SUTTON: You were beginning to speak about the fact that all of us, when we think about the past, forget part of it.

FAWCETT: And when you try to recall what the three most outstanding accomplishments may have been, I wouldn’t want to assert that I am certain about what those are because I never tried to measure accomplishments or never kept a record of what I considered to be major accomplishments.

SUTTON: But you did start in with some goals you had in mind.

FAWCETT: That’s right. And I jotted down three things that came to my mind quickly. The first problem I faced that took a lot of time, a lot of energy and a lot of thought and a lot of planning was how to plan to deal with what clearly was going to be this massive increase in numbers that would have to be developed and revised and upgraded over a period of two or three years. And so I suppose being able to accelerate dramatically the manner in which we could construct housing and feeding facilities and academic facilities for an increased number of people could be considered not the most important thing, but one of the most memorable and constant problems that you had that you somehow or other solved. That involves way too many things to discuss here but in involves the establishment of branch campuses as well as the developments on the central campus to accommodate what very clearly was going to be a lot of problems. I think we came through that in reasonably good shape because when I went there the campus was partially fixed with worn out World War II, horrible buildings. That didn’t go very much to enhance the appearance of the campus or to provide what I considered to be a satisfactory learning environment. So dealing with that problem over a period of years while enrollments continued to increase and dealing with the programming that was necessary to upgrade with the programming that was necessary to upgrade the quality of education, all combined, was what I thought was rather a significant accomplishment for a major university of this kind. That did involve establishing the branches which we would never had established had we had the space on campus, but it did accommodate the philosophy of that time that it would be good if you bring opportunities close to the homes of these young people who maybe could not afford to go to the campus, or if they could, there was no place for them to live and we didn’t have enough academic facilities to accommodate them. That was an ongoing problem and it involved all kinds of ancillary activities, including how you organized and managed that kind of student body, how you recruited faculty to provide the teaching and the research that was necessary. So I guess I would consider that as an accomplishment in a sense because we did not turn anybody away—we did for as much as a quarter at time but not for any general length of time. With the open attendance law you couldn’t. So, we just lived with that and tried to solve it as best we could. Closely related to that was an aspiration I had that I think came out fairly well. Prior to that time when they built a building they just found a place and put the building in and sometimes there was a little money to improve it with landscaping and sometimes there wasn’t. We did those in total packages, including the landscaping in
an effort to try to beautify what I think at that time was very unattractive campus. I think we had a major success with that. I had a feeling that a learning atmosphere should have a total atmosphere inside and out, and doing that the best we could would contribute somehow positively to the quality of education, later the quality of life of the students who came there. Well that would be one thing that I would thing would be considered a fairly major accomplishment. I know that because you had to do that. Some people tagged you as a builder instead of an educator but you can’t educate unless you have someplace to do it.

SUTTON: As a person never involved in administration, I see two things I want to ask about. Of course all that you’re speaking of was accomplished through the selection of people who could carry out various phases of what had to be done. No one man sitting in the central office could think of all the things that had to be done. So obviously you were astute in choosing the men who could carry these things out so that you could go on and do other things.

FAWCETT: As you know also, concurrently we launched the development of a campus plan which for all intents and purposes still remains in effect and I brought John Herrick in to head the planning division. That was all a part of what I’m talking about.

SUTTON: But at the same time you also had to be the person representing the university with the Board of Trustees and specifically with the state administrative authorities, so as to finance what had to be done. Does this divide up so neatly as I’m trying to divide it?

FAWCETT: It never does. As you indicated a while ago, you have to have staff who are knowledgeable to assist with that in order that you have an ongoing program of activity toward a central goal, and I think we had people we used. If you had been free and could have done so you might have done better in selecting people to help in doing that. We didn’t have any time for that; so we did the best we could with what staff we could put together. We were already behind when we started. That was a difficult period in order to get that movement going and to relate it to a campus plan that would ultimately make some sense in terms of the location of the various disciplines and in the colleges and the programs that require activity and relationships between two or more colleges—interdisciplinary approaches to problems and this sort of thing. This evolved or was beginning to evolve and I suppose that problem had a hundred different facets in terms of completing it but I thought of it as just this one large effort that somehow or other still works. I’m not proud of, never was, of the tower dormitories and I don’t take much credit for having designed those. Mr. Carson at that time was my vice-president for business and finance, and Mr. Carson was very interested in towers. He and I disagreed many times in the course of construction of those dormitories. Fortunately they have the space now that did not cost so very much in terms of what students pay for board and room because they were built at a time when the cost of building was considerably less and the cost of borrowing money was considerably less. So they got the space and they have it at a good figure and it’s usable for a long period of years. In fact we borrowed all we could from the federal government as we went along, and we still could not keep up with the housing problem. We used a state statue under which those two towers were
constructed outside the framework of the remainder of the portfolio that was involved and the regular construction of student housing. It’s a state statue that gave us the right to, as a separate entity, go out and construct those areas. They’re paid off in a shorter period of time, even though the space might not be ideal for certain other things. I understand they’ve moved a lot of the office operations over into one of them. I’ve never seen that.

