Q. This is Adrianne Chafetz and I’m interviewing Simon Dinitz for the Oral History Project at Ohio State. Let’s begin by asking whether you can identify those persons and events that were influential in guiding you to an academic career.

A. I’ve thought about that a little bit over the years. And I can tell you that my recollection is that I had a number of people who influenced me, some considerably less than others. To give you a little brief history of this thing, I went to Boys’ High in Brooklyn, and I was a major in the Social Sciences, particularly History and Economics. From there I went to City College, and again majored in History and minored in Economics. I had a history prof there my very first semester by the name of Weyant. He sent me, so to speak, to thinking about an academic career. But then after a year and a half I went into the Navy, and shortly, nine months later, was sent to an Officer Training Program called the V-12, and of all things I was sent to Vanderbilt University in a group of 150 people, all but one from the New York/New Jersey area. This was at a time when campuses were denuded of males, and it was a very, very strange cultural experience. Culture shock worked both ways. I had no idea what to anticipate, and I was surprised by the differences in the way in which a school like City College worked, and the way in which Vanderbilt worked. I won’t elaborate on that. But at Vanderbilt, there was a prof who had recently returned from being the
chief administrator for recordkeeping, statistical stuff at the OPA, the Price Administration. His name was Marshall Clinard. And since I was then free, the war was over, I was then free to take any class I wanted, and I signed up for his class. I didn’t know why. I don’t know why to this day. But I did. And it was the experience of my life. Clinard was a most unusual teacher, a most unusual scholar. And he took me under his wing, and in due course, he left the next year for Wisconsin. I followed him to Wisconsin at his request a year later to do graduate work with him. And I became to all intents and purposes a member of his family. I became also his first genuine Ph.D., and I wrote both my master’s and my doctorate with him.

Q. You said he was in statistics?
A. He did the work for the OPA, in terms of an analysis of what was going on.

Q. But what did he teach?
A. He taught Sociology at Vanderbilt, but at OPA he was interested in such things … he wrote a book on the black market, which is the standard really for that period of time. So yes, he was a sociologist [who] was interested in criminology. He was a criminologist. He was trained as a criminologist. So I followed him to Wisconsin, and I discovered a whole new world. It was a world, just as Vanderbilt had shocked me, so Wisconsin shocked me. Wisconsin shocked me intellectually, in a way, it was like City College with a lake and grass. The students were extraordinary, especially the grad students. And it was a very competitive environment. And yet everyone was helpful. I worked there for four years under his direction, and got my Ph.D. with him at that time, in 1951. While
I was there, I might just mention parenthetically, that he got interested in the problem of alcoholism, and that was because, well it’s a long story, but that was because one of the breweries in Milwaukee was interested in cutting down on their problem with blue Fridays and Mondays, and what have you. And so they came to the University and they asked for somebody to come in and do some research. Well, he put me into the library to search everything I could find on alcoholism, but of course the unions later objected, and we could not do that particular study. I might add that my specialty was labor relations when I got out. That was my goal. And so I couldn’t do the very thing that I wanted. Well, here I was sitting with all this material on alcoholism, whom it hits and why, and all that sort of stuff, and he had read in the paper that a new group was forming in Madison called Alcoholics Anonymous. It was forming in a house just blocks down from the University. And so naturally I was the available one and he sent me to investigate. And so I joined AA so to speak. I became a participant and observer, which was in those days a fairly common kind of sociological research, and I tried to work from the inside. There was a good deal of doubt about my authenticity since I was 22 or 21 years old, and I was hardly shaving so to speak, and here I was with men who had been through the ringer, and some of the women who had been even more through the ringer than the men had been. That’s a long story.

Q. All right. We’re talking about Alcoholics Anonymous at Madison.

A. Right. And so I was deeply involved in that particular group. I did a lot of things with them. I went to their meetings every Friday night. I went to some of their
meetings on Wednesday nights, and they were educating the new fish that they roped in, and also some times on a Monday night. I also went on occasion to lunch with them at the Lorain Hotel, which was then downtown, and also to a football game or two because as a group, they didn’t trust each other not to drink, despite all their protestations about faith and their ability to maintain themselves one day at a time; it was pretty hard for them. And so I also traveled with them occasionally across the State of Wisconsin to set up new groups. So I really became quite interested in this whole question of the group influence on altering behavior. Obviously it ran counter to the analytic idea that you have one patient at a time and you delve deeply in, and the only therapy that you could experience, the only positive gain you could get, was from his deeper and greater understanding. Wel, here was an attempt to use group therapeutic methods in a context in which they hadn’t previously been used. And I can tell you that I did my master’s on that and wrote a volume on it. And it influenced me for years and years to come. Well, then, we still didn’t get into the brewery, so I followed that up with a continuing study of alcoholism for the remainder of my stay, and did my dissertation in the same area. So that was basically my Wisconsin experience. Wisconsin, unlike Ohio State, had prima donnas. Every area was somehow staffed by a prima donna. And I learned a lot about teaching. For example, we had a guy, Kiefkoffer, who wouldn’t start a lecture in Economics without spreading his hands apart and waiting for applause in the auditorium. And then at the end of his lecture, he would do the same thing. It was an interesting way of getting students at least to listen to him, and he did very, very well. We had
Howard Becker in my department. And Howard Becker was a nemesis to just about everybody who went through there, but I found him to be, well an exciting prof. I don’t happen to agree with what he did, and I don’t think that he made that much of a contribution, but he did. So I learned from all of these people. It was a very, very exciting time, right post-war in 1947 to 1951, and I can’t imagine any university anywhere that offered more excitement to its students. So that’s my background.

Q. You went directly from there to Ohio State. What did you select Ohio State? Did they select you?

A. I didn’t and they didn’t. It’s one of those weird stories. You know how jobs are, how occupations are, accidental. Mine was the most accidental of all. The story on that is very simple. When I got out of Wisconsin, I didn’t have a job. My Ph.D. was conferred on July 7, and all the jobs such as they were had already been taken. There were many returning veterans who had started school long before me, and they had filled up the available jobs. And so I went back to work in a factory, an underwear factory, where I had worked from the time I was 13 on and off. It was my uncle’s factory. It was sort of a family enterprise. So I worked there. And then toward the end of the summer, still without a job, I decided I would go visit my brother who was stationed at Camp Atterbury, Indiana, who was headed for Korea. He was about to ship out. And so a friend of mine who was going to Dayton to visit his relatives offered me a lift. And I went to Dayton and then from Dayton I took a bus and got to Indianapolis, holed up in some flea bag and tried to see my brother, who as it turned out, had guard duty
and so on. So I didn’t see him until Labor Day itself. And we spent some good hours together. Then being already in Indianapolis I decided to go on to the American Sociological Society Convention being held in Chicago, whereupon I boarded a bus and went to Chicago. Got there a day early. The meetings generally don’t start until Wednesday. I got there Tuesday. When I got there, I naturally registered for jobs and all that sort of thing. My pedigree was pretty decent. Nevertheless, there weren’t too many jobs that I could qualify for, for one reason or another. And there weren’t too many jobs, period. Towards the end of the conference I was getting ready to go home, disappointed beyond words, when I was walking down this corridor. This was the Conrad Hilton Hotel, in case you remember it. It was a monster place, with three towers and all that sort of deal. And so I was walking down there and there were two men standing there, one facing me as I was coming, and one facing away from me. And they were engaged in conversation. The man I recognized immediately facing me, was Bill Sewell. Bill Sewell, I shall never forget him, who was trying desperately to unload this character who was boring him to death. And so having been at Wisconsin, I had been in his seminar, he motioned me to come over. He was in a hurry to get me to come over. And so I came over. He introduced me to the man who was here. I won’t mention his name, but the man who was here. And he said to him, “Is there a possibility of a job at Ohio State?” And out of the blue, the man said, “Yes.” And while I was there, that day he gathered all of these profs that had come to the national meeting and they each interviewed me, some together, and some individually, and I spoke to the chair towards the end of the
day. And the chair told me, this was on a Thursday – no, it was on a Friday – that
he would call me the following Friday and let me know what the decision was.
On the following Friday I was home and I got a call from the chairman at 7:00 in
the evening, offering me the job at Ohio State at the magnificent sum of $3,000. I
beg your pardon, at that point it was $3,900. I was absolutely elated. Not being a
high jumper or anything of the sort, I probably could have touched the ceiling.
And my wife of two years then was equally elated and we were going to Ohio
State. I had something like ten days or fifteen days to prepare to come here. I had
no car. We had no furniture. We had just a couple of trunks, steamer trunks
really, which we packed up and headed for this place. This was 1951. It was in
September. I got here. We left our trunks at the station. I asked for directions on
how to get to the University. We got on the High Street bus and got up to campus.
I asked my way to the Soc. Department. I got there and then the first order of
business was (a) to sign up, and (b) to find a place to live. Well, I went over the
housing people, and of course it was late. Everybody else had already been
housed. So they directed me, and without a car I couldn’t go very far. So they
directed me to a place on Fifth Avenue, West Fifth Avenue, between High and
Dennison. Three houses off Dennison Avenue. And so we went there and took a
look at the place. Well, I didn’t realize at the time, nor did my wife, that this was
a converted mortuary, and we got an apartment which had been housing for the
stiffs that they kept. But anyhow, we made it and we were there for the first year.
It was a good year. I liked my colleagues right off the bat. There was some very
notable people here, some of whom you as an interviewer might even have
known, like Chris Jonassen and Brewton Berry, and Ray Sletto and Russ Dynes and Al Clarke, and any number of others. It was a great group of people. And they accepted me right from the start. My teaching load was insanely heavy. It was 15 hours a week, three introductory courses, scattered so that the first one usually began at 8:00 in the morning. The second was at 11:00, and the third was later in the afternoon, so that I wouldn’t leave the premises. That was the general idea of how they scheduled courses. There was obviously no help. You had to grade your own papers and do all that sort of thing. Well, I found that not to be particularly trying. I liked to teach, so I began teaching. My courses were two Social Problems courses and another introductory course. The following year, the man who was teaching criminology in our department, Walter Reckless at that time, had a joint appointment between Sociology and Social Work. And he was housed in the Social Work area. But the man who handled the criminology courses, Mike Hakeem, was offered the possibility and took the job at the University of Wisconsin. And so, here I was, with all the credentials for that kind of work, and so naturally I asked for and received the possibility and the right to teach the crim course. And so that’s how my criminology career began at Ohio State. Reckless was in India. He came back from India where he, by the way, or came to be known, as the father of probation and parole, and he came back. And I must tell you in all candor that he wasn’t too happy about me. The reason he wasn’t was I was trained by Clinard, who was a Sutherland man from the University of Chicago and Indiana. And Sutherland and Reckless had different, let’s put it this way, different perspectives on the field of criminology. And so
from a position of essential distrust, he gradually came to realize that I was not here to impose an ideology on the department contrary to anything that he was interested in, in perspective, and after five years we actually began to work together. So that was my introduction to the department.

