Q. I’m Lewis Branscomb and I’m tape interviewing Dr. Everett Walters, former professor in the Department of History and Dean of the Graduate School of The Ohio State University. August 13, 1986. We’re at my home, Upper Arlington, which is a suburb of Columbus. Well, Everett, starting with your early years, I recall that your father was a university professor and administrator at Lehigh University and Swarthmore College before he went to the University of Cincinnati as President. Did his vocational choice influence your decision to eventually go into higher education?

A. Well not directly. I had of course gone to Swarthmore College for one year, and then had transferred at the end of that first year to The University of Cincinnati. While at The University of Cincinnati, I had become, particularly in my junior and senior years, I had become very interested in history, primarily because of the influence of two or three very good professors, which is usually the case. You become interested in something because of good faculty members. And so I was very interested in history at the time. Then however, when I graduated in 1936 from The University of Cincinnati, I had contemplated going to a business school somewhere in the east, either Columbia or Yale or University of Pennsylvania or Harvard. However, that did not work and so I returned to Cincinnati after that. And this was of course in Depression years, and because of the financial situation at the time, it was very difficult to get jobs and I was very fortunate and I had a job.

Q. I can vouch for that, because when I finished Duke in 1933, I pounded the pavement for six months before I could get the first job.
A. I was very fortunate. My father knew the president of the gas and electric company in Cincinnati, and word from him and from my father to this man, landed me a job at $18.75 a week, with the electric side of the gas and electric company. After a few years of that, I decided that that career was not for me, that there was something else to do. So with father and mother’s help, we decided that I would go to Columbia University in New York and I would major in History.

Q. You have already answered a couple of other questions. One had to do with why you chose History. Your father was _________ something about moving to Cincinnati. Also that you did, although from the record you did spend a year at Swarthmore.

A. My freshman year.

Q. Your freshmen year. I figured you must have done that because at that age you were still in Pennsylvania.

A. Yes, in my 17th year, 1932.

Q. Maybe a stupid thing, but can we move on to the fact that the record doesn’t show, at least to me, what you did between 1936 and 1940.

A. Well, I worked for the gas company. I was with them until 1939. And then in 1939, we were married at that time, Janie and I were married at that time, which was unusual in our circles in Cincinnati. The following year, in 1938 and then in 1939, we went to New York, and I enrolled in graduate school at Columbia in History.

Q. And during that period, at least part of that period, you were instructor in History at Finch Junior College.
Yes, after my first year, after my Master’s year, a year of Master’s work, I was fortunate enough to become, receive an appointment as instructor at Finch Junior College, a former fashionable finishing school which had now become a junior college. And I was appointed as an instructor in History and Anthropology.

Finishing school may be the right term because we did finish. I looked it up and couldn’t find it. You cleared that up for me. There’s many other small schools.

It was a very interesting small college. It was very helpful. Many daughters of well known people were in my classes including one of the Kennedy daughters.

Oh yes, that’s interesting. I would like to know next, Everett, about your getting on at Ohio State University as instructor in History. I understand you were interested in your chosen area of History. But how about Ohio State? How did that come about?

I was in the Navy from 1944 until 1946. When I came back to Cincinnati from having been in China, I looked around for a position, teaching position, and wrote a number of letters and sent them out. And one of my letters to Ohio State received a response. So I was interviewed and hired as an instructor in the Department of History here at Ohio State in 1946.

Do you recall who was the Chairman of that department then?

Yes, George Washburn was Chairman.

Oh, he was still here?

Oh yes, and he gone when I came in ’48, but I remember the name.

Yes, he had been Chairman for a good many years.
A. So I was finishing my doctoral work at Columbia at the time, and came back and received it the following year, in 1947.

Q. So your fairly recent trip to China was not your first?

A. No.

Q. Everett, when you accepted appointment as an assistant dean, this is part-time I believe, for the graduate school in ’54, were you then or even earlier thinking in terms of higher level administration, which you were going to get into or were getting into? Had you planned or thought much about this, or did this kind of happen as so often does?

A. It happened in a way. I was called back to the Navy in 1950-52, and when I returned, I was assistant director of the orientation programs and that was a part-time job, mostly during the winter time and spring, getting ready for the big influx of students in the fall of the year. I was working with Bill Guthrie who was then dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. So I had some literal interest in administration that way, and had tentatively in an around about a way, inquired as to whether or not I would be interested in doing an assistant dean in the Arts College office. There were a number of them. I think they were one year appointments. My good friend Paul Varg was one, and I think that I was supposed to be appointed a year or so after that. Paul Varg eventually left and went to East Lansing, didn’t he?

Q. Yes, to Michigan State. I was just guessing, and maybe I’ve guessed too much in here, that your father having been a higher level administrator, might have kind of
put you in mind whether you realize it or not, that you might follow somewhat the same career. Maybe that’s reaching.

A. I don’t know. I don’t know. I don’t think we ever talked about it. We often talked about opportunities for administration later on.

Q. I come into the picture now a little bit, in that I can remember, as Director of Libraries, sitting in on the Graduate Council of meetings. I remember Dick Armitage and Ned Moulton were your Assistant Deans I believe at that time. Big tall guys, both of them, and I wonder what your recollections are. You see these two men, of course, from time to time even now. Dick is on the west coast and Ned is here in Columbus.

A. He is near Berkley where his wife is now employed with the University of California system.

Q. That must have been quite a trial for it.

A. Yes, it was. It was very interesting, I did not specifically plan on hiring very tall men, but it worked out that way. And after Alice Moran, who had been secretary of the Graduate School for many, many years. I don’t remember how many, but she, as I recall, began in the Graduate School out of high school. She resigned then when I became Acting Dean of the Graduate School. And so I thought I would get someone from the teaching staff to become Assistant Dean and Secretary. And it was then that I approached Dick Armitage on the advice of some people. After some hesitancy, he came in with me and that of course was very good. We got along very nicely and he did, I think, a splendid job of
straightening out the office procedures and records and so on, which helped a
great deal in relation to the graduate students and with the Graduate School office.

Q. And having Dick Armitage, a humanist, and Ned Moulton, Engineering, gave you
something of a balance there.

A. Yes, that’s exactly true. The appointment of Ned Moulton came before Dean
Alpheus Smith had been the Graduate School’s liaison person, with Wright-
Patterson Air Force Base, where we had a good sized program in engineering and
science.

