Q. Oral history of Dr. George Johnson conducted by Frank Himes. George, let’s have just a little brief background on you leading into how you selected Animal Science as a profession.

A. I was born and raised on a dairy cash crop farm in western New York, just south of Rochester in Caledonia, New York. When I was old enough to join the 4-H Club, I decided to not go along with my brother and have a dairy project, although I was very much interested in dairy. I chose sheep. And they had not been on the farm for many years. So I started out with Shropshire sheep for my 4-H project. My 4-H experience helped develop my career because it resulted in my thinking about the College of Agriculture at Cornell University, even though at one time I was thinking of law. I had so much background and enjoyed my work with livestock. So I decided to go to Cornell University. I worked for the professor in charge of sheep and hogs in the Animal Husbandry Department. I expected to join the Extension service when I received my B.S. degree. The Director of Extension was my advisor at Cornell. However, I was employed to establish a Department of Vocational Agriculture at a school system at Corfr and East Pembroke, New York. I was there for three years. My next job was County Agriculture Agent in St. Lawrence County, New York, where dairy production was very important. I was there for a little over a year. When I was asked to join the Cornell University faculty as a State Livestock Specialist, with emphasis on
sheep, meat and swine programs. Cornell was very good to me and provided time for me to complete my master’s and doctorate at Michigan State. My doctorate is in Animal Nutrition. I was at Cornell from 1943 until the summer of ’55, when a good friend of mine, Larry Kauffman, was made Chair of the Ohio State Animal Science Department. Larry convinced me to join the faculty in Animal Science at The Ohio State.

Q. As you indicated, you were more or less on a general farm when you were growing up, and in these recent years you’ve seen the mega farms. I would like to know if you have any comments on the advantages and/or disadvantages to the producer and the consumer.

A. I guess I’ll make a few comments. Many years ago, when I was doing Extension work in New York State, I was interested in the optimum size of farms. When I was in England, I visited one of the research centers there that did work on the optimum size of dairy farms in England. And then of course, we started seeing this increased size in the U.S. Certainly the size probably cuts down on the expense per unit of production. During Depression days, large farms had large losses.

Q. They were in debt.

A. Right, they had the higher debt. And the smaller farms were able to provide food for the family and get people through the Depression. So we didn’t really see a major shift in size until WW II, to my thinking. Today, waste management is one of the major problems. Operators of large livestock farms must do the things that
should be done to maintain a satisfactory environment. Do you have any particular questions?

Q. No, because I think you raised the valid issues here. I just thought since you’ve been in Animal Science and you saw this development, we ought to get your impression. Coming from the standpoint, then, of sources of students and interest with a few large farms, is that influencing a number of things?

A. I’m not up to date on the source of students. Early in my career at Ohio State as Chair …

Q. And that started in what year?

A. January 1, 1958. I was Chair for 25 ½ years. I took on the assignment to talk with high school counselors. It didn’t take long to realize that the high school counselor, as they advised students, did not understand the wide variety of opportunity for students that graduated from the College of Agriculture at The Ohio State University. They were thinking of just the jobs in production agriculture. Many are employed in agricultural business and industry. The first time I determined how many women we had as majors, it was 8 percent. The last time I figured it, before I retired in 1984, it was 48 percent. This was a major change. Women had been employed in jobs related to Agriculture. Large farms have provided more specialized jobs. Many animal science majors have not had any experience in agriculture.

Q. You’ve touched on the major environmental concerns. How about the animal rights groups. Were they getting active before you retired?
A. Yes, to some extent. First, I have no objection to people expressing their opinion. I do object when they cause harm and injury and try to convince somebody else to do it their way. I don’t know what the effect is right now. We started a beginning animal science course several years ago entitled “Domestic Animals in the Service of Mankind.” We had students from various majors in that course.