SUTTON: Yes, about half of one is taken up with offices now.

FAWCETT: So, that was just one of the little fringe problems to the whole concept of finding a place to put the people, and finding the kind of facilities so that academic programs could go forward.

SUTTON: Now, since you were an educator, and this wasn’t just a building proposition, there must have been a problem that I suppose you yourself didn’t deal with directly. It had to do with expanding the faculty because I suspect there were universities that expanded their faculty at that time and didn’t get as good quality people as they needed.

FAWCETT: Well I suppose that’s a fair statement. We went direct to the departments and based upon estimated enrollments that they would have, cleared the way for them to recruit what they believed would be necessary to accommodate the problems. We still had some problems like night classes. I remember we had something called twilight school at that time, and a little was done there but not as much as what should have been in my opinion. But the whole thing was a maze of problems that somehow or other had to be related and brought into a meaningful form of structure. I think we did fairly well on that given the limitations of money and people and everything that is required in order to accomplish it. I think the campus looks a lot better than it did at that time. I don’t follow it too closely recently but I recall if we wasted a little money to plant flowers on the campus, we sometimes were seriously criticized by some faculty for having wasted a little money on that. But I think it did improve the appearance of the campus. I don’t really want to pursue that question any further.

SUTTON: The question I was after really was: How does a man in your position as president undertake to assure that we did get good quality faculty members, for instance? You have to dilute this to other people, but you can’t just lose sight of it by passing it out to 15 to 18 deans.

FAWCETT: No. The thrust at that time was for people to teach at the lower undergraduate level. Sometimes when those needs could not be met through conventional sources in recruiting we used qualified people in evenings, for example, who came out of the high schools. Some of them were better than some of them that we had on the campus; so I don’t think that we negatively affected the quality. As a matter of fact, one of the things that I was displeased with when I went there was the number of remedial students that we had—the students who did not meet standards as we thought they should. They had to take make-up courses in Math and English, for the most part. We began to work at that by recruiting outstanding freshman of considerable promise. We
really went at that. Our staff visited the high schools; they went there to recruit people who could survive academically. We advised carefully high schools to suggest to students of questionable academic promise not to try it and sometimes we postponed their admission by a quarter if they insisted on coming because we would be to the limit with the number of people required to fill up all the classes and fill up all the rooms we had and so on. So there were a lot of things tried with that. Different departments worked hard trying to find and recruit competent people in the various colleges because these were mostly the general education courses and the lower level. I think I remember that enrollment, for example, in agriculture was down at that time and enrollment in education was way up. It varied all over the campus; so you had to study where these people were going and recruit in accordance with the academic demands of the students who were entering the university or were staying for a second year. So that was just an overall campus effort that we kept harping on quality and we kept advising people who could be admitted under the law that your chance for survival is not very good. We kept some from coming through that kind of advise. We had a whole staff of people who went out to high schools all over the state and talked about that subject.

SUTTON: Where were they housed? Was this…

FAWCETT: You mean the people who did that?

SUTTON: Who went out that way?

FAWCETT: Well the leader of that at that time was Ronald Thompson.

SUTTON: Oh, Ronald did that.