Q. Excuse me. And Alpheus had preceded you by one or two, as Dean of the
Graduate School.

A. Yes indeed. Distinguished man. Very fine man. He came in to see me one day
and said he thought it was time for him to retire. He was quite elderly. There was
no doubt about that and didn’t see very well. It was very difficult for him to make
the long trip down to Dayton. So, he did retire and I thought we needed
somebody to take over that duties as well as some other relations with the science
people and so on. So, with some advice from people in Engineering and the
science fields, I talked to candidates and finally selected Ned Moulton. Turned
out to be a splendid choice and his primary activities at the time had to do with
Wright-Patterson base.

Q. Taking over the duties that Alpheus Smith had.

A. And then he extended them too. He did a great deal in the way of getting full-
time faculty people to go down to the base. It wasn’t a pleasant journey because
it was long and I can well remember Ned talked to the administration into buying
an extended automobile, called a Camel Caravan. And he would take four or five faculty people almost every night. He increased the salary for the faculty people. It was really an additional teaching load for most of the faculty people. But the Air Force people wanted first rate people and was willing to pay for it. So that’s what we did.

Q. You were Assistant Dean in 1954-55 while Paul Hudson was still Dean. I remember him well. I wonder what your recollections are and what your comments might be about Paul and about his administration. I believe he’s living in Florida now and he’s in his early 90’s.

A. That’s what I’ve heard. Yes, I enjoyed working with Paul, although there was some difficulties in the office, I must say, because Paul was a very intelligent, fine man. He had both a Ph.D. and an M.D. degree and had done outstanding work in scientific activities in Africa during the early 20’s. And he had returned to the United States and had several good teaching positions. He came to Ohio State and was made Dean of the Graduate School because it was felt that they needed a scientist at the time. He was, I believe, he had problems with dealing with other people, because his mind was very quick and he would anticipate exactly what the other person was going to say, and join in too soon while the other person was talking, which was disconcerting to say the least. He was pretty well sure that he knew what everybody else should do as well. I can remember soon after I was appointed and went into the newly remodeled office on the third floor of the administration building. My desk was placed in the middle of the room, obviously for me to put in a location that I wanted it. Paul came along and he
said, “Everett, you’ll want to put your desk right over there.” And he pointed to one corner, and I said, “No, Paul, I’m going to put it over here.” So we talked about that for a few minutes and finally he said, “Oh well, you do what you want.” And I said, “I will.” Unfortunately, he often would tell the graduate students who had some problem what they should do, and I think he was right most of the time. But his brusque directed approach always caused some unhappiness I must say between student and the dean.

Q. I can remember the Graduate Council meetings in his office. I also remember definitely, if I’m incorrect and you might have touched on this, he had at least toward the end a certain rigidity that causes some problems, as you said, between him and the people he worked with.

A. I think that’s true. He was not willing to yield to suggestions or accept them readily. I think this caused a good deal of friction between him and the Graduate Council. As you probably remember, they build up quite a good deal of interest in this direction, and so in the fall of 1955, he retired, resigned.

Q. And became one of the Assistant Deans of the College of Medicine.

A. Yes. To assist in the teaching of faculty members in learning to teach and getting alone. And I understand he did a first rate job at that.

Q. In a number of ways a brilliant man.

A. Oh yes, he was. There was no question about that. But it was a very interesting experience for me and I think we got along very well. I enjoyed going to meetings, the graduate deans, around the country. We always had a good time
talking on the airplane. Well, in the early years, on the train. Then later on, on planes and so forth.

Q. And he and Emily, his wife, had great cocktail parties.

A. Yes, they did. They had very find parties.

Q. Very interesting man.

A. Yes, he was.

Q. Everett, I noticed in looking at your vita and also the history you wrote, which was so useful, that you made a study of the Assistant Dean on the possible need for reorganizing the graduate students. I think that is of some importance. Would you say something about that?

A. I was, as an Assistant Dean, I went to one of the meetings of the Midwest Conference on Graduate Studies, a very large organization which always met in Chicago. It was the largest group of its kind in the United States and very helpful to graduate deans, because of its relaxed air and made it possible for young deans and new deans, newly appointed deans, to learn a good deal about being a graduate dean. So it was at one of those meetings, a dean had been asked to read a paper, to prepare a paper which he did, on student relations with students, graduate students. And in the course of this talk, the dean made the comment that at Ohio State they had a very good Graduate School organization. I of course was very interested and jumped somewhat because I was right on the scene and hadn’t heard about this. So returning to Columbus after the meeting, I looked into it and found out that three or four years before, there had been an effort to organize a Graduate Student Council. A woman had been asked to supervise it, organize it
and supervise it. And that had been done. Paul obviously had written this up in
the Graduate School record, which had been going for many years, and all the
deans around the country liked to read that because it was the only thing of its
kind. So that’s where the reference came from. Well then, I thought it would be a
good idea to do something about the Council for the Graduate Students. And so
Paul agreed with me and I got it started. I was very fortunate in being able to
have the same woman, a young woman graduate student, somewhat older than
most graduate students, to get it started.

Q. Am I right in understanding that when it was started, it simply was earlier before
you got in, it limped along and didn’t amount to much?

A. Yes, it collapsed.

Q. You really reorganized it as the Council of Graduate Students, which is still
going.

A. Still going.

Q. So that made an effective reorganization.

A. Yes, it was. And of course it was not easy to accomplish because the Graduate
Student Organization, that is the Undergraduate Student Association, was very
powerful, and they thought the graduate students should be incorporated into that.
And so that took a good big of doing to get that situation straightened out. But
that was overcome and then we worked up a system of dividing the faculty into
the disciplines, correlated the sciences and the social sciences and the humanities
and so forth. Then they would elect representatives and so on. And after a period
of time, that worked out quite well. It was slow going, I must say, because
graduate students didn’t want to be interrupted with a meeting which reminded them of their undergraduate days.

Q. It must have been a pretty good organization because it’s been going for 30 years approximately.

A. Yes, and I’m sure such an organization was very helpful to graduate students during the later years, during the late 60’s and 70’s because there was something that had been going.