Q. Is that the course that Fred Stevens had?
A. Yes. Fred was an excellent teacher.

Q. I know the course has been very popular.
A. Right.

Q. Well let’s move on to another aspect of animal farming, the exotic animals.
A. Well, exotic animals are interesting.

Q. You might list a few.
A. I was criticized for not supporting the development of the beefalo, which is a cross of beef cattle and buffalo. I have nothing against buffalo or beefalo farms in Ohio that are supplying restaurants and other consumers. I’ve had very little experience with llamas. Sure, I’ve watched the llama show at the Ohio State Fair. I did have experience with the Karakul sheep many years ago in New York State, when producers were trying to get them developed, because they produced lamb pelts used in the clothing industry. They never could compete with some of the European or Mideast producers. I’ve been reading about the expansion of the meat goat. We all thought for many years of the milk goat. There’s been quite a few developed here in Ohio and there were a lot of meetings to try to get more expansion of the milk goat. And to have a special product. But in recent years,
from some of the ethnic demand, the meat goat has expanded in the United States and also here in Ohio.

Q. Apparently the Somali population in Columbus can’t find enough goat meat.

A. Probably, right.

Q. You indicated that the Chair of the Animal Science Department convinced you to come here as a faculty member. So that apparently attracted you. You as Chair saw the division of the department into two physical locations, between Columbus and Wooster. What are the strengths and weaknesses of that?

A. That’s an excellent topic. Of course, historically we know why the Experiment Station was moved to Wooster. When I came here in ’55, one of the things they wanted me to do was to help get more research started at the Columbus campus. In 1947 Dean Rummell was the first person to be Dean of the College and Director of the Experimental Station. Scott Sutton was the first joint chair in Animal Science between Wooster and OSU. OARDC at that time was called the Ohio Agriculture Experiment Station. Certainly, a researcher that wanted to spend most of his time on research, have suitable labs and animals – the Wooster experience should have been satisfactory. They did a lot of good research. They’ve been well-known in certain fields for a long time. At the same time, the group at Columbus was best known nationally for an outstanding undergraduate teaching program. Research opportunities were limited for the faculty at OSU, Columbus campus. We didn’t have the same support system to do research at Columbus as we did at Wooster. You could provide some money for them, but at Wooster you had all of the support services.
Q. Specialized analytical equipment.

A. Right. And other types of support. At Columbus, if you wanted something done to your lab you had to pay for it. So that was a challenge. Now, the other thing that prevented our faculty in Columbus from doing more research was the fact that we had a tremendous increase in undergraduate enrollment. During a few years we taught three times as many Animal Science course hours, but had only a 3 percent increase in personnel to do it. Faculty did not have time to do research. We also wished to improve the graduate program. The Animal Science Department had not emphasized graduate education, even though Dr. Sutton had an excellent graduate program in Animal Nutrition. So some of our faculty that should be major professors for graduate students were at Wooster. It was difficult to have the Graduate Faculty Council approve Wooster’s faculty as members of the graduate faculty. That’s old history now, but at the time it was a very big challenge.

Q. I commend you for getting that ice broken. I would think, likewise, how difficult it was for some of the Columbus people to do research because of a shortage of animals or space for the animals.

A. Yes, except we could do some small animal research. Animal Science faculty were active in the Institute of Nutrition and Food Technology.

Q. There’s been a change in research funding. It used to be people at Wooster knew that they were going to have money to do a certain research project, maybe over ten years or so. In the case of agronomy I know the field plot work, they were
going to be able to continue that. And now a lot of the granting agencies feel three years is maximum.

A. Which I’m not up to date on, but let’s start out on one of the major sources of funding at Wooster: It was federal and state. And the federal money came to Wooster to be distributed. It wasn’t earmarked too much. I was a great believer in the regional research program, which provided regional funds.

Q. You want to mention one or two?

A. Well, the sheep project was one. Ohio was the leading sheep state east of the Mississippi. Several colleges in the north central region joined Ohio in a major sheep research project. We had a regional project in swine nutrition. We did not do a lot of grant research when I was first here, either at Wooster or Columbus. Interdepartmental and intercollege research was encouraged. [Professor] Bob Van Stavern and Animal Science faculty worked together for years.

Q. And Bob VanKeuren was a pasture man, forage man.

A. Right, OARDC was set up so you did not have departmental projects. We used to think of them that way, but they weren’t. They were experiment station projects. So there was no problem of having workers together from various departments on a project, because it wasn’t an Animal Science or an Agronomy project; it was an OARDC project. And I was very much supportive of that idea.