Q. Describe Reckless.

A. Reckless was a mainline Philadelphian who went to the University of Chicago as an undergraduate. He wanted to study Egyptology. He was interested in archeology, Middle Eastern archeology, and he really did want to have a career in this. During the course of his training at Chicago, he and three other men, students, went to the Princeton game. They drove from Chicago to Princeton. On the way down, they had to cross a railroad track. They didn’t see the train. They didn’t hear it. They were hit by the train. The other three were, well, severely battered. I’m not sure that any survived. I never had the nerve to ask him whether they survived or not. I don’t think they did.

Q. Was he driving?

A. No, he was sitting in the back seat on the passenger side. What happened to him was, that he broke a hip and lost his finger. And this was a blow, the likes of which you can’t even imagine, because his family had slated him to be a concert violinist. But the mainline family wanted all of their children to engage in musical careers, to embrace them. And he, as the son, was going to be the fiddler. And he had a lifelong interest in fiddling. His sister became a critic for one of the major, I forget which newspaper, music critic. And the third one, I believe, the other sister became a music teacher, but I’m not certain of the third one. Well,
that ruined his career obviously as a violinist, and he became interested, of all things, in criminology while he was then at Chicago. He stayed on for his Ph.D. and he wrote a classic book based on his dissertation, called “Vice in Chicago.” It was cited for many, many years. This was essentially another one of these participant observation studies, but which the University of Chicago was justly famous. In fact, they started sociology in America with these kinds of studies. For example, Lou Wirth’s *Study of the Jewish Progression in Chicago*, from Maxwell Street all the way out to the suburbs. It was a wonderful study. The study, for example, of the Gold Coast and the [Slum] by [Harvey Warren] Zorbaugh. *The Taxi Dance Hall*, by [Paul G.] Cressey. And there must have been twenty in that series. Well, Reckless’s was one of the earlier ones, and he developed a tremendous reputation for that. He then went, his first job was at Vanderbilt, of all things. And he went down there and he became the criminologist/sociologist of note. He also had a gal in his class who was an interpretive dancer, 13 years younger, by the name of Martha, Martha Reckless now, and he married her. Eventually, he was called to Ohio State to head up the criminology department. The criminology group, it was not a department, it was a group, a small group, two or three people. The group was headed up by a former dean of our college, business college of all things. His name, I forget at the moment, but Reckless came in to replace him. And so Reckless got here in 1940 or roughly 11 years before I came here. And he developed programs in probation and parole. He developed delinquency program courses in just about anything you could think of across the board. He placed people. He was a
tremendously good community type. He could get people involved and get them placements in just about every agency that had been closed previously. So he did a yeomen job in that regard. He was also a workaholic. As I said in an obituary which I wrote for him, wrote about him, he was an indefatigable worker. I never met anybody like him. Seven days a week. And when he was off, and [he] entertained, it was also a work-related deal. So he had, for example, a superintendent of schools in, the police chief, all of these people, as part of this deal where the University became enmeshed in the activities of the community. So that was Walter Reckless. And he wrote all the time. He wouldn’t correct. As a writer you know you have to edit your stuff. Well, Reckless refused to edit anything. His first draft was his last draft.

Q. When I was a student at Brooklyn College in 1964, we used a textbook. And I thought that was the first criminology textbook.

A. No, it was not the first criminology [textbook]; it was one of the early ones. It was called Vice in Chicago. No, it was called The Crime Problem. And it went through many editions. He also had an earlier one. He did have the first one in social psychology, but his co-author delayed, and as a result he always said that he was second, but he should have been the first. He explored many areas. He felt he had the confidence that whatever it is that he studied and wrote was gospel. And that’s the way he taught.

Q. What were your impressions of the University when you got here? Did you feel the atmosphere was drained or strained because you were one of the few Jewish staff at the University at the time?
A. I’ve considered that question many times, obviously. This was not Wisconsin. I thought that I had gone to a University which didn’t have the intellectual punch of a Madison. I think that was true for a long period of time. It was essentially, as my colleagues sometimes refer to it, as the University of Central Ohio, as opposed to a national university. On the other hand, I was only 24 years old when I came here. And so I don’t know whether the treatment that I received was a function principally of my age, or of my religious background, or of my New York background, for that matter. I obviously had somewhat of an accent, and I didn’t come from central Ohio. But my adjustment in the department was perfectly good. The dean of our college at that time, Weidler, in all my years here never acknowledged my existence. He would walk by me in the hall without ever saying a word.

Q. This was the business college?

A. This was the business college. I don’t know why this was. It just was. He may not have been too friendly to other people as well but certainly I know how I felt. When I was hired, I was brought into the assistant dean at the time by a fellow with a real good sense of humor, Wayne Ley, and he said to Sletto who was my chairman, he said, “Can’t you find anybody to hire who is an adult?” I was young, no doubt about that. And so this was my introduction. But on this Jewish score, there are a couple of things I want to tell you. First, we had three people in my department who were born Jewish at least. You may know who they were. You may have met them. Kurt Wolff, who was very well-known. He later went to Brandeis. He lasted through the Second World War in Italy as a student, which
I never could quite understand. So there was Kurt, who you never knew he was Jewish. I never did until much, much later. There was Meph (Melvin) Seeman, who was by far the star of our department intellectually. I mean there wasn’t anybody quite in his category. He went to UCLA eventually and is still there. The president doesn’t want to let him go. He still gives him various tasks. The man is in his middle 80s now. And there was Erika Bourg. And so these three were what might be called Jews, but only in the sense of being born that way. I was the only authentic Jew, so to speak. And God knows I wasn’t all that authentic either. But at least I hadn’t rejected it or had left it behind. There was never any question about my Jewishness. As a Jew, I didn’t have any problems in the department. I knew I was in a select few on campus. There really weren’t very many when I came. As a matter of fact, the barrier had just recently been broken after the Second World War. Guys like Beckman and Kullan and Spitz and Nemzer and Goldberg in history had preceded me. This was a very strong group of people. But you could count them. And then there were people in the art department like Sid Chafetz, and this was before Jerry Hausman and Manny Barkan was here at the time. So we knew each other. We came to know each other pretty well, and the reason we came to know each other and I recommend this for anyone who happens to be in a minority, is that at Hillel they had these faculty suppers. And we went religiously, religiously only in the sense of going regularly. And we went regularly. It was a monthly affair and we got to know a lot of people on campus. Some of the people in the medical school, some of the people in the physical sciences, and so on. And we became friends with many of
them, life-long friends with some of them. Examples: I did the obituary for Lou Nemzer on the occasion of his unfortunate death. I got to know, Jerry. Jerry came much later. But my wife and his wife, Flora, became fast, fast friends. The Shapiros in mathematics and many, many others, who are not of any great interest in the history of this thing. But anyhow, it became a cohesive group and I felt very comfortable in that setting. People in Wisconsin asked me the same question. How did you manage here, because it had a reputation of not being hospitable to Jews. And I told them that as far as I could tell, I wasn’t experiencing any problems. But that wasn’t exactly the truth, largely because I was, with a Ph.D. and a darn decent record, I was an instructor for six full years. I didn’t become an assistant professor until my former professor, Clinard at Wisconsin, came here for a meeting, and he told the chairman, he said, “Look, I can get this guy another job. If you don’t promote him, that’s exactly what I’m going to do. You have one year to get him promoted.” Whereupon, of course in my seventh year I was promoted. But I probably still hold the record for the number of years as an instructor with a genuine Ph.D. at Ohio State. In our department. I don’t know how it was, there may have been other departments where this was also true. But in our department I was the only one. People like Bullock and Jonason, to name two, were promoted to assistant professors within a year or two of their coming. And Jonason had a degree at or NYU. Bullock had a degree out of Ohio State. But I sat in rank. I think it was partially age. But who knows what else it could have been. I don’t even want to speculate. But anyhow, the point was, that I was an instructor for a long time. That’s about the only
possible effect that I could think of that my being a priority might have had. Okay?

Q. You talked about many of the people in your department, the chairs and the ______. I guess you’ve sort of spoken about this. Who were the most effective leaders in the department, and why? What made them so?

A. Well, Sletto was chair, Ray Sletto. He was chair for 16 years, and he wasn’t just a chair. Because in those days, in our department and in my building at least, the chair was equivalent to being the head. Sletto did pretty much what he wanted to do during those years.

