenn's desk with the book marked, that's the end of the second chapter, now I come to the third chapter. A couple of months went by, I knew Garrard had forgotten all this, but I said, "Garrard, I've been reading a lot lately about these American legal realists, fellows like Carl Lewellyn and Jerome Frank and Bill Douglas, what do you think of them?" He said, "You know, Hardy, there are some very preceptive minds in that group." Just shows he's human. Well, I told that to the Bar they exploded. He was a wonderful person, he had a great sense of history you know. We used to go over to White Sulpher Springs to the Greenbriar, we would go with Garrard and it was a delight. He would always want to stop in

Lexington and revive the Civil War, he had a great feel for history, coming from Georgia. He was a great person.

There were other turning points, something that I can't document very well. You know Jack mentioned what a terrible student ratio we had and how small the faculty was. Now Dean Ribble appointed a committee, of which I happened to be chairman, and asked us to comprehensively study this matter. Garrard was on the committee. You know the Association of American Law Schools had a very energetic Secretary-treasurer, who used to make us fill out forms all over the place, the Dean and I used to dread having to list every faculty salary medium, but I found it was a gold mine when he wanted to write a report and compare you with other law schools. Now we were pretending to be competitive with Yale, with Harvard, with Columbia, with Stanford, but the figures revealed that we weren't near competitive with those schools. We would be competitive with the pip-squeek schools, I might call them, spread all over the country. So we wrote a devastating report, these data permitted this, you see. So I was told that when President Newcomb received that report, he turned to Ribble and said, "I hope you'll never send me another report like this." The Dean reported that back to us, because we didn't ask for one more professor, or even two, we asked for four. Just like that. We didn't ask for minor faculty salary

raises, we asked for substantial ones. Although it was not favorably received, in the course of a couple of years it accomplished its purpose. Many years later, Carl McFarland did a study--when we had a problem accommodating how many students--because we were so cramped for space. With the JAG School in Clark Hall and us here, we didn't know what we were going to do. I stubbed my toe once, I got soundly and correctly tickled with the knuckles, because I hauled off with a letter to Colonel Murray, who was then Commandant of the JAG School. I said, "I think the time has come for you to consider moving out of the Law School, and getting you another building or something." Well, I didn't have the authority to say that really you know, and I think it raised hell--I had to eat crow later. But this was while we were thinking about what we were going to do. That's where Carl McFarland's study comes in. That is somewhere in the archives, it was a major effort he put in there. But I am wondering a little bit. There were other turning points for instance, that report was a turning point, it broke the ice and it was not too long after that they reduced the faculty student ratio to a comparable thing, and we were then in competition with Harvard, Yale, etc. I would cite that as an example, and I would cite another turning point, of course, was the establishment of the Law School Foundation. That was a far-sighted thing to do. Now another turning point, apart from faculty appointments like Charlie Gregory and Garrard Glenn and Leslie Buckler, in my view it was attributable to Lindsay Cowen. May I elaborate

on that slightly. The problem here was fund raising. You've got to have funds, you can't attract first-rate faculty unless you can pay them a first-rate salary. Well our fund raising had been really quite unsuccessful, and the Dean was aware of this. He had appointed an alumni committee--now you can see a busy lawyer, he hasn't got time to go around to different places raising money, he would write a little letter to his colleagues, and that was it. That's when we got Knox Turnbull here. Knox was supposed to raise money (he was the first Director of the Foundation), but Knox's idea of raising money was to get a few wealthy people, not a mass problem at all. It was not until Marion Kellogg got on the scene, and it was Lindsay who suggested this, he was here on a kind of half-professor basis, to head up this whole thing. Marion, who had a lot of experience in civic matters, took hold of that thing wonderfully and he began a really systematic, imaginative organization.

Miss Farmer: Well, you became the Director during your deanship didn't you?

Judge Dillard: Yes, that was my appointment. I got it across to the faculty, but Lindsay was the one who was part of Marion's particularly.

