

INTERVIEW OF SIDNEY CHAFETZ  
MARCH 6, 2005

Q. I'm interviewing Professor Emeritus Sidney Chafetz. It is March 6, 2005. Good afternoon.

A. Good afternoon, Adrienne.

Q. Let's begin with your background a bit. All of your schooling and early training seem to propel you toward a life of an artist. How did you get involved with academe, and particularly Ohio State University?

A. Well, I was lucky. I had gone to school at Rhode Island School of Design. I'd begun in 1940, following high school graduation. I was drafted at the beginning of my second year. And after the war, I survived, and in the winter of 1945, I immediately went to New York. After a few months in New York, I was urged to return and finish my schooling at Rhode Island. The GI Bill had been instituted. The officials at Rhode Island wanted me to begin at the beginning. I told them that there was no way I would start as a freshman again. And so, I was allowed to enter my third year. When I graduated in June of 1947, I already had more time left on the GI Bill. And for the first time since the war, the American School of Fountainsbleau had reopened. So I went to Fountainsbleau for that summer. I still had additional time, so I moved to Paris after that Fountainsbleau experience and, at that time, Fernand Leger had returned from the United States and had started classes. So I studied with Fernand Leger and I had no idea that I could make my living as an artist, but friends in Paris told me that there were teaching jobs available. And I had the names of a few schools to apply to. So I went to the

American Embassy where I was getting my mail, and I asked one of the secretaries if she could type up a vita sheet for me. At that time, they were very, very accommodating to American students. And so a vita sheet was prepared and I had sent them out to several schools, including Ohio State. I received an offer from Ohio State, and I believe having Leger's name as an artist I had studied with, was a big plus. A real advantage. So, I came to Ohio State, not knowing anything about the institution. Fortunately, Ohio State was one of the first state institutions to have a vital, bona fide art program, studio art program. At the time I went there, there was the School of Fine and Applied Arts located in Hayes Hall. The Director of the School was Frank Seiberling. Unbeknownst to me, there had been a very, very difficult amount of political infighting between two of the senior professors, Hoyt Sherman and Irwin Frey, who each thought he would be the heir apparent upon James Hopkins' retirement.

Q. I'm sorry, I'm confused. You said Frank Seiberling was the Director. Who was ...

A. Frank Seiberling was appointed by the Dean of the College of Education evidently, because two senior faculty members were in contention to succeed James Hopkins.

Q. Who was James Hopkins at the time?

A. James Hopkins had been the long-time Director of the School of Fine and Applied Arts.

Q. But you said Frank Seiberling was the Director.

A. Because there was a bitter fight to succeed James Hopkins, the Dean of the College, Donald Cottrell, appointed Frank Seiberling, who had been at the museum in Toledo. I was completely unaware that there was contention and a political fight. I was immediately welcomed by the studio faculty, who were very much interested in my experiences as a student, both at Fountainbleau and in Paris with Leger. And I made several life-long friends immediately upon joining the faculty.

Q. With your experience at Rhode Island in the School of Design, then in the institutes in France, how did you think the Art Department at Ohio State compared, both in terms of the ability of the faculty and the quality of the students?

A. I was very much impressed by the vitality and the awareness of contemporary art of the studio faculty. Hoyt Sherman was a very dynamic teacher, and a wonderful mentor to all of us. I came in at the instructor rank. Many of the graduate students at the time – Roy Lichtenstein, Chuck Csuri, and others – were also instructors. Rather than [make them] TA's, they gave out the instructor rank at the time. And Hoyt Sherman proved to be a very important mentor to those of us who had no teaching experience. He would \_\_\_\_\_ us after the school day, where we would all gather together in a common room, and he would ask us what we had taught, how we had used language in explaining projects to our students. And he would be a very, very long and encouraging critic.

Q. You spoke about the conflict between Hoyt Sherman and Irwin Frey. What year was this?

- A. This was the year of 1948.
- Q. Oh, that early?
- A. That early, yes. It was my understanding that this was Frank Seiberling's first year as Director. Frank was an ABD from Princeton in Art History. James Hopkins had been a painter, and I was unaware that that would be at the time, the studio faculty was working to de-throne Frank Seiberling.
- Q. Seiberling was ...
- A. The Director of the School.
- Q. Yea, but he was also the son of the big rubber family.
- A. Yes, he was.
- Q. The youngest son, I believe?
- A. Yes. He was the youngest son of the Seiberling [family] from the Seiberling and Goodrich Rubber fortunes.
- Q. What were your impressions of the University as a whole when you got here?
- A. I was absolutely thrilled because this was a huge University. At that time the enrollment was well under 20,000 students, and the University was pretty well self-contained from High Street to 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Neil Avenue and the fields beyond, and to, I think it was, the street north of the University where University School was.
- Q. Woodruff?
- A. Woodruff, yeah.
- Q. Did you feel the atmosphere was strained or strange because you were one of the few Jews on campus at the time?