Q. He was the chair of sociology?

A. Sociology. He did pretty much what he wanted to do. And he turned the department around. It was a department that tended to emphasize the qualitative research. Bruten Berry’s *Almost White, Studies in Meztizos*. It was that kind of historical, participant observation kind of a department. They wrote a lot of textbooks. John Cuber was internationally known for his textbook writing on stratification, on social organization. So these were the people who were there prior to Sletto’s coming from Minnesota, and he came a few years before I came. And with his coming the department was transformed into a quantitative department. If you didn’t do empirical research you were devalued, not as a person or anything, but your work was devalued. And so some of the best brains in the department began to feel like outsiders, particularly Bruten Berry, who did these classic studies on almost white and on race relations in America, and things of this kind. Kurt Wolff, Meph Seeman, these are the people that left, of course,
later. But Sletto turned it around in other words. The people he began to bring in were all people who knew how to use data bases and how to do empirical research, which was of course what was happening in economics. It was happening in political science. It was happening in all social sciences. This was an attempt on the part of the social sciences to become as precise as the physical sciences. I think it’s a foregone conclusion that it won’t be that way, at least not in our lifetimes. But in any case, that was the goal. So he was the head and he gave this direction. He was an interesting character. He had come from the University of Minnesota, which was very empirically oriented. And he had had a farm background. And so he worked for the Farm Administration during the Depression and did surveys of what was going on in households in the South, in particular. So he had a pretty good feel for empirical research and this kind of thing. So he was very strong. But my identity was not with Sletto particularly, not in the beginning at least. It was with people like Cuber and Berry. I considered Cuber to be the best by far, the best lecturer in our department. There wasn’t anybody like him. He could get up in front of an audience, in Hagerty Auditorium, and spellbind them. He was very, very good. And he was also a book writer, and he also was a minister. By the way, ours was a department of ministers in the beginning. Ministers included people like Nissen, Carl Nissen. It included John Cuber, to name two right off the bat.

Q. Why?

A. Well, Sociology in the beginning, except for the Chicago school and most places, was essentially secular Protestantism. And so these guys who came from
religious backgrounds, whether they were ministers or not themselves, they came from these backgrounds, tried very, very hard to put their religious ideology …

Q. Were you talking about the social gospel kind of thing?

A. Well, it was more than social gospel. It really was. It was a way of looking at the world. It was a focus on the integration and cohesion of society on its institutions, religious institutions, family institutions. And so they found a home in Sociology. Not specific to Ohio State but this was a general thing that was happening around the country, but it did not happen at the first-rate schools in Sociology like the University of Chicago and Madison and Columbia, and in other places. Berkeley in particular. But in most other Big Ten schools, and in schools below the Big Ten, this was fairly common when you got a lot of ministerial input. And a lot of your students, grad students, had been in the religious life. To this day in our department we have one woman who was a former nun and we had her late husband who was a Jesuit. And we’ve had others who have this religious interest. Anyhow, I think I’ve tried to answer your question in that way.

Q. You’ve combined both teaching and research. What do you like better?

A. Well, it depends on the project. I like teaching. I’m basically, if I would have been anything else, I would have been a high school teacher of history. That was essentially as much as I thought in those days that I could aspire to. I didn’t know anybody who had more than that. And I figured if I could make that, I’d be okay. But teaching is my first love. I don’t think there’s really any question about that in my mind. Research is very important if the project is important. To do research the way it’s done now by some people in all departments, to use data bases and
manipulate them empirically and statistically doesn’t appeal to me. I can do it, but it’s not the thing that appeals to me. The kind of research I’m interested in, obviously, is dictated or is exemplified by what I have done in the past. I started off with Reckless on good boys in a high-delinquency area, which was a pithy question. I mean, how in the heck these kids come out okay, go on to blue-collar jobs and so on and never get into any difficulty coming from these deteriorated neighborhoods. And it was a real question. And we pursued that question for seventeen years. Among other things, we developed school programs, after-school programs. We followed up kids in places like New York and Akron, Columbus, where else? Anyhow, there were four areas using different kinds of populations to see if we had something going. And our stuff on Juvenile Delinquency: An Experiment on the Prevention of Delinquency outlines seventeen years of work. And there was a fascinating kind of a deal. We had a deal with the public schools. We had a deal with teachers. We darn near got kicked out. I nearly left Ohio State on an issue. The Dispatch, for some crazy reason, do you remember, were you in town when there was a Mrs. Suarez running loose? She had a kid in the schools, and this kid was given a questionnaire that we had worked out. The kid hid the questionnaire, took it home to mama. Mama went to The Dispatch and raised a ruckus. The Dispatch published the questionnaire and was critical of our work. And I said to myself, “What am I staying here for?” Well, it soon became evident that The Dispatch didn’t really mean it. They had second thoughts on it. And we were allowed, in fact encouraged, to continue our work.
Q. What was her ______?

A. It was a Communist deal. It was in the ’50s. We were asking questions that invaded family privacy, and it was obviously conspiracy. She had trouble, by the way, with all teachers. They had a case history on her that would fill up a bushel. Nevertheless, The Dispatch felt compelled to publish it. You may remember that they also published the names of all the people who voted against going to the Rose Bowl. Were you here then?

Q. Yes.

A. You remember that. What it was essentially, as I read it, is that The Dispatch wanted to be a major player on campus. And if it didn’t suit them they were going to undermine whatever effort was going on. Well, we got caught in that. Reckless took it better than I did. I didn’t take it very well. And I started looking around for a job. But then I thought better of it and I said, “Look, enough of this stuff.”

Q. [Unintelligible]

A. They just dropped it. They never again did anything on it, which was fine. And you know something? For all the power of a newspaper, hardly anybody saw the story or cared about it if they saw it.

Q. You can use it to ______.

A. Well, you can use it to wrap fish, except they don’t have fish around here that need wrapping. It’s all frozen here. Well anyhow, you asked about research. But the most interesting work that I did was not the good boy/boy bad stuff. It was the schizophrenia stuff. If you’re interested I can tell you the story.
Q. Sure.

A. The story is essentially this. There was a man in my department by the name of Ray Mangus who had done one of the first epidemiological studies of mental illness in a general population. That was called the Miami Valley Study. It was done down here in the Miami Valley. There have been hundreds of studies that have been done since, along the same lines, but he was the pioneer, Ray Mangus. Ray Mangus and a new guy on campus in the medical school, Director of Research, Benjamin Pasanamick, who had just come here. He was a psychiatrist, a research psychiatrist. He didn’t want any clinical practice. And his wife, who was a pediatrician, Hilda Knobloch, and was at Childrens Hospital, and did these studies. You may remember the colo study of a pediatrician going to study a chimp? That was Hilda Knobloch. And they were nearly run out of town on that story. I mean that sincerely. She was a damn good pediatric researcher. I mean, she was first-rate. But that’s the way it is. It was tough because the University in those days, I’m convinced, was not nearly as much respected as it is now.

Q. Was that when [then-OSU President] Novice Fawcett was there?

A. Oh yes, Novice was still in there. This had nothing to do with Novice particularly. It had to do with the way in which The Dispatch wanted to run this University. (end of side 1)

Q. We’re talking about the study on schizophrenia.

A. Yes, what happened was that, for some reason, I guess Pasanamick, when he came here, immediately looked up Mangus because Mangus had done the epidemiological study. And they had lunch together and they worked out a study,
which they were going to do jointly. It was going to be one of the first studies that Pasanamick’s group over in psychiatry in Upham Hall had embraced.

You’ve got to understand that in those days, they could count on money coming out of their ears from the National Institute of Mental Health. It was after the Kennedy initiative. There was money galore. And so they were going to do this study, and one day I get a call from Mangus asking me if I wanted to go to lunch with him at the Faculty Club along with Ben Pasanamick. Well, I couldn’t be happier frankly. I knew his reputation. He was one of the first ever to win the award of the American Psychiatric Association for research. He was a brilliant epidemiologist. He was just a brilliant individual. To make a long story short I had lunch with him. And at the lunch it appears Mangus can’t do the study. He’s going, and particularly for the summer, he’s going to Langley-Porter. He got an opportunity. Langley-Porter was the biggest named clinic in psychiatry in those days. It made Menninger look small. So he was going to Langley-Porter. And so, would I be interested in taking over the actual running of that particular study? Well, I said of course I did.

Q. When was this?

A. It was in the ’60s, very early ’60s. And then I got to meet Pasanamick at lunch on a couple of occasions with regard to the study and what have you. It wasn’t a particularly important study, but it was a break for him to start working on campus. And we got to know one another. And it turns out that he could have been my brother in terms of his interest, his orientation, the way he saw the world and so on. What he didn’t have were people skills. And he needed somebody
who would front for him. And without knowing it, I was drawn into that kind of situation, where I became the front man, where I made the arrangements, where I did the speaking externally, where I arranged the conferences and did all this kind of stuff. And so I got a part-time appointment in the Department of Psychiatry in the research unit. We began a whole series of studies there. We really did. But the big one was essentially based again on this initiative. Well, let me give you the story on that. In 1953, word of new drugs, psychotropic drugs came out. They started in France and moved to the United States pretty quickly. And obviously the psychotropic, for the first time in the history of mental illness, offered a possibility of dealing with people in a medical as opposed obviously to a penalogical or any other kind of way that had been used. No more blood letting and no more breaking of ankles and all this kind of stuff. And so in a sense it was a revolution. Very few people at the time understood the nature of that revolution. Ben did. He really did. And so did a few others at Columbia University in that center that they have on 186\textsuperscript{th} Street in Manhattan. I forget the name of the center. It’s really a very powerful center. Anyhow, what happened was, that the use of these drugs in the hospital made it unnecessary to get guards who were attendants, who were guard-like football player types, to control the population. What it did was it calmed the units. It made it possible to walk through these units without fear, and maybe even to get the attention of these patients who were unreachable before. So this drug revolution was so spectacular, that very few people realized it at the time. But those who did could see the implications for the future. Ben saw the implication for the future. So the
next question was, if it makes that much difference in the hospital, why can’t we prevent people from going to the hospital by using these drugs on the outside? And so we began a study, which was a very dangerous study. Couldn’t be done today. It really couldn’t. Human subjects, committees and various universities would never, ever permit this kind of thing. What we did essentially was, we were going to do it in Ohio, and I’m not going to go into all the details, but after getting all the approval that we needed, they reneged on us. So we had to move the study to Louisville, Kentucky, to Central State Hospital, which was a large mental hospital like the one here on Broad Street used to be, in Louisville, Central State. And we set up a treatment center called “In the Heart of Louisville.” It was staffed by psychiatrists, nurses, and then I sent my student down there, Frank Scarpitti, down there to ramrod the whole study. He was even younger when he went down there than I was when I came here. He didn’t even have a Ph.D. at the time. But he had everything else that you could want in a research man.