Q. For certain kinds of research it’s extremely valuable to do it that way.

A. Sure.

Q. That’s great. The diversity of students majoring in Animal Science, you’ve touched on that a little bit.
A. Several women and students with little or no farm background majored in Animal Science. I thought it was very important for faculty in Animal Science to advise Pre-Vet students. That’s when I talked to the Assistant Dean and Secretary of the Veterinary College. I put him on a courtesy appointment in Animal Science. We worked out a plan for students in the college to get a B.S. degree with a major in Animal Science, by using some Vet courses as part of their major. The transfer student was another type of student; that needed attention. We had quite a few transfers from two-year tech schools, and other colleges.

Q. Okay.

A. Does that answer your question?

Q. Yes. You’ve studied a little bit of different aspects of education, method of teaching, the role of lecture, laboratory, internships.

A. That’s a good question.

Q. What is your opinion?

A. Number one, most of our courses needed an accompanying laboratory. I supported recitation sections for courses taught to a large number of students in one lecture. When we started our beginning course taught by Rod Plimpton, Fred Stevens and Harry Barr, recitation sections were used. Other faculty also taught those beginning course recitation sections. Recitation sections allowed the instructor to become better acquainted with the students. Field trips were encouraged for several courses. In our production courses I thought we needed to have the students visit successful operations. We developed some internships.
Q. In fact, at one point I wasn’t sure the College administration really encouraged internships. You probably did it against a lot of inertia.

A. We established some scholarships for interns.

Q. Okay.

A. Interns can have problems, because I remember an intern was only allowed to do menial tasks. The student did not learn much about the industry that he was studying to join. We probably did not do as good a job as we should have of visiting the interns and evaluating the program, primarily because we didn’t have the funds and the people to do it.

Q. Good. All right, now, to ATI. Do you feel it complements, competes, supplements the OSU programs?

A. I was one of the few chairs at the time it started that had a little background on two-year tech schools. We had seven of them in New York State. I was an Assistant County Agent, I was in a town where we had one in northern New York. It had quite an impact in certain areas. Many were called Agricultural Technical Institutes, but they had other programs like large-scale food distribution, auto mechanics, and training field representatives for equipment companies. In St. Lawrence County, a very high percentage of the dairy farms that I worked with had a family member that had a two-year dairy production degree from the tech school in the county. They were a lot more able to receive and digest new technical information. Now, going back to ATI, I was in several of the meetings when programs were discussed. We had a meeting in Wooster and the Governor gets up and says, “We’re going to have a school where students
will have a degree in one hand and a job offer in the other. And then a Wooster resident said, “Really, it’s going to be a branch of The Ohio State University.” We had those two announcements on the same night. I was not in favor of saying, “Okay, anything you take at ATI is transferable to Ohio State.” I felt credit had to be evaluated the same as any other transfer credit.

Q. Did the New York tech schools seem to have this underlying philosophy for really preparing you for the first two years at Cornell University? It seems to me that’s been the case.

A. It’s gotten more so. It wasn’t in the original plan.

Q. No, I know it wasn’t in the original.

A. No, Cornell didn’t accept two-year tech school students as well as I thought they should. At the time I came to Ohio State we had open enrollment. When I left Cornell they had very restricted enrollment. Some programs at ATI have developed better than others.

Q. Good. Well, I was wondering about your role as Chairman in the development of a college policy, curriculum, tenure promotion aspects, field days, public relations.

A. I wanted to emphasize better communication with the industry. Now how did we do it? We had the OARDC field days. When you’d get 1,000 people to come into the Sheep Day at Wooster, that was an impact. We had excellent swine and beef days. We moved the Beef Days around to some of our research branches. I’ll give our Dean Roy Kottman quite a bit of credit for letting people in the State of Ohio know that there was a good experiment station located at Wooster. In
northwest Ohio they knew about Michigan State, but they didn’t know much about Wooster, even though we had a branch up there. At the department level, one of the early things I did as a Chair, was to form an advisory committee, made up primarily of people in the industry. They even appreciated and joined in when we had the federal review of our research projects. Members of the advisory committee shared their experience with others. George Greenleaf, the executive of the animal feed industry trade association and I started what we called the Nutrition Seminar, made up of people in the industry and our faculty, plus representatives of the Department of Agriculture in Reynoldsburg. We wished to improve communication with little publicity. It worked very well. We’d meet at Wooster or Columbus and Reynoldsburg and then at one of the food company’s headquarters. I always tried to work with the industry.