Q. You mentioned something I didn’t know and that is, that the Graduate School Record was the only one of its kind in the country. I didn’t realize that.

A. Oh yes.

Q. Did that go on for several years?

A. I can’t remember exactly when it was founded. That could be determined cause there were files available. And normally the dean, who was editor of the Graduate School Record, would write an editorial on some subject, he would hear about it at the next meeting of the graduate deans. I can remember one called “Building a Boat Dock.” This was widely read and reprinted in some graduate school offices and set up. This was an account of a faculty member who comes back in September to be greeted by the dean and other people on what was done that summer. And the report of this faculty member, a full professor, was that he build a new boat dock, and he was very proud of that.

Q. Was that for the university or for himself?

A. That was the point. When he was supposed to be devoted to research and teaching, this is his single great accomplishment for the entire summer.
Q. Another thing which you got started among others, was the course on college teaching which I think you began in 1958. The record indicates that this might have been at that time the first such course of any graduate school in the country. Is that your understanding?

A. That’s my understanding. I looked into it, when I thought about the idea of a course in college teaching, I made a little research, a little search, to find out whether there was anything going on and I couldn’t find any evidence of such a course. And so I then decided to go forward. Then later on I found out that it was the only one and asked the question at meetings and could never hear about it.

Q. Do you recall whether or not others followed suit, or perhaps you wouldn’t have noticed?

A. I don’t know. I do know that it was very successful at Ohio State. The first year the classes were not large. And then after that of course they increased in size. It was given every quarter, three quarters.

Q. Tony Nimitz taught one.

A. Tony Nimitz was an assistant professor in the Department of Philosophy, taught the course. He and I worked over the general topics that should be talked about. I think one of the features was having guest speakers come in and give a little talk about what they expected of a college teacher. We had one of the board member, board of trustees member, a lawyer from Cincinnati came up and the students were kind of surprised at what his comments were. Then of course the conversation that followed was very interesting. We had Governor DiSalles, who brought his own tape recorder, so that he could always prove what he had said and
not be misquoted. He was very good. Later on, the course became somewhat expanded. That was so that each area, each department, that had a large number of graduate students, and of course at Ohio State there were a number of those, they would give their own course as a sequential. And that would be then say, a student would be asked to attend the course, the general course, in the fall term. And then in the winter term the Department of Zoology for example, they would have their own course on teaching zoology. And that it worked out very well in some departments. Not every department was enthusiastic about that unfortunately. And then the third quarter would be devoted to supervised teaching.

Q. The fact that some other departments picked it up as a sequential course would suggest that that was very worthwhile or they wouldn’t have bothered.

A. Yes. To me, it made a logical development of three quarters, in general and the specific teaching of the subject and then supervision of instructors and graduate students on the job.

Q. That continued as a Graduate School course for at least several years.

A. Oh yes, yes. Tony Nimitz did not stay on and went somewhere else. But under the Dick Armitage administration, I think it was a young man from the Zoology Department, either Zoology or Botany, who ran it and did extremely well. How long it continued, I don’t know.

Q. Related to that is this question. We did hear criticism from time to time of the College of Education, that it spends too much time teaching students how to teach
rather than what to teach or subject content. Could one criticize this course on the same basis, that it was teaching grad students how to teach?

A. I don’t think how to teach was the main point in the beginning. The point was (end of side A)

Q. … the end of one side, Everett, and you were talking about the course on college teaching at the graduate level, and I had raised a question about was there any similarity between this and the emphasis in the College of Education on what to teach. But you go ahead.

A. The main purpose of the course, certainly when it started, was to indicate to graduate students what it meant to be a college teacher, and it was very forthright in the problems of salary and fringe benefits and future and tenure, and all the other aspects of academic life. And what it meant, particularly a large institution, to be one of many to be teaching the subject or, on the other hand if you were a small college, or at a small college, the entire department, which I was at Finch incidentally.

Q. I can see that this is quite different from what the College of Education, quite different.

A. Incidentally, the College of Education did register some question about the Graduate School giving such a course, and I can remember having a long chat with Dean Donald Cattrell on the bow of Lake Erie. We had been up to inspect the University’s activities up there in fishing.

Q. South Bass Island.
A. Yes, that’s right. And finally he said, “I guess there’s nothing we can do.” And I said, “No, I don’t believe there is.” I think we have the authority to establish a course. The course was Graduate School 101 or 501 or 601, and it wasn’t an education course and it wasn’t in any department. So he grinned and he thought it was fine.

Q. Was he concerned about possible competition?

A. I think so. It should be in the College of Education. I think that’s the point. But because it said Education. But I think that worked out very well and before long, teachers from Education would come and take the course.

Q. But it would seem to me to have been misplaced in the College of Education, which was not the focus.

A. Yes. Because they had very little experience in college teaching. One or two other things about the course on College Teaching. One was that, let me put it this way, I had noticed that the National Science Foundation had graduate scholarships, graduate fellowships, which paid a good deal of money to graduate students to go through the courses, go to Graduate School. And one of the things they were to do required by law by the Foundation, was to get experience in college teaching. And so I talked to the heads of the science department and I said, “I think you ought to do something specific, that is have your students come and take the course in college teaching. Then you could certify this in all honesty and not just say they were teaching and getting advice on the side.” Well, they weren’t sure about that and after some conversations, a good many students did come over. Then the National Science Foundation learned about this and made a
feature of it in some articles and advocated that other graduate schools do the
same thing. So it did of course receive national recognition on that particular
course.

Q. Yes. Everett, I think you also, I believe you also started the Annual Conference
of the Humanities in 1958, if I recall correctly. Is this correct?