Anyhow, the study is very simply this: People get sent to the mental hospital. They’re evaluated at the mental hospital by the physicians there. We send our psychiatrist in to evaluate them. We create three groups of people. All of them had to meet certain criteria. They had to be between 18-65 [years old]. They had to be schizophrenic. They could not be aggressive to the point of homicidal or suicidal. They had to have a relative who was willing to take them home and take care of them, if and when they got home, and they had to be available for drug treatment. We explained to them that the drug treatment, how could they understand perfectly all of this, that the drug treatment would involve a drug and a
placebo condition. And so what we did was we got a deck of cards. It had three sets of letters on it. One said HC, hospital control; the guy stayed in the hospital. One said D; he went home on drugs, one said P; he went home on placebo. And we did this for 30 months. We had four public health nurses with one stand-by. And they went out to these homes, first every week, then every other week, and then once a month and so on. And they brought out the appropriate drugs, and they got all kinds of readings on the patients, how they were doing. Then we sent out a social worker to see whether or not we could get [them] jobs, whether we could find things for them to do, whether we could help the women with the children, all that kind of stuff. In other words, we became an agency not only that treated medically, but treated them socially and psychologically. And we gathered this massive amount of data over a 30-month period. What the data showed was that 77 percent of the drug home-care patients succeeded remaining in the community continuously throughout this period. Thirty-four percent on the placebo did the same, which is exactly what a placebo effect is, one-third. And of the hospital controls, 52 percent were released and sent back. And they were there an average of 112 to 113 days. I don’t have all the details. In other words, we could keep people in the community. We could keep them on drugs if they’ll take them. And we could do a whole lot better than the people who were sent to the hospital and remained in the hospital. What we couldn’t do was make these people healthy. They were still functioning below what you would expect a normal population to function at. The women still had trouble. They became, as the days went by, they became less and less able to go out to do the shopping, to
take care of the kids and so on. They hung on but only by the skin of their teeth. The men had trouble holding onto their jobs. They just couldn’t. So we had a largely unemployed population, but they weren’t home. They weren’t costing the state very much. And we were able to demonstrate the effectiveness of drugs. That was the whole point. It wasn’t just keeping them home. It was keeping them home on drugs, because the placebos were also kept home by the same nurses. So what you have here is a clear-cut demonstration of the effectiveness of the early psychotropics. We had five drugs that we used. Chlorpromazine, which is Thorazine. Stellazine, Mellaril, Artane and Parnate. It doesn’t matter. And it was the psychiatrist who could change the dosages, could shift the drugs, could do anything he wanted during that time, both for the placebos and for the controls. But we had a problem, because the nurses could soon enough determine in their own minds who was drugs and who was placebo. They could see by the behavior of these people, okay? So that was one of the things that bothered us. I had a 24-hour answering service, so in case anything went wrong, I could be notified immediately. We had all sorts of other things. We had to make alliances with the police and so on, just in case of trouble at the hospitals and what have you. And Frank Scarpitti took care of all that down there. He was a genius at working this out. I mean he was just good. So that was the thing, the most important research of my life, and the one that had the most profound effect. There’s no question about it. What we demonstrated is that, oh I didn’t tell you the rest of the study. At the end of these 30 months, we discontinued it. You can’t imagine how difficult it was to work from here and there and here. We discontinued the study
and put the patients back into where they would normally go, to the Department of Mental Health in Kentucky. The Department of Mental Health proceeded the way it always proceeded, with limited care or whatever it was that they were dollying out in those days. By the way, that’s no slap at that; that’s the way it was. And so I said to myself, well, the social worker down there had been a student of mine, Ann Bates. And she was now at Miami University teaching. And she wanted to do some more research. She knew all of the patients. She knew all of the nurses. She knew the psychiatrists. She knew the psychologists. So we got together and said, look, suppose we check out what happened to these patients now that we don’t have any care, they’re under ordinary care in the community? And so she followed up with 204 patients that we had in our study. Followed them up in terms of their histories for the five years, since the end of the study to then. We had five full years on each and every patient. And it turns out that roughly 60 percent of patients in all three groups, the hospital control group, the drug group and the placebo group, were all returned to the hospital. There are some lessons to be learned. In addition, we also checked all the times that they went to the clinics, and we found that there wasn’t a whole lot of difference between the drug, placebo and so on. So that’s what the deal was all about. What we concluded was that, it’s almost pointless, it isn’t pointless to them, but it’s pointless to public policy, to set up a program and then drop it by referring these people to the community so that they got what they got before. We intervened. What we need obviously, and we wrote a volume on this, the way her book is called, Women After Treatment. The original book was Schizophrenics in the
Community: An Experiment on the Prevention of Hospitalization. And we did this kind of work. It was really exciting work. It was unbelievably exciting work. We also did another study that I liked even better in some ways. What we did was, we had women discharged from Upham Hall, and they returned to the community. We didn’t have anything to do with their treatment in the hospital. We just returned them to the community. We knew what treatment they had gotten. And so they were returned to the community. And then we sent in our people to see how they were doing. And that’s not a big deal. You do that normally. But we also sent in the same people to go ten house numbers away to check with the people that lived there. So we had a study of neighbors. And obviously you control the socioeconomic status when you do that. You control for race for the most part. You control for all of these extraneous elements that normally influence outcome. And what we found is what you would expect. These women who had been treated weren’t doing very well, and their neighbors were doing fine relatively speaking. And we were able to document what they could do, what they couldn’t do. The lead person on that was Shirley Angrist, who went to Carnegie Mellon and got her degree. She’s really very good. She was one of the best I think we ever had.

Q. Was she from your department?

A. Oh yes. And she got her degree with us. So, we had this whole series of studies. My initial study was, we had three units, three women’s units. Are you getting bored?

Q. No, no.
A.  We had three women’s units and they were all run differently. The first unit on the first floor was run by Lohrman, who was the chief psychiatrist in that unit.

Q.  Was this at Upham Hall?

A.  That’s at Upham Hall, yes. And Lohrman was organically oriented. He used shock, he used drugs. He used all of the organic technologies of his time. The second floor was run by one of my favorite people of all time, Pine. You know Pine?

Q.  No.

A.  No? Well, he was a staple in this community, Pine. And Pine was essentially psycho-dynamically oriented. I’d go to these meetings on Monday morning and we went through every single of the 28 patients. He asked every person who had any dealings to say what he or she knew about this patient. And some of these things you got were just absolutely ludicrous. I mean funny as hell. “I looked into her eyes and I could see that there was great improvement.” That kind of stuff. It was just unbelievable. But he was a wonderful guy. And if I ever had, as I told him once, if I ever had a sick relative or friend or so on, I would send them to Pine, because he had human goodness flowing in his veins. The other guys were business people in the sense that they were doing their job. But this guy was something different. And on the third floor was a guy named Tippett. And Tippett ran this group stuff. We would sit around in a circle and they would sometimes critique each other’s patients. That was common in those days. But what I essentially attempted to do was see if it made any difference whether you used drugs or whether you did the psychoanalytic stuff and so on. Well, it sure did
make a difference. On Pine’s unit, the second floor, patients stayed a lot longer because you had to find out all of the dynamics underlying their behavior. On Lohrman’s unit they came in, he juiced them, and they went out eventually. And on Tippett’s floor, God knows. These group meetings sometimes lasted longer than individual psychotherapy, sometimes didn’t. But anyhow what I found was, in the long run, all that mattered was in the length of time they stayed. It didn’t really matter in terms of outcome a whole lot. So those were the kinds of things that I did. They were exciting years. They were the most exciting years of my life.

Q. Those were what, in the ’70s?

A. The schizophrenia book was published in 1967. I was there in the ’60s, from about ’64. No, I was there from ’61 to ’73 inclusive. Ben left in ’69. I stayed on for a little while longer. I had some projects and so on.

Q. Let me take you back to the academic atmosphere. Were any of your early illusions about an academic life _________?

A. Well, in most recent years, yes. Not in the beginning. In the beginning I really felt that the academic world, we had some pretty bad scenes here and so on, but in general, the academic world lived up to my expectations. But as the years went by, the nature of the academy changed, and that’s what [Albert] Soloway’s book [Failed Grade: The Corporatization and Decline of Higher Education in America] is all about. And I felt it very, very keenly. I really did. Because even in a department like ours, you had to start going out getting grants. I was never opposed to getting grants. I got plenty of grants. But the pressure to publish and
to get grants and to support your own people and so on, became for some people
acute. And that wasn’t the mission of the University. In Europe they have
research universities. You go out and get money and you work there. In the
academic system what happened was, people could buy their way out of teaching
classes by getting a grant.

Q. When do you think it happened?

A. The shift in criminology came in with LEAA under Lyndon Johnson, Law
Enforcement Assistance Administration. Money became available in large sums.
And that’s why we have so many schools of criminal justice in this country.
When I started in criminology, these were in academic departments, and they
were legitimate academic departments. Then, Michigan State was the first to put
in a criminal justice program, and all these schools followed, so that most
criminal justice programs now are in second- or third-level universities.
Appalachian State, Eastern Kentucky, Sam Houston State, which has the best
criminal justice program in the country, and so on down the line, okay? So this
was the departure in the criminology area. It was 1967, ’68. And from that point
on, with money available, for the University as a whole it became available with
Sputnik. That’s when they began pumping money into the sciences. We had to
catch up. We had to get ahead. We’re going to put a man on the moon. So
money poured into the University. The LEAA poured money into sociology,
particularly into criminology. And that changed the deal in this field as well. So
what happened is, Soloway is quite right. There’s no question about it. The
University has become a business enterprise, and if you can’t compete for grants,
if you can’t win in competition for grants, if you can’t publish in the best journals, you’re simply out of luck, no matter how good a teacher you are. It’s almost irrelevant.