Q. From a standpoint of some of the field days not being offered that you thought were important, in the case of the sheep industry, I think it’s the number, but likewise with mega dairy farms, the people there may be going straight to a research person and feel that they don’t need a field day.

A. That’s true, you just brought up a real good question. We had discussions in Extension on which Extension programs and where you should supply technical information. The feed company’s going to have their own technical person. At the Nutrition Forum, the consultants were the ones who participated. My nephew’s daughter, a graduate from one of the tech schools in New York, worked at a 2,000 head of dairy. She and other technical persons with similar positions
had an organization where they met to receive up-to-date technical information. I think it’s important for Extension to provide such information.

Q. Well, that’s probably my omission on this list. If you want to talk more about Extension now, go ahead.

A. Within the department we established commodity groups, which meant we had the researchers, the extension specialists and the teachers, meet and share with each other their programs related to the swine industry. We had had inter-departmental Extension groups.

Q. Okay.

A. I encouraged researchers and teachers, in a limited way, to participate in Extension activities and meetings. Maybe in one or two cases we got too much participation. But in general, they were helpful. I’ve never studied programs at the university level from state to state that had greater differences with delivery than Extension. In Ohio, we started the Area Agent Program to work with major programs. In several states area agents worked with minor programs. I wanted the Extension Specialist to review research in their area. Some thought the researcher ought to be doing the review. I felt the Extension Specialist should review research done in Ohio and at other universities.

Q. Your Extension Specialists do some research projects?

A. That’s one of my disappointments. We had them on some projects. I was biased, because I was one of the first in the U.S. to have a combination, Extension Specialist, and research appointment before I came to Ohio. I had an Extension background, which is not usual for a department chair. Usually, they are research
or teaching. And it was helpful. Some of the other chairs used to call me once in a while about Extension programs. I wanted the district extension agents to be active with the research projects at our branches, but we never really got that done. That was a disappointment. Some of our Extension Specialists participated in research projects. Have you got any particular question on that?

Q. No. My experience with the Extension Specialist in Agronomy with Sam Bone, Larry Shepherd, Gordon Rider, George Gist while he was there. The research I felt gave them a chance to say, “I’ve grown 200 bushel of corn or ten tons of alfalfa.” They communicate better. That was my feeling, that the research gave depth to their comments.

Q. So now in the area of promotion and tenure. How do you evaluate excellence of an individual?

A. That’s a big challenge. As I started out as a Department Chair, it was pretty much what I put in the letter. Now, I’m a great believer in the peer evaluation. But I’ll have to admit, I never found a system of peer evaluation that seemed to work like I wanted it to work. We had a Promotion and Tenure Committee and I had informal meetings with faculty members. Our Promotion and Tenure Committee differed on how to evaluate peers. I had one plan where the faculty was given an opportunity to tell me what they thought, or they could just turn my request back with a big “NI” on it that said, “Not Interested.” And, of course, I got quite a few of those. So even though I believe in peer review, evaluations made by individuals not close to the faculty member bothers me. Just looking over the list of publications is not enough. Teaching is very important.
Q. And letters of support from outside the state.

A. Yes, now I was involved in that by other states, two states in particular because of people I’d known.

Q. But you were still holding excellence in what the person was assigned to do.

A. Oh yes.

Q. And not having to be excellent in all areas.

A. No, I was quite a believer in student evaluations, as long as you evaluated for what they were. I discussed student evaluations with faculty. I was very pleased when we had the most faculty listed as an outstanding teachers by any Ohio State University Department.

Q. Your department was very good at that. That was great. You had outstanding teachers in your department. It was wonderful.

A. One area that bothered me about promotion and tenure was personal traits that were not part of the academic production of the individual. And we’ve all known those.

Q. Right. I assume when you first became Chair, you knew the faculty student load was still not too high, and you heard some of the student comments, and you were out over the state, and you saw the products from these people, or how they were being accepted by the professionals. You had a lot of input besides just your own with that one individual.

