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A. This is Professor Franklin Ludden, professor emeritus of History of Art. And this is our contribution to the OSU Oral History Project, with primary attention with the history of the Fine Arts program and the History of Art program that developed out of that. Before we go further, let’s introduce our interviewer. As I was saying, the history of Fine Arts at OSU is a very long and complicated story and in some respects unique for a Fine Arts program in state universities in the country. We propose that we separate it into three separate parts of our interview. One, the situation of the Fine Arts department when I arrived here in the 1950’s. Then for better understanding of that situation, to go back and look at the very unique development of Fine Arts from 1900 to 1950 at OSU. And then subsequently, to talk about the development of the History of Art program since it was recognized as a distinct program around 1960.

Q. You and your wife first came …

A. I and my wife came to Columbus and OSU in 1955 to what was then considered to be a temporary year appointment, because the previous art historian, Mr. Ralph Fanning, had retired that year, or had taken a leave of absence. I’m not saying this very well. At the time I had just finished my dissertation at Harvard College. I had served five years at the University of Michigan. Five years of, shall we say, apprentice to teaching.

Q. What were you teaching?
A. I was teaching the history of art there and teaching in my field. First of all, in general instruction, and then I launched Michigan on to Picasso and Cubism, which is an interesting story in itself. Because I’ve been called upon to introduce advanced courses in Renaissance and gothic art. And a course in modern art – one of the first courses in the department – an advanced course of modern art. The university there immediately accepted the medieval courses, but they delayed and delayed and delayed on acceptance of the Picasso course. In any case, after five years at Michigan, I was not too pleased with the situation there and perhaps later on we can get into the reasons. But it primarily was that in the 1950s, history of art was undergoing very radical changes in its conception of its mission and its implication. The Michigan department was, to my mind, trying to be in a most orthodox way, trying to develop a program that was entirely orthodox as it would be considered in the more developed art history departments of Princeton and Harvard. And I myself had already begun to explore the possibility of introducing into the normal instruction and research of the history of art, considerably more concern with meaning the history of ideas, in other words, and in the exploration of the history and theory of the department itself. At that time, I accepted the year-long appointment at OSU, with the understanding that I might be returning to Michigan or I might be going elsewhere after that. Because art history at OSU was not considered a very strong discipline at the time.

Q. Before you go on to OSU, can we find out what brought you to art in the first place?

A. Oh that’s a long, long story.
Q. That’s what we’re here for.

A. As a Wisconsin boy, I had no introduction to the arts, nor did my family have any special concerns with it. Except the fact that we all knew that Frank Lloyd Wright, who we referred to then as Uncle Frank, was within 50 miles or so of where I grew up. I went to West High School in Madison, Wisconsin, and was surprised to find that I was picked for a Harvard freshman fellowship. So in 1934, I was one of the first of the so-called Thayer fellows to go to Harvard. And the Harvard experience was utterly explosive for me, because after that first year at Harvard I didn’t know where I should turn. And I found that I was considering all possible career opportunities. And that summer, I found a chance to go to Spring Green, Wisconsin, Frank Lloyd Wright’s home, and be a visitor to Taliesin, where the fellowship existed. Thinking about architecture as a possible career for myself, since all things structural already had a great concern for me. I got a chance to talk to Frank Lloyd Wright for a couple of hours about the possibility of going there.

Q. That’s impressive.

A. And as soon as the interview developed with Uncle Frank, it became apparent that he expected a certain kind of innocence that I no longer had. And that I expected from him a certain kind of latitude, which was probably not going to be allowed. In any case, he offered me a chance to cut his fees 50 percent to become an enrolled member of the fellowship. Unfortunately, his fees were so large that 50 percent was way out of hand. So I had to go back to Harvard to my Harvard Fellowship. Well that got me going on architecture, and from there on I increased
my interests. So I enrolled as a major at Harvard and a joint degree of architecture and fine arts or history of art, which was what was involved. And knew that I had to learn a great deal. In any case, my undergraduate experience was complex, full of a lot of ups and downs, and included however a summer that I could take to Europe, and I made the rounds of the major monuments, mostly riding a bicycle and [hitchhiking], through Germany, just before the beginning of the war was taking effect.

Q. That was 1939.
A. 1938. In fact, it was then I went back to Harvard to do my senior year. And wrote a senior thesis on Rembrandt’s Nightwatch, which the Harvard faculty felt was worth _____ But wouldn’t give it to me because I enrolled in a course in Aristotle, which was above my head and I got a “C” on it. In fine arts, which meant a double focus. One in architecture and architectural practice and in history of art. Then, having failed to win a special fellowship for prospective painters at Harvard, I went to New York and for three years tried to find out whether I was a painter or not. Or, whether I could continue, could apprentice myself in architecture. So three years were probably very decisive to me because at that time I was exposed thoroughly to all the liveliness that was going on in New York and in the world of art. I spent some time being an apprentice to Paul Nelson, one of the most adventuresome architects of the time. And of course I attended the studios of George Grosz at the Art Student League. And Hans Hoffman downtown. And towards the end of the two years with the [war] becoming more and more apparent, I took a studio of my own and tried myself
out on several styles of art. I might say now looking back that I almost was able to find a way of continuing an artistic style of my own. But then the war came and I found myself in the war as a camouflage instructor. And later on through the forces of the Harvard faculty, I found myself assigned to the historical program of the Army, where we were trained as so-called eyewitness combat historians, our job being to be as close to action, front-line action. This led to my assignment to the Third Army in Europe. So I continued to do interviews and other historical studies on the actions as they were taking place and as they were completed.

Q. Did you do this by going, by visiting the various places of war?

A. The way it works is one was assigned, we were assigned first to General Patton’s Third Army. But from Third Army the members of the team went down to the division, to regimental level, and sometimes into company level. And I was apparently not too bad at being a reporter of those actions, filing also eyewitness reports. I had the privilege to be in a front tank as we approached Chartres Cathedral. I was also privileged to be in the front ranks when we got our nose bloody at _____ in the _______. In any case, I stayed with that kind of operation until the war ended and we ended the war just outside of Prague in Czechoslovakia. I would ask to come back to the historical section general office where they were accumulating data and was given an assignment to write up sections on the operation. In fact, I stayed with them long enough so they were able to complete their rough first draft of the Third Army Operation in Europe. I think, since you’re kind enough to want to get into the biography, I was faced
with a decision whether I would stay with Army history because the war department was offering me a chance to become what they called a historical editor, or to go back to further studies. Well, my own feeling at the time, that after the events of the war and so on, during which painting and other aspects of the fine arts had receded very far in the background for me. And I found myself with a very deep interest in trying to continue the historical studies, so that I would have a better understanding of what was going on. So I applied for graduate school at Harvard and came back to enter the graduate school. Took a year of study in the graduate, the history department proper. And then finding that I had some very special attributes that I had forgotten about in the understanding of ________, I shifted over to history of art and came through the graduate program in the History of Art for the years ’47, ’48 and ’49. And had decided on a dissertation on early Gothic sculpture, one which I should have had a better sense of choosing, because I quickly found later that there three or four other highly gifted European scholars who were working on the same area. In any case, after completing graduate studies, I was offered a job at Michigan. And at Michigan I did my five-year tour of duty. I filed my thesis. Unfortunately, it wasn’t recognized for nearly a year and a half because Harvard doesn’t recognize a thesis until a calendar year comes around. And so I had difficulty with the Michigan faculty, among other things, in the fact I had not completed the dissertation within five years. In fact, there was some confusion there. But as I say, I was not too happy with the Michigan Department and could not conceive of myself following a career in accordance with the Michigan program. So OSU,
from what I knew of it, looked interesting because I knew that there was a very large program here. It was a program that, while it didn’t have much reputation with scholarship and history of art, had a very considerable reputation in the number of artists enrolled and working, some of them working seriously in theory at the time.