Q. But hasn’t it always been publish or perish?

A. No, it hasn’t. You had to publish. There’s no question you had to publish. But you didn’t have to publish in the three major journals, and you didn’t have to publish one or two or three articles a year. And there were a lot of things you didn’t have to do because teaching took up your time. It was a legitimate endeavor. Suddenly, teaching has become less than a legitimate endeavor. And there are people that we hire. I’ll give you one example. We hired a man, a great teacher when he was in Madison, but the chairman at that time felt that he was a better researcher, and so he scrounged up some money and sent him to Japan to do some work before he set foot on this campus. Then, he got rid of some of the courses for him. So this man taught very, very little, and it turns out published very little as well. So that’s what happened. It was a tremendous transformation. For those of us living through it, it didn’t seem so tremendous because each year a little bit more, a little bit more.

Q. In increments.

A. It was incremental. And now what you see essentially, well, my colleagues and I who meet Mondays for lunch, four out of the five that meet regularly probably would not go into an academic environment if we had to do it over again. Or into this academic environment if we didn’t have to do it again. Only one would probably go in again. See, we were Depression kids. We all grew up with next to
nothing. We didn’t know about this big money deal. We didn’t know about all these research foundations and all this stuff that goes on now. We didn’t know that this was going to be one of the Big Ten universities for research that Holbrook keeps talking about. That isn’t what we signed on for, so to speak. But that’s what we ended up with.

Q. Where would they go instead?

A. Well, even lesser universities in terms of stature are beginning to put this kind of pressure on. If you want to go teach, you go to Miami or you go to where my son is, at the University of Vermont or any number of places that haven’t yet begun to push this hard. They push but it’s reasonable pushing. This is almost unreasonable pushing. We have one man in our department now who is the laughing stock of the department because he can’t publish in these journals. He can’t get money. He can’t do all of the things that are required. So it’s hard. It’s very, very hard. The second change that made a real difference, a real difference is the entry of women into the business. There were even fewer women on campus than there were Jews when I got here. Women were a noncommodity. They couldn’t go into the Faculty Club by themselves. They couldn’t be members. Now, with the advent of women, that changed everything on this campus. You now have, not here, but everywhere, not only here but everywhere, you now have women presidents, women provosts, women deans, women chairs, and you know what? There’s a subtle shift in terms of the way in which these things function. It’s very, very subtle but very, very important how they work. In many ways women are more competitive than men. They don’t have a kind of
brotherhood the way men did. You may have seen this in the newspaper; you may have seen it where you work, but it’s a different ballgame and some departments have gone kaput as a result. Their salaries are low. Take Social Work. Wherever you have a preponderance of women, to this day the salaries are low and the status of the department, the status of the operation is low. Nursing, Education. Education is the best example of that. They’ve literally wiped out the stature that education once had.

Q. Is that sexism or ability?

A. It is the devaluation of a field which then attracts in certain kinds of people who do certain kinds of work, until finally you have what amounts to a kind of a ball of yarn. If you unroll it, you can’t even find where the beginning of the thing is.

Q. Journalism.

A. In journalism. Law. Medicine, Vet Med. Vet Med has changed. I talk to people. It’s interesting. Vet Med used to be about big animals, certainly here at OSU. But women can’t deal with the big animals. Imagine handling a cow. So they like little ones. So you’ve got veterinary medicine for cats. It’s a whole new field. The little animals. The birds and so on. Different world. It’s a different world. They changed, you know what? I can give you a menu of what the Faculty Club used to serve when I got here, and then the menu after the women’s revolution. And you’ll know exactly what I’m talking about. And you know what? [The] Torch [Club] is the same way. Torch was a man’s preserve. And then women were admitted. Slowly but surely. And it changed the entire ambience of the group, for the better, I might add.
Q. But I think there are only about six women.

A. There were more, however. They drop out. They find themselves still fairly uncomfortable. This gal, Mary Lou Briggs or whatever her name was.

Q. Yes, Lou Briggs.

A. Yes, Lou Briggs, the woman who died, the president at Ohio Dominican, was in. And any number of other women. But it changes the complexion of the thing. It changes the discourse. It changes the topics. It’s a very interesting phenomenon.

Q. You haven’t put a value on it?

A. No, I’m saying that on campus it’s cost a lot of people a lot of income and a lot of stature. When I came social work was a respectable discipline. They had some really good people here. I mean, this was one of the better places in the country. And gradually it sunk so that now when you mention Social Work, only people who are really dedicated or have no other occupation will go into it.

Q. But had this reflected what happened in society, welfare, social work?

A. Yes, but the reason it happened in society is partially due to the fact that you had change, when you had a, what was the name with Roosevelt, Hopkins.

Q. Harry.

A. Yes, Harry, and when he went and taught you got a different kind of social worker, right, than you get now. And that’s pretty bad. The same way with library. Library science has gone feminist. Not feminist but feminine. And that’s cost a lot of wages for a lot of people. That’s essentially my reading of what happened in our place.
Q. Talk for a minute about the students. And you were here for the post-War generation in the ’60s and ’70s. How do you think the students have changed?

A. Well, they’ve changed dramatically. This was a party school when I came, in the sense that you got a gentlemen C or a lady C.

Q. This was after the war?

A. This was after the war. Men wore jackets for the most part, tie, shirts. Not all of them but most of them. And women wore attire, dresses and what have you. And we had a Dean of Women. And they had to come in at certain hours. They used to close the doors on the side of the building. Sometimes they would even patrol it. You had dances that were more or less formal most of the time or much of the time. In other words, this was still an attempt to create or perpetuate a kind of elite. And you did it through education and you did it through polish. So we were polishing a lot of people here. We were giving them an education. They weren’t necessarily taking it all that seriously, except in business and in law and economics and so on. On my end of the campus, this was a polishing kind of a deal. And this lasted for a while. You may remember the panty raids. It was all in good fun, and the most important riot we had on campus was the riot that dealt with football. After the game if they won they would burn down, they decimated High Street. And that was a period of time where boys would be boys and that kind of stuff. They were good students. They were every bit as smart as the kids are today. And then came the revolutionary period. The late ’60s, early ’70s. And the revolt on this campus mirrored the revolt on other campuses, beginning at Berkeley and at Columbia. It’s hard to tell you, well you were here, so you know
what it was like. And it wasn’t very pleasant. Hagerty Hall was locked up by
students linking arms, in tank shirts mostly. Every single Wednesday of the
spring quarter in 1970, or ’69 and ’70, I forget. And they were yelling slogans
that they really didn’t understand. Sure, the Vietnam War was a fiasco. It makes
Iraq look almost like a companion piece. But it was a chance in a sense for the
revolution to take place, and the campus became, look, you want a sociology. We
had the urban riots and the campus riots, and that transformed America. The
urban riots pointed out the inequality that continued to exist in these communities,
that the black community was not getting anything really in the way of benefits
and so on from the society, neither educationally or any other way, and the revolt
was very real. The police obviously were white, and they inflicted whatever they
had to inflict on the minority community. So we had the urban riots. We torched
something like 300 cities. I was here when Columbus escaped that. We had a
committee that was formed. Remember Sam Stellman? And there were a
number of faculty people and so on that were involved in this, trying very hard
with the mayor to get some peace and quiet. And we succeeded, by the way.
There was no major riot in Columbus. One of the very few cities. I thank
Stellman for that. Also, because I think, the influence of The Dispatch was so
great, that somehow they kept the thing in check. There have been some papers
written on this and so on that you can check. But anyhow, then the campus
revolts were sort of a corollary of this kind of thing. Society was undergoing an
amazing transformation. The urban, the movement to urban areas continued
unabated. The farms were being decimated. Look what happened on this campus
with regard to the College of Agriculture. They even had to change their name. They can’t get enough students. So now they’re College of Food, Human Ecology, God knows what else they are. But they’re not Agriculture, whereas when [Roy] Kottman was here, Kottman was one of the three big powerhouses on campus. He got a whole campus. It was just farm land when I got here. He built that place. The guy before him, Smith, wasn’t a builder, but then Kottman came in.

Q. He was very political.
A. Yes, he could go to the legislature. He had, what do you call them, agents in every single county, and they worked on their legislature.

Q. Extension agents.
A. Extension agents, right. And they worked on their legislature and before you know I, t he got whatever he needed. There were only three people who got what they needed: the dean of the medical school, Woody Hayes, and Kottman. That was it. That was the way the campus was run. That was the power structure. The president, in the case of Fawcett, was more or less powerless. He did what he was told. That’s another long story. But I think I’ve answered your question. The revolution in the ’60s and ’70s was part of a general transformation of American society, where this was an after-effect of the Second World War and it was an after-effect of Korea, and it certainly was an effect of Vietnam. People decided that they were going to speak up. All hell broke loose here. It was a heck of a riot, and these kids ran around campus breaking windows wherever they could with sticks, cops chasing them, National Guardsmen came on campus.
Q. How do you feel about that?
A. The National Guard? I opposed the National Guard.
Q. The whole riot, the whole breakdown of civilization on this campus.
A. Society can’t exist without some element of law and order, right? We had lost control of the campus. The administration had lost control of the campus.
Partially this due to the fact that those in power couldn’t talk to people who were revolting. They didn’t have a common language, a common level of discourse.
You can’t picture Fawcett talking to rioters. It’s just out of the question. You can’t picture [University College Dean John] Mount having done that or any of the people in authority. There was in a sense a gulf between those people who were in power and those people who were rioting. There was no way you get them co-mixed. Now if you’d had people like the green-ribbon people on campus, maybe. These were faculty who put on green ribbons, or armbands, led by Nemzer and others, who tried very, very hard to mute the intensity of the conflict. Incidentally, Woody Hayes tried very hard too. And so what you got then, essentially, was that there was really no peacemakers so to speak who were credible other than a few faculty. And that wasn’t enough, because the few faculty couldn’t speak to the administration and get them to do things, and obviously therefore couldn’t speak to the students. But there was more than that. It was essentially a different kind of a deal here. What you had was, the people who rallied behind Woody Hayes on the Oval on Wednesdays, were a breed of people who came from the smaller communities of Ohio. They were life-long Republicans. They supported the administration regardless. My country right or
wrong. They were patriotic. They were the kids who went off to the National
Guard, and eventually to Vietnam. They saw themselves as true Americans. The
kids on the left that Nemzer stood in front of saw themselves as people who were
liberal, people who wanted change, people who reflected in a sense a majority
opinion in America, but were being frustrated by these other folks standing here.
So it was a conflict between the old timers, the nativists, and the nouveau groups.
And what the old-timers objected to was that the nouveau groups were largely
from New York, Philadelphia, the big cities, the outsiders. And they resented it.
And that the nouveau group was constituted with an awful lot of Jews who were
high up in the ranks, and otherwise considered outsiders. These were people who
didn’t, they were not a good fit for Ohio. That’s what the conflict was. And that
was irreconcilable. You can’t make a kid not come from Cleveland. You can’t
make him into a non-Benson Wolman or a non-Nike Schwartz or a non-this, non-
that. And so what the administration did, I don’t know who did it exactly, but
certainly somebody did it, was they got to one of the guys in the leadership group,
Phil Loose, and they turned him. If you remember, he eventually outed, so to
speak, all of the other leaders in the rebelling group. And that’s how the
administration worked. And he was from Springfield, Ohio. He was a good
Protestant boy or Catholic, I don’t know. But certainly he was different from the
other members of that leadership. That explains it in my view. Not completely.
But the tenor of the times determine what goes on on a campus. We’re not
immune to that.