A. You’re thinking about students. One thing we haven’t mentioned that I was a great believer in, is the faculty advising of students, which the College did. And going back, I was a strong believer in freshmen orientation and freshmen
advising. When I advised thirty students that hadn’t declared majors, that was an interesting time to discuss options. All at once somebody would come up with something they hadn’t even thought about. They changed their mind, which is fine, as long as they thought it through. I don’t know what they’re doing now; I assume they’re doing the same thing. When I had a student come in one time that had been at another college, and had seen an advisor on getting his courses lined up, six different individuals in the last six times he had been in the office advised him. They were called professional advisors, but he was very unhappy.

Q. Well, let’s move on. Your evaluation of the Ag faculty interacting with the University committees.

A. That’s a good one.

Q. Because we both remember the Speaker’s Rule and how it sort of segregated the Ag College from the rest of the campus.

A. Some of the things got me close to President Novice Fawcett. Because I sent over a letter after a department meeting, and within an hour after he received the letter I had a hand-delivered response from him. Those were tough times. We had student riots. Now, going back to the Ag faculty getting active across the campus. When I was first here, Mr. Larry Kauffman was very much aware of that. And he gave me advice about two things I ought to do right away. Going to the Faculty Club to meet people that were not in the Ag College. The other was to join the Bowling League, because you get acquainted with people from all over the campus, from all facets, which is not true anymore. We had thirty-some teams then, and we’re down to less than fifteen. I served on the Faculty Council and
was an alternate on the Graduate Faculty Council. I became aquatinted with
Professor Willard when I was on the College of Agriculture’s Academic Affairs
Committee.

Q. C.J. Willard in Agronomy.

A. Yes. We were on the College Academic Affairs Committee at the same time we
were developing various curricula for the College. I made a study of our students
and found that after two years out, about 48 percent of our graduates were in some
kind of Ag industry. So I felt we should have an Ag Industry program. We
visited each department in the college to discuss it. Willard represented
Agronomy at the time. So we had quite a few discussions. I think it’s very
important to participate on committees.

Q. I thought an outstanding individual for being accepted by people in other sections
of the University was Dr. Nate Fechheimer.

A. Nate was active with the American Association of University Professors and
promoted more faculty involvement in University affairs.

Q. But he would discuss it as an idea and not against an individual, my experience
with him.

A. Back in those days I made a prediction. I predicted that within five years the
faculty at Ohio State was going to be unionized.

Q. Okay, very good. What advice would you like to give incoming Ag students and
new or young faculty members?

A. Well, let’s start with the young faculty member. The number one thing, that the
more years I had, the more I supported it, is to try and share with them and instill
in them the tremendous responsibility they have on developing youth at an age
when so many things are determined for their whole lifetime. We don’t think
about that, but those years in college are so important of determining what you’re
going to do for the rest of your life. And to have the student number one. Again,
to encourage them to be student advisors. And then I guess the responsibility for
their specialty or field or whatever it is. Be aware of what’s going on in their
field. The one that I don’t know how to express, is be open to ideas expressed by
other faculty that might not be part of their thinking. I encouraged junior faculty
to respect and get all the help they could from the senior faculty. I never believed
in going in to a young faculty’s classes the first time or two he taught. That’s
really his challenge right then. I might go in later on. Young faculty felt they
wanted to do things their way. But then when they get to be senior faculty, some
thought that they ought to have more control of the junior faculty. One area that I
never was able to get done as well as I liked was the so-called “team research.” I
understood it because some faculty wanted that other team member to be
somebody that had a piece of knowledge or background that they didn’t have. It
was very difficult for them to share.

Q. How about the balance between the work at the University and family members?
A. You’ve got a good one. And I’m a poor example. As you’re getting started as a
young faculty member, you may be also getting started as a young father. And
it’s even more difficult now than it was in my day because both parents may be
working. Tremendous challenge. I’ve watched it with my daughters. I have four.
Three of them in education. I had the terrible habit of going in Sunday afternoon
to the office, there was nobody around, and I could organize what I was going to
do on Monday and for the week, especially if I was going to go to Wooster. It
wasn’t fair to the family. I’m interested in your ideas on it. To me, that’s true
with any job.

Q. True with any job. I feel that there’s just burning out, the faculty members and
the young employees in industry, in not letting them have time with their family.