A. Not at all. I was not made aware of being Jewish or that it would be detrimental in any way. I was accepted wholeheartedly. At the time there were very few Jews on the campus as a whole, and in the Department at that time, I can recall only one other man of the faith, Manuel Barkan, who was in Education. There may have been some I'm overlooking. Later on, there were other Jews on the faculty. And many of the students, the graduate students, Roy Lichtenstein was Jewish, Laura Ziegler. There were other graduate students whose names I don't recall, but being Jewish was not a factor.

Q. Do you think that was just in the Art Department, or throughout the University?

A. I think in the Art Department, I can only speak for the Art Department. For the Jewish faculty, I could say that the Hillel Foundation was the focus. And at the time I recall there were about 200 or so Jewish faculty throughout the University. Many of the secular Jewish functions were held at the Hillel Foundation.

Q. The School of Art, how was it organized? Where was it contained?

A. At the time I came in 1948, the School of Art, the school was officially called the School of Fine and Applied Arts. And we existed mainly in Hayes Hall, but there were many WWII [Quonset] huts. I remember the B&Z Building on Neil Avenue where we had art classes. And on 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, there were [Quonset] huts, one-story huts, that were heated with coal stoves every day. And there was a big cafeteria where Arps Hall parking lot as it is today, that served both as a cafeteria and for some classes.

Q. The School of Fine and Applied Arts was part of which college, and was it separate from Art History and Art Education? How did it all work?

A. Well, we were fortunate because the School of Fine and Applied Arts included art history, art education, studio arts, and also home economics and commercial art.

Q. They were all in the School of Art?

A. All in the School of Art. We all existed. We had a common foundation program, which was very, very good because all of the disparate art units had to participate in determining the form of that foundation program, which included studio and art history survey, primarily. Some of the prominent faculty at that time were Carolyn Bradley, who had a very important costume design program that was located on the third floor of Potley's [?] Hall. And her space was filled with sewing machines, and was a mainstay requirement for home economic students. For me, coming from a school that didn't have ceramics or print making or some of the other units, always as large as our school, it was a very exciting and stimulating atmosphere. I was also excited by having the opportunity to meet other professors from other units in the University, such as the English and History people, people in Sociology and Anthropology, Geology. One of the best things that happened when I came in 1948, was that the School of Fine and Applied Arts used to have a Wednesday luncheon at the Faculty Club every week. And it was a wonderful opportunity to meet my colleagues in other areas of the Department, such as ceramics, such as art history, on an informal basis. For me, that was an excellent way of getting to know my colleagues who taught in different parts of the building, whom I might otherwise never had contact with.

Q. You were hired to teach water color I believe. How did you become the master print maker?

A. Although I was hired to teach water color, I had had just a very brief introduction to print making when I came back after the war at Rhode Island. When I came to Ohio State, I wanted to use some of the presses and I was told by the professor at the time, Professor Gatrell, that I could not use them because they were out of service and if I used them, other students might be tempted to use them and would damage the presses.

Q. Now this is Catrell or Gatrell?

A. Gatrell. G-a-t-r-e-l-l.

Q. Now who was he?

A. He was a professor of painting and print making. Now print making was listed in our catalog as including all four of the processes: relief, engraving, silk screen, and lithography. But in fact, only silk screen was being taught, because we were on the quarter system, a ten- or eleven-week time for instruction. And there was no possible way to include all those four processes within that time frame, which was given once a year. However, finally, after two years, the politics got the better of the department, and Frank Seiberling left to head the department at the University of Iowa in Iowa City. Donald Wood was appointed temporary chair while we looked for a new Chairman for the school. The dean hired Dominic Severino to become the new Director of the School of Fine and Applied Arts.