A. Yes, that came about because the Dean of the Graduate School at Ohio State was
very fortunate. By tradition, he received $25,000 for lectures, off campus
lectures, to come and talk to the various departments. As Graduate Dean I was
quite popular, I must say, with department chairmen and others who were always
wanting money to bring in a visiting friend. And they were not just friends, they
were good lecturers too, superb lecturers. And in the course of this I was invited
to go to a meeting in someone’s house, I can’t remember, and they were talking
about Medieval history, Medieval culture and all of that. A historian and people
from the language department. And of course the English department, Fran
Utley. And it became obvious to me that this is a very interesting subject and for
these men, it was the center of their life, and that other people might feel the same
way. And of course it is interesting. So I broached the idea of having a little
conference and talking about some of these things with members from other
places. Well of course they had their discipline meetings, but never bringing the
various disciplines together. So we had a small meeting and had an off campus,
several off campus people, and it was very successful. And of course these men
were all very pleased with the results. Then we organized the first one, which of
course was very successful. We had some suburb people and we also added
music and the arts. So we had people from other areas. We had invited people from primarily the Midwest, although we had friends from the east and some friends from the west coast. But one of the nice arrangements that we made, and that was for say, a faculty member at Oberlin or for the faculty to come down to Columbus for the meeting and bring one or two students. And they were on their own except we provided a dinner and something else. That worked out very well. We got a lot of students. I don’t know whether we got any graduate students to come to Ohio State as a result. And it’s been going very strong ever since.

Q. I remember those. I attended a number of those and found them fascinating.

A. I can remember one of the activities, one year we had the Promusica group with Noel Greenburg I think. That was fascinating.

Q. I remember that. It was excellent.

A. And people said it would never work because it was a football day, but it did. We had a nice concert over at the historical ________. It was wonderful. I was reminded of this not long ago at attending a dinner in honor of Frank Ludden, who is retiring. Frank Pegues gave a talk about Frank and his activities, and said Frank of course was such a strong member of the Humanities Conference Group which Everett Walters had founded. And he went off on a long discussion about that.

Q. Excuse me, that Frank Pegues for the record in the Department of History. That was a good series that you started and it’s still going, isn’t it.

A. Oh yes.
Q. When you went into the Graduate School as Dean, the student enrollment was 1,702. When you left the Deanship in 1957, it was 4,411. I’m sorry, you left the Deanship in 1963. So that’s quite an increase. Perhaps there are several reasons to account for this increase. How would you assess this?

A. I don’t recall making any study or looking into that matter, except that I think graduate schools in general were increasing in numbers. Ohio State was one of them. I think that, there was no doubt about it, we had an increasingly good reputation during those years. We had excellent relations with some of the small colleges, and that helps. Kenyon was virtually part of our faculty in two or three departments, in English and History. We had good relations at Oberlin and other places too. So that I think it became a graduate school that people were interested in. And of course, there were increasing strengths in science.

Q. Weren’t we bringing in professors who were distinguished in areas?

A. Yes, low temperature physics and some of the other field. And chemistry of course had a splendid reputation. And we attracted students. And furthermore, of course those were the years when large numbers of graduate students were coming in too. Foreign students. And they became an interesting problem for most of us in administration.

Q. It must have been gratifying for you to see the increase.

A. Oh yes.

Q. One of the things I remember with great interest, and I’d like you to comment on, was the re-establishment of The Ohio State University Press. I had only a very small part in that as Director of Libraries. But you had a major role, as I recall, as
Dean of the Graduate School, in re-establishing the Press, which is still going on very strong. How about that?

A. Well, when I was Graduate Dean I was interested in the fact that most universities had a university press, and Ohio State did not.

Q. We had had one.

A. We had had one. I found that out because there are still books in the storage places at Ohio State University on the spine. I found that out. So I went to several meetings of the Association of University Presses, including a very interesting one at New Haven at Yale, which had a first class university press. And I met my advisor at History at Columbia, Alan Nevins, and had a good time with him.

Q. I remember that name.

A. Oh yes. He was twice winner of a Pulitzer Price. And we had a good time together. In fact, he took me to see his farm, which was not far away from New Haven. Well, after those experiences, and I made a few trips to Princeton and others, places to talk over with deans about a university press, and they encouraged me. And so I decided to get started and found out that there were a few manuscripts on the campus that would be available. And believe it or not, one or two of them had some financing to go with it. And the largest one of course was “Fishes of Ohio.”

Q. Troutman, was it?

A. Yes, an appropriate name almost. Well, that was financed by, I think, a grant by the State and the University both. And it was a beautiful book, well done. Troutman was an excellent scientist and a marvelous artist. He drew all the
pictures. So it was a good first choice. It came out so well. For the Press it didn’t make much money, but it got it established. And that was very useful. And fortunately, a woman who worked in the Graduate School office, her father was a very highly placed official with World Publishing Company in Cleveland. So she knew a little bit about it. And her husband knew more. He was a graduate student in Zoology. And so he did some of the technical work for me, of getting it ready for the printer and all that sort of thing. So, I had some difficulty in combating some resistance on the part of departments who liked to publish things and put Ohio State’s name on it.

Q. I was thinking, it wasn’t as easy to do as you’re making it out.

A. So I issued an edict saying it now belonged to University Press, which was located at Graduate School. So no one complained, at least the president and vice president. That was the only thing that I was concerned about.

Q. It wasn’t difficult getting it approved at the highest level?

A. No, I had talked to the president about it, Fawcett, of course. So then, one day I received a telephone call from President Fawcett, and he wanted to know whether I had any kind of a position in the Graduate School office for a young man who was a son of a very good friend of his over in Bexley. President Fawcett, of course, had been Superintendent of Schools in Bexley. And would I interview the man. Well of course I would. And the young man, Wendell Keefover came over, and I hired him to get the Press started on a secretary salary. I forget what it was but it wasn’t very much, and he said he’d be happy to accept that. He wanted an interesting job. He had had four or five jobs before that including teaching at the
Columbus Academy. He taught French and English and several other subjects. And correcting things. He had gotten somewhat tired of that. So he came over and we set up a little office for him and told him to go at it. And he did. I didn’t know that much about all of this but he soon did. He taught himself all of the difficult things. And of course he was a natural born editor if you will. And pretty soon he got that started. He employed faculty wives as editors and delighted to have a position. They received money and stayed at home with the children, and so on. And so that worked out very nicely.