A. Ohio State did not have a good sabbatical program. I had one sabbatical at
Cornell to finish my Doctorate. Cornell faculty were almost pushed to take their
sabbatical.

Q. That was my experience as a graduate student at Purdue. Every seventh year they
were expected to be gone.

A. And it had to be a positive experience. We had the assigned research program.
We had faculty take assigned research leave but it wasn’t like a sabbatical.

Q. For incoming, say a new freshman in Agriculture. Any words of wisdom for
them?

A. Well, I guess I can think about what I tell my grandchildren when they go to
college.

Q. That’s good.

A. Number one, don’t be afraid of your professors. Always clarify anything that
you’re not sure about. I like the faculty advisor system. And if they haven’t quite
made up their mind what they’re going to do, encourage them to talk with faculty
in other departments. I always encouraged students to participate in their student
clubs or their organizations or something that would get them acquainted with
other people in a different environment than just the classroom.

Q. Coming to OSU, how can they make the large university seem like a small one?
A. That’s a good question. I had daughters go to small colleges and granddaughters
big ones. At the smaller colleges, they sometimes had bigger classes. Again,
participate in the clubs.

Q. The Saddle Sirloin Club for the Science major.
A. Right.

Q. No, I suppose when they’re selecting courses, if they know what they want their
majors to be, should they get into, say, one of those courses early on? Or get the
“basic” courses.
A. That’s hard to say. I was never one to believe that you ought to give this high
school graduate a big dose the first quarter. There are those that feel that is the
way to do it. Let’s just see what they’re made of. I never was quite a believer in
that. I don’t know how you feel about it. Let them take at least one course that
they think they have a real interest in.

Q. That’s very wise, I think. This was either Bill Studer or Rai Goerler wanted me to
add this to it, of your many contributions to the College of Agriculture, which one
or two did you find satisfying, and also disappointing?
A. Okay. From a long-term standpoint one that was quite satisfying was to improve
our graduate program. I encouraged the faculty to do it. We developed a pretty
good graduate program. I was not a researcher. I could be criticized for not
putting enough emphasis on research. I thought I understood the importance of research.

Q. You were wanting to distribute the information they gained.

A. In some areas we developed some real strong programs. We brought Walt Harvey [professor of Dairy Science] in to strengthen our animal breeding and genetics program and within a few years it was excellent. I worked hard to improve our department contacts with the livestock industry. I encouraged our faculty to report their research results to persons in the livestock industry. That’s pretty hard for some people.

Q. Extremely hard. And so the disappointment of, you weren’t involved in a whole lot of research personally then.

A. No. When I first came here, Larry Kauffman encouraged me to do some research. I did some lamb feeding work in the old artillery barn. At Ohio State I encouraged a stronger program in what we called the “early adopter.” You locate someone that wishes to utilize new research results and they become an “early adopter.”

Q. The 1970 riots. You were located on the west side of the river. Was there any tear gas on this side?

A. I don’t remember the tear gas. The thing I remember, was being in that Animal Science building all alone for a lot of hours. I was the only one they let in. The caretakers of the animals were allowed to work. We organized the professors on 24-hour duty, in our barns for fire security. From a positive standpoint, it didn’t take us long to develop a program to have the seniors graduate. We had stopped
school for several days. We determined how to handle those courses that weren’t completed. We put a lot of effort into how to have the seniors graduate. I didn’t have any personal problems with anybody trying to come in and shut down my office or anything like that. It was a very unfortunate time.

Q. Did you go to the main campus to see what the National Guard was doing?
A. No, I had National Guard right outside of our building.

Q. Oh okay. But over on the Oval while they were throwing tear gas at each other.
A. No, I didn’t get into that. I spent some long hours in our building. We checked refrigeration because of some laboratory items in freezers.

Q. And the meat lab would have been very sensitive to that.
A. Right. I didn’t have anybody come into the building to try to do any damage. We had the National Guard right outside.

Q. As you say, restricted access to the campus for a while.
A. Yes.

Q. Well let’s go on. You’ve worked under a couple different deans at the College, and a couple – three – presidents.
A. Well, [OSU President Howard] Bevis was just getting through. Let’s see, [OSU President Novice] Fawcett was the longest one. That’s when I was active on the Faculty Council. Fawcett put me on a speaker’s bureau to go out and meet with alumni. I was aquatinted with President and Mrs. [Harold] Enarson.