Q. In 1981, you were honored with something called the festschrift. What is that?
A. A festschrift is a derivative of German. It’s a German phrase that they used for professors over in Europe, particularly in Germany. It’s the celebration of life and work of an individual who either retires or something of this kind. It’s an accumulation, an accounting of his work. And it’s usually put together by his former students, by colleagues, and by people of this kind. This festschrift in ’81 celebrated, theoretically, my 30 years at Ohio State. And that’s what it was about. All my students plus one or two professors, my advisor Clinard and somebody else, were the only professors represented. The rest were former students of mine.

Q. It was quite an honor.

A. It was quite an honor. It was a surprise. We had a visitor here from City University in New York by the name of Ed Sagarin, and I thought they had a big party at the end, and I thought that the party was for him, as a sort of farewell as he left the University. And so I’d come and she must have known, but I didn’t. I come and I say, “When will the festivities begin for Ed? I’d like to say a word or two.” They looked at me funny, and then it occurred to me that here was a book written in my honor. It was really quite a tribute. That’s the festschrift.

Q. It doesn’t happen to everybody everyday.

A. No, it doesn’t. It does in Europe, I suppose. I’ve written some articles for people who have retired. Sometimes they write one posthumously. So luckily mine …

Q. When they’re gone, not when you’re gone.

A. Yeah, right. When they’re gone. Luckily, I’m still around.
Q. Your involvement in national organizations gave you an opportunity I would think to compare Ohio State to other universities in terms of your field. How does Ohio State rank?

A. Well, when I came here we were ranked 13th.

Q. Thirteenth in the nation?

A. Yeah.

Q. Out of how many?

A. Well, see, at that time there were a smaller number of schools that were evaluated. There was some ranking organization. I forget. And I guess we’re probably 12th or 13th now. But of course, the pool of people that are competing now, the number of universities, is greatly enlarged. So I think we’re doing better now than we did then. But we were pretty well-respected in sociology in those days. And that would have been ’50, ’51, when the ratings were more conducted. Over the years, our ratings have gone, well they’ve tumbled and they’ve gone up and they’ve tumbled. For a long time here, until the late ’60s we had a very stable, congenial department, with the same rating nationally. We were doing okay. In 1968 or ’69, we brought in a guy as a chairman by the name of [Hans] Zetterberg. A man who was a Swedish millionaire. His family was one of the five millionaire families in Sweden. He had taught at Columbia and he was a highly respected guy. He made a tremendous impression on the search committee and on everyone who heard him. So we brought him in as chair. Following Sletto they wanted change. They wanted serious change because Sletto, as I told you, was a numbers guy, pushing it very, very hard. So in comes Zetterberg. And he brings in
Gunnar Myrdal for one quarter. The first quarter he’s here, Gunnar Myrdal comes on campus. Gunnar Myrdal was his teacher. Then in the spring of the year, the following April, he came in in September, and the following April you have to make decisions about people for next year. And so he wrote a letter to each and every member of the department, and he classified (it was a long letter by the way), and he classified people into three groups. He called them his “superstars,” who would benefit from any raises and so on, available in terms of monies to the department. Then he called the “invited,” those people who were invited if they continued to work, they would probably become stars and superstars and what have you. These are mostly associate professors. And then he had a group of people, roughly 12 or 13, whom he refers to, and I kid you not, in various ways, using his words, as “frozen” or (end of tape). … Zetterberg came in, and in April or March of that year he wrote everybody in the department a letter. There was a revolt of monumental proportions in the department. Imagine being told you’re frozen. I had a guy who lived in Bexley not far from me, they had just brought him in in the fall. He came here from Rutgers. They had a baby. He came to my house and he was crying. He sat on the front porch and he said, “Why am I frozen? What have I done? I haven’t done anything. I’ve never even laid eyes on this guy beyond the formal occasions. He’s never talked to me, and here I’m frozen.” He absolutely destroyed the department. He absolutely destroyed it. When we went to a meeting, a national meeting, we were called “Zetterberg’s entepreuners.” These posters were over urinals; these posters were everywhere in the building. Ohio State, you asked about rankings. That’s what
I’m trying to tell you. The rankings fell from number 13 to the fact that there were years when nobody wanted to come here. People would asked me, “Why have you stayed?” And my answer to that was always the same: “I have a research agenda. I have work that has nothing whatever to do with Zetterberg or with the department. I’m in a sense my own boss. I’m tied in with the Department of Corrections, the Department of Mental Health. I’m involved in a lot of things, and what Zetterberg does, does not affect me, except as a human being. And I resent what he has done and what he has done to the department, what he’s done to individual people. I resent him and I will until the day I die.” That was my answer. And that’s why I stayed. But we lost a lot of people. We lost all 13 of those people. Plus, a few people who were sympathetic like Dean Knudsen, who was a man of principle and went to Purdue; said he wouldn’t work under this kind of a guy. Well, there were a few people that supported Zetterberg, very few. And one man committed suicide over the whole episode. He left here, and he eventually committed suicide. So we had terrible trouble here. Our rankings, as I say, fell; there were times people wouldn’t come. So our ranking couldn’t be very high. And then, of course, it began to pick up.

Q. How long was he here?

A. He was here three years. He alienated not just his faculty, but he alienated the dean. He alienated everybody. He was just a horse’s ass. Not in the _____ sense obviously, and he was a very smart character. One day, I just have to tell you this story. Is that on? One day, he’s walking down the corridor. He’s got these two beautiful women with him, and I’m walking this way, crosswise. So we’re going
to meet. And I stopped and I say, “Hi,” and he says, “Hi.” And then he says, “Which of these women would you prefer?” That was Zetterberg. One was his wife, she was in her 20s, and the other was his sister. That was Zetterberg. He’d pull stunts like not anything I’d ever seen. The only thing I can tell you based on work I have done in prisons and mental hospitals and so on, is he was a psychopath. But he wasn’t a criminal psychopath. He was one of these guys who was totally untrustworthy. His mind ran in ways that hardly anyone I know could fathom. And to this day, when we go to lunch, the topic of Zetterberg frequently comes up, because to this day no one can decipher what happened during that period of time.

Q. Where did he go?

A. Well, he went from here back to Sweden. He’s now in the Swedish legislature as a conservative member of the parliament. His family owns the International Gallup Poll. He never had to worry about anything. He had a free ride. By the way, he was a very competent guy. Don’t get my wrong. But his sophistication never really went into dealing with people or understanding how places are run, organizations, or anything of the sort. After he was hired and I came back, I had been away, I got a call from a man who was very, very well-known. He writes occasional articles for The Times and Washington Post and so on. He called me and he said, “Are you considering hiring Zetterberg?” (He didn’t realize that he’d already been hired.) I said, “Yes, as far as I know he’s already been hired.” He says, “Why in the hell didn’t you call and ask?” And I said to him, “As far as I know members of the committee called people at Columbia and were told that
this was a good man, that there’s no real reason not to hire him.” Well he said, “Didn’t you know about some episodes with other people’s wives and so on?” I said, “I didn’t know a damn thing,” and I don’t think it would have mattered had they known, because they were so enamored with his presentation and the way he handled himself, that he just won out. That’s all. He really had no competition.

Q. You worked with state governments on issues of crime and punishment, you worked with committees on proper responses to these issues. Do you feel that the work of academics had an impact on politicians?

A. Only when they wanted it to. When they wanted your advice and when they wanted something done, they would ask you.

Q. Did you have to have a crisis first?

A. You have to have a crisis. You have to have a crisis. I started out, I became involved, well as a matter of fact you probably know the people involved. I became involved under [James] Rhodes’ tenure as governor. They were setting up the Ohio Office on Aging, and what’s her name?

Q. The first one?

A. The first one was the chair, headed up the department. So I got on the committee and we dealt with the problem of the housing of the aged and so on. And it did result in some important things. Papier, Rose Papier. And she was very effective. That was my first taste of task forces in Ohio. For that matter anywhere. And then, of course, came the prison riot at the Ohio Pen. And I was asked to chair the committee that dealt with the internal affairs.

Q. It was the one downtown.
A. Yeah. Not the community. There were two chairs. I chaired the institutional, and there was someone else who chaired the community alternative stuff. And that was under [Gov. John] Gilligan. And we handed in a report, some of which was implemented. I’ll tell you how it works from my experience. The way it works is that if it doesn’t cost them anything, they’ll implement it. If there’s the slightest bit of cost or the slightest bit of doubt in their mind that the legislature would appropriate even limited amounts of money, then the answer is no. But we had a firebrand in those days by the name of Isabelle Rennie. She was in the newspaper all the time. That’s why I thought you might know her. And she was a firebrand, and she single-handedly went well beyond the committee and got things moving in terms of services to inmates.