Q. And he stayed on until last year. He retired last year.

A. That worked out very well and some of the big printing companies became very interested in him and would try new things. I think the type for one of the books was typed up, a girl in the office was typing it up. It set the type down at Kingsport Press down in Kingsport, Tennessee. I think the other distinct thing that went along with that, was the Journal of Higher Education, which has been published by the School of Education for many years, and had a good reputation, meticulously edited, well done and so forth. And so, the editor was going to retire and so I struck up an arrangement with Dean Cattrell at the Graduate School, to be willing to take it over as part of the University Press. And he was delighted because this would relieve him of a certain financial obligation, and he knew it would go into good hands too. And so it did. So, soon after that, I think a year after that, then Bob Patton was professor of Economics became editor, and he did a very good job.

Q. I remember.
A. And I think those in the Graduate School and the Press did, was to become more aggressive about getting manuscripts. We would write people and call them up and ask them to write things. People who had had something to say and had written an article or two that might go on to project the thought. And so we had some very good issues. We had one very good issue on graduate education today. That was widely used in graduate education. In fact, that became the basis for the book I edited on graduate education today.

Q. I’m not sure I recall but I would guess that most of the books published didn’t pay for themselves, for reasons which we don’t know. Did you have problems with the subsidy?

A. Well, that worked out quite nicely. I went over and had a long sessions with President Fawcett, and we talked about the problems with Press and the need for money, and incidentally about football, here and there and so on, and how well the team was doing, and the reputation that the football team receives, and what about the Graduate School and Academic Affairs. And they make so much money for football and we need money. We had a nice talk about it. Soon after that, we received quite a good grant. It was not a lot of money.

Q. So he understood that the Press could hardly be self-supporting?

A. Oh yes. All university presses as far as I know.

Q. The readership is small.

A. Yes. So that worked out. We got subsidies here and there and so on and were able to bring things out. We also sold out a lot of books in our early days in the University Press.
Q. So the financing was not a major problem?

A. I wouldn’t say that. I think it was, but we had enough that we were able to sell to get started. One interesting comment, I think along that line, a thing that took place, was that several departments thought I was going at this the right way. That I should demand at least $75,000 from the President to get the Press started, and start with a full fledged editor and all that sort of thing. I said, “Well, I don’t think we’d get the money, and furthermore, I think it’s better to grow into it.” And that’s what we did.

Q. That didn’t sound like the right approach.

A. No.

Q. I think that was one of the most significant things you did, Everett. It has such continuing implications. The University of course should be involved, not only in teaching and research, but in dissemination of knowledge. And this is one of the important functions of a great University. So I think that’s terribly important.

A. I think one of the great aspects of recognition that the Press has received, is some years ago when Keefover was elected President of the Association of American University Presses. And then after that, he was considered for the Secretaryship, permanent Secretaryship of the Association, which he did not take, because he realized the he would have to live in New York City. His large salary would not be enough to compensate him for his expenses of living there and so forth.

Q. His being elected President must have been some indication that the OSU Press was coming of age.
A. Of course. There’s no question about that. We had no trouble being recognized as a member of the Association, because in a few years, we had the requisite number of books and then we had the Journal of course to go with it. By the time we got there, we were already as large as some of the …

Q. And quality was a concern too.

A. Always good, yes. And they looked into publications of course.

Q. That’s very interesting I think and important. In October 1957, Ohio State held its first Graduate School convocation, which I’m sure you had a hand in.

A. Yes, that’s true. It was because, it seemed to me, that the graduate students and the graduate faculty members, should have some recognition of the unity and position of a graduate school in the University. And everyone, all the other areas, colleges and schools, had programs of that kind. And so, yes, we had the graduate convocation and had one every year, and had really some very good speakers.

Q. What were the purposes to be achieved by the convocation?

A. Well I think first of all, some of the faculty people would say, well of course the President never goes to these things you see or anything that the Graduate School did. So I got him early in the year when his schedule was not full, and he said, “Yes.” Of course, then perhaps the highlight of all of that was when we had Logan Wilson, who was President of the, I can’t remember the name, National Association for Universities, I can’t think of it right now.

Q. AAU?
A. No, all the big universities, the American Council on Education. He was President of the American Council on Education. So he had a good academic background and had written a book on college teaching. He was a sociologist, Logan Wilson, I think from North Carolina.

Q. I remember his name.

A. He had been President of the University and then went to Chapel Hill. Then he went to Texas. And then he went to Washington. And so I got in touch with him and pointed out the fact that I didn’t think anybody from the American Council on Education had ever been to Ohio and a few other things. And got a nice reply from him and he said he’d be happy to come. So that helped a great deal too. I must say I guess it was then, I met him, when I went to Washington.

Q. These continued for a while as I recall, several years.

A. How long, I do not know.

Q. I don’t recall off-hand. I found it very interesting to read one of your lasting contributions I would say, and that is the 50th anniversary of the Graduate School Historical Essay. Would you say a little about that? That is a lasting contribution.

A. Yes, thank you. Of course, as a historian I was interested in such things and this was the opportunity to write up 50 years of graduate education at Ohio State. And in the process of all of this, I found that there were good accounts of faculty people in the library. So I spent a good deal of time there looking into the beginnings of graduate education at Ohio State and the discussions that went on.

Q. Back to 1911.
A. Yes. That was the official time. Graduate courses had been even before, been offered. So I looked into that. It was interesting, personally, because now I think that it was looking into the background of some of the faculty members, who were leading in this movement, that they had taken graduate work at German universities. And that led somewhat, I must say, in some writing of a history of just that, Americans who went to German universities.

Q. From whom we got our Ph.D. actually.

A. Yes, that’s right. So that I think was very interesting. I think it helped too, because it was carried as you know, as a special issue of the Graduate School Record, so that it had immediate distribution through all of the graduate schools in the country. I think at that time there were over a hundred and some.

Q. It’s something which was useful then and continues to be useful for a long time.

A. I think that’s right.

Q. When you became Dean of the Graduate School, what were your perceptions, Everett, of the job in the context of university, and did these perceptions change, vis-à-vis the mission of the University, the duties of the provost, of Al Garrett as Vice President for Research? Is the question clear there?