Q. And then [OSU President Edward] Jennings.
A. Jennings – I knew a little bit about Jennings because of one of his assistants at Wyoming, before he was here, [was] a friend of mine. I was interested in
developing contacts with the Columbus community. Did you ever get involved with hosting the downtown Kiwanis?

Q. No.

A. Well, that was a program that started with Larry Kauffman and others. We had the Ag Day and different departments put on the program in Animal Science. For years it worked fine. The OSU police would park their cars like they would for a football game. And then I was asked to buy parking passes for the Kiwanis members. That was one reason to discontinue the program. I mentioned working with the industry. I wished to have them visit the campus. Having their meetings here. We had some meetings but it got harder to do. President Jennings gave a talk on how important it was to work with industry. I said, yeah, we used to do that but we got discouraged. We were encouraged to move the meetings from Animal Science to the Fawcett Center. Industry organizations moved their meetings “off campus.”

Q. Did each president sort of emphasize something a little different than the other two, that a combination of the three made the University maybe stronger?

A. I think Fawcett was very strong for undergraduate teaching. He was also interested in research. One thing that your department and our department got involved in a little bit was getting smaller amounts of money to help with research. If you went through the Research Foundation, the overhead was so great you couldn’t hack it unless it was a big grant, which I understood. We used the Development Fund to get some “current use money.” But you couldn’t promise anything. You could say, do you want to support our ongoing research?
My experience with the Development Fund over the years was very interesting. My first experiences indicated that they didn’t want us to raise money for the department or the college, they wanted it all in the general fund. And my feeling is, any individual that wants to donate money to The Ohio State University, let’s find out what they want to do with that. And I had one or two departments that were surprised when I had a donor that wanted to give money to another department. That was fine with me. I was a supporter of the President’s Club. Recently, people that I worked with have given major gifts for scholarships, which I feel real good about.

Q. Yes, I would think so.
A. So I’m sure there was a different emphasis. Fawcett, of course, was a little more formal. He had the President’s reception and luncheon to entertain people at football games. I participated in a few. I don’t know who would be the most informal, perhaps Enarson.

Q. Enarson?
A. Yes. President Enarson invited a group of Animal Science students to camp overnight at his Colorado ranch after they had meetings in Colorado. He told me that he had never had a group that was so careful on cleaning up before they left. They were just the kind of guests that he liked to have.

Q. Yes. Well, any other comments?
A. One disappointment: I never was able to find the key to integrate OARDC and OSU as well as I would have liked.
Q. Yes. Now, once you got some research going here, was it similar to what happened in Agronomy, because it was mainly graduate research at Columbus, and papers were written and published, whereas the people at Wooster, “Well, I’ll collect one more year of data before I publish.” And so there was a big difference in the publication rate.

A. Yes, you get into publications and there’s one thing that goes back to field days. Field Day Reports sometimes were approved as publications.

Q. Experiment Station Bulletin.

A. Yes, and they would go to libraries. And then that kind of passed by. You were talking about the pasture group.

Q. [Professor] Paul Henry Long and then before him was [Professor] John Parsons.

A. Yes. I got to know John. I thought we ought to be able to have a little research at the Don Scott Livestock Center.

Q. Do you want to make any other comments about Don Scott?

A. No, I think it’s a challenge right now. I’ve heard a lot of things that they’re going to try. There has been interest in moving livestock programs to the “Molly Caren Center” near Springfield. Molly took courses in the “over-60 program.” She provided the land for “the Molly Caren Center” at an extremely reduced price.

Q. I don’t think you were alone on that part ________ of the other departments.

A. We were talking about your department and our department. Your department tended to do a little more benchwork here in Columbus than our department did. And some of the applied research was done by the Wooster faculty. And ours was just kind of the opposite. We had some very basic work in microbiology and
nutrition at Wooster. The OSU Animal Science faculty started research projects
at the OARDC branch. And some of the faculty at OSU are doing more work at
the branches than they used to. Further questions?

Q. No, I think that’s it, and we’re almost at the end of this tape. Thank you very
much, George.

A. Is this what you wanted?

Q. Yes. We’ll find out from Dr. Studer.