Q. Did she get The Citizen?

A. Just The Citizen. Her husband, they had come here from, he had come from Massachusetts. He was the first Harvard economic student that had gone through solid A’s, only A’s in economics. And he came to work with Murray Lincoln. He became Murray Lincoln’s chief speech writer. And this was his wife. She was an author. She’s a published author. She’s got maybe five, six books, mostly fiction. But she did write a book as part of my project called The Search for Criminal Man, which is really a very, very fine piece of work that she did. Anyhow, she was a firebrand and she worked her tail off to get changes implemented in the state. But in the long run, we got a few things. For example, we got Lucasville out of it. We told them we can’t keep the pen going. It’s irrational. I think, I like to think, that we got rid of the Grooms Squad. There
were a group of guys who considered themselves the Grooms Squad. I think we
got rid of that. I think that we began, well Gilligan didn’t need any convincing.
But it was clear, what we told them was that we needed professionalize. This was
not a part-time occupation where guys farm and then go to work in the
correctional system. We needed people who were professionals, not political
appointees and so on. And it eventually resulted in a professionalization of this
department, and far more so than most other departments in the entire country.
And that finally happened under [Gov. Richard] Celeste. And we got a Ph.D.,
Rick Seiter, to head up the department. Rick Seiter was my student, and he
completely transformed the department.

Q. You’re talking corrections.
A. In corrections, oh yeah. Well, the thing had grown mercilessly.

Q. It used to be the corrections and mental health.
A. It was mental health and corrections, then it separated, and the first guy who
headed it up while still in mental health was a social worker, who wasn’t
considered to be strong enough by the wardens and they ran the place. And then
it separated and there were a whole series of what I would consider to be fairly
temporary guys who headed it up. The latest was Denton, and he was from
probation and parole. But anyhow, then came Seiter. I was on the committee that
chose him. And there were several people, the guy who preceded Seiter was a
black man from Kentucky. He’s dead now. Ineffectual. But most of them had
been ineffectual. And then Seiter came in. Seiter had everything going for him,
savvy, know-how, whatever it takes. He had come from the federal system. He
had worked his way up in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. He had worked his way up. He was probably second or third or fourth in command. And he wanted to come back to Ohio, for reasons I never understood. So he came back and he transformed the department. He made it a miniature Federal Bureau of Prisons. He had people that had the education, that had the training. He set up the training academy. He did all of these things that we had recommended over the year that nobody could do. He did it. He built the prisons on a whole new scale, a new model. For example, they had all been Bastille before, Mansfield, Pen, London, Chillicothe. Those were the major ones. Marysville. What he did, he set up these campus-style institutions which was the prevailing ideology at the time, which tends to send the message that we focus on education, we focus on treatment. This is a campus. This isn’t Bastille. And what he did was he transformed the whole place. And to this day, corrections owes him a debt of gratitude which it can never repay. So to make a long story short that’s what happened. So that in the various committees that followed after that, I think the legislature began to listen to us a little more, and began to implement. For example, after Lucasville we submitted about 160 recommendations, and they implemented I would say 100 of them. But those were the easy ones.

Q. Was this after the riots?

A. Yea, at Lucasville, right. In which nine inmates and one guard were killed.

Q. This was in the ’90s?

A. 1993. I handed in the report in January ’95 I believe it was. It was April of ’93, Easter Sunday riot. I handed in the report in ’95. I’ve had some influence in the
political realm, but only because (I never kid myself) they wanted the changes to be made, or they wanted a cover. You use task forces as a cover, right? You want to go get more money, you bring a task force in to tell you that we’re not doing well enough. That’s what they do. But Gilligan and Celeste in particular were serious guys and dealt with these issues in a serious way. So I had some luck with that.

Q. Voinovich’s brother, __________?

A. He was an architect for prisons. He was an architect. His firm was an architectural firm that had some interest in building the prisons. Voinovich cared. He went about implementing some of the recommendations of our task force. He called me in and DeWine was there. He had a really man-to-man talk. I really appreciated what he was talking about. And he didn’t have any front men around to fend for him. He talked a lot of good sense. Voinovich was the one who appointed me to the Lucasville task force. So that’s how it happened. The other guy besides Seiter, Seiter headed up the Department of Corrections and then Geno Natalucci-Persichetti headed up, he was also a student. I controlled it so to speak. I controlled the entire penal system through my graduates, although neither one of them got a Ph.D. with me. Natalucci-Persichetti got a degree in social work, and Rick Seiter got a degree in public administration. But they were mine.

Q. I just have a few more questions. You came with Fawcett as President.


Q. Bevis, then Fawcett, then?

A. [Harold] Enarson.
Q. Then Enarson
A. Enarson, then [Edward] Jennings.
A. No, [William] Kirwan was in between. I didn’t work with either Kirwan or Holbrook. I left under Gee.
Q. How did the presidents you worked under match up?
A. Well, Bevis I hardly knew at all. He was an imperial. I was a young whipper snapper. So I didn’t have any dealings with him whatsoever. None.
Q. What about Fawcett?
A. Well, Fawcett. In the beginning I didn’t know Fawcett too well. But for some crazy reason, I got on the speaking trail and I was invited to all of these groups. I was asked to give a talk, John Mount asked me to give a talk, to Torch, downtown Rotary. And they had several hundred people down there. And I was an academic that didn’t speak either in business terms or in legal terms. I was a novelty, so to speak. I talked about the work, the research, that I had been doing. And I spotted Fawcett sitting all the way in the back of the room. And I didn’t think anything of it. He was there and so were other potentates. And I went home and that was the end of it. Well then, I get a letter from Fawcett, thanking me and telling me that the University is very, very proud to have professors like that and so on. After that, I was obviously something of a fair-haired boy, but not on a personal level. Never on a personal level with Fawcett. But there was never any problem with Fawcett. I got increases. I got all kinds of things that were routine. I didn’t get any special benefit. But he knew I was alive and he knew
that I wasn’t going to harm the University in all of the talking that I did. In fact, he recommended me to speak at a number of other groups over time, like the Judges Association in Ohio. I went up to Cleveland to speak to them and that kind of stuff. So I got along with him but only as a member of the faculty. Then Enarson came in and I had more personal relationship with Enarson. Enarson was a political scientist. We talked the same language. I would meet him sometimes on campus and we’d stand and talk for a while. He was very frustrated by what was happening in the legislature. He couldn’t handle it. He was brought here, as you know, because of the rioting situation. He had had handled the riots in Cleveland, and they thought he would handle it. But by the time he came there were no more riots. The period had ended. He was not native to the area. He was the first non-central Ohio guy. And he didn’t have the kind of credentials that central Ohioans demanded in their presidents.

Q. [Unintelligible]

A. Well, no, having grown up in this area, having a network of friendships, having church affiliations, being in a sense a member in good standing of this community, rather than an outsider. This community has always been afraid of outsiders until more recent years. And so he was an outsider. He was the first one. So he came in here, and he was, after all, a Colorado guy via Cleveland State which really isn’t high prestige. So he comes in and the legislature is giving him terrible trouble. So he was having trouble and he expressed his doubts about how the University was being treated.

Q. [Unintelligible]
A. Yeah, they were reducing, of course, the per-capita amount given to the University. I don’t think they understood what his goals were. His goals were not to go out and reach money, get money, because that wasn’t his background. His background was like mine. He wanted a solid teaching research but on a small scale. You don’t have to compete with Harvard. You have to do good work, but you do it in the context of this campus, not somewhere else. So he was a fish out of water, and that became evident pretty quickly. And he was gone. Then Jennings came in. He was the best president of all. Because he understood the economics of the University, and he developed patterns of administration on campus that are reflective of what a major bureaucracy is going to do. This is the way the University has evolved. He became the first modern president of this University because he had a background in finance where he came from, in international business. He also knew something about organizational strategies and so on. So he was pretty good. He was very good. There are some people across the campus who weren’t too happy, the medical school. What he tried to do was consolidate power in the president’s office. He was trying in a sense to drag it away from the Kottmans and the Hayeses and the [Richard] Meilingses, and consolidate it. Well, nobody gives up power easily. So he had his troubles of course, and of course the Woody Hayes episode undermined him with the locals. [Hayes was fired during Enarson’s, not Jennings’ tenure.] Not that anybody else would have done anything else. If Woody would have had any sense, he would have resigned and let it go. He wouldn’t have put people through this pressure. So I think that Jennings set us on a course. He modernized the University, the
organization, structurally. And he tried, without success, to get a practice plan, which other major universities like [Johns] Hopkins had. Cornell has that. There are a lot of good places that have practice plans. He would never effect that here, and it cost him his job. There’s no question about that. All the other stuff was extraneous. He could have probably overcome the personal problems that he had.

Q. The ______ were too powerful?

A. Much too powerful. Now I don’t know. I never had any discussions with him about this, but that’s pretty clear to me what happened looking back on it.

Q. [Unintelligible – Discussion below, however, is about Gordon Gee.]

A. He looked like a winner when he came. He had been at Colorado and before that at West Virginia.

Q. And Nate was on the search committee.

A. And Nate was, I never fail to kid Lottie about that. I never fail to kid her about that. And his comment was, through her, that he may not have been the best person ever, but he was the best candidate that was being examined by the search committee. And he was right. What he had done at Colorado was go to every county and get the legislature to do these things. What you did before is just prologue to what you’re going to do now. The past essentially is prologue. And what he did there, he did here. He got to every county. He slept in the dormitory. He taught this kind of nonsensical upbeat stuff, boosterism. His was the day of boosterism for the campus. And he succeeded. The legislature loved him. He didn’t pose any problems for them. As far as the campus goes, any thoughtful person on campus didn’t think much of his reign, largely because he wasn’t
interested in the academic side of the campus or even in the research side of the campus. He was interested, he was a public relations man. And that’s what he did. And when he left here it didn’t work at ground. They didn’t need a flag, they got plenty of money.