A. Well yes. Of course, I think I was, like many other people who have become Graduate Deans, they haven’t thought a great deal about it before. It’s not one of those things that you progress through normally. The appointments are often made through a full professor who has quite a reputation. I was not one of those of course. And I grew into the position if you will. So that I did have the advantage of being an Assistant Dean for several years, so that I was familiar with
the technical things, the dissertations and this and that, and the language requirement, which was always a much discussed subject, and so forth. So that I soon came to recognize this and became very interested in it. And then of course the position at the Graduate School and the total University picture. I think that with President Fawcett’s administration, there were meetings of deans and vice presidents, and I’m not sure that such things had been held before. If so, they were very casual and not frequent. But we met fairly frequently and of course, as Graduate Dean I had taught for graduate education and hold my own, and of course so I did.

Q. Were there any problems that you recall, between your sphere of responsibilities and those of other higher level administrators?

A. I think there was always just a little friction with the other, I won’t call it friction, but a little unhappiness with some of the other deans, because they had, I think it comes with that job, say the Dean of the School of Education or Business, that they are also responsible for graduate education in that area. And so I was almost like an outsider interloping into this area. But I stood for the fact that if a certain professor was to be given tenure, given a promotion (end of tape).

Q. Everett, you were talking at the end of the tape, about the relations between the Graduate Dean and other disciplines and colleges and deans.

A. Yes. Before long, it was rather taken for rather granted that I would be consulted on matters of tenure and promotion for faculty members in the various schools and colleges. And I think that helped. Along that same line, I had realized that whenever a doctoral examination was being given, that the graduate dean always
appointed a representative at those examinations. And I realized that here my
name, my title was being used, and I had nothing to do with it. So I did some
work and decided that I would make a decision. I would appoint the person. And
I worked out a little scheme and presented it to, I think it was the Executive
Committee of the Graduate School. They thought it would never work.

Q. It wouldn’t fly?

A. It wouldn’t fly. So I thought, well if it’s alright with you I’d like to try it. So they
said that would be fine. So I started that and my secretary, Mrs. Helen Smith,
kept the records on all this, so that I wouldn’t make mistakes and duplicate and all
that. And so it went into effect. And I think that, if I may say so, broke up some
close relationships that had been worked out, so that the Graduate School
representative would never ask embarrassing questions of the candidate. I think it
was something of a shock, that there was not much they could do about this.
After a while it was widely applauded and I can remember vividly the Department
of English calling up, the Chairman, saying, “Everett, you cannot have a Graduate
School representative from the Department of Psychology.” And I said, “Why
not?” And he said, “It’s just not proper. History would be alright, or Language,
but not a psychologist.” And so I said, “Well, we’ll see how it works out.” I had
known that the young man in the Department of Psychology had gone to Harvard
and had almost received his Ph.D. in the field of the candidate, and then had
suddenly switched to psychology. And so they were very aghast when this man
came from Psychology, came in and asked the questions of the candidate and
faculty. But they had to recognize that it was a good selection. That was typical.
Dick Armitage had similar experiences with this. He continued it. I don’t know whether it’s continued now or not. But it seemed to be that it was a very good device and I could receive a note from a Graduate School representative saying that the examination had been conducted in a thoroughly and scholarly method and so on and all the rest, and in his or her own opinion the candidate was properly examined.

Q. I have the impression, which may not be correct Everett, that in some cases it was felt that the representatives selected by the department were not always the best ones.

A. Oh, I think that was true.

Q. And didn’t represent the Graduate School or did not protect the interests of the examination or the individual as well as you would like. Is this correct?

A. Yes, I think there were truly some strong feelings in one or two areas, which I could name, but I won’t. You see, they had no complaint because the Ph.D. is a doctor of philosophy, and that’s it and this means that they really should be answer questions from any other department.

Q. A part of that I presume, and maybe a large part of it, representative, is to see to it as best as he or she can, that it is conducted fairly.

A. That’s right. And that the Graduate School representative could ask questions if he or she wanted to. Those were the important points. I remember, I asked Professor Sidney Fisher of the Department of History, to go to a number of these. He’s enjoyed that and he’s a well prepared scholar in his own field and very well read. He enjoyed himself. He was highly thought of by people in other areas. So
I think that worked out very nicely. So I think relations with the other administrators was very good. I had good relationships with the Dean of the Medical School. There was not much with Dentistry.

Q. Doan would have been Medicine.
A. He was Dean of Medicine. Of course, because he had so many students, he became an acquaintance of Dr. Zollinger. I know him more recently, renewed acquaintance. Very intelligent, very bright man. He had so many fine students who came up to learn the techniques of his surgery. They had to write a little dissertation which was not easy for them.

Q. In surgery, I understand that Bob Zollinger often would not charge a faculty member for his services as surgeon.
A. I wouldn’t be a bit surprised.

Q. Going back to the other, Everett, was there an occasion or two where the representative said he felt it was not conducted properly?
A. Yes, I can remember one or two of those.

Q. What action was taken?
A. We had a discussion with the Chairman of the Department involved, and of course the head of the committee, and worked out, I think there was a re-examination.

Q. So there was a remedy?
A. It was probably called poor communications or something of that sort. I think that we had considerable difficulties with the Ph.D. in Veterinary Medicine, because it was a very highly applied subject. We wanted to make sure that there
was more research into it. They recognized that. Not the DVM but the Ph.D. And there was one younger faculty member who was very much for all of this. He was research oriented and so he helped a great deal in getting, make sure that the students had done real research in the area.

Q. This is the way it was handled, I presume, at other good universities.
A. I think so, yes.

Q. Protecting the student and also the scholar level of the examination, which was very important.
A. I think other relations with the deans were very good. I invited all of them to come to meetings in their departments and colleges, and make little talks, which I did. Of course, I must say that one of the interesting beneficial developments was that, when these lecturers would come to the various departments, it was always under the name of the Graduate School and the department. Often there were social activities after the lecture. And on occasion, there was no one to give the party, so my wife, Jane and I, would give some parties. Now after one or two of these, they became fairly expensive receptions and so on. So I felt, “Well, there must be some money that I could use, could have for this.” So I talked to Vice President Frederick Heimberger, and he said, “Well, if you just send me an itemized list of your expenses,” he would be glad to reimburse us. So we did. We have many, many parties. And I must admit that that helped the Graduate School a great deal. Fred Heimberger and his wife were fine people but not socially inclined, which is understandable. But he had the monies I suspect from alumni funds.
Q. One had to __________ because as Director of Libraries, I had very little luck in getting money for entertaining, which was really professionally oriented, not just social.