FAWCETT: Ronald Thompson and a lot of his people in that area traveled the high schools weeks upon weeks to explain what our focus on quality was, what their poor chances for survival would be if they didn’t have a certain kind of high school background. As a matter of fact I think it took us only three or four years to eliminate all remedial work. Well then, not too long after that, eight or ten years, the problems of society changed, the quality of education didn’t appear to be as good, and I remember reading, long since I left the university, all these statements about how many remedial classes they have, and what percentage of the freshman had to take remedial work in Math and English and that was getting out of hand again. Then, in my alleged retirement, I did help the Board of Regents bring together the Board of Regents and the State Board of Education and begin to work through a statewide commission, which I helped the Board of Regents put together, to develop an acceptable curriculum for automatic admission without condition. I think it was this year that they began to apply that. Everybody could be admitted but some only on the condition that certain things would be done within a year, I think it is, after they enter college I see yet a good deal of reference made to that, as I look at articles in the press, as being a significant accomplishment. I think Ohio was about a year or two year ahead of most states in moving in that direction. I felt very good about that because from my knowledge it was the first time in history that the state superintendent and the public instructor and his board met with the chancellor
and his board. I always looked at education as one total process and what affected one would affect the other, positively and negatively, and I think it has. I believe they’re going to have an opportunity to eliminate about all the remedial education in the university within the next few years. I hope they do at least. That gave rise to whether there was adequate teacher competency in math and other subjects and all that you see in the literature everyday now.

SUTTON: Now you went from the one things that first came to your mind, the accomplishment of expanding the university as it had to be expanded but expanding it evenly and with a good deal of success and not too much turmoil. What was the second thing you thought of?

FAWCETT: The second thing I thought of was the research venture on this campus. As a land grant institution, it has this trilogy of mission of teaching, research and public service and I thought we were hitting the teaching part of it with the effort you and I have been discussing. At that time, the university was engaged in research to the extent of something like three million dollars a year from everything, from all sources. We had three agencies involved in that with total conflict all the way around. One of these was the Research Foundation which did most of them. The Engineering Experiment Station had taken it upon itself to go out on its own to get research money from industry and from government if they could, but government resources were very limited at that time. And we had the development fund with the so-called alleged “independent alumni” where modest little gifts that were given in comparison to today to the university through the Development Fund were decided by the executive director of alumni affairs without any consultation with the administration of the university. This was Jack Fullen’s job and faculty would come in and shop. They would go over to the research foundation or if appropriate they would go over to the engineering experiment station and then they would come in to the development fund. You well know, Dr. Sutton, that when you sign up to engage in a research project, not very many of the grants are for 100 percent of the cost of putting on the program. Automatically university resources were being attached. You could not have independent authorities with no responsibility for raising the remainder of the money loose doing that kind of thing. We had to terminate that. I suppose that was probably one of a number of things that disturbed Mr. Fullen’s with me and I’ll comment on that in a few minutes. We had to find a way to coordinate the total university research effort and then to set staff and organization to go after that money. That was a slow process in development. We had a good operation at the research foundation, not a very large one. We had a dynamic one underway at the engineering experiment station. Then we had this little hand behind your back handout over at the Development Fund if you couldn’t get it anyplace else, which committed university resources without the university knowing it. That’s a long story and I don’t want to go into all that, but we did get that solved.

SUTTON: How does one go about as president to do that?

FAWCETT: Well, I had a study made of the whole matter. Jack Corbally, as a matter of fact, was pulled out and set on that to head a special study at the university research effort
in these three areas, and to make recommendations, which later were approved. He had been in the College of Education as you remember. I think with his California, Berkeley degree in finance, he was qualified to do that and I had him head it. We did get a handle on it for the first time in the history of the university, but that came concurrently with the great increases for available resources for research because of the first Sputnik going up in 1957. So that again was a complex effort. But I think when I left the total university research effort, which was smaller than this now, was up to 60-some million a year and I thought that was a substantial accomplishment. That meant, of course, to get research grants, you had to have a recruiting effort in all of these areas, particularly in science and engineering and medicine, that would bring people sufficiently talented to come to the attention of the government in order to get those grants, who would be competent to carry on research efforts. So all of that went along concurrently. I felt that Ohio State began to become one of the great research institutions over a period of years as a result of that effort. So, I would have to say that while I was there, that while I didn’t do all of that work obviously, that would have been one of the major accomplishments of the institution, because I know it is now rated, was when I left, as one of the principal research universities in the country. It didn’t match MIT; it didn’t match CalTech or Berkeley or someplace like that; but it was really on the way and it is now one of the good research institutions of this country.

SUTTON: And is able to attract more excellent people.

FAWCETT: That’s right. Well that’s the second.

SUTTON: All right. Now the third one.

FAWCETT: Now if you want a third one I can give you a list. I feel that the massive effort you and I once before discussed, to achieve the academic reorganization of the university, was probably one of the significant things that happened while I was president. I know that took persistence; it took a lot of thought; it took hundreds of hours of work with faculty, staff and others; but the university had become large and cumbersome and unwieldy and unorganized or disorganized because of its fast growth academically. This was a way of clarifying for students where they were headed. I don’t believe that there’s ever been a major change made in it since. I think the existing academic organization of the university is probably adequate, and I think it’s adequate because there has not been a very great change in the total enrollment since I left. Faculty sometime will want to reexamine that as changes in all of our educational programs, and science and technology involved. It may be necessary to take another look at that, but it’s structured so that one relates to the other, I think, quite well now. I would consider that something of an accomplishment. I remember that other major universities said to me during the year following the accomplishment of that that is was the most massive academic reorganization ever accomplished in a major comprehensive university in history. So I felt good about it. Others have tried it since. There had been an effort at Michigan State, not as comprehensive as ours, but I think it worked. I’ve always been rather proud of the tedious hundreds of hours that had to be put into that effort to have everybody go along with it, well not everybody but almost everybody. I would look at
those, I guess, if I had to, as being significant accomplishments from my point of view. Now other would have a different view about that, and I can think of a thousand other things you could put in and shape down, but I think if you’re going to limit it to three these are the major ones.

SUTTON: They were three that were on your list when you started the plan?

FAWCETT: They were.

SUTTON: They were ones you were successful with?

FAWCETT: That’s right.

SUTTON: In the meantime you had all kinds of brushfires around you.

FAWCETT: Hundreds of them. A dozen a day.

SUTTON: A dozen a day, but there were some of them that were terribly persistent. That’s what I was asking about when I was asking what kinds of things were most vexations? What kinds of things were…

FAWCETT: Well you know…

SUTTON: …maybe disappointments.

FAWCETT: You know, you asked me then to list three of the most distressing or troublesome events or episodes while I was there. Now that was difficult to do and I’m going to disclose one that I’ve never talked about in public before, but which was a very difficult one. It’ll be my third one because we have, I think, discussed the other two in a different context as we’ve met. The one that I agonized over the longest, and it took the longest to resolve was what was affectionately known as “the gag rule” at Ohio State. That was a very vexing problem and it was mixed up with political and social change going on in the country. It was related to student unrest. It just took in everything. But I would say that as I looked back on the nine years required and the effort required to deliver something that everybody would accept from a condition nobody accepted (including me but I had to enforce it) I think that was probably one of the most agonizing experiences that I’ve ever had academically. It got into people’s basic political philosophy. Trustees have their views; faculty have their views; some enlightened students have their views. To have finally gotten over the humps, so to speak, with that problem, well I thought was a major accomplishment in a sense, given the conditions that were there when I arrived. It is one of the most stressing and troublesome events in my memory in an academic setting. It was one of the most difficult and gruesome problems to attack and ultimately try to solve that I had. I don’t suppose it’s perfect by any matter of means but it was such a slow process that we used in order to get there to move it faster, because of people’s deep-seated convictions.
FAWCETT: I’ve forgotten quite where we were.

SUTTON: You were just winding down on the matter of this controversy.

FAWCETT: Some of these things took place in that have never been disclosed in order to accomplish a satisfactory result. I think I mentioned to you that I did get that through a political maneuver of writing a long letter to a good friend who was a member of the Board of Trustees and who was against it, and knowing another one who was against it would be out of the country and timing my recommendation so I would get a 4-3 vote. I never hear of it anymore; you don’t either, I don’t think.

SUTTON: No one hear of it anymore.

FAWCETT: Yet it was recurring several times every year, all the time I was there up until 1965. I never heard of it after that. Now, the second most distressing memory I have was trying to understand 1962 to 1970, as all other people in higher education were—what was happening to the minds of the young people who were going to overthrow the establishment. The culmination of all that in 1970 was the shootings at Kent State. All the problems that evolved on our campus prior to and following it would be probably one of the most unhappy memories I have of the period when I served there. I have talked about that in answering journalists and others so many things I’m sick of even remembering it.

SUTTON: I can well imagine.

FAWCETT: The third one, as I said, I’ve never talked about and I should not want to be exposed publicly, but I will share confidentially at this point a problem that as with me from the time I went there until about two or three years before I left. I want to talk about the movement of organized alumni associations in this country. John B. Fullen, the executive director of Alumni Affairs, was a leader of a group nationally that prided itself on being independent. It was a journalistic philosophy that if you were an independent alumni association you were free to pick at, or attack or do anything you want and you couldn’t be taken to task for anything as long as you didn’t report to the university. They’re on a campus by sufferance. That philosophy began to be obsolete by 1960 and if you will look at all the alumni organizations and their relationships in the outstanding universities in this country today, you’ll see that they’re very closely related to the total university and its administration and how the university operates. In other words, they do not have this concept of total independence. Now that relationship had been deteriorating before I went to the university. I didn’t know why because I was a member of an Alumni Advisory board representing the college of education for several years before I went to the university. I knew what Mr. Fullen’s philosophy was, and while I often challenged that while I was working with that group, I found myself in a very different position when I went to the university as president. I cannot prove this statement except to say that Dr. Lou Morrill, who had been the only vice-president at Ohio State way back in
1930, 1940 and who did not get the presidency at the time Dr. Bevis came to the
university, went to believe the University of Wyoming as president, then to the
University of Minnesota for many years—13 or 14 or something like that. It was told to
me by many people who thought they understood Mr. Fullen that he was extremely upset
that he was not selected to succeed Dr. Morrill, who one time had been in the job Mr.
Fullen was in, then had become vice-president and I don’t remember what else. Whether
or not that’s true I can’t prove it. I do know that one trustee told me when I went there
that Dr. Bevis, my immediate predecessor, told him with tears in his eyes after his
retirement, that the only unhappy memory he had was the difficulty he had in working
with Mr. Fullen. Now, at the time Dr. Bevis was going to retire and the Board of
Trustees was on a search which I wasn’t even interested in. I know for a fact that Mr.
Fullen was, he thought, a contender for the presidency, which was all right. I certainly
know a lot of people on the campus who were. It wasn’t my fault they selected me
instead of selecting someone else. It would have been the same no matter who would
have gone to the university as president. To his credit Mr. Fullen, after my appointment,
publicly gave me rather nice support in his articles in his little gossip sheet called the
Alumni Monthly, written with a journalistic philosophy instead of really representing the
University. I thought perhaps I could continue to relate to him in a meaningful way, but
that was impossible because he was a champion of controversy, nothing he loved as
much as controversy. He was a glib and sometimes very good writer, a very effective
writer. He could stir up a lot enthusiasm about anything. He was in trouble with Woody
Hayes even before I came to the university. This was the kind of thing I’m talking about.
I remember one of the first things he suggested I ought to do was to replace University
Hall. That’ll just be an illustration. Well that didn’t come about for awhile, but when it
came time to make a final decision on the disposition of old University Hall, he showed
up on the other side in all of his advocacies and his writings. I remember too, he was a
member of an alumni committee that really ran the School of Journalism. It honestly
wasn’t reporting that anybody was supposed to report to the dean of the College of Arts
and Sciences but reporting was just a procedure. It didn’t really affect anything. When
they changed the director of the School of Journalism, this outside committee would
come in and they would make that decision and you, as the president, lived with whoever
was selected. So, not knowing quite what to do with some of those problems, I began to
look at that carefully. The Alumni Monthly would from time to time publish a lot of
letters to the editor that had appeared in the Lantern, the campus newspaper. I was told
afterwards that a lot of letters to the editor that had appeared in the Lantern, the campus
newspaper. I was told afterwards that a lot of those letters were commanded to appear in
the Lantern so they could be lifted to attack me in the Alumni Monthly. I tried to be very
tolerant of that but it was difficult. But you kept on trying to work with them because
you had to try to work with your alumni. You needed your alumni, and you always do
and you always will. I can recall there would be a meeting once or twice a year with that
Alumni Advisory Board, twice a year I believe it was, where you’d come in on a Sunday
morning at 8 o’clock, when you’d rather have been doing something else, and you’d meet
with the representatives of all the different divisions and colleges on the campus. There
was something like 16 of them, and you sat with a tape recorder going full blast, while
each one of those 15 or 16 or whatever it was, made a report on the colleges. Then when
that was over, you were expected as president to stand up and respond to each one of
those. And I did that for a number of years. The volume that would come out of each one of those was staggering, the volume of information. If some statement were made that would be useful, even out of context, I often read that in some Alumni Monthly that would be published during the months following. So you were always conscious of having an adversary with no legal right to exist on the campus, who was always ready to pick at whatever the university was trying to do and using any kind of information that would somehow or other be exciting for the alumni to read or be exciting in terms of something to criticize. Now I never expected everything to come out in the newspapers or publications on the positive side. That would have been impossible. A school like Ohio State is a place for controversy. But it should be intelligent controversy, and you should be able to talk on your adversaries and reason with them, or they could reason with you. But I felt this was a very unfair and one-sided operation that shouldn’t have exited in the first place. The concept of the “independent alumni” was so far out of date, and Mr. Fullen, as the originator and leader of that movement in that direction, was so protective of that philosophy, that you could not keep that aspect of university relations at a growing level in accord with what was happening in that field in communications. He finally retired. I think he retired a year after compulsory retirement or alleged compulsory retirement. I don’t know what their requirements were in that association, but he always made sure that I knew that he was against most everything we were trying to accomplish. One of the senior members of the faculty one day walked back across campus with him a year before he left and said to him: “You’re at retirement age, aren’t you?” He said yes, but he was going to stay another year because he was going to get Fawcett. And the faculty guy left him down at the door and came walking upstairs and told me about this. Well I knew it but I never had it put to me quite that directly before. We managed to live with that during that year. That was just about the time of the founding of the Presidents Club. Jack wanted, despite what he at times might have said to the contrary, to keep that whole mass of alumni paying 500 dollars a years dues at that time to the Association, which was the main part of their budget to operate the Independent Alumni Association. Finally, through Mr. Everett Reese, who was chairman of the development fund board, and Mr. Kenyon Campbell, who was in the association but in charge of the development fund, the lawyer, and myself, almost over Jack’s dead body, we founded the President’s Club. No one needs to apologize for what is the success of that operation today. I think they have now in cash and commitment something like 130 million dollars. I remember the first year, we had 70 members. I think it’s over four thousand now, but it turned out to be an excellent thing. If you look at the record you’ll find he was never a member. Mr. Fullen wasn’t; he never put his money on the line. I can remember a lot of efforts that were put forward during that period to make it as impossible as he could for it to succeed. One of his closest friends, now dead, joined and then found a reason to resign, which was a technique they were going to use, allegedly, for bringing it down. We just gave the man his money back and that was kind of a shock. After it succeeded, you would have thought that he had been the chief sponsor. It was just his nature of behavior. I liked him as an individual, he was a fun person to talk to. But he saw himself as having a role, because of his tenure more than anything else, of creating problems rather than helping to solve them. That was my opinion. But being aware of that going on all the time, under your nose, with an office located less than 500 feet from where yours was, was not a very comforting thought if
you had all these massive, major problems to deal with. I remember on another occasion when I had a little disagreement with the dean who had engaged in what I had considered to be a very unethical procedure (and I would have thought he would have been the first to recognize it and he later decided to leave an accept a position elsewhere) he planted that in the Alumni Monthly. The article was written, I always felt, to help generate a controversy and some great movement that would keep the man there, whether I wanted him there or not. But he didn’t stay. So these were the kinds of problems that were always with you. I guess I didn’t really like those, but they were a fact of life and you lived with them.

SUTTON: Now in a struggle like that, you have to have some sense of tactics I’m sure, because you had two things you had to deal with Fullen about. One was this free-wheeling development fund money you had available, which had to be coordinated with other research matters and then the other one, of course, one other aspect of the non-relation of the Alumni Association to the policies of the university. I take it you moved first with respect to the research fund, you mentioned that.

FAWCETT: Yes, we did. I never attacked him outright, I can’t remember doing that the way he did me.

SUTTON: No, no. You never did. You didn’t attack him, but you had to deal with the fact daily, that this would be interpreted by him as an attack.

FAWCETT: That’s right.

SUTTON: So, you didn’t do it carelessly, I’m sure. You were very careful.

FAWCETT: No, you were very careful about the manner in which you treated problems.

SUTTON: Your technique there seems to have been to draw in Corbally to work with people and work on an overall plan, that could succeed only if the development fund were brought in, and therefore would be accepted by enough people that, whether Fullen agreed or not, he would be brought in.

FAWCETT: He had been a factor in the creation of the development fund. He and Mr. Lincoln, of Lincoln Electric I think it was, were more or less responsible for finally getting a development fund operation underway. But it didn’t bring in very much money at that time. They worked at it but he never let that dominate the alumni effort. That was not his main interest. I always believed that, after the private institutions began to receive public support either through the federal or state governments, public institutions had a right to get help from the private sector. I operated on that philosophy, and I think it has worked, but it was a problem. I don’t think it would have made any difference to the president at all. Jack and I could talk to each other; we had been together socially literally dozen and dozens of times. You could have a good time, but you always were aware of that problem being there. As I say, my predecessor had it; I had it, but we were on a way to solving that before I left, and that relationships been a lot better since I left.
SUTTON: So this was an accomplishment too.

FAWCETT: We took Dick Mall, or they did. Dick came in and conferred with me about that job, and he and I arrived at an understanding about how we would work together if he accepted that position. He was doing an excellent job here. He died. It was most unfortunate. He was an able man.

SUTTON: Now I’m interested in one thing as a faculty member. You haven’t mentioned faculty members who, many of whom also regarded you as an adversary just the same as Fullen apparently did, and may have devoted considerable time to being a burr under your saddle. I’m interested that in your recollections this wasn’t important.

FAWCETT: No, it really isn’t because I have this strange philosophy, strange for a lot of people. I like to be able to disagree intellectually with people ad not have it be a personal matter. Obviously a lot of people either can’t do that or do not wish to do that. I think I reported to you once that one of my toughest adversaries was Mike Marco, chairman of mechanical engineering, who came in when I was going to leave in 1964 or 1965, whenever that was, and asked me to stay. He was representing my major faculty adversaries, and laughed about that. I asked him why he, my leading adversary, would be in there asking that and he said, “Well, it isn’t that we like you so much; we’re afraid of who we’ll get.” And he was very honest about that. He was a remarkable human being. You know. He was one of my best friends but one of my toughest adversaries and I always liked that kind of relationship. I think that has to go on, on the university campuses. If everybody agreed you wouldn’t have much of an academic atmosphere. A university has to be a place of controversy. If you’re discovering any truth and you’re engaged in any important ideas, people can’t all agree. And they shouldn’t or you won’t come up with the truth. So, I liked that part of university life. That I clearly enjoyed.

SUTTON: How about the relationship with the students themselves?

FAWCETT: well, it was misunderstood of course. We lived on the campus. It was very different that it is today, when the president does not live on the campus. You were really the only person in resident on the campus (this is overstated) from five o’clock in the afternoon until eight o’clock in the morning. So you did have responsibilities, you did have interruptions, and you did try to help with all of that as much as you could. In the really riotous period during the 70s, they tried to cook up a view that I wasn’t ever available or seen by students, which was to me about the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard, because my door was always open to them. Students could get to me before they could get to their professors because I was always available. I never operated with a closed-door policy, never. So that to me was a farce; they just cooked that one up. You didn’t meet all of them or get to know all of them, obviously. But I stayed very close to the student leadership group always, and worked with them and tried to help them in everyway that I could. I can’t tell you how many hundreds of nights I spent having dinner in the dormitory and talking to the people afterwards that were there. All kinds of questions would come up at that time. That was in the period when the men and the women were housed separately and when they didn’t allow alcohol on the campus, when
there were a dean of men and a dean of women and they were all treated very properly, you know, as was the custom in those days. That all went out the window when the student personnel people decided that there wasn’t such a thing as the dean of men and the dean of women; it was the dean of students. That changed things a good deal.

SUTTON: Now you mean the student personnel people in general in the country or in the state oh Ohio?

FAWCETT: It’s kind of a non-professional profession. I considered it not very important after that happened. I felt sorry for the people who were doing graduate work in that field because it was just almost a non-existent profession after the 60s.

SUTTON: They still carry on.

FAWCETT: Well it’s come back some, but it doesn’t have the same significance it once had. That was really a very distinguished profession for a while, where you organized to give leadership. But in that era students discovered they didn’t need any leadership; they provided their own leadership.

SUTTON: You were fortunate to have as Dean of Men and Dean of Women persons who did have some excellent stature.

FAWCETT: Yes, that’s true. Chris Conaway and Mylin Ross were the two people who were the standbys in that general area. Then, when Chris retired, was the time when they were talking about just having a dean of students. We tried that. Frankly, I never felt that was as good. I don’t think the university’s communications with students and its relationship to students was ever as good after that was changed. Maybe it is now but it wasn’t when I left.

SUTTON: That was in that sense a think you could not control, but…

FAWCETT: It was a national movement.

SUTTON: Yes, but still a disappointment.

FAWCETT: That’s right. It wasn’t easy.

SUTTON: Now, you can go so far as to think of a fourth accomplishment. Did you? I didn’t ask you to.

FAWCETT: I haven’t even thought that far.