Q. He did raise a big endowment.

A. Oh he did. Yea, there’s no doubt about that. That’s what he did. That was his specialty. But of course other universities without that kind of leadership are also raising big money. This is the age of big money. The reason is that these guys, post-war guys, who are coming through, they’ve succeeded and they have lots of money to give and you can see this endowment is everywhere. And he didn’t do it. He brought in this guy. What was his name who came into campus? Jerry somebody.

Q. Jerry May.

A. Jerry May, who raised all this huge amount of money and now he’s in Vermont, someplace. So what they did was, they organized the fundraising, and that’s what happened. And as far as the others are concerned, I didn’t work under Kirwan and I didn’t work under Holbrook. And by the way, whoever was president didn’t affect me in the least.

Q. Yes, I understand that. But it affected the atmosphere.

A. It affected the atmosphere, correct, right, right.

Q. When did you retire?

A. ’91.

Q. What have you been doing?
A. Oh, I’ve been doing all kinds of things. I’ve taught everywhere since then for a quarter at a time. Since I’ve retired I’ve been to Israel several times to teach. I’ve taught in San Antonio at the University of Texas San Antonio. I’ve taught at St. Marys in San Antonio. They set up a Ph.D program and a criminal justice program at Indiana University at Pennsylvania. I taught there. I taught at the University of Vermont. Pretty active until last year. That’s it.

Q. When did you become a full professor? It took you seven years to go from an instructor.

A. Then three years to become an associate. Then three more to become a full professor. So it’s 13 years. By this time you have to understand some things happened. I got the teaching award. Then I got the award of the American Psychiatric Association for research. And by this time there was no way on this earth that they could have prevented themselves from it. I could leave then. I got offers from a lot of places.

Q. But you never did.

A. No, I didn’t. And I tell you, I was tied in with the Department of Mental Health and the Department of Corrections. It would have taken me a decade or two to get involved. If I had gone to California, University of California Irvine was interested. If I had gone there, I would have had to commute from southern California to Sacramento to get anything done. It would have been an impossible chore to get a research agenda going such as what I had. I had students that I placed everywhere. I got 39 Ph.Ds. In addition to all these people that populate all these levels of government here in the State of Ohio. So if I want something I
call up and I can usually either place one of my students or do something. That’s an advantage that you just can’t duplicate too easily. I fell into it like everything else. But that’s the way it is.

Q. Any regrets?

A. No. I have no regrets. I could have probably been at a place like Irvine. One year, they talked to me about coming to Duke and I didn’t want to go there. NYU offered me a job back in ’64. I didn’t see any real possibility there because I would have to teach at night, teach grad students at night, and then I’d have to do something all day long. So I’d have two jobs every day. I wasn’t about to do that. And then being close to family could have been a problem because both families were clingers. And [neither they] nor I could have escaped, particularly with the kids. Friday night at my mother’s house, and the afternoon at my mother-in-law’s house. I could never have gotten anything done. So we decided that independence was worth something and we stayed here.

Q. Do you consider yourself a criminologist, a sociologist?

A. I don’t know. I started out as a sociologist with an interest in deviant behavior, whether it be mental illness or alcoholism, or whatever the case may be. Deviance is a respectable area in sociology. It encompasses criminology. So basically I’m a sociologist with an interest in deviant behavior, and a specialty in things like corrections, delinquency and things of this kind. Does that answer?

Q. Yes.

A. Sociologist first but all these are subheadings under that. Nowadays, criminology is so separate that there are just departments of criminology or criminal justice.
So people don’t understand what I’m telling them. They want to know what I’m not.

Q. What did we miss?

A. We missed just one period of my life, when I went over after I left psychiatry. I went over to the Academy for Contemporary Problems, and I spent a good many years there from ’74 to well into the 80’s.

Q. Were you still teaching there while here?

A. I never stopped teaching. I never, never, never gave up my courses. I don’t remember when I left the Academy for Contemporary Problems. But while there we published six books and an awful lot of articles on something called a dangerous offender. We had a dangerous offender project supported by Eli Lilly Foundation in Indianapolis. And so we did all kinds of work on the dangerous offender. And I have a number of dissertations that came out of that. And all kinds of work. One of the most interesting pieces we did, is we did it with a guy who was a student of mine. He’s now the Director of Research in the Department of Corrections, Steve Van Dyne. It was popular under [then-President Ronald] Reagan to argue for a policy of incapacitation. That is to say, you put a guy away for a period of time so that when he’s away he can’t be out in the community committing more crimes. It was a popular theory. Guys like Van den Hagg, I don’t know if any of these names mean anything to you, but James Q. Wilson was the brains in the outfit under Reagan. And James Q. wrote an awful lot of stuff. And they were arguing for a policy of incapacitation, which means that on the first offense you get this much, no parole, no nothing. The second offense you get
this much more. The third offense you get this much more. And that’s where the three strikes comes from. And that’s where the determinant sentence comes from. Okay? So that was a very big thing. And all these states, Senate Bill 2 in Ohio, is a reflection of that attitude. The idea of Senate Bill 2 was to add aggravated offenses, thereby increasing the penalty.

Q. What year was that?

A. That didn’t come out until the 90s. But the thinking on it began much earlier in the Reagan years. And it was really a hard line that they were taking, extraordinarily hard line. And the three strikes is a good example of that. Also, the penalties were outrageous. We’ve got 400,000 guys now in prison in the United States for nothing but drugs which is stupid, to put the least bad interpretation on it. Anyhow, to make a long story short, we did a study on the incapacitation on the dangerous thug. What we showed was, you could reduce the crime by 7.3 percent in Franklin County, but you would increase the prison population from Franklin County by 350 percent, and you would increase the cost by some incredible amount. And so, on a cost-benefit basis, sure you want to reduce the crime 7.3 [percent]. We’re talking only about robbery, rape, aggravated assault, and murder. Those were the dangerous offenders. And if you extend that to ordinary offenses, it doesn’t add a whole lot of value. So what we did, was we did this book, and it’s gotten a lot of play. And to a large extent, the incapacitation strategies have been washed out. They’re not talking about them much anymore. But we had empirical data which showed that in Ohio, at least in Franklin County, the incapacitation strategy was a losing strategy. Eventually, the
administration came to realize how many more prison cells you can build. That’s why we had so many prison cells built in the first place. When I came to Columbus, we had 7,700 men in prison. We’ve got 44,000 now, and that’s after building all these community facilities. We’ve got 18 now, like the one on Alum Creek Road.

Q. You’re talking about Franklin County.

A. No, I’m talking about statewide.

Q. Statewide we had 7,700?

A. Yea. We only had four prisons. We had Mansfield, we had Pen, we had London, and we had Chillicothe in about 1955.

Q. I thought Chillicothe was federal.

A. It was and we took it over. The feds, quite a story. The feds found it was too costly to keep that thing in repair. And so what they did was they offered it to the State of Ohio. We had to fix the roof on it and do a lot of repairs on it in order for it to become acceptable. And that’s what we did. We spent a lot of money refurbishing the place. So we had London and Chillicothe, had the Pen and Mansfield. Then we had the women’s prison. When I came the women’s prison had 200 women at the most. We now have 3,000 at Marysville and we have another few thousand scattered around the state, in Northeastern Correctional in Cleveland and then here in Franklin County. So the fastest-growing population by far is the population of women. And we didn’t know how to handle that. That came as a shock. Who was going to think about that? We had a few women who
killed their husbands, poisoned them and so on. But now it’s a plague. And it’s
drugs, it’s murder, and God knows what else.

Q. Go back to the Academy for Contemporary Problems. What was this?

A. Battelle had additional monies that they needed to get rid of because of a court
suit, if you remember. And they decided under, there were a number of people
involved in that, but they decided that they would build something like Academy,
a building and share it with the University to do studies of public policy. And
that’s what happened. And so they brought in a guy, Ralph Widener, and if ever
there was a loser, if there ever was a guy who undermined the operation without
meaning it, it was poor Ralph. He was a very nice guy, good education, all the
right credentials. But I don’t think he knew anything about research and I don’t
think he knew much about public policy. He just blew the thing apart. We used
up all the endowment in no time, and then there was no money. John Conrad and
I supported ourselves because we had the money from Eli Lilly. We never
depended on the Academy. We brought in our own money. First of all, he should
never have hired John Conrad. We had a growing criminology operation here.
Why are you setting up a dual thing? Well, John and I got along famously.

Q. Who was John Conrad?

A. John Conrad came here from Washington, where he was Director of Research for
the Bureau of Prisons. Before that, he had been in California, where he was
Director of Research for the California Prison System. He was a great scholar,
good writer, wonderful guy. And we hit it off and we did a lot of work together.
But there was no reason for it. It was a duplication of facilities. Okay?
Q. Have we done it?
A. I don’t know. Have you done it?
Q. I think so.
A. Okay.
Q. Let me ask you this. In comparing OSU when you arrived and when you retired, how would you compare the two, or did you really speak about that when you were talking Al Soloway’s books?
A. Yeah, I did. That’s what I had in mind, is that the University has been transformed. The people today would not understand the Mr. Chips university of the period when I came, when students were all important. When we didn’t have all these foreign-language guys teaching math and teaching English or teaching whatever it is that they’re teaching, chemistry. If you go over now to the engineering side of campus, you have a majority of students as well as profs, who are non-American. They are Chinese and so on, which is a wonderful thing for diversity and they’re damn good. This school would probably close down in physics and math departments if it weren’t for the foreign element. But in my day that was unheard of because we didn’t do much research and we couldn’t bring all these people in. Now you can. So really we’ve gotten into the big league. The Lantern or somebody carried a story last week that we had more people inducted into the American Association of AAAS than any other university in America this year. And that says a lot. That’s what happened to this University. But in order to do that, you’ve got to bring people in that cost maybe a half million dollars to bring a guy in. You’ve got to create a lab for him, you’ve got to bring in his
assistants. We’re talking real money. Real money. It was [Everett] Dirkson who said a dollar here, a million here, a million there, and before you know it you’re talking real money. That’s the way it is now.