A. You had your own expense account but it was the social activities that were expensive. And so Fred Heimberger was very kind along that line.

Q. We’ve talked about a number of important accomplishments during your administration. Do you think of three that you feel perhaps proudest of?

A. Well of course the University Press. I think that was very important. I think another was the course on college teaching, and I think along with that would be the bringing together of graduate activities from around the campus, which had been somewhat fractionated. Bringing them together in kind of a spirit of graduate education and to raise the sites of a good many people and to help the scholarly activity of the campus.

Q. At least two of these will be continuing improvements, accomplishments.

A. I think so. I think the others were important too.

Q. In my own case, and perhaps in your, things you regret, wish you had done differently. It’s always easy to look back, hindsight. Can you think of two or three things that you regret most?

A. I really don’t have many regrets. I think that had I stayed, I think I would have continued to increase the course on college teaching as I have outlined the three courses. I did not stay long enough to do that.

Q. It was going when you left, is that right?
A. Yes, but it was not the three. So I think that could have been, I don’t think I thought the whole thing through in the beginning, that that was possible. And I’m sorry I didn’t because I believe it could have been done on a larger scale. Cause I think the time was right for it. There was a great deal of talk nationally about poor college teachers, ill trained, and so forth. And I think we could have made a larger contribution in that particular area.

Q. But at least you got it started.

A. At least I got it started. I haven’t many regrets. I’m sure other people could point out these things that could have been done. I always felt that since I was a historian and not very strong in the sciences, that I could have done more there. But with Ned Moulton, who was very conversant with all the people, and the subject as well, because Ned was very well qualified. He truly was a Ph.D. in civil engineering, but he was along with that, did a great deal of research and got his Ph.D. from Berkeley.

Q. And selection of someone from that area was no accident?

A. No. So it turned out very nicely that way. And he was dramatic, inventive and kind of a nervous type. He would want to get things done and I didn’t object to that.

Q. I was entertained by your witty remark in prefacing your retirement as Dean in 1963, when you said that after a period of years, a Dean’s peculiarities often outweigh his strengths. Would you now indicate your real reasons for leaving?

A. I think that I had been affected by some studies that had been made about the effectiveness of administrators. One that I can’t remember who wrote it, it was
that after five years, a good administrator really doesn’t have anymore ideas, new ideas, and enough drive to put them into any kind of action. It’s not that it’s coasting, but you can become a very confident administrator, but you don’t look to new things.

Q. Not innovative or creative.
A. That’s right. I don’t think this has been true of every president and dean, but I think it’s been true of a good many.

Q. I think it does apply to presidents too.
A. Oh I think so too. I think this study was about presidents. And I think that has been true, and I think that was one reason the man at Yale resigned. He barely got started before he resigned.

Q. But it was five years.
A. I think it was five years and that’s about what he said. That’s why also a lot of men who accept presidencies say that they will stay on for five years. This is why they always want tenure in a department of course you see. After five years they want a full fledged review of the administration. The person coming in would make sure that this was an honest appraisal and not to just make him feel better. I think they did that at Indiana and some other places. I always felt that was a very good idea.

Q. The average that tenure for college and university presidents used to be seven years. Maybe it’s still five, six or seven, something like that. It does make sense not to say in there ten, twelve, fifteen years.
A. Oh, I think that’s true. One of the earlier attitudes was that if you didn’t stay on longer, you had been a failure. And I think that’s foolishness. So, I think that was part of it. The other thing was, I forget how old I was at the time, but it seemed to me, and Jane went along with it, that it would be interesting to try another activity. And that came about because I was asked to become Director of the Graduate Fellow Scholarship, National Defense Graduate Education Program. So I went to Washington for one year. That’s all they wanted you.

Q. Was that immediately following your leaving the deanship here?

A. I didn’t give up my deanship. I had a leave of absence for a year.

Q. That’s what I was remembering, yes.

A. And Dick Armitage was Acting Dean. And then, I think it was in the spring of ’63, that I received an offer to go to Boston University.

Q. I know you were there for several years and then to St. Louis, University of Missouri, St. Louis. Could you comment briefly on these two?

A. Yes, I was asked to go to Boston University in an interesting way. Soon after I accepted the position in Washington with the Department of Education, and I must say it was a very slow job at the time. It was not a financial year, so that they didn’t have problems with making up budgets and all of that. Keeping the shop going, keeping the shop open. So I got around the country, I must admit, which was part of the job, to inspect graduate programs, defense program, at the various institutions. So I took in some institutions that I had never been to before – Cornell and Florida and some others. But during that year, I became interested in putting together a book on graduate education, which I did, called “Graduate
Education Today.” And I got all my friends who were graduate deans to write on certain subjects. I asked the advice of a Dr. Alan Carter, who was Vice President of the Council on Education, and we had a number of lunches together in planning all of this. And then I did all the paperwork and all the rest. Then Alan went to New York and he was Provost at New York University. He was an economist, first rate, wonderful. So during the course of all of that, I received a telephone call from Washington to have lunch with Logan Wilson who remembered me from Ohio State. He was not an easy man to talk to. He would say something and if he got no response, he would change the subject and go on to something else, hoping he would strike a fertile field. But anyway, we seemed to get along pretty well because soon after that he wanted to follow up and wanted to know whether I wanted to be a member of the Cosmos Club, where we had had lunch, and I said that that would be nice. So I did. It went through very quickly, so I was a member of the Cosmos Club until fairly recently. But then he also put my name in for the Vice Presidency at Boston University. It seemed like an interesting place and I had never been to a private institution. So I was interviewed by President Harold Case. And so I started in the fall of ’63 and stayed there until, and Harold Case resigned and he was replaced by a young man who came in. And then he left and then Mr. Silver came in from Texas. It was at that point, in ’70, in the fall, he was going to come on the first of the year in ’71, and I decided that I would not get along well with him and he would probably not get along very well with me. Since I was at that time a Senior Vice President, and so I left.
Q. Did you leave before he arrived?

A. I was there during the troubled times of the search committee which was highly written up in Life Magazine and all of that. It was a ghastly affair altogether.