Q. Dean being Donald Cottrell?

A. The Dean of the College of Education appointed a new Director, Dominic Severino. Severino had come from my former school, where he had been one of the deans, and I had known him. He did a very intelligent thing. He met with the

faculty as a group, and then he gave us each questionnaires to fill out. The questionnaires had questions such as, “What do you believe you are most qualified to teach? What constructive changes would you make in our curriculum?” They were to me a means of expressing my dissatisfaction with the way print making was being taught. And so I suggested that, although Professor Gatrell had a proprietary interest in maintaining control of the program, I felt it was unfair and dishonest to list all the processes while teaching only one. And so, in the spirit of conciliation, I suggested that I be allowed to teach the Intallio, the engraving process, and relief processes, and Professor Gatrell could have his silk screen and lithography.

Q. What was Professor Gatrell’s first name?

A. Robert. Bob Gatrell. Bob Gatrell immediately took this as a very ungrateful action on my part, and fought bitterly against breaking up his course. However, Severino was very polite in suggesting, “Well, let’s just see how it works out.” So then, I started teaching printmaking.

Q. What year was this?

A. I think it was 1954, ’56. Can I back track?

Q. Sure.

A. At that time, we had the instructor rank as the beginning position. After two years of being an instructor, if you were not retained, you were out. Well, I had one of the first \_\_\_\_\_. And so in 1950 and ’51, I went to Paris after having only really less than two years of teaching at Ohio State. And Seiberling told me, “Well, when you come back, your application will be considered with all the

other applications we will get for your position.” Fortunately, I was rehired when I came back. But during that year in Paris, I had the opportunity to apprentice with Stanley Hayter, who had come back to set up his workshop in Paris, after having been in New York during the war years. So, I came back and I was awarded, in fact, tenure to continue my teaching at Ohio State.

Q. Still as an instructor?

A. I went from an instructor when I came back. I had another year as instructor. Then I became an Assistant Professor.

Q. Tell me very briefly who Stanley Hayter is or was?

A. Stanley Hayter was the world-famous engraver, who had established a shop in Paris called Atelier \_\_\_\_\_, Studio 17, and had encouraged artists such as Picasso and Matisse and Chagall, and all the famous artists of the day, to come into his studio and work with the processes. And during the year I was there, Juan Miro had worked for three months in the studio. Another apprentice and myself, helped print one of the works of both Hayter and Miro. So I thoroughly learned all the processes of engraving.

Q. You speak very highly of the academic atmosphere of both the department and the University, yet a significant portion of your work involved academic satire. How did that start?

A. Well, I came to Ohio State University with absolute stars in my eyes. I was going to be part of a great University dedicated to truth and learning. And I was dismayed to find that, at a departmental level, I was in the midst of a political squabble, that fortunately I had not been a part of, so I was able to stay out. And

secondly, so many of the people I met from other areas of the University talked about having the same kinds of political infighting. And so, another factor was, being a part of the College and having to attend College meetings. These proved to be extremely deadly, boring. People would get up and speak nonsense literally, followed by their colleagues who would speak nonsense. And there was a great deal of jargon. It became amusing. And also, I was offended by it. So I began making images. I should say that I'm a great fan of the work of Francisco Goya, and a great fan and admirer of the English satirists, such as Gillray and Hogarth and Cruikshank. And so using these role models, I began adapting my work in their tradition.

Q. What was the response of your colleagues to this work?

A. Some of my colleagues were amused. Other colleagues were absolutely offended. I dealt with academic types, not caricatures of particular people. But still, some people would say, "Oh, that is professor so and so. And that is Dr. so and so." But these were academic types. I would like to add one item. When I came to the University, I had come from an \_\_\_\_\_ background. When I started art school, art schools gave certificates. They did not give diplomas.

Q. Degree.

A. Degrees, yeah. During the war, all the art schools converted to bachelor programs. So when you gave out Bachelor of Arts programs following the War. Now, coming to the University I did a great deal of research about the origins of universities, about the origins of academic cap and gown. And so I was fascinated by the academic ceremonies, the various colorful gowns, and various

universities. And for a printmaker, having gowns that were predominantly black with colored adornments, played right into my role as a printmaker who primarily worked in black and white. And so I found that teaching was both stimulating, a great learning process for me to develop as an artist, and also I found that I was a very effective teacher.

Q. What was the response of the administration to your academic satire?

A. Later on, I should say that when I first came, Howard Bevis was the President. He was succeeded by Novice Fawcett. And Novice Fawcett was appointed by, I think, a non-academic [group] of people downtown ...