Miss Farmer: Now to place Lindsay, he was the Associate Dean in your administration and Dean Ribble's administration as well. But when Mr. Ribble retired he continued in the post as Associate Dean as you came into the deanship. Is that correct?

Judge Dillard: I think that's correct. I hated to see him leave, but he wanted to have his own deanship.

Miss Farmer: Hopefully, we can persuade Lindsay to come back for a brief interview on this series. I think it would be great.

Judge Dillard: Lindsay used to amuse me a great deal in our faculty meetings, he was always so sure of himself. I'm a timid fellow, never sure of myself, but he was always so sure of himself, it was a delight to hear him. I mean that I was very fond of that fellow, and Ted Mearns who succeeded him as Associate Dean. Ted had one very great characteristic, he was a great judge of people. He was not as dynamic as Lindsay, as a teacher he appealed to the top five percent of the students. He didn't communicate vividly. I'm afraid I'm wandering around a little bit, but this fund raising was important, because when we were recruiting faculty, and the generous provisions the University had on matching funds and the Foundation picking up your fringe benefits made it possible for us in recruiting faculty to say, that we have in addition to the basic salary, 20 percent more at least. This made us competitive. So these are the turning points, but I put at the top Garrard.

Miss Farmer: At the moment, I would like to go back to the published tribute to Deans Dobie and Ribble, as well tributes you have prepared and published. Most of them, I believe, in the Virginia Law Review. You've tributes to Deans Dobie and Ribble, and tributes to Professors Gregory, McFarland and Kellogg. At the conclusion of this interview I expect to add these citations because I think it would be very interesting to have those close at hand.

Miss Farmer: You have already given us a birds-eye view of most of these individuals. You haven't had much to say about McFarland, but I take it from your tribute that he made a substantial contribution to this Law School, and his report is one that — you think is a great effort.

Judge Dillard: Right, he was so thorough in everything he did. But I also wrote a tribute to Munford Boyd and Edwin Patterson, and others. Don't forget there is also a tribute to you in the Virginia Law Review. Do you want what I said about Ribble?

Miss Farmer: Let me say that this is titled Law and Learning and appears in the Virginia Law Review, 1963, Vol. 49, No.4.

Judge Dillard: Well, in any case the Law Review asked me to combine my philosophy on legal education with a tribute to Deane, which I did, gladly. I have to say this, the qualities displayed by Deane Ribble as an administrator were natural reflections of his qualities as an individual. Indeed, it was this identity of personal and administrative attributes that was the source of his strength, and the reason for the universal respect which he commanded from students, alumni, university associates and professional colleagues. Conspicuous among these qualities was a combined sense of integrity and modesty which intuitively held him to state the flamboyant, self-asserative type of executive who so frequently ignores the purpose of power in his zeal to demonstrate his capacity to wield it. He was modest and unassuming, but strong.

Miss Farmer: You know it is very interesting, even a person as far down the ladder such as myself as librarian, when I first came here and would go into Mr. Ribble's office and say, "Please, may I have a little help about this." I could say what I wanted to say to him which often times would be insignificant matters when compared to faculty, etc. He would say, "Do have a seat, Miss Farmer," and it was if I was going to bring to him the most important thing in the Law School and he treated everyone in that same way.

Judge Dillard: Oh, yes--he was a gentleman to the core in the best sense of the term.

Miss Farmer: Now I must say that I didn't always have that kind of treatment from you.

Judge Dillard: We had to keep you under control. We saw how you pushed Deane Ribble around. But let me say a word about Lile and Dobie. Now, Billy Lile, I don't think the whole time I was a student here that I was in his office but twice. Once was when I had to clear with him raising money to get Charlie Graves' portrait. I happened to be President of my class and we decided that as he was retiring we should have a portrait. He resisted this before. I had to clear this with Billy Lile and I did, he gave me a benediction and I wrote alumni both here and at Washington & Lee, where he taught, I tell you frankly, we didn't ask for but \$10.00, within three weeks we had raised enough money for that portrait, \$1500 or more, and the most glowing letters.