Q. He was a controversial figure and still is.

A. I had a friend, a graduate dean at Texas, and so I had some conversations with him. It was on that advice that I decided that I would not want to stay. So after it was known that Silver would come in, this was in the fall of ’70, I began to search for other positions. And I looked and was considered for several positions at that time. So that when Mr. Silver arrived soon after the first of the year in January of ’71, I had one conversation in greeting him and extending my services to him and that sort of thing. And then my second discussion with him was to come in and tell him that I was leaving. Hello and good-bye. And just as well. I am very happy. I really don’t brag about many things I’ve done, but I think that was the smartest thing I’ve ever done.

Q. Things seemed to have been something of a turmoil.

A. Oh yes, it was terrible, just awful. So many of my friends at Boston were on the committee and they thought this was wonderful. They needed a dynamic man like this and all. Then the School of Theology, the Dean of Theology, a very fine man, Walter Miller, with a great reputation, used to come and talk to me about how things were. So he worked it out somehow or other that the search committee would have some outside advisor to go down. He was just shocked that this man came back. He said he went down and found out he wanted to ______ and nothing else.
Q. I recall that he and AAUP had trouble.

A. Yes. It was disastrous. I’m glad, as I say, decided to leave. But I enjoyed my experiences at Boston University. It was a fine university. And as Vice President for Academic Affairs, I had virtually all the top level decisions. I’ll be frank to say that the other, Chris Janner, who was President in between, and Harold Case first, who hired me, then Chris Janner, neither one of them were terribly concerned about academic appointments and standards and decisions of that kind. So it was really up to me to do all of that. And so I enjoyed all of that and organized a very tight council of the deans and a few other people. We worked out all kinds of things like tenure and promotion regulations, this and that and so on. I had a very good experience.

Q. And I assume that your experience here in the History Department, and especially as Graduate Dean, was useful there.

A. Oh yes, very much so, particularly the Dean’s Council, which met regularly every Wednesday morning I think it was, and that sort of thing. I was always very pleased that often the medical dean and the dental dean would come.

Q. That’s an accomplishment.

A. That was a real accomplishment. There were seventeen deans.

Q. Then you went from that, in ’71 Everett, to St. Louis?

A. Yes. This was a new branch of the University of Missouri located at St. Louis. And it was typical of the new universities, it was founded in 1963.

Q. That late?
So it was pretty new when I arrived. But it had gotten off to a good start. The University of Missouri had four campuses, one at Columbia and Kansas City, Rollo, which is the Engineering College, and then UMSL, the University of Missouri at St. Louis. It was pretty much traditional arts and science education in business areas. Very high standards. I don’t think everybody in the city of St. Louis approved of that. I think they wanted easy admissions, easy standards, and so on. But the early chancellors and their advisors made sure that they had high standards and good faculty, and made many sacrifices in order to pay the faculty.

Q. Were there graduate departments in a number of areas?

A. When I went there, there was only Master’s degrees. But they were good.

Q. It takes a while to build up to that.

A. Yes. And then, let’s see, when I left we had a graduate work and a Ph.D. in chemistry and then psychology, and then one or two others followed.

Q. And maybe one or two have been added since then.

A. I think that’s true. Anyway, they had very good departments, in chemistry. Chemistry was superb, as good as lots of well known universities. So it was an interesting experience with a new type of student, new location. No resident students at all, although students lived in apartments and rooming houses. Nothing officially run by the University.

Q. In some ways a relief I guess not to have to provide living quarters.

A. There was no stability on the campus, no students everyday, at night time you know. A very large extension program.

Q. A commuter’s university.
A. Exactly. So I was Dean of Faculties for a period of time, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and then I asked for the title Dean of Faculties and got that. And appointment as tenure too.

Q. That always helps.

A. Always that. Although I must say that any administrator that came in had to have his CV searched by the department, which I thought was a good idea. It just so happens that the ones that I knew had no trouble. They had a larger publication record of anyone in the department.

Q. That brings us to about the end of the questions I had. Unless you have something further to add, Everett, we’ve touched on many of the areas and your accomplishments. Can you think of anything further before I wind it up?

A. No, I think that covers things quite well. I’m sure I’ll think of things later. You always do after this kind of an experience. This has been very enjoyable for me. But I enjoyed my years at Ohio State. I think, if I may say so, probably more in the Graduate School office than the Department of History. The department was somewhat troubled. I don’t know if you remember that. There was division, basic division in the department.

Q. This is often true.

A. Often true. So it’s not just … I must say that, tenure of course was not a big thing in those days. That was the least of your problems.

Q. It is now.
A. It is now. And so I don’t remember being much concerned about it, except that the only problem that I had was a department rule, that the department would not hire any of its own graduates.

Q. I remember that.

A. And I think there were only two exceptions. One was a man whose name I can’t remember who was hired during the war years. He was an older man. And I think he retired about two years after I did.

Q. But that was a definite exception. (end of tape)

Q. We’ve changed the cassette now and would you continue?

A. I would have to say that I was not at all adverse to leaving the History Department to go into the Graduate School. I think that I was more upset in those years by being called back into the Navy in 1950. I was stationed at Newport, Rhode Island, which was a delightful place to be. We were there for 23 months. That was difficult for me. It was almost impossible to do any research there. I did a little but not very much.

Q. You didn’t have access to libraries, did you?

A. No. The situation was not conducive. There was no place to go and work. And I was working on a biography of McKinley at that time, but I didn’t have much time. Brown University was there but that was 3 some miles, 25 I guess. It was just not a good situation for that.

Q. I can see how your work in the Graduate Work would have been more creative and more exciting than in the History Department.
A. Right. So I enjoyed that part of it. I believe, and I’ve told people this, that with few exceptions I enjoyed being an administrator. There are always a few problems you have here and there and so on.

Q. Always.

A. And sometimes it doesn’t work out very well.

Q. Thank you, Everett. And happily for your friends and some organizations, such as the Ohio Historical Society, which I believe you are currently a trustee.

A. And Vice President.

Q. You and your wife, Jane, have returned to Columbus, or did return in 1980 as I recall, for your retirement years. We are certainly glad that you chose to return to Columbus and live among us. Thank you again for your kind cooperation in this. This goes in the University Archives as part of the Oral History Program. Thank you, Everett.

A. Thank you very much.