Q. The artists were working in theory?

A. The artists were working in art theory. And so of the several possibilities, I accepted what was then a one-year appointment and came here. And very quickly sensed two things about the OSU department. One, that it was going through a very considerable crisis of direction. We’ll come back to that later on, I think. But the second, it was almost the largest university program of fine arts in the country. And third, that it was a kind of crisis, which was very hard to understand for me for a long time. It was complicated enough, so it took a long time to understand that. And that in the midst of this, I could detect that there was a possibility of making some real contribution to the fine arts and to the history of art. And so I very quickly in that third year, with the help of the then-director of the school, N. Alexander Severino, who gave me some encouragement, I accepted a regular appointment. And so my regular appointment was for the following year. And then it was most interesting to see what was to go on. At first I was tremendously impressed with the number of students who would come to classes. You’d have an introductory course and at one time it was the first year, I took on a summer course in what would be art theory. And found it almost entirely enrolled with art education majors and artists. And they had to be told again and
again what theory was all about. What art theory was all about. I remember I settled upon a curriculum for that course in which I’d get them all reading on the fundamental dichotomy of classic versus romantic art. And fortunately, that was a very handsome book by the then-director of the Louvre in Paris, who has done in wonderfully French manner the full layout of what was romantic, what was classic. And at least that first dichotomy that could understand something about it.

Q. This was 1955?
A. This was probably 1955, ’56.

Q. Right.
A. No, ’56, ’57 would be the year I had it all ready. Besides that fact, because this offered a kind of excitement and an opportunity despite the fact of all the other difficulties. First of all, the slide collection was practically unusable. The curriculum was a curious jumble of things, mostly determined not on the basis of a chronology or any rational understanding of the history of art, but the history of art was designed entirely to assist the studio people to get to the point of understanding something about modern art. And it was quite apparent that that was a key problem. Because the whole school and the whole university for that matter, seemed utterly provincial in their thinking about what was going on in the outworld at that time. One would say that when the senior artists gave a course what was supposed to be a introductory survey of modern art, and when he got up to ________, he thought he was going perhaps too far. I say it would be hard to understand how much had to be done. It broke down, first of all, on the basic
curriculum level. We very obviously had to find some way to introduce a teachable art history curriculum on the introductory level, let alone the upper class and the fact that the graduate level was practically never taught. And then second was at the physical level, the very necessary resources in visual arts, slide room and photographs as I say, had not been attended to and were administered in a very chaotic way. The Fine Arts library had had very little attention and only recently had come under the direction of the librarian, Jacqueline Sisson, who brought to it a learning that had not been there before. So we had to work, we had to try to build a library. First of all in modern, which had not been purchased. And then second, I was happy to see that I was given some encouragement, from sources I don’t really know about, to build the area of medieval, which I had now indicated was going to be my specialty, despite the fact that I was teaching general history at an introductory level and had begun to lecture on Picasso. So I was taking on the course and had already framed a mission on Picasso. Well in any case, a number of things were stirring.

Q. How did you teach without slides?

A. We had a few slides. I think altogether there was something like 20,000. We now have nearly 400,000. They almost never got back in the slide box once somebody pulled them. They would never get back to the slide box. It’s a trivial thing but it’s something very important. I might take this moment to say that when I was given an office, they gave me Mr. [Ralph] Fanning’s office. Now he had been art historian since the ’20s here. We’ll talk about him a little bit more later on, I hope. And his office, first of all, had a rolltop desk. A perfect rolltop
desk. In it was all the stationary a junior executive should have, including every Western Union tabloid you could think of. And all of his syllabi for every course he taught, he had a syllabus. So his shelves were full of these. Well, we’ll come back to that when we talk a little bit more about curriculum. But most of all, Mr. Fanning was a water colorist and he could turn out a water color very well. But his office that I inherited had a side room and an outdoor room and when we got around to count, there were 2,007 water colors stored in his office. As I say, the physical aspect was one that needed repair as quickly as we could. So, it became very apparent also that the school was suffering from a very chaotic history of administration. Mr. [James] Hopkins, who had been the long-time director of the school, over 20 years in tenure, I think, when he retired. This was way back in ’47. The directorship had been given quite hastily to Frank Seiberling, a member of the Ohio Seiberling family. And he was still working on his Ph.D. dissertation at University of Chicago. He had been at Toledo. I think the Toledo Museum, but not entirely sure. But then had been invited to OSU as an art historian and almost immediately was asked to become director of the school. Well, Frank’s gifts were not in administration and certainly were not in an administration where you had a faculty of over 40 members of the faculty, including artists in all specialties you could think of, including a few artists and very few art historians. And at that moment, the problem in administration was greatly complicated by the fact that first, art education was beginning to develop in a more professional program under the direction of Manuel Barkan, who had been brought here and been given [tenure] and had a Ph.D. in the College of Education. But most of all,
because of the force of personality and of instruction of Hoyt Sherman. Before I go on I’d like to say about Hoyt Sherman. I would like to point out that the record showed that once Frank Seiberling was appointed, every year for the next five years of his tenure, the faculty would send a delegation to the dean of the college to ask [that] Frank Seiberling be removed. Frank apparently during that period did make an arrangement with the University of Chicago to change the dissertation from the very ambitious notion of doing a dissertation of Austrian Baroque architecture to a dissertation on George Bellows. And so he was one artist or one member of the faculty that had a Ph.D. and he was the senior art historian. But Frank was tremendously involved with that introductory curriculum in which the whole purpose was to somehow have the magic touch to teach art appreciation, so it would satisfy the studio people including Hoyt Sherman. Hoyt Sherman had his own ideas of what the introductory course should be.