Q. Trustees of the University?

A. Trustees of the University, who were fairly conservative and took the opinions of the downtown leaders, the newspaper people in particular, very, very seriously. And I found myself making more and more pointedly satirical comments in my work. I had a good friend in Kenny Krouse, President's Assistant.

Q. So you're referring to Ken Krouse?

A. Yes.

Q. K-r-o-u-s-e.

A. Anyway, by that time I had a very well-established printmaking program going in the new art building next to Hayes called Hopkins Hall. And I began noticing a very well-dressed, short individual coming by and poking his head into our printmaking studio. So one day I invited him in to see what we were doing. Turned out that he was Ken Krouse, who was a special administrative assistant to President Fawcett. And so, I asked him what his function was, and he explained

that he was at the administration building, and if I wanted to know what he did, I should come to the President's office the following day, and he would reveal his role. So I went to the President's office and Ken Krouse met me. The first thing he did was introduce me to President Fawcett as Professor Chafetz. And Novice Fawcett said, "I'm very happy to meet you. I regard you as my loyal opposition." I said, "President Fawcett, my prints are not directed at you personally. I just feel we can become a better University. And all of my work is directed to that end." And so we shook hands and Ken said, "Now I'll show you what I do." So he went to his office next to the President's and it was vast. He sat behind a big desk on a swivel chair. And behind him on the wall was a huge photographic mural of the University campus. And so Ken reached into his drawer, pulled out a pointed dart, threw it over his shoulder towards the mural, and he said, "Wherever that dart lands, that's where I go each day. My job is to be the eyes and ears of the University. I go downtown several times a week and I talk to people. I ask them what they are thinking about what the University is doing." And there were some very tough political times under Bevis – there had been a professor in one of the sciences who had taken the Fifth Amendment in a congressional hearing and was abruptly fired.

Q. Who was that?

A. I think it was a Professor [Byron] Darling in Chemistry or one of the sciences.

Q. Were you here at that time?

A. I was here at the time.

Q. What was the response on the campus?

A. The response was feeble protests. Very disorganized protests. We also had a faculty member, I believe there were loyalty oaths at the time, who refused to take a loyalty oath. Many of us regarded this as a stupid request because if any of us were Communists we would gladly have signed falsely. But we had been to the war and we were good Americans. So during the Fawcett regime, we had a crisis with free speech.

Q. We'll get to that in a minute. Let me just ask you one more question about your work. What is the significance of Mickey Mouse in your work?

A. Mickey Mouse. I had come from an art school background, not a university background. And I had heard students talk about Mickey Mouse courses. And I wondered, "What are Mickey Mouse courses?" And I was told, these are courses you take and you're guaranteed a high passing grade because no intellectual involvement is involved. And so I thought, "My goodness, if we have courses such as this, this should be part of the academic cap and gown routine, substituting the mortar board with a Mickey Mouse cap." I had never heard that expression before.

Q. One of the probably more intimate tales about the School of Art at Ohio State was the failure to grant tenure to Roy Lichtenstein, who went on to become one of the great artists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. What were the circumstances/

A. Roy Lichtenstein was a very well-regarded teacher and artist. He was an instructor along with Chuck Csuri and Miles Gibbons and others. And he was a devotee of Hoyt Sherman. Very vocal in his support that Hoyt should be the Director of the School of \_\_\_\_\_ Applied Art to replace Hoyt Sherman.

Q. To replace [James] Hopkins.

A. To replace Hopkins, yes. Now his outspokenness hurt Seiberling and when it came time for either keeping Roy and promoting him as an Assistant Professor or denying him that promotion, Frank Seiberling simply said, "No, I cannot have anyone who is not supportive of me as Director." I had been away in 1949 and '50. I had had that Fulbright in France. When I came back, both Roy Lichtenstein and Stanley Twardowicz asked me to go to the College Road cafeteria and have a cup of coffee with them. Each showed me a letter from Frank Seiberling. Each letter said pretty much the same thing with a small change. Stan Twardowicz had been hired during the War years to replace some of the male faculty, and he was "a real artist." He didn't wear a suit and tie. He wore a T-shirt and blue jeans. He was gruff. He had an art school background but no college background. But his work was excellent.

Q. Was he a painter or a printer?

A. He was a painter. Stanley was a painter. But anyway, the faculty didn't like Stan because of his dress and behavior, which they thought was uncivilized. Anyway, over the cup of coffