INTERVIEW WITH JIM JONES

JANUARY 9, 2002

Q.  This is Henry L. Hunker, Professor Emeritus, carrying on an interview with James Jones, an Athletic Director retired.  Jim was born on June 23, 1936.  We are carrying on the interview at the University Archives on the morning of January 9, 2002.  I’m going to ask Jim Jones to comment about his early career, give us some idea of what he did before he came to Ohio State, which is quite a while ago, and also then bring us up to date and we’ll move on from there then, Jim.

A.  Very fine, Henry.  I’m a native of Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, and a graduate of Cuyahoga Falls High School.  I’m the first member in my family on either side to go to a university.  So I went to Kent State I had a father who never finished high school.  And he insisted that I go to college.  So I didn’t have much choice as to whether I was going to college.  It was decided since I was the eldest.  I went to Kent because it was closest and cheapest and I had to pay my own way.  I have a bachelor’s degree in mathematics from Kent State.  I taught in high school, was an administrator, and a coach for a few years.  And subsequently, during the protest years, or as the protest over the war was beginning, my experiences as an administrator were less than exciting daily.  I went to see a former high school teacher of mine who is also a friend, a colleague that I dealt with.  She sent me to Ball State and I taught at Ball State and coached at Ball State and got a master’s degree there.  I came to Ohio State simply because I enjoyed what I was doing at Ball State.  An older member of the faculty there who had taken a liking to this
older graduate student who was married with a youngster asked me what I was going to do one day. And I said, “I kind of like what I’m doing now.” He said, “Then you need to go get a union card,” and he had a friend at Ohio State and that’s how I ended up at Ohio State. I don’t know of any youngster that ever was associated with athletics in any way or coached in Ohio that wouldn’t have wanted to be at Ohio State in some fashion. So, I was excited to have the opportunity. And I came to Ohio State to get a Ph.D. and to return to Ball State to teach and coach. Obviously, Coach Hayes hired me and I never left.

Q. You came in as an instructor in the Department of Physical Education?
A. That’s correct.

Q. That’s an important point.
A. Well, it was to Dick Larkins, the first Athletic Director I worked for also. He came out of teacher education. It’s interesting, Henry, at the time we decided I was to come to Ohio State with this professor friend at Ball State, I said, “I have one problem, though. I can’t just be a normal graduate student because I’m not single. I need to have some employment, some income.” So he called over here and my real interest was not in physical education. I obviously have my bachelor’s in mathematics. Physical education was not necessarily where I was interested in as a Ph.D. But, this gentleman knew someone in physical education over here, and he called and said, “I have an instructor for you. You need to hire this guy so he can go to graduate school.” And they had no positions. It was late in the year. About six weeks later they called back and said, “If that young guy can ice skate, we’ll hire him.” And a little known fact in my career, probably
hidden I guess and maybe should stay hidden. I did compete in figure skating when I was in late elementary years and early junior high years. And so I could teach ice skating. So I came to Ohio State, was in the Physical Education Department, basically to teach ice skating and to work on a degree.

Q. Great. Tell us what happened with the degree.

A. I pursued the degree very religiously and was progressing along and passed the general exams, working on my dissertation. And [I] was asked one day after a class if I’d be interested in interviewing with Coach Hayes. I don’t know of any young man who played or coached in Ohio that wouldn’t say yes. I said, “Sure, I’d be happy to interview with Coach Hayes.” What for I had no idea. I didn’t hear anything. I didn’t hear anything. Subsequently, I got a call at dinner time one night from a gentleman who said, “Are you busy?” and [he] identified himself as Woody Hayes. Well, when Woody Hayes called, even though I was sitting down to dinner, I was not busy. So I came over to the University and had what I characterized as a talk. I’m sure he characterized it as an interview. It wasn’t the normal type interview and we just kind of talked about my career, what I had done, where I’d been, who I’d worked with, who I respected as faculty members. He said, “Fine.” He thanked me and I left. And I went home to my wife and son, and my wife wanted to know what happened and I said, “I don’t know. We just sat and talked for an hour and a half.” About six weeks later, he called me back about the same time, one more time, wanted to know if I was busy; we were at dinner hour. And I said “no” again and came over here and discovered that he was going to hire me as what he called the “brain coach.” It’s what we call now
the Athletic Counselor. To my knowledge, there was no other type person in intercollegiate athletics in the country. He and Darrell Royal had been talking about it for some time. And I don’t know what got Coach Hayes interested in it but nonetheless I was hired as his brain coach. So I was a member of the football staff.

Q. What year was this?

A. This would have been, gosh, I’m getting old Henry. I want to say ‘67. I want to say maybe spring ‘67. I don’t know if that’s right. But it’s close. And I went home, told my wife that I had been hired by Coach Hayes. She said, “That’s great, what are you going to do?” I said, “Well, I’m not real sure.” She wanted to know how much money I was going to make, and I said I did not know. I was so surprised to learn I was being offered a job that I didn’t realize I had applied for. And that I had received a job that I was so excited I guess I didn’t ask what I was going to make. I can remember the next day Coach Hayes came into my office and said, “I just want you to know I just came from the Athletic Director and I got you more money than I ever thought I could get” – $6,200. In 1967, I suppose that’s probably, well, Coach was probably making $20,000 at the time. So, that’s a comparison. At any rate, my job was to assist with the freshmen football team and to take care of academics for the entire football squad. And, as an afterthought, help with any other athletes you have time for. But football first. I did not meet the Athletic Director, didn’t apply for any job. I guess that’s just the way it was done. Subsequently, Ed Weaver, who was the Associate Athletic Director, and I were going to a golf outing and he asked me if I had ever met Dick
Larkins. I said, “No I hadn’t.” He said, “Well, you worked for him and I suggest you make an appointment and go see him.” Subsequently, I did do that. In those days, I guess I didn’t feel like the Athletic Director had any time to just sit down and chat with me. I was wrong. Dick Larkins was that kind of a guy. That’s how I met the Director of Athletics, at Ed’s urging. And so I had numerous opportunities to leave here to go into coaching or administrative jobs. And I just never left. I stayed with Coach Hayes and moved up the line in administration and never left, and spent my entire career here.

Q. I’m going to interject. Your career here and as a young man at home is very similar to my own. It’s interesting. It must be generational.

A. I think it probably is, Henry. I didn’t make any of those plans and they just sort of worked. I don’t know who told Coach Hayes about me. I don’t have any idea how he got interested in me. But obviously, somebody told him about me and he liked what he heard. Or he talked to the right people and then liked what he heard. I don’t know. I know this: when I went back the second time, various people that I had talked to, because he asked me questions like, “Who is your best professor, what professor did you respect the most, who was your first superintendent, who was your best high school teacher,” things of that sort. Most of those people he talked to between the two times that I talked to him. That’s an interesting way to, I guess you would call them, recommendations. I’m not sure what he was checking out on me.

Q. They would have been flattered, I’m sure, many of them, to have known Woody Hayes.
A. Right, I would say so, right.

Q. Well, you moved in then over the years through, worked with several of the Directors and would you want to comment about that and talk a little bit about that. You’ve done some already.

A. I worked for every one of my predecessors as the Director of Athletics except L.W. St. John. Dick Larkins became a very good friend and advisor. A couple of times I tried to leave and Dick talked me out of it. I tried to leave for more money, what I thought was a better job. I remember Bill Peterson from Florida State University was going to double my salary and I forget what all kind of perks he was going to throw in. And Dick Larkins called me in and said, “I understand you’re thinking about leaving us.” I said, “Yes, I am.” He said, “Well, I don’t think you ought to do that.” And this is also a generational thing. If you respect somebody, which I respected Dick Larkins a great deal, I thought well, if that’s what he says I should do, that’s what I should do. So I passed. And not having any idea, not really researching Ohio State, to know that Ohio State had never hired a Director of Athletics that hadn’t previously been on their staff. And I had no idea what Dick had in mind. Subsequently, I got a call from Ed Weaver who was the Associate [Director]. I want to say that was during the ‘67 football season. I’m foggy on the year but I think it was early in the ‘67 football season. And I went to see Ed and he closed the door and he said, “I think you ought to know that on Friday Dick Larkins is retiring. I’m going to be named the Director of Athletics. And when I am, it’s my intention to make you an Assistant.” I said, “That’s wonderful.” I guess this was maybe in 1970, Henry, come to think of it
now, I think that’s about when it was. I said, “That’s wonderful. What do I tell Coach Hayes?” Because in my opinion I was a member of the football staff. And I worked for Coach Hayes. He said, “You don’t tell Coach Hayes anything. I will tell Coach Hayes. You work for the department.” So I didn’t tell Coach Hayes anything, which I’ve regretted a number of times and I’m sure Woody was hurt when he learned of it. But Woody and I had a great relationship. And so I don’t think it really affected the relationship. That actually happened. One more time I went home, told my wife what was going to happen to me on Friday. She said, “Well, that’s great. How much money are you going to make?” And I said, “I don’t know. I didn’t ask.” I was shocked, I didn’t think to ask how much money I was going to make.

Q. Wives are a bit more practical than we are.

A. Yes, they are, yes, they are. And at that point I became the Assistant Director of Athletics. I oversaw grants in aid which was Ed _______ at the time. Fit right in with the academics. The athletic counselor, of course my job I still did the first year.

Q. Did they use the word counselor by then?

A. Yes. Well, they always used it. Woody never used it. Woody always called it the brain coach and if anybody asked, that’s what it was. And that’s what he told the kids. The players were told, “This is either Mr. Jones or coach. It’s not Jim. He’s not a friend of yours.” So I became an Assistant. And subsequently, we hired an Athletic Counselor. The job became much more formalized when Ed Weaver was the Director than it had been under Dick Larkins, in that I was literally a
member of the football staff. That Athletic Counselor was housed in the football area. But technically did not answer to the football. They had their ties elsewhere. And subsequently, I guess, six or seven years later, in that neighborhood, Ed announced his resignation, retirement. And Hugh Hindman who was the Associate became the Director of Athletics. And at that point in time, he changed the working relationship, I guess you would call it, within the University, and I became the Senior Associate as opposed to Associate. And he had two associates below me. The intent was that I would be the day-to-day management of the department. And he would take care of the national, NCAA, Big Ten materials and so on. And that’s how we functioned. And then of course, Hugh resigned some seven years later or so and Rick Bay came here from the University of Oregon. And I stayed as the Senior Associate under Rick for which I’m grateful. When you’re the number two guy in an operation and they bring somebody for the first time in from outside, that person usually likes to sweep the plate clean. You don’t need any old-time back biters sitting around behind you. He accepted me. We became good friends. And I retained the same title and he made it an even stronger position than it had been previously. Rick’s relationship with the Athletic Council and the president deteriorated very quickly after he was here. And so he was not here very long. He was here I think less than three years. And he left at the same time as Coach Earl Bruce was dismissed, and I became the Director at the same time.

Q. Jennings was the president then.

A. Yes, Edward Jennings.
Q. Just a comment about Hindman. That was a good man to serve under I understand.

A. That was a good relationship for Hugh and myself. Hugh and I had a great relationship. Both of us coming off the football staff. He was a former football coach.

Q. I didn’t know that.

A. And we both came to administration at the same time. Because he came off the football staff to become the Associate and I came off to be the Assistant at the same time. So yes, we had a very good relationship. He was a good guy to work for. Hugh was very well thought of nationally and in the Big Ten. Probably more so than Ed Weaver was nationally. Larkins obviously was well-respected nationally. And was one of the leaders informing the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Wanted to be the first president and he refused. That was typical of Dick. He didn’t like the limelight. I can remember as a side light. In 1968, when we took our team to the Rose Bowl, it was a tradition that the Big Ten team would have a welcoming cocktail party. That’s a little strange since we were the visitors in California. But nonetheless, on the first day we had a welcoming cocktail party for the Tournament of Roses people and some of our people and so on. I can remember Dick Larkins taking me by the hand literally and saying, “Come here, I want to show you how a successful Athletic Director runs one of these functions.” He took me to the back of this room, we sat down at a table. Ed Weaver was out front. Shook hands with everybody that came in. And only those people who asked or wanted to talk with Dick came back to the table. And he stayed there the
entire cocktail hour. Stayed out of the limelight. Let Ed be in the limelight and obviously had me under his wing there.

Q. That’s known as a secure man.

A. Yes, it is. Yes, it is. A very secure man. He, I’m sure, is carrying in his grave or shaking his head in heaven, the turn of events in intercollegiate athletics today. Cause I’m sure they weren’t the things he believed in. But that’s pretty much how I became the Director of Athletics.

Q. That was in ‘87?

A. That’s correct. The University [was] determined to dismiss Earl Bruce. Rick Bay was not a happy camper with that decision. And [he] chose to resign over the decision.

Q. That wasn’t his decision, in other words?

A. That was not his decision to replace Earl Bruce, that’s correct. But that was a 14-month saga. We had gone to the Rose Bowl and Earl Bruce had an opportunity to go to the University of Arizona. And went and interviewed, had the job, and then Rick talked him out of it. He felt Ohio State was the better job and at the time I would agree with him. It was the better job. But Earl wanted the job. And so it was probably a mistake to talk him out of it. But at any rate, he talked him out of it. And so he stayed and in the process of that, Rick made some pretty strong comments about the Board of Trustees to the news media from California, which didn’t sit very well with our Board. So that did not endear Rick or Earl to our Board. So the following year, we didn’t have a very good year. And the powers to
be determined to dismiss Earl, and Rick said, “You can do that if you want but if you do, I’m resigning.” And he did.

Q. That was a very difficult time.

A. A very difficult time. We still had one game remaining with the University of Michigan. It was on a Monday. I can remember it like it was yesterday. At the same time that Earl was dismissed and Rick resigned, I became the Director. And it was a very trying time. And I can remember it was so tense and so confusing I guess, that I was summoned after Rick told the staff that he had resigned and what had happened. I was summoned to see President Jennings and got to the President’s office where there were attorneys and vice presidents and whatever. And President Jennings took me next door to a smaller office, just the two of us, and we chatted. And I can remember it was so tense and so trying that he obviously offered the job to me and I didn’t hear it, the offer. Because I didn’t respond. And then he said, “Well, do you not accept?” And then I realized that I had been offered a job, without going through all kinds of interviews and whatever. There were no interviews. Obviously I had interviewed for the job when Rick Bay got it. So when I came the Director, there were no other interviews, no other candidates. On the same day one was dismissed, the other one was hired.

Q. Literally.

A. Right.

Q. Just as an aside, did the team beat Michigan?
A. Yes, they did. And the coach was by then not the coach. We agreed to let him coach his last game that was up at Ann Arbor. I agreed that Rick should go as the Director of Athletics. I’m not sure our friends at the Board of Trustees thought that was a good move. But I figured they both deserved to serve out the year. We probably weren’t supposed to win that game. If I look back, I was too emotional to think about it, to remember whether or not we were that good or not. At any rate, it was one of those years when I don’t think we were supposed to win and we did win. And so Earl went out on a high note.

Q. Do you think that was reflecting the team, the team support of the coach?

A. I’m sure. The kids came together and supported Coach Bruce. He was well liked by the kids. There was no problem with Coach Bruce and our players that I know of. Other than what is only normal with X number of players with every coach.

Q. That’s an interesting theory.

A. It was a very interesting.

Q. You happen to be a party in that.

A. I did indeed. It was very tense. The Trustees were not at all happy with our football coach. And determined that they were so unhappy that they were going to do the interviewing for the successor. They didn’t. But that’s, when we started, that’s what they said they were going to do. I told President Jennings, “I don’t know how we do that. I don’t know how to help them do that. I don’t know of a football coach in America who will come here while they’re employed and recruiting elsewhere and interview with our Trustees in Columbus, Ohio, and have it get out that they’re thinking about leaving.” They can’t do that. People
just don’t do that in our profession. And eventually Madison Scott’s wise advice to me with our Trustees and they deemed that only one trustee would participate. And in the end, he decided that he would trust President Jennings and myself. And so we formed a committee, a committee of six, and chose a successor.

Q. That was John Cooper.

A. Yes, John Cooper. It was interesting times. I did not have any preparation to get ready to be the Director of Athletics and pick a football coach. It happened immediately.

Q. It’s an interesting career really.

A. I never applied, Henry, for any job literally in my career. But at Ohio State I never applied for any job that I got. For some reason or another, I was always in the right spot, or the right person knew who I was or whatever. And I just kept progressing along.

Q. They knew your qualities.

A. I hope some of that’s true.

Q. I think some of that’s true. Looking back on it, as you think about it, your relationship with the Athletic Directors. The past is pretty well positive relationships it seems to me.

A. I believe my relationships with all my predecessors were very good. I’m very proud of the fact that my relationship with the Athletic Council was excellent. For whatever reason, I had a very good relationship with the faculty representatives as well as the faculty on the Athletic Council. Maybe because I
believe strongly in the way that we were organized, which gave a lot of power to the faculty.

Q. Yes.
A. Perhaps that’s the reason why we grew so close. But I did have a good working relationship with the faculty.

Q. Does that kind of faculty role still prevail?
A. I don’t believe so. I believe that, well first of all Henry, when I came to athletics here, the members of the faculty who were on the Athletic Council were chosen by the Faculty [Council]. The President nominated two people for each opening and then there were nominations from the floor. And the [Faculty Council] actually voted who the faculty members were to be on the Athletic Council. So they were not beholding anybody but their peers. Also, those faculty members chose who the faculty representative was. And the rules in those days were that the person to be chosen as the faculty representative must be a member presently serving on the [Faculty] Council. So it couldn’t be a member of the faculty that was a good ol’ boy from out in left field that you brought in. It was somebody that everybody knew. And the members of the faculty selected the faculty representative. In that case, the faculty representative actually in the Big Ten, outvoted the President. Because the Big Ten was a strong faculty conference. And as long as no one was appointed by the President, they were more or less independent of the President. During Harold Enarson’s term as President, there was some reorganization of the Faculty Council, as you know, to become a University Senate. And that reorganization changed all the various committees.
And eventually changed the Athletic Council to where it became four and four. What I used to kiddingly tease the faculty about was four management and four employees. Because four people no the faculty were appointed by the President and four were elected by the faculty. It was ______ and workers I guess.

Q. It changed things.

A. It’s changed them a great deal, I think. Likewise, the faculty representative at the same time, the position was changed to be an appointment by the President. So the President could then appoint whomever they want. It takes an unusual person, I think, even with tenure, to be the faculty representative and to be independent of your President, when you were selected by your President. At some point in time, I suppose for 99 percent of the business it would be no problem. But at some point in time, that’s how we lost a faculty representative here, who was very good, by the name of Roy Larmee [professor, College of Education]. Roy was very strong. And Roy used to always defer to the faculty. If there was a tight vote coming up, he would bring it up to the faculty and he would say, “Okay, I need your instruction. Now, you understand that I’m going to have to listen to the discussion and vote, but I need your instruction.” He never went to the President for instruction. Well, at an NCAA convention, I don’t remember what the issue was now. But Roy and President Enarson and I were sitting side by side and the number on the floor came up, and the President said, “Roy, I hope you’re with us on this vote.” And Roy said, “No, Mr. President, I’m sorry I’m not. The faculty has instructed me to vote no.” And at that point in time there was friction between the faculty representative and the President, to the extent where the
President then determined he was going to appoint someone. Because Roy had
been elected by the faculty. So Roy’s successor was appointed by the President.
And 99 percent of the time, unless it’s a sticky issue, that’s going to work.

Q. Is that the way things are now?

A. That’s the way things are now. Except that the Athletic Council now has less say
so than ever before. They are slowly becoming more advisory than policy[-
making]. When I was working, they were a policy board and they determined
how many absences you could have from class, for a schedule, or determine what
the schedule was like, determine what the budget was within bounds of University
guidelines obviously. But they controlled everything about athletics. At one point
in time, when you made a hire, you needed to go to the Athletic Council and
present your person. That person wasn’t there but you needed to present their bio
and tell them why you were going to hire this person. And it was reaffirmed by
that group.

Q. Would they ever take exception?

A. Not that I recall, Henry. Probably because technically speaking, everybody here
is hired by the Board of Trustees.

Q. Yes, yes.

A. So, in essence, a coach could get hired without the faculty agreeing. It just wasn’t
the thing to do in those days to cross the faculty. If the faculty thought this was a
bad person, you wouldn’t take it. But as I used to tell the faculty, they used to kid
me because they said, “You get practically everything you bring us in a positive
vote.” And I said, “Well, that’s my job. My job is to bring you things that you will approve. If you won’t approve them, I’m not doing my job to bring them here.”

Q. It’s a waste of your time.

A. That’s right. That’s not my job to do that, to bring things here and throw them up in the air and see whether you hit them or not. But I don’t think they have that power anymore. I think they’ve become more advisory now than ever before. I don’t think that’s good. I think that’s how we got in trouble. We, this University. We, in intercollegiate athletics in the past, where the faculty didn’t have enough control. The faculty in my opinion, Henry, is in a unique position, maybe not so much now as in the old days because faculty members move a lot now. They don’t stay at universities. But faculty members who stay and develop tenure have an independence that can make decisions, that no one else in the University could make, and stand up to it.

Q. That’s right.

A. At the time that we voted no on going to the Rose Bowl, I don’t know whether Novice Fawcett could have weathered that storm or not. His successors would never have weathered that storm if they had taken that position without the faculty. But the fact that the faculty stood up and said, “We are not going to the Rose Bowl,” made the decision stand and while everybody wrang their hands, everyone was upset, and they printed names and they printed salaries and they did whatever they wanted to do. The bottom line is, the decision stood because the faculty had strength. I think that’s a shame that we’ve lost that because that kind of strength came about from misdoings in intercollegiate athletics. At one point
there is a report on our campus, I don’t even know if it exists, but I hope it’s in the archives someplace, called the “[Fullen] Report.” [Fullen] was a professor on this campus and in 1950 I want to say, Ohio State was disciplined by the NCAA for both Coach Hayes and Coach [Floyd] Stahl. One was a football and one was a basketball coach, for what today would be perceived as minor infractions and [would] never become public. I think Coach Stahl had bought a pair of trousers for one of his players. And I think Coach Hayes had bought dinner for players that appeared on his coaches sheet on Saturday night after a game. I think. At any rate, the “[Fullen] Report” was to bring strength in oversight to intercollegiate athletics at Ohio State. That’s how the Athletic Council was formed. And I’m sure if we could go back and pick L.W. St. John’s brain, the stories I’ve heard about L.W. St. John is, a lot of the members of the Athletic Council were chosen by L.W. St. John. They really weren’t his boss; they were his friends. Which was a different way of doing things. But the faculty really became strong as a result of the “[Fullen] Report.” And then of course, over the years it’s been eroded, in my opinion. And I think now they’re more advisory than ever before. For example, in the not-too-distant past, not to pick on my successor, but this University for the memory of man not remembereth to the contrary, has always said any student who wanted to go to a football game was entitled to a football ticket. In the last three years, it has been determined that some students could get one ticket to one game. In the old days, the faculty never would have allowed that to stand. Because I was here when we were selling 28,000 to students and we would wait until the last minute before we determined how many tickets we could sell to the
general public. But the students always were guaranteed and a large number of
the faculty [and] staff got tickets. In fact, at one point in time, more than half of
the stadium was in what we call reduced price tickets, which were faculty, staff or
students. I think that’s a strength.

Q. I do too.
A. Then there’s no doubt when you stand up and say this game is for the students on
campus, you’ve answered that question. If they’re buying the tickets and coming
and the faculty and staff are coming, it is a campus event. It’s not an auxiliary
event.

Q. And the faculty itself responds positively to that.
A. That’s correct. I really believe that. I’ve been shocked by this.

Q. But they have changed. Times have changed now. Well, I call that the
corporate University at work.
A. That’s probably not far off. Well, universities have had to, rightly or wrongly,
raise multi funds. And it’s gotten us away from the old-time idea of what is a
university.

Q. I think that’s true. Can I ask you some questions?
A. Sure.

Q. I’ll go to page 2 and I won’t ask you all of those. I think we’ve talked a little bit
but you’re welcome to add to it if you want to. You served under four presidents.
Is there any additional comment you would want to make about that experience?
A. Well, it was a unique experience that I’m sure that today’s Directors of Athletics
will never experience. They were all, it seems to me, unique. Novice Fawcett
was an old-time administrator who believed that he had hired a Director of Athletics and he had an Athletic Council, and never the twain shall meet. So he didn’t spend any time with us. To my knowledge, the Director of Athletics did not meet with the President. There was no need to. That was the way Novice Fawcett ran the University.

Q. Yeah, he came in, you remember, from public school. A lot of the faculty were very unhappy with him. But he probably ran a pretty good ship.

A. I have the feeling that he did, right. Harold Enarson was a different bird, as you recall. Not one of the first choices when he became the President. He came out of some labor-management background.

Q. And also the students riots and so forth up in Cleveland.

A. That’s correct. He was a little more interested – well that’s not fair, not interested. A little more involved than President Fawcett. But I remember him saying at a football banquet once that his favorite thing to do on a Saturday afternoon in the fall might be reading poetry under a tree. That’s not exactly the way to endear yourself to football fans at Ohio State. This was not necessarily one of his exciting things to do on a college campus, was be involved with athletics. Ed Jennings was, as you know, very well received by the faculty because he was one. He also was very interested in athletics because when he was at the University of Iowa, before he went to Wyoming to come to Ohio State, he was the Vice President to whom intercollegiate athletics reported. So he and the Director of Athletics there became very close, and he helped pick the Iowa football coach. So he was a little more interested, got a little closer. But [he] still
allowed the faculty to make their decisions. The Trustees were much more active I guess, is the word under President Jennings about intercollegiate athletics than they had been in the past.

Q. That changed you mentioned earlier.

A. I think my first year as the Director, President Jennings had me to the summer retreat with the Trustees. I think I was the first Director of Athletics to ever appear in front of the Trustees. And it was to discuss the budget, what I saw coming from intercollegiate athletics and so on. President Gee was obviously very interested. President Gee had a different viewpoint altogether. In my opinion, President Gee saw intercollegiate athletics as a way to promote the University and to promote President Gee. And he liked that part. So he was always in the middle. He went to the locker room after every game. He was the [first] President I know of to do that. And he would go to the locker room after every game, football and basketball for men. So they were all different. All had different ideas about faculty involvement and the place of intercollegiate athletics. President Gee was obviously more different than Novice Fawcett by a long shot.

Q. No question about that. I’m going to just throw this question out at you. I have a question of how has academic vigor changed over time?

A. Well, that’s a difficult question to answer. I have the feeling that there’s as much emphasis now as there was 25 years ago on academics. But there’s more opportunities now in four or five sports to make money in the professionals. And that has affected it. I was on the coaching staff and the brain coach when we started an award called the Fergus Award way back that went to a football player
for post-graduate work. That was when we started the scholar-athlete dinner
where the idea was to have a 3.0 in order to get invited to the dinner. And we
gave you an award every year and you got a different award as you progressed, if
you could stay for three or four years. I know that dinner is still going on because
I get invited to it now, but it’s vastly different than it was before. It’s much more
showy now. It has outsiders now. It has donors invited there who provide
scholarships and it’s not, in my opinion, it’s not an academic dinner like it used to
be, as much as it is a show.

Q. Is this role of donors … historically I thought of the donor as doing something,
let’s say, with the Board of Trustees, the broad University. But the donors are
becoming much more important and available it seems to me, at the departmental
levels in my area and I sense it may be true in the sports.

A. Oh, it’s definitely true in sports. At one point in time, when I became an assistant,
on the budget we showed a line that I recall was titled “Unsolicited Funds.”
These were people who donated money to intercollegiate athletics. Supposedly at
that point in time intercollegiate athletics was not to ask anyone to give us money.
So it was a very paltry sum. During Harold Enarson’s term it was determined that
intercollegiate athletics could hire a fundraiser. But Harold was very concerned,
as was the head of the President’s Club, that intercollegiate athletics would run
amuck and take all the money. I don’t think that was ever going to be the case but
I could understand why they felt that way. And as a consequence, it was agreed
that we could ask for contributors. We could not ask for large sums. We could
only solicit people who already had football tickets. So if you owned a company
and you had four tickets, we were allowed to come see you for either $500 or
$1,000. Period. We could not ask for more than that. I think because there was
concern that if someone gave to the library, for example, and wanted football
tickets, they were afraid we wouldn’t give it to them. I think that was one of
them. And two, I think there was still that concern that if intercollegiate athletics
gets this thing rolling, there won’t be any money out there for everybody else. So
there’s obviously going to be someone out there who’s interested in other parts of
the university. Which has proven true. And subsequently that got rolling. And
intercollegiate athletics was allowed to, under President Jennings, was allowed to
raise more funds. But I can hear President Jennings’ reminder: that a gift is a gift
is a gift. So if you give $1,000 to intercollegiate athletics, $1,000 to the library,
$1,000 to the mathematics department, each donor is entitled to the same perks.
That rankled athletic people because we felt that a lot of the donors wanted their
perks from athletics, who gave their money elsewhere. The southern philosophy
is totally different [from] our, ours being Ohio State. Well if you give to athletics,
athletics give you the perks. And you have to give to athletics to get the athletic
perks in the south. They don’t worry about, if chemistry has to raise money,
chemistry raises money. But they have to get their perks someplace else. That’s
not been the case at Ohio State and to be honest with you, it was never one of
those things that I wanted to get in the middle of. And so I never researched other
universities in what they did. I just did whatever I could do under the rules here.
Since I’ve left, obviously they’ve gotten into big-time fundraising, to build
buildings and to endow scholarships. And most of the people who are invited to
the scholar-athlete dinner now, are people who endowed scholarships. So they, I
guess the thought is, I would hope they’re there with the students they have
endowed. I don’t know if that’s always the case. But maybe they make sure that
when they have an endowed scholarship, the person who fulfills that could be at
the scholar-athlete dinner, I don’t know. But the scholar-athlete dinner has
grown, which is good. But I don’t sense that there is the same pressure I guess or
interest in football, basketball, ice hockey, golf, baseball that they’re used to be
because of the pro opportunities in those sports. And that’s a shame but it’s a fact
of life.

Q. In Columbus here, we’ve had I think in connection with this and the development
of the arenas, we had some controversy over whether or not the Ohio State
program ought to be at a public or downtown arena, didn’t we, over time?

A. Yes, we did. President Gee took a lot of static. I think they believed he didn’t tell
them the truth. But the bottom line is, and I told one of our Trustees this when I
was working, the pros and the college don’t work together in the same building. It
just doesn’t work. It sounds good to save everybody money, but it just doesn’t
work. What the pros want from the facility doesn’t work well with the college.
The pros, let’s say if you have an NBA franchise, the pros will play Monday
through Thursday to smaller crowds knowing full well they can make a lot of
money on Friday, Saturday, Sunday. Well, Friday, Saturday and Sunday is when
the college plays. We don’t play on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday by
and large. And so you’re always going to be in one another’s throat. Then you
get the matter of VIP suites. And you argue over who gets the suite money, who
sells the suites, and when you buy the suite, if you buy the suite from a professional owner, do you have the right to use it during the collegiate season or do you’ve got to pay for it and so on and so forth. They just don’t go together, I don’t believe. An occasional game here or there, because your arena is small and the downtown arena is large, might work. I just believe intercollegiate athletics properly belongs on a college campus. We don’t share our facilities well with professional teams and I don’t think it’s a good idea.

Q. That is an interesting point that you make.

A. The University of Kentucky has a little different operation and they wish they didn’t. They have a downtown arena. They don’t have a professional team but they have a downtown arena. They wish that their arena was on campus.

Q. I would think so.

A. Because every now and then you end up with a problem, where you either want to use the arena and there’s a circus in there or there’s a concert in there or whatever. And it’s just difficult to do that. So yeah, there was some controversy. President Gee and the city fathers didn’t see eye to eye, and somebody with more knowledge of the situation than I would have to explain that. But it did not work well.

Q. Well, he did take a lot of flack as you said earlier for that. Do you think the two arenas, this is pure maybe guesswork, can they both survive do you think? I think our own arena is in heavy debt supporting that, I think.

A. Our own arena is in heavy debt but that’s been ever thus in intercollegiate universities. As soon as you build a facility, you have a lot of debt. Unless you
have a place like the University of North Carolina, where their athletic donors
donated enough money to pay for the arena before they built it. But by and large,
there’s heavy debt. There was heavy debt at one point I’m sure when they built St.
John arena. They probably thought, “My gosh, we’ll never pay this thing off.” In
the end, we deferred paying it off because we were making so much money on
our money and the interest was so low on the bonds, that we’d pay the interest
and not pay the principal because we were financially gaining. Can the two
survive? Yeah, I guess they can survive. But they’ve got to survive only on the
basis that a university builds an arena, it’s on campus, and it’s the university’s
function and you have to build it with the idea in mind that it’s something we can
afford to pay off. I’m not sure that’s what we did. I think we may have gone a
little overboard in terms of how much we spent. But the downtown arena has
advantages that a collegiate arena doesn’t have when you’re in the same city. We
cannot have the circus in our arena during the wintertime. That’s when our two
basketball teams and our two hockey teams want to use the building. So a circus
and basketball don’t go together. So a circus could go downtown, for example.
And then you get into the management agreements and there are a lot of
management organizations around that manage three or four different arenas. And
so they say to the big popular concerts, “We’ll take your concert here in
Columbus.” And they say, “Well, I can get it cheaper at Ohio State.” “Well, if
you want to play our arena in Philadelphia and in Boston, you’re going to play
ours in Columbus.” So they can do that to them. Within reason, I think two can
survive. But as I say, you get to build the collegiate facility on the sound principle
of what it’s for, how it’s going to be paid off. And I don’t know if we’ve done that.

Q. We’ll let someone else worry.

A. That’s right.

Q. I came across a question about the role of Title IX in changing athletic programs over time. And I followed up with a note that apparently we are a University with one of the largest athletic programs in the country. Are the two things related, the fact of Title IX?

A. They’re somewhat related, Henry. We always had a very large sport programs. We’ve added sports since Andy Geiger, my successor, came on board. Title IX obviously stipulated that all things being equal, the same thing you provide for men, you provide for women, or vice versa. That’s not an easy task when you have a football program. If you don’t have a football program, it’s pretty easy to say we’ll have two basketball teams or we’ll have, you can come up with comparable numbers. When you’ve got 101, then you’ve got to end up looking for something for women to participate in. I don’t believe, we went through a Title IX investigation, I guess is the word you use. When I was the Senior Associate, I did all the reporting work to the government and it was agreed that we had passed the Title IX. I don’t know in this day and age what the legal interpretation of the lawyers out of Washington is now. There was a point in time that they tried to make everybody equal. You can’t do that. You can’t make a woman gymnast eat what an offensive football tackle eats. They don’t go together. You can say we believe in providing three squares a day for our student
athletes and whatever that is. But to make them equal is very difficult. I think you can say we’re going to travel the same way. If it’s an overnight stay, we’re going to go by airplane and whether it’s a male or female team, they’re both going to fly. They’re not going to stay more than two to a room. Things of that sort.

Q. You need to have that spelled out.

A. Exactly. You can do that. We were ahead of Title IX here, in that our women sports participate under AIW, the Association for Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics, I believe is the correct name. It is AIW. And they had very strict rules. Basically, they did not want to copy the men’s model, which was a good idea, except that times changed. Title IX came along. Phyllis Bailey and I, I was the number two at the time, agreed that we were going to change and offer grants in aid for women. We had never had grants in aid for women. And Phyllis Bailey and I decided, convinced Ed Weaver, that we would have the same kinds of scholarships for women as for men. That was not legal under AIW rules. But Title IX had come along, the NCAA was getting involved. Phyllis and I determined that that was a fair thing to do and we were going to do it. Well, we got in trouble with the AIW. They wanted to reprimand us, but in the meantime they saw the folly of their ways in that we were doing the right thing. We were providing the same kinds of scholarships, not the same number, but the same kinds of scholarships for male or female athletes. And working toward how do you equate 100 scholarships in football, how do you spread that. You could give everybody in the women’s side twice as many grants as they need. And you wouldn’t equate that to 100 in football, which was a problem. But nonetheless,
we started offering grants in aid before it was legal in AIW. And we forced AIW to recognize that. And a lot of the things we did, I think, preceded Title IX, but I would not be totally candid if I didn’t say we realized Title IX was out there. And we had to pay attention to it. And so it colored our thoughts in terms of how we were functioning, how many assistant coaches and so on and so forth. But we did pass a Title IX investigation. They are much further along now. Title IX in itself was a sound decision. It’s interpretations by lawyers were not sound. They just don’t fit intercollegiate athletics. There’s no reason to say just because Title IX says everything’s got to be equal, that means you give women’s golf an assistant coach but you don’t give men’s golf an assistant coach. Well, they are one and the same kind of sport. If one needs an assistant, the other needs an assistant in my opinion. But what Title IX interpreters have tried to do is give extra grants to women’s sports and extra assistance to women’s sports to try to equal the men’s program. I think that’s an error but it would be hard to equate in numbers anyhow. You have the same problems, but … If the volleyball team competes [with] six players at a time, and it’s determined that the men should have ten grants in aid, then I fail to see why the women need 14 grants in aid. And that’s what we’ve done. We did not make the two sports equal.

Q. The volleyball [team] was more a women’s sport it sounds like.

A. Exactly.

Q. Plus, that almighty football over there. To me, that’s unfair to the kids, male or female. You need to look at both sports and say, “Okay, what does it take to have
this sport? And this is what we need to provide men and women.” But I guess maybe that’s too logical.

Q. Well, I’m going to stay with the football question for just a minute. Do you believe the role of football, especially, I want to get at the pay for play anyhow that’s going on right now. Football is integral to universities. There’s no question about that. We’re having this pay for play issue in the air now and as I mentioned, President Kirwin has actually participated in that “60 Minutes” [television] program, relatively briefly, and you and I have papers before us where he takes his position. What do you think? Have we gotten ourselves into this in some fashion? Not just Ohio State, necessarily.

A. Yes, we have. All colleges have. At Ohio State for example, there is no question that for a long time, until the last six or seven years, football and men’s basketball could support 32 sports at this university. Then, it became a little more difficult when we had so many grants in aid. So we started supporting grants in aid with contributors, donors. But by and large, the rest of the budget was covered by football and men’s basketball. That’s not possible today with the size [of] budget we have in intercollegiate athletics at Ohio State. Football and men’s basketball cannot bring in enough money to support it. That’s why in years past football and men’s basketball played an important role in the intercollegiate program at Ohio State. Because it supported everybody else. Literally, paid the salaries of the coaches and paid for the uniforms. It paid for the travel expenses. You name it. That’s not possible anymore. And I think Ohio State is probably one of the few, I would guess less than 25 universities, that can say they are somewhat self-
supporting. By and large, all the rest of the Division I schools need to be supported in some fashion from the general budget. I don’t know whether that’s good or bad. I think at one point in time, philosophically, in my younger years, I believed it was good because it more mirrored the Division II and III example, which is here’s a budget, we believe that intercollegiate athletics is important for our university, and so we’re going to support it. We don’t care whether we win or not or whether a lot of people come. It’s another way to add to the learning experience on a college campus. Obviously, in the last 30 years at various times money has gotten tight and so those times have changed. And now they’ve really changed. I don’t think we’re going to be able to put the genie back in the bottle so to speak. Now you go to the pay for play and the reason is, the emphasis on basically football, basketball, maybe two or three other sports but most of them are coming along, women’s included. The pressure to succeed has become so great that the coaches more or less demand 100 percent of student athletes’ time. There’s no time in the off season to just be Joe or Sally college student. You’re also an athlete, even in the off season. There’s no time in the summer time. When Coach Hayes was here, we used to work at making a list to make sure everybody had a job. Coaches don’t worry about jobs now. Coaches worry about working out. Practicing in the summer time. Well, if you do all those things, if you put that much pressure on the kids, you give them a grant in aid and the grant in aid does not permit them to work, they aren’t like the other college students. At one point in time they were similar – not alike, but similar. There are a lot of college kids on the campus that don’t have any money. I don’t feel sorry for an athlete
who tells me, “I don’t have any money.” I can go and find you a lot of kids on our campus that don’t have any money. Or don’t have enough money to go buy clothes or don’t have enough money to go out on the kind of date they would like to go out on. Or, when their friends go out to drink beer and eat pizza, they can’t go every night. There are a lot of kids like that on our campus.

Q. Absolutely.

A. On the other hand, there are the opportunities for that student to try to figure out whether it’s work-study or working in the cafeteria or scrubbing dishes in the fraternity or sorority house or you name it. There are ways to earn some money. The athletes today can’t do that. Then you couple with that the fact that we pay the football and the basketball coach a million dollars. We demand thousands and thousands of dollars for television, shoe contracts, advertising in our arenas, and it’s pretty obvious that you look at, people are coming to see. There’s no coach on our campus that we could draw 80,000 people to see. But they will come to see a coach on our campus if they’ve got student athletes who run around on the field. And so it’s obvious that the student athletes are important. And they aren’t getting any money. And they see from their efforts the University is getting richer and richer or at least bringing in a lot of money, if they aren’t getting rich. They are bringing in a lot of money and the coaches are making a lot of money.

Q. Yea, that’s the big interesting issue.

A. So you put the kids at a disadvantage. Do I think they ought to be paid to play? No, I don’t. I think we will have a dangerous precedent when we develop an employee-employer relationship with our student athletes. You’re going to have
to worry about worker’s compensation. You’re going to have to worry about disability the rest of their life. You’re going to have to worry, if you develop an employee-employer relationship, I’m not sure the University can afford to put the whole football team on an airplane and fly them to a game for fear that the University would go broke if the airplane went down, because of the amount of money supposedly these players can earn.

Q. That’s the other side of it.

A. Do they deserve some money? Yeah, I think they deserve some money for no better reason; I didn’t used to believe this. I believe that we were giving them more grants in aid than any other student on campus, that it is free grant money that they didn’t have to repay and therefore they didn’t deserve anymore than that. Getting a full grant in aid and getting an opportunity to get an education was repayment enough. But I’m afraid with the kind of money that we’re talking about now, that we have to figure out a way for student athletes to receive some remuneration. It would seem to me to be very simple for the NCAA to get with financial aid directors. If a student on our campus comes from a poor family and goes to the financial aid office, they have a budget. And in that budget are trips home and living expenses and so on. The NCAA does not recognize any of those things. If we would go and let the financial aid directors determine what is a full ride worth on the Ohio State campus and go by that budget, then I suppose you’d probably end up giving the athletes a stipend. Where I have no sympathy, and this is just a political aside, these people that think because of the pros we ought to do it for football and men’s basketball and nobody else, [these people] don’t
understand what intercollegiate athletics is all about. If we’re going to do that, fine. But it’s going to be very expensive because, in my opinion, the male or female fencer is no less a student athlete on this campus. And is contributing no less. It isn’t their fault that we can’t draw 80,000 people to watch their fencing match. They would be happy to draw 80,000 people to a fencing match if people would come. So it’s not the student athlete’s fault. And I don’t think they deserve any less.

Q. You’ve picked a wonderful example because I had two sons who were major fencers at this University.

A. I used to brag about fencing at this University at a lot of alumni speeches because for a long, long time, they were very academic and very few of the kids who fenced for us actually were accomplished fencers before they came to campus. Quite often, they came out of a physical education class. They were athletic, but they had taken fencing in a physical education class and a coach grabbed onto them and developed an interest. To me, that was silly to try to articulate it to go back to that. But to me that was the antithesis of exactly what intercollegiate athletics was supposed to have been.

Q. I agree.

A. It isn’t and it isn’t going to be.

Q. Well, I think we do have worries. I think a lot of us on the faculty or sitting around talking about it, of the influence of the pro sports, they color virtually …

A. Ruined Division I athletics.

Q. That’s what I’m trying to say, I think.
A. We are mirroring exactly what the pros are doing in terms of, I say, Division I, not just Ohio State, not all Division I ’cause Duke doesn’t. But when we put up advertising in our arenas and we have VIP suites and on and on and on, we’re getting very close to what the pros are doing.

Q. That’s my opinion.

A. The youngster who comes here to be a pro, that’s not what a University is all about. But that’s what kids are about. A lot of kids are about now. And I don’t know quite how that’s going to shake itself out. ’Cause it doesn’t seem to me, in the 30 years I’ve spent on this campus, I came across some kids who really didn’t want to be students. They wanted to be athletes.

Q. Yeah, no question.

A. But the rules were such that the rules forced them to be students whether they wanted to be or not. But the kind of money that’s out there now, I just don’t know how we’re going to stand up to it.

Q. It shows up, too, in the kids who are leaving school early because the money is there for them.

A. Well, they all say, Henry, that they’re going to come back. They’re not going to come back. They won’t come back (1) because they’re going to be wealthy; (2) they’re not going to come back because they’re not going to want to take the time year after year after year to come back one quarter a year to get their degree. I just don’t think that’s going to happen and it’s a shame. Because it’s not what a University is all about. It’s part of our fabric now and it’s going to be here, whether we like it or not.
Q. That’s what worries me. I don’t know how much more we want to do.
A. I’ve got some more time.
Q. We’ve got about 15 minutes on our meter. But we can throw another one on.
   Just for fun, any comments about Woody and his role in the University?
A. Coach Hayes was an interesting bird.
Q. Because he always is a topic of interesting conversation.
A. Oh yes, with everyone.
Q. That’s why I’m asking.
A. Coach Hayes prided himself on being a member of the faculty. That was very
   important to him. It was important to him to stress that to all of us. If you came to
work for Coach Hayes without a coat and tie, he would, and, by the way, football
coaches don’t come to work in ties at all anymore or any other coaches for that
matter. He would say, “Now look, if I wanted to hire a gym teacher I would have.
He said, “I hired a professional. And we wear coats and ties.” Nobody coached
for Coach Hayes that didn’t have at least a master’s degree.
Q. I didn’t know that.
A. I belong to the Faculty Club to this day because of Coach Hayes. He said it was
   the thing to do. Join the Faculty Club. Go over there and eat. And so I did. And I
know he did regularly. A funny aside. Because he knew I belonged, he used to
get me regularly and come by at 5:00 or 5:30, and say, “How about if you have
dinner with me tonight?” We’d go to the Faculty Club. [I] always [would] give
him the answer, “Coach, it is very difficult to work for you.” And I spent a lot of
hours [with him]. Every chance I get to have dinner with my family I [would] do
so. And so, “No, I have to go home and have dinner.” “Well, you do that regularly.” “Yes, I do.” “Well, then you can make an exception tonight. And you can go with me tonight.” And he would say that to me over and over and over.

Q. And what did you do?
A. I always went home.

Q. Did you really?
A. I did indeed. Because what I said was literally true. He was a very demanding person but he didn’t demand any more of you than he demanded of himself. As a consequence, we all worked long, long hours. And so the only chance I got to see my kids was at dinner time. So I always went home at dinner time and had dinner with my family as often as I could.

Q. You think he understood?
A. Yeah, sure. I do. In fact, Coach Hayes, a number of things in Coach Hayes’ life were, I think, habit. He got in the habit of not going home. Of going to the Faculty Club for dinner and coming back to work. And so he never did. He didn’t go home for dinner. He ate on campus. Those kinds of things. For whatever reason, he believed that it wasn’t cold. You didn’t need to wear a jacket. You could go out there in short sleeves when it was cold. He didn’t want you standing around with your hands in your pockets and so on and so forth. He knew it was cold. There’s no question in my mind he knew it was cold. And once he had his heart attack he started wearing a jacket. So there were a number of things that he did, he got rid of his car there for a while during one particular time and I don’t
remember what was wrong with the economy, but he felt driving two cars was wrong. So he got rid of his car and he walked to work.

Q. My gosh.
A. In our society that’s great to have that kind of philosophy, but in this day and age you can’t be the head football coach and walk to work. There are too many other places you’ve got to go and people you’ve got to see, that you need an automobile.

Q. Do you think there’s truth in the fact that he turned down salary increases?
A. Well, I know there is truth, yeah. There were a couple of factors we need to remember now. At one point in time, no one on campus could make more than the governor. Which meant the president was underneath the governor and the governor wasn’t well paid. And so, the Director of Athletics was under the President and Coach Hayes and so forth. And so for a long time Coach Hayes made $20,000. And I know for a fact that a number of times he turned down a salary increase, to divide it among the rest of his staff. But you know, it’s hard to equate that today because we’re probably talking about how you divide up $2,000 among ten people. And [we]re] talking about [a] two- or three-hundred-dollar raise. When someone looks at this history and said, “A two- or three-hundred-dollar raise. That doesn’t sound like bus fare.” So it’s hard to make people understand that. But yes he did turn down raises for his staff. It came with a mistake. I remember the person who broke the football salary schedule was Dave McClain, who was on the University of Kansas staff. He was the son-in-law of one of Woody’s former assistants, Doug Perry. And Woody determined he
wanted to hire Dave McClain as the Defense Line Coach. And Dave said, “I can’t come for anything less than this.” And whatever that was, was more than any assistant was making on our staff, which got everybody a raise. Up until that time, it was kind of a ceiling. As soon as they brought one in that blew out the top, then everybody started getting increases.

Q. Was he a good man for the University?

A. I think he was a good man for the University. For warts and all, I think he was a very good man. He believed, he loved, he lived Ohio State. He didn’t do much else.

Q. No, he really didn’t.

A. Didn’t take very many vacations. If it wasn’t related to Ohio State, he and Ann didn’t do it. She was as good of a speaker as he was and she’d always come out and bring the money back to the University. They were unique individuals. But yeah, I think Woody was good for the University. Woody had his controversies. He admits he had a bad temper which got him into some trouble. But by and large I think he did a good thing. I know during the protest years, you could find him right out there in the middle of the Oval fighting as hard as he could to convince kids that this is not the way to solve the problem.

Q. I was next to him in High Street bringing in and trying to get stuff out of the street. I suddenly looked at this guy that was working along with me and it was Woody Hayes. He was out there. How about this? Are there any other matters you’d like to discuss or comment upon?
A. I hadn’t thought about that, Henry. I don’t know what else. There are probably a lot of things in my background that someone might be interested in.

Q. After all, I understand it. I’ve had a life in this University and that’s what I talk about.

A. I think it’s a shame. This will serve no purpose for anybody. But it’s a shame that people in intercollegiate athletics don’t go to the Faculty Club. It is. I can remember when I first started to go, the Director of Athletics and his Associate would go over there and eat lunch with the faculty and would play rum at lunch time. That’s where we got the idea for the chairs for the press box, from the old cribbage chairs that they made at the Faculty Club, so you could sit higher than the rest of the people around the table and watch the card game. I think those were good times. I think they developed relationships between intercollegiate athletics and other members of the faculty, which I don’t think takes place anymore. I think it’s a shame for any university. But I guess like everything else, all things change, and I don’t think we’re going back. I don’t think we’ll go back to those days. But it’s a shame.

Q. I’ve thought about that often because of Woody’s dedication to it. And I also, this is off this record, but I’ll say it to you anyhow. I don’t think anyone on the faculty who I know ever saw John Cooper in the Faculty Club. He might have come over to give a coach’s talk every once in a while. And if the big guy doesn’t do it, the assistants won’t either. And I don’t mean to be critical of Cooper.
A. No, that’s fair. I just think that’s the way things are now. I don’t know that there’s probably anybody on our coaching staff that understands the value of the Faculty Club. The faculty don’t either.

Q. Well, that’s true. We’re working on that.

A. But I think there was a lot to be gained in the Faculty Club. But maybe that’s because I went. I admit I could be biased.

Q. You’re allowed to be biased.

A. I think intercollegiate athletics has become what I hate to say and that’s big business. And when it becomes big business, you don’t do things the same way on a college campus that you normally would. You don’t go associate with the faculty. It’s just the way it is.

Q. Okay. Anything else?

A. No, I don’t think so. There’s probably a lot.

Q. Well, I know that. But I think we have covered a major aspect of your life and I think you’ve been very frank in your comments and I think that’s good. And I hope we’ve put it all on tape properly.

A. I agree.

Q. All right. I’ll stop it.