Judge Dillard: Now I regret to tell you this, but those letters were so glowing about Charlie Graves that I had them bound in leather along with some famous people like Thomas Edison that we had written about a portrait, I gave them to Miss _____, and she later lost them. Too bad, they would have been great for the archives. To get back to Lile, the second time I was in his office was when he offered me a job as an acting assistant professor, along with Charlie Scott. Now, there is an interesting story about Lile, I can't document it but it was told to me by Eddie Mead of Danville, one of our illustrious alumni, and he said that he was once engaged in a case that was quite complicated and involved equity procedure. Finally, the Judge couldn't make up his mind and he said to the lawyers, both sides, that he wanted them to go over to Charlottesville and consult Dean Lile, and give him all the facts, and if he says the complainant should win or the defendant should win, I'm going to abide by his judgment. That was the respect in which he was held by the Bar. He was very proud of his practice in Lynchburg, and he would pepper his lectures with these examples. He was a great man, Lile.

As for Dobie, I'll tell you Frances, he was so dynamic, and everybody respected him but not everybody had affection for him. Sometimes he could get pretty brutal, he'd get them up for a half-hour cross-examining them. I could tell you a story about that but I won't right now because it's too long. There is another story I told when I was asked to dedicate his portrait.

Judge Dillard: I don't think you know who Clarence Morris is, maybe.

Miss Farmer: He was a great friend of yours and he was a professor at University of Pennsylvania.

Judge Dillard: Yeah, and he's been down here of course, and he was interested in jurisprudence--a great man, great fellow. Well, Clarence Morris told me that he will never forget Armistead Mason Dobie because when he first started teaching he was just a hillbilly from Wyoming, his first association with the American law school he was just constantly sitting in the corridor of the Mayflower Hotel when this fellow came up to him and said, "Young man, I don't recall seeing you at these meetings before, I'm Armistead Mason Dobie of the University of Virginia, who are you?" He said, "I'm Clarence Morris of Wyoming." Dobie said, "Young man, come with me. I want you to meet some of my friends." Clarence Morris said I went with Dobie, and what do you know, the first thing I knew I was shaking hands with Roscoe Pound, Wigmore and Williston and all these fellows I stood in awe of. I'm not sure I got all the names right, but the idea he said, "I've never forgotten that. Everytime I go to an Association meeting I look around and see if there is some young fellow who seems a bit lonely. I mention this because you usually hear stories about Dobie being rough and tough, this is the other-side of the coin. I think I mentioned this in the address I gave. You can check it out. So, all of these fellows were personalities of a different kind, no doubt about it.

Miss Farmer: Would you say just one word, we haven't mentioned, either Jack Ritchie or you, and I have not brought it to the surface,

one person whom I respect so highly and who was on the faculty, he didn't play a prominent part as a teacher but he was a great supporter of the Law School, and one of our greatest supporters of the Law Library, and that is William H. White. I don't think he was a great scholar, but he was a great supporter of the Law School.

Judge Dillard: He was, but I tell you, he didn't make a big impression on most of us because he didn't seem to have any itch toward scholarship whatever. I was always told that he wasn't particularly effective as a teacher, didn't have much interest in teaching.

Miss Farmer: But he did contribute tremendously to the Library.

Judge Dillard: I don't want to be disrespectful of him, but he was in charge of Placement for a long time after he retired from teaching.

Miss Farmer: Now there is a long story, and I don't want you to cut this one short, because I think it's extremely important that we get it first hand from you. I would hope that we could digress a moment from the Law School and have you tell us about the beginning of the School of Military Government which had just come to the Law School prior to the time that I arrived in 1942. My first impression of the Law School building was that it was completely overrun by the military, you included, because you were playing a prominent part in that School, which was preparing offices for the Army of Occupation after World War II. It was a long story about how you were picked to develop that school, and I think it is important for the record that you tell us

(23)

the story of how it came about, even if it's tedious and long
I wish you would do it.