Q. Was Hoyt Sherman an artist?

A. I’ll come back to Hoyt. Let’s go a little bit further. In any case, I had decided to stay. And Nick Severino saw it to that I was appointed to some of the major committees of the college. The most important for my purposes was the graduate committee, in which it was quite apparent that we had to re-think the graduate program that was then being given at the School of Art. I personally owe a great deal to Nick Severino for what he did with his few years of directorship. But Nick was very quickly enticed to leave the directorship to go to a full professorship in the College of Education. And so the position was again left
open. And at that time, there were a couple of things happening. One: There was a great deal of lobbying about how would be the next director. And very little effort to go outside and find a director, [which] to my mind, was needed. The lobbying ended up so that the young 20-year-old associate professor, Jerome Hausman in Art Education, trained in New York in higher education, faculty there, was selected by the Dean of the College of Education to be the director.

Q. He was 20?

A. He was late 20s. And during that period, if my memory here is entirely clear, after Nick Severino had indicated he was not going to continue, there was a movement in the faculty and a committee of myself, Hoyt Sherman and Professor [Sidney] Kaplan were called upon to be a writing committee to develop a document, the gist of which was we requested to be removed from the control of the College of Education. The document was written with great difficulty and pain from my part because I had so little understanding then of the history of the Fine Arts program, and particularly had no understanding at all about the way the College of Education, in a sense, controlled the whole history of its development. In any case, we developed a document ending with the request for removal. Unfortunately, our document was very weak because we had no idea – removed to what? It was only later that I discovered they’d gone way back to the very beginning of the fine art program at OSU. People had talked about the need for a College of the Arts and conceived in several ways as combined College of Arts and Architecture as in Illinois and so on. But it was only later on that I realized that each of the directors, including Mr. Hopkins himself, had helped at one time
or another, tried to develop a notion of the College of the Arts – an independent College of the Arts. Well, when we presented this to the faculty and presented it to the Dean, we were utterly defeated. The faculty did not want to support it, and one could speculate on why they didn’t. And of course, it took us another 10 years before we finally were able to get a College of the Arts. And only then because the University as a whole was being reorganized.

Q. So for those 10 years you were under art education?

A. Never under art education, no. I would refer to them on another interview that I hope we will have later on, the program of Fine Arts was given to the College of Arts way back in 1922. And the University organized itself very consciously to be the kind of vocational university. And I hope I understand this well enough so I can clarify things in a subsequent interview about how all this happened. But coming back to the moment of crisis – the faculty was at odds with each other. Most of the senior faculty were, of course, content to remain under the College of Education. One could examine their motivations for it. But the little, what I called mutiny, that we tried to do then, was supported by perhaps a third of the faculty. But not enough to carry the weight. And as I said, this committee that I mentioned, it was Sherman, Kaplan and myself to write the document. Let me give a little time to Hoyt Sherman. He was one of the most striking personalities in the whole Fine Arts program. And he had come here from the South. Even as an undergraduate he was dubbed a bright young man. And been made an assistant to the great engineering drawing professor, Mr. [Thomas] French. So he assisted French in drawing and showed his capacity from there on in it. He
developed a very fine sense of draftsmanship. He was adopted as an assistant to Mr. Hopkins and very much agreed with Mr. Hopkins’ point of view. So he painted for a time in a manner that was a kind of romantic version of what Mr. Hopkins had painted. However, during the ’30s, and some say it’s a result of the fact he went to Europe, he became for the first time very much aware of what was happening in the School of Paris. In other words, in the modern movement in Europe, which before that had been rather bare knowledge here in Ohio. And so he came back filled with a desire to bring the Fine Arts program up to date. And his strong and vivid teaching brought to a great many students because he did have a fine intuition of, shall we say, quality in the kind of things he was doing. Then, as work went on, we’re talking about ’38, ’39, ’40, he became aware of the movement in psychology concerned with visual form. And generally we called this the Gestalt psychology movement, although it moved more widely than just all people. In the course of his interest, two things happened as I understand. One is that the University was called upon to prepare a program for the Army and Navy, for the armed forces, to assist in the quick recognition of planes in flight. And this was given some considerable backing. Hoyt’s contribution to that program remained a little bit unclear. But in any case, Hoyt became convinced by using certain developed Gestalt techniques, namely that of rapid focus, quick and rapid focus, one could increase the efficiency of recognition. And this led to considerable University support for that point of view. The second thing is that he became aware of special developments in Gestalt investigations by Professor Ames at Princeton. Professor Ames had worked up a means of making sight
much more acute by using various devices, by tricking the eye with certain false perspectives, by developing certain illusions and so on.

Q. Is this Winston Ames?

A. I’ll have to look that up. I don’t think it was Winston, no. In any case, Hoyt, with all his energy, replicated a good many of the Ames demonstrations here on the campus. Out of this Hoyt developed a kind of doctrine. The doctrine had to do with the fact that if you could train students first of all by not pushing them to linear drawing, charcoal drawing and so on, but to put them in a dark room and have them draw half a second or a millisecond demonstrations of something on the screen, they would be able to draw much quicker and much more rapidly and they would automatically show what Hoyt, what I think Hoyt had a kind of special fixation. He was utterly convinced that the visual system was itself an organizing principle. And that the organizing principle developed according to several rules, most of which was the concentration on the center of a composition. And Hoyt, in the course of this, developed a manuscript which, with the help of Ross Mooney and the College of Education, became a manuscript publication called, “Drawing a Scene.” And Hoyt wanted to turn this into what would be a national contribution to the psychology of education through art education. He also wanted us to build an entire curriculum around that. And that curriculum included, of course, the organization of History of Art, so that according to Hoyt, certain artists evolved more and more this acuity, would develop this, the iris or the great emergent realists, ______, ______, Rembrandt he got in somehow and that led up to Phazo, Phazon being the contemporary artist. And so somehow we
should teach them with the understanding of this progression of the greater acuity. Now Hoyt’s was always exciting because it was very difficult to understand what he was saying. And he interlocked a number of his so-called principles, verbal principles with a notion of dynamics. So that it was always a question of feedback. You got the thing there and then you got the progress to a feedback and improved. Well, as I say, I cannot help but say that Hoyt unfortunately had no full University learning. He was not read in the philosophers and not knowing that the philosophers from Plato on had been aware of the kind of intuition he was dealing with. And most completely that this had been developed. And the aging century when all the great philosophers, _____ and _____ and their notions of perception. And most of all, he was almost totally unaware of the literature that surrounded this in America during the early 20th century. But it being Hoyt and his very sharp intuition of what he was up to, his great success as a teacher to the undergraduate students in the class lab, they developed a class lab then. He developed this in order to put them through a regime of classes to assist them to overcome their difficulties. And finally to develop a … it’s remarkable how this thing developed in the university. One time he was teaching football players how to improve their reception of footballs in this thing. And he had all the dentists coming through. The dentists would understand form much better. And so many other programs. And they built the flash lab at the back of Hayes Hall to do this. But Hoyt’s intensity, let me say first, Hoyt was most interesting to talk to. And his perception of composition was great. And his instructional drive, while it was utterly unconventional, by the way, he, for a long time, didn’t take graduate
students. It was only later on that he accepted graduate students. And so very few of the people who started under him can say they got a degree. Of course, Roy Lichtenstein _________. Because however Roy developed his art, he thinks he learned a great deal about composition from Hoyt. I think he also learned a great deal about how to be adventurous in style from Hoyt. Well, in any case, Hoyt was ambitious enough so that he not only wanted to be the director of the school, particularly while Mr. Seiberling was in office. And he had a number of followers among the faculty and student body. But he also wanted to build the whole concept of the history of art on this thing. And he spent a great deal of time searching through photographs and what have you to try to find those artists that would be considered moving towards the ____________. For the first five years and for another three or four years, I worked quite closely with Hoyt because I would get on the graduate committees and some of them looked to me to help them write that thesis that each one had to write along with the presentation of his master’s program. But my greatest problem with Hoyt is that Hoyt first of all had not become educated in the vast area of philosophy that he was working in. He was taking what he wanted and forgetting the rest. He was utterly convinced that someday the optometrist would prove to him just what it was individual action that would count for this thing that he was sure was there. And once he was convinced of this, he was very hard … he wouldn’t listen to people. He made a remarkable contribution, but it came to them, to my mind, that he seemed to split this very fragile faculty of the School of Art into various pieces and so on. So that it acted as a therapeutic effect. And certainly it helped to
arouse some of the people on the faculty, to the fact that every style of art that you practiced had to have a theoretical basis to it. It also aroused them to the fact that they had to understand what was going on in the outerworld. Hoyt himself really couldn’t explain what happened after _______. I’d like to get some sort of account from Ralph Fanning – first of all, because he became such a legend to the OSU community and he was a man of very polite and gracious habits and his manners were always well bred and so and so on. He, for a long time, well from his appointment I think in 1923, when he was appointed here as the art historian, he dominated the whole area. And he of course controlled the curriculum of art history until Mr. Hopkins retired. And then one could see that he was giving in to some of the new requirement that Hoyt and his followers were asking. Fanning retired in ’54, and the kind of art history he taught was one that I like to use a good phrase in saying is like a guidebook kind of art history. Or more precisely, like a better guidebook of art history. Each one of his courses would start out with a brief survey on the geography, climate of a region. Then a very quick survey of a principle of a historical event, carefully spelled out in these thick syllabi that he gave to the students. And then you had a mention of the monuments or the artists and the monuments in chronological order and reasonable order and so on. So that you became aware of a great many monuments. This kind of art history was not unusual in American universities during the ’20s and the ’30s. There was a similar kind of instruction at Michigan. Another one at Wisconsin and so on, that taught more or less the same kind of guidebook for art history. And of course to accomplish a purpose which was to
provide people with a smattering of learning. When the School of Art was given the authority to give graduate degrees, which was sometime in the late ’20s, a few students came forth to take [their] MA and Ph.D. And Mr. Fanning would lead them, despite the fact that for a long time he was the senior art historian and there was nobody else in the faculty that even had [an] MA or Ph.D. in art history.

Q. Did he?

A. No. I was coming back to it. Mr. Fanning came from Long Island and he took degrees in what are called architectural sciences at the University of Illinois before he came here. And when he came here, he was already a favorite faculty member of Mr. Hopkins. And he must have lived a very regimented life. Or he couldn’t turn out all the watercolors he did. There were many legends about how rapidly he could turn out watercolor. He taught almost every lecture hour in the day. Then in the 14 minutes between lectures he would come in and turn out another watercolor in between. He of course made a point of traveling greatly. So he did his watercolors in Europe. He went to Egypt and he traveled the older regions to the south and New England regions in this country doing watercolors of the houses and so on. One of this students took an MA with him and then went on to New York University and had become quite a prominent art historian at Iowa, Charles Cutler. Another one took a degree with the first Ph.D. in art history in our program, Mr. Roos. Once he got the degree he taught here for a little while and then went to the University of Illinois to teach.

Q. Who would confirm a Ph.D. then, not having a Ph.D. themselves?
A. That seemed to make a little difference. I’ll come back to that if we have a chance. In any case, it was said, it was known that Mr. Fanning had, during World War I, joined the Ambulance Corps and so he for a time served in a very difficult assignment of taking soldiers from the front to the hospitals. And apparently he was gassed during that time. So he was apparently not a healthy person. He later on developed a form of Parkinson’s disease. And he left an account of his later years on the faculty at OSU. And it’s a wonderful account. Everybody is a very nice person. There is some recognition of the conflict. But the account never goes beyond that. And never is self-critical enough or shows concern, to know what his relation to the history of art as it was being developed. Now, of course, coming as I did with my Harvard graduate training, I was particularly excited by Erwin Panofsky and the new meaningful art history. One that I wanted to develop particularly, because in the five years at Michigan I was not encouraged to develop that. So when I came here, there was for me quite a clash and quite a delight, shall we say, and the opportunity to reform a curriculum if one would find a way to do it. But it took help and the only help I could see was Frank Seiberling who was primarily interested in what we call art appreciation. And I was not at all into art appreciation. Or Mr. Kaplan and one or two other art historians. One, Gibson Danes, who got his Ph.D. from Yale who stayed here for a couple of years and was the chair of a couple of the graduate students in art history. Then went on to California and finally ended up as the director of the NYU at _________, devoted to the arts.

Q. New York Institute?
A. At New York. Not the Institute, no. The special school in West Chester County.

Q. That’s the New York State School at Purchase?

A. Purchase, yeah. Okay. You have said it.

Q. Who was Kaplan?

A. I wish I knew more about it, but Kaplan was already quite a sick man when I came. He had taken a degree in Asian art, primarily Indian art. He was primarily interested in Indian ceramics. He, I think, went up to Harvard and got his Ph.D. from Harvard, at the time when Harvard faculty and Asian art was pretty ________ shall we say. He also had stopped at Michigan for a year and he left Michigan and came down here. But he was already showing signs of his illness. And so for a lot of the time, he was not on duty. He was over at the psychological hospital at Upham Hall, or whatever that place is. And soon they found it almost impossible to organize a course. He would start talking and he would get involved in such things as whether a lintel could be longer than 10 feet long without breaking. He did find a place here because of his interest in ceramics, in order to carry on his Ph.D. research. He apparently went off and built an Indian kiln and so on. Well, in any case, he certainly was spending more and more time in the hospital, diagnosed with schizophrenia. And after a rather troubled family life, he committed suicide. And that was, I’d have to look up the date to see when that was. I think it was ’58, ’59 or ’60.

Q. So basically you didn’t have anybody to help you.

A. No, but coming in soon after I was here, came people I’ll talk about a bit more later on. One was Glenn Patton, with a degree from Michigan. Another is
Anthony Melnicke, with a degree from Michigan, too. And they were the ones who were appointed, but I must say, as part of the experience of being here, is that Ohio State University in general was a very aristocratic institution. If you were a Dean or the head of things, you didn’t need to communicate with the rest of the faculty. And you assumed powers that, I must say, shocked me greatly. Because I was accustomed to other kinds of faculty government. Those powers were assumed very thoroughly by the College of Education, which helped to explain why there is such a gap in the art history program. But it was under the control of the College of Education because the deans and the higher-ups of the administration ________ College of Education. Dean Cottrell didn’t have the slightest idea of what was going on in the School of Art and didn’t care as long as the enrollments were going up. And so I come back to the point. Soon after I came and Jerry Houseman was appointed, the control of recruitment was not in the hands of other faculty members in art history. It was assumed very much by Houseman and I assume by his rapport with Dean Cottrell and so on. And so I take no responsibility for the appointment of Glenn Patton or Tony Melnicke, and some others I’ll talk about later on. An almost catastrophic crisis of the Fine Arts program at OSU as I saw it, I must say that during those early years in the ’50s, the history of art was undergoing the first of its radical changes, from an old-style history of art, which was dominated by two kinds of orthodoxy: One was the orthodoxy of archaeology and the archaeological methods, which was primarily exemplified by Princeton. The other is the one that you, because of your writings on Alfred Barr, the emphasis at Harvard on what we called connoisseurship. That
is, the exigency of the authenticity of the work of art and being pretty much focused on those two things. And both of them excluded pretty much what would be considered what Panofsky stood for as meaning individualized, or what we more broadly consider the facts of art history being seen as one of the history of ideas. Now, it became more and more apparent as you saw what was happening at OSU, that somewhere in the past the land-grant idea that OSU was focused with its highest priority on the vocational mission of the University. And that vocational mission unfortunately was never defined. Nobody knew what the world history mission was. One of the reasons it was never defined is because it kept shifting so rapidly during those years. You’re moving from a time before the automobile until the automobile became a primary means of locomotion. In any case, the vocational idea at OSU was a primary statement of the rhetoric of the College of Education because they wanted to turn the education of teachers of others into what we would call vocational teachers. And then another wing of the faculty was very happy in interpreting the vocational aspect of history of Fine Arts as producing what we call artists in residence. The people who could – like Hopkins and Mr. [Irwin] Frey, and in a sense, Mr. Fanning, who was an artist in residence, because he did the water colors. All of these people had salaries that were augmented by the sale in a professional manner of their works of art. And many of the junior faculty members were doing the same thing. And sometimes assessed their reason for a position on the faculty because they could make sales.

Q. So who would benefit from the sales?
A. They themselves. They were professional artists in a sense. They were here with an appointment but they made a living by their sale or hopeful. I’m not sure that Fanning ever made enough from his water colors. He only charged $37.50 in 1950 for a water color. Now, of course, they’re worth several thousand dollars. Well, I guess my point being that when you look at, even superficially, at the history of art history, I guess almost all the Big Ten universities during the ’50s, they were going through a great crisis. Now Harvard was going through this same crisis but didn’t know it and it delayed it for some time because of changes and so on. Princeton in a sense never lost it as far as I know until they got interested in shifting the focus of their archaeology from Syria and the Near East and medieval thing, to Byzantine. And when they got interested in Byzantine they found themselves involved with something that demanded a cultural approach. And of course that later shift that can be tied to the ’50s and to my generation. Most of us looking back at what we went through felt that, in a sense, we all had to re-make ourselves as historians over what we had been taught. I particularly had been taught in that school of connoisseurship that was there. But others who were taught in the so-called archaeological method had to re-make themselves. And I must add a final point here. I’m also aware of that generation of graduate students that I was with at Harvard and got to know in other places, who are actually the immediate generation after the war. This was all GI generation. How many of them in effect have disappeared from history after their survival of the great ____.

Q. Why do you suppose that is?
A. Well, I know in some cases, let’s say simply it was _____. They just couldn’t live on what was being offered. In some cases, it was a very infirm understanding of a passion for art. In some cases, it was incompetence. Because I have to admit that, looking around the requirements of getting a degree in my generation, was very loose in most cases. In effect, one could make one’s own requirements, and we tended to sort of define ourselves on whether we wanted to go for a good degree or we wanted to go for a degree that was relatively simple. I don’t remember, two or three of my colleagues who very quickly decided to do Gericault. Now Gericault was not considered a very difficult research assignment. Now to do Gericault would require a much more intensive training and involvement. Another one did _____ or at least part of _____ because ____ was too big. And he left art history soon to be a very bad, I’ll correct that and say, a very questionable museum curator.

Q. I found in my reading of the history of scholarship that there were big blips in the number of people who got their Ph.D.’s after each war. In the ’20s and in the ’60s.

A. Part of that was delayed action. And, of course, mine was a delayed action. I had completed my coursework and I really had completed my research before I went to Michigan. But I couldn’t sit down and write it because they had me doing everything else like proposing three courses, brand new courses. And totally rewriting the Medieval Survey course. No, we were overworked in a sense. We could talk a good deal more about this but my point for this section of the discussion is the fact that the ’50s was a time for revision. And of course the
revisions didn’t catch on until an awful lot of people who were still getting their degrees in the 6’0s and ’70s.

Q. So actually it was a great opportunity for revision.

A. Oh yes, yes. I mean, it was wide open. I have a little vignette, I may have told you this before. They can cut as much of this or we can cut it after I’m done. No, I had written a highly acceptable thesis on Rembrandt’s Nightwatch. And looking back at it, it was pretty good. But that was a BA. And then when I came back to graduate study I, of course, then was able to do some more studies on 17th century with the great Rosenberg. And he of course was touted at Harvard as having really the greatest eye. And when you come to Rembrandt, he did have the greatest eye. He could see Rembrandt drawing in the dark I should say. I had signed up to take Panofsky’s seminar because Panofsky was at Harvard for the year and some of us were invited to sign up for Panofsky’s seminar. I remember coming down the stairway for a meeting with Professor Rosenberg and he said, “You have signed up for Professor Panofsky?” I said, “Yes.” And he said, “Well, I’m sorry. I wonder why you’ve done it.” It was his polite way of indicating that he didn’t think Panofsky’s art theory or history of ideas was proper.

Q. They were on two ends of the spectrum.

A. Yeah.

Q. This is November 21, 2001, with Frank Ludden being interviewed by Sybil Kantor. This is session two.
A. This is session two of our contributions to the oral history of the Fine Arts program at OSU with special emphasis on the History of Art. We have a thought that our contributions would break down into three parts. The first one was concerned primarily with my, Frank Ludden’s arrival at OSU, and the situation, very critical situation, of the Fine Arts program of the 1950s, as we found it there on arrival. The second session we propose to make a contribution to the history by going back to its earlier developments under the understanding that one realizes that any academic institution develops its own points of view and its so-called internal culture, way of doing things, out of its past and past development. The Fine Arts program at OSU is, first of all, one of the biggest and most comprehensive of all of the fine arts programs in state universities in the country. And at one time, it celebrated a kind of golden age with large enrollments and large accomplishments in the field of fine arts.

Q. Franklin, let’s pause for one minute. Okay.

A. The program at OSU developed several interesting aspects and I think our purpose here is to try to highlight some of these interesting aspects of its early development. The one that is most apparent is the emphasis on vocationalism or on a industrial aspect of the arts at OSU. This arises out of its history that we’ll try to explore a little bit more later on. The second is, of course, that OSU’s program in the arts developed here in close connection and under the umbrella of the College of Education, which gave it a particular concern for the teaching of art and for the development of a professional art education point of view. The third aspect that seems to be of particular interest is that OSU developed during the
'20s and '30s a program of instruction which was, in many respects, like the program of instruction in the arts academies of the country which were disassociated with universities, and it gave impetus to this by treating at a very early period, what we would call the role of the artist in residence in a university setting. These aspects are, in some respects, paralleled by the two universities that were used as benchmark rivalries for the program here. The two programs—the one at Illinois, the other one at Cornell. And in both cases, at Illinois and Cornell, a very distinctly and special attitude towards the development of fine arts in the universities developed. Now, in all these factors one could see the gradual development of a unique OSU attitude towards the development of fine arts. One that separates OSU from its rival “land-grant universities” is that for one reason or another OSU never developed the need or felt the need for a fine arts teaching collection or works of art or of reproductions of works of art to supplement its program. This has been a theme of some concern for those of us later on when we found that we did not have a chance to refer to the concrete values of fine arts productions, rather than to put our emphasis on the role of the creation on production of works of art as we saw here. I mention this as a preliminary to a few things I like to cite in the history of the early period of the program. And it will be understood that one could give only a brief sketch of what this earlier history was. For one thing, it was tremendously complex in detail. And I must note that we have a manuscript by an associate professor, Ross Norris, who came to OSU after a degree in Wisconsin, who has composed a manuscript with considerable research and great care on this early history, but with emphasis
almost entirely on Ross’s own profession, which was that of art education and professional art education. There’s another book on the history of the College of Education by Professor H. [Harry] G. Good that is important to understand the development, since it gives a chronology of the development in the College of Education while OSU was developing. Now to recall that OSU was founded in 1870 and as far as its first development, its first faculty had one faculty position devoted to fine arts and photography. And then somewhat later that position in fine arts and photography had grown, so that there was the first real head of a program, Professor Thomas Matthew, who was mostly concerned with architecture, but nevertheless set up the first program in what was headed almost entirely as drawing, feeling the need that both mechanical and free-hand drawing were necessary for the education of OSU students, both in liberal arts and in engineering.

Q. That was a pretty universal concept.

A. Almost all of the programs that I know of in other universities would start out with an understanding that mechanical drawing and free hand drawing were important. Then of course where some people move more rapidly than OSU did, was the recognition that one could form a professional school of architecture as they did at Cornell at a very early age. That it was easier to organize such a program and probably easier to make people aware of its need. That was to organize a program that extended to painting and modeling and so on and so on. One should mention that very early in the program at OSU was the importance of the figure of President Rutherford B. Hayes. Mr. Hayes was a very important
man in Ohio and had a culture that was, I suppose, best described as a true Victorian culture. As governor of the state, it was he who appointed the first Board [of Trustees] of the Ohio State University and no doubt he could develop his own general and personal views of what the University mission should be. It became quite apparent that Mr. Hayes was very concerned with the land-grant mission as defined in the Morrill Act as setting up the land-grant universities in the country; and that mission, as stated, although we were very vague and subject to a lot of interpretation, allowed for an interpretation that put the emphasis on vocational training. After President Hayes left office, he was again appointed to the Board [of Trustees] of Ohio State University and no doubt exerted a great deal of influence on whatever happened. He is given credit as being the one who was able to promote the building of what is now the Hayes Hall, which was originally set up as a house for manual training and for industrial arts, as well as for the training of the home economics students and at one time, it’s interesting to note that they even had a blacksmith in Hayes Hall. The model in front of Hayes Hall, it would be interesting to know who dictated what it was, the cultivated mind and the skilled men, a model which is still above the door of Hayes Hall. And that I think insofar as architecture can help motivate our program, the fact that Hayes Hall was built as a building for the vocational education in the fine arts, has had a considerable effect. Certainly as one looks back, OSU has paid much more attention to this kind of development than any of the other Big Ten schools. The gradual growth of the program meant that a multitude of problems appeared. Should there be a Fine Arts program that included not only drawing, but painting
and sculpture, as well as some aspects of agricultural education, specifically landscape architecture? Should it include the early training of some of the people who later would take on architecture? Well, to go back to this a minute, one of the remarkable early personalities that emerged at this time is Joseph Bradford, who was teaching in the drawing program. His own concern was with mechanical drawing. And as things developed further on, he became the originator really of the architectural program at OSU, when he was allowed to develop from mechanical drawing to courses in architectural design under the College of Engineering. Professor Bradford is important to the whole program, particularly because he was able to separate one whole aspect of the program and by doing so, gave further definition to the specific mission of the department of free-hand drawing, that moved more and more into painting and design and then later on into what became the School of Art. This early period set the tone of it and it’s interesting to say that as far as one can make out during this early period, nobody in the University was very much concerned about developing a teaching museum or to acquiring or displaying works of art. This in contrast to what happened in Illinois at the same time and at Cornell and particularly up at Ann Arbor.

Q. They all had museums?

A. Yeah. At Ann Arbor the museum that was developed as a matter of fact Ann Arbor developed three museums. But the first museum up there was an archaeological museum. And then Michigan participated very early in archaeological projects in Syria and in the Near East and so on. Then, later on developed a museum in the anthropology department for findings that the
anthropologists brought back from their studies in the Philippines. I’m getting a little far afield here. This period of development deserves a good deal more study than I was able to give it or that Ross Norris has been able to give to it, because it in so many ways established the basic patterns of thought for our program. Now, in 1912, the then recognized Department of Fine Arts received Charles Fabens Kelley as its head. Charles Fabens Kelley, who had a degree from Harvard. He was brought up in Boston with a classical high school education and his Harvard career apparently already developed an interest in the holdings of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts in Asian Studies and so on. But his education was like one can only sort of put together. But certainly he was there when Harvard was being moved towards a Fine Arts program based on literature and criticism by Charles Elliott Norton, who was already teaching a history of art [class] based on the general notions of the history of culture that was later on developed further in the Harvard program. In any case, Kelley was a Harvard man. He was sometimes referred to as being a proper Bostonian when he came here. And he has the appearance of a very well-groomed person. He obviously was a man of great energy and with a clear and highly organized mind. Now Kelley was the first one to organize the Fine Arts department into a greater series of courses in drawing and painting and design. And also in the history of art. He introduced into the History of Art program eight courses, which included a course in Asian art. And I believe this was the first course in Asian art that was given in the country outside of Boston at the time. How many of these courses he taught himself doesn’t seem to be in the record, but he must have taught most of them. He certainly had a
concept of the fine arts which would emphasize its cultural and its aesthetic values. And he attempted in numerous ways to implant this in the University course structure, as well as in the many other activities he had in the University community. I might add that Kelley was a member of the first Board of the College Art Association of America, acting as treasurer for a period of time. When he came to OSU, he apparently gave himself the notion that he would spend ten years as its director. And during that period, he formulated a number of memos and requests, which included the request that the program in Fine Arts at OSU be organized under a College of the Fine Arts. This, of course, becomes a major theme from then on, that we should have a College of Fine Arts. Despite the fact that most of the program was now being administered by the College of Education. He was able to promote the idea of the need for space for the Fine Arts program and there is a design for a combined building for the Department of Fine Arts and Architecture to be placed at the entrance of OSU, opposite the now Sullivant Hall, which was first designed as the home of the Historical Society of the state. If Kelley had stayed longer, apparently the future direction of the program would, in my mind, have become a program closer to the liberal arts idea of most universities and would very probably have been moved. The department would have been moved into the then Colleges of Science, Philosophy and the Arts. This was before the College of Education was given a much larger mission. Professor Kelley announced that he would leave OSU after the 10-year period that he was here. It would be interesting to speculate since there seems to be no record of what caused him to decide to leave. One can suspect, however, that he
found it almost impossible under the aegis of the very strong Professor Thompson to change the vocational direction of most of the program here. It’s interesting that before he actually resigned, he had the influence to nominate and probably in effect appoint his successor, and to do so he chose not a scholar or a teacher, but a painter, Mr. Hopkins. And Mr. Hopkins we’ll speak about a bit later. He was the man to succeed Kelley. Kelley had also, before he left the University, appointed a sculptor named Bruce Seville to be a sculptor in residence. And this was the first real artist in residence in the program. It’s interesting to note that before Kelley came to OSU, he had a short term of duty at the University of Illinois. And there apparently he had met Ralph Fanning and he had recruited Ralph Fanning to come to OSU to assist in the teaching of the History of Art program. Mr. Fanning had an undergraduate degree at Cornell and had taken degrees in the history and science of architecture at Illinois before he came to OSU and was one who at least had a master’s degree among the new faculty. One can speculate that Kelley had sensed or understood the trend of the so-called philosophy of OSU and the emphasis on vocationalism, and one can also point out that the campus was beginning to show certain, shall we say, aspects that might have influenced him strongly. I note that it was at this period that two things were happening at OSU: one was that we were changing from a semester to a quarter system in order to accommodate better the large number of summer school students.

Q. Now what year was that?

A. 1921, ’22. And it was also the years when the greatest thing happening on the campus seems to be the building of the great stadium and the very enthusiastic
building of the great stadium, which drew the attention of the whole state. In any case, Kelley left OSU having done the best he could to maintain his own aptitudes and interests in the art program. And went to the Chicago Art Institute, where he sometimes acted as the associate director of the so-called art institute, and then later became the very remarkable and precocious curator of the Asian collection of art. And lived out his career until the ’50s as one of the major founders of the Chicago Art Institute program, of teaching and scholarship.

Q. And that was the early ’30s?
A. ’20s. Well, he went there in ’22, but he lived through to the ’50s.

Q. When did he leave OSU? In ’32?
A. ’22.

Q. When did he come here?
A. He came here in 1912.

Q. Oh, 1912, okay.
A. On his retirement, Kelley had left the Fine Arts program with a well organized, some people seem to think too well organized, program of the curriculum in art history as well as in the studio courses. He had also managed to appoint the first “artists in residence,” Bruce Seville, the sculptor, and he had brought to OSU Ralph Fanning, having an MA degree in architectural science [who] was primarily concerned with being a water color artist. And all during his long career at OSU, while he was the head and the full director of the History of Art program here, he produced innumerable water colors. And in a sense, although he was called to lecture at some universities as a temporary instructor and he sometimes headed as
the temporary appointment the NYU program in fine arts, he seems to have been a kind of artist in residence himself because while he taught the history of art in a thorough and fastidious way (I have referred to his way of teaching in our first contribution, in our first session), he was not himself interested in scholarship or in keeping abreast with the very rapid changes that were going on in the art world and in the history of art. Shall we stop for a moment? Mr. Hopkins became the director of the school in 1922-23. And I might say retained the office for 25 years until 1947. Before I talk about the major trends of things during the Hopkins regime, I would like to make a comment that as far as I can make out, Ohio State University had an attitude about university government that might well be called “the plantation idea.” In other words, there were a number of great men in the administration and the senior professorial ranks that were treated with the utmost respect and seemed to have overwhelming influence on what happened. They had a kind of club attitude about their own relationships and seemed to consider themselves as the insiders who ran almost everything. Now what I’m trying to say here is that all universities, of course, work out their own atmosphere of governance, but it seems that at OSU the idea of governance by the great men with all the special privileges of governance has been a mark of its development. And I have used the term “the plantation idea” of governance because its again and again seems to preclude the kind of governance that was developed on a more democratic level, which occurred in some other universities at the time. Now, Hopkins I think immediately treated his directorship as the real power which included power of appointment, the power of assignment, the power of
interpretation of standards, and so on. And the faculty would come and go in the program, I sense, were pretty much at his direction. This was certainly true with regard to Ralph Fanning being one of the insiders of the so-called university. And as an insider was able to act as the most dominant figure. Any assistants he had were assistants to the head professor of the History of Art. This is an attempt to characterize, a poor attempt I’d say, to characterize the quality of governance that I at least found at OSU and the quality of governance that helps to explain how so many decisions at OSU seem to have been made without much reference to the faculty as a whole or to the needs of a student body other than the needs to provide them with their useful training. Now under Hopkins' regime, as early as by the 1930s, the faculty had expanded in innumerable directions. It drew faculty who would teach commercial art, to include faculty who would teach design to the fashion students in home economics. It included a further development of the various divisions of drawing, painting, and design. And by 1930 the faculty numbered somewhere around 28 or 29. Part of this was a remarkable expansion of a program in ceramics. The ceramic program here arose, first of all, out of the special engineering program in ceramics by the son of the first president of the university, Mr. [Edward] Orton [Jr.]. It then was given financial support by the manufacturers of ceramics in Ohio and the comprehensive ceramic program and for the kilns that go along with it, which are rather expensive kilns. And three or four additional faculty members were added for the program including Professor Littlefield, who was a graduate of ceramic engineering and Professor Atherton, who had already made a name for himself as an artist in ceramics. And Professor
Paul Bogetay, who was an imaginative ceramist, maker of ceramics. Highly imaginative. This program was obviously professional enough so it justified the giving of an MA and Ph.D. in ceramics at a very early age. One must say the only such program in America outside of one in New York. In the meantime, through a set of changes which I personally find hard to pin down during Hopkins’ regime, we find that authorization of MA degrees in painting, sculpture, and the other major disciplines in the school were authorized and very quickly filled with extensive enrollments. And soon after, at least by the mid-'20s, the School of Art was altering the Ph.D. The way it was designated, it was called a Ph.D. in Fine Arts with specializations in painting, sculpture, ceramics, art education, and history of art. Now the first of these degrees was offered in 1924. And then somewhat later it became a much more regular program. Now there seem to be no papers recording the consideration of what the degree requirements would be. And it seems that this is directly tied in with the notion that the College of Education began to offer a Ph.D. in education sometime in the 1920s. I note that the graduate school of OSU was not founded until sometime in 1923 or 1924. And that the first degrees in education seemed to date from 1924-25 period. And then very quickly after that, OSU offered these graduate degrees. The interesting part of this is that when they were offering the degrees, there was practically no one on the faculty that had a degree higher than the MA. Naturally the fact that students could come to OSU and get what would be the higher academic degrees in the fine arts was a great draw and one finds immediately that the student enrollments in the graduate programs expanded rather greatly. By the 1950s,
there had been over 40 Ph.D.s in fine arts granted by the Fine Arts program. And the number of MAs seems to be almost uncountable. But I suspect it runs well over 100 or 125. The offering of a Ph.D. for painters and sculptors was apparently justified by the fact that people would move with these academic degrees into other teaching jobs throughout the country, and the final requirement of a degree candidate was that he or she produce an acceptable master’s [degree] exhibition. Or acceptable exhibition called master’s because it refers still to the medieval notion of having a master’s exhibition for entrance to the guild. They also were required to produce a written statement involving some aspects of history, theory or their own creative experience in a literary form. Certainly the graduates with this degree were given priority in their search for appointments in the university, and one could say that by the end of the ’30s and the beginning of the ’40s, graduates from the program had been put in positions all over the country.

Q. Now, I know of a graduate in ceramics and maybe in the late 6’0s, early ’70s, and she was still required to do a written statement. Is it still continued?

A. It continued on, yes. It was only, as we’ll talk about later, it was only in the ’60s that the giving of a Ph.D. for studio majors was abandoned, partly under the pressure of the College Art Association and partly because the faculty members who were concerned with the degree had been replaced. Under Hopkins, OSU had what you might call a golden age with very high enrollment, with a very comprehensive program. And with a faculty that was more than 40 members, including the members in the History of Art. Towards the end of Mr. Hopkins’
regime, it became necessary to clarify the divisions within this large faculty and so there was noted that there are special areas of painting and design and the graphic arts. Design which included interior design, fashion design. And there was the had of sculpture, obviously. I haven’t yet mentioned the fact that during this period Mr. Hopkins had recruited Irwin Fry to be a member of the faculty.

Q. Was there photography?

A. No, photography was kept in engineering. That was part of the thing. As they branched off, the photography department was over in engineering. Of course, History of Art was included as a specialty. Ph.D. with specialization. And of course, ceramics was given a specialization. So that one had one degree of graduate degree, MA and Ph.D. in the various divisions within the college. One has to go back and see if you can include art education [which] had by that time become a specialization and so on. Since I’m a little tired, a little mumbleheaded, let’s see if I can record this. A Ph.D. in Fine Aarts with specialization in painting and graphic arts, sculpture, specialization in art education, specialization in ceramics, and specialization in history of art.

Q. Now, you could get a Ph.D. in all of those things?

A. Yeah. I mean one degree covered all of these.

Q. Oh, I see.

A. It was just one degree, Ph.D. in Fine Arts. Not too different than Harvard you know. Harvard continued to give a degree in fine arts until they found they had to change it rather recently. So you got a degree in history of art.

Q. But they never had studio art, did they?
A. No. But they had something, the Carpenter Center, gave a program in design. Photography and design. And then my degree actually was, if you look at it closely, was in architecture and fine arts. But my degree is a degree in fine arts. We’re not making an awful lot of sense here but Mr. Hopkins’ long tour of duty, 25 years, ended in 1947. And by 1947 or by 1940s, I should say, by that time, the situation after World War II on the campus was that a great many students had appeared on the scene. And a great many of those were enrolling in the various Fine Arts programs. Particularly in the graduate program. The resignation of Mr. Hopkins left the then-School of Art in a very awkward position with a faculty that had theoretically been divided into areas or heads of areas, but the heads were really only nominal heads without control of budget, recruiting or scheduling. And the College of Education searched for a subsequent director and at that moment Professor Seiberling was appointed to what was his very chaotic tour of duty of five years.

Q. That would bring us up to 1955, when you came in.

A. Yeah, yeah. This session has not gone very well from my point of view. I have had to be very sketchy, and sometimes I obviously have made a few mistakes in terms of omission and commission. I almost think that we might try to do it again.

Q. No, I don’t think that’s really necessary. I think that all is required of this history is sketchy review of the history. Because what we want to concentrate on really are the issues.

A. Thank you very much.
Q. No, I’m serious.

A. This brings us to the ’50s, of course, and we had responsibility in the School of Art for a very large graduate program. We had responsibility also for what now was becoming a much more professionalized art education program. We had a few graduate students in History of Art, but we had not developed a notion of a scholarly graduate program in the history of art under Mr. Fanning. And we had no teaching museum, which was a very great lack that most of us felt. I’ve tried to indicate previously, in the first session, that the morale of the faculty at this time was very unsteady, partly due to personal conflicts and particularly the conflict between Frank Seiberling and Hoyt Sherman.

Q. With each other?

A. Over principles of instruction and governance of the college. And in the third or next section of our contribution, I should like to deal a bit more intimately with the development of History of Art program which needed to be established, in many respects through its equipment and its resources and its faculty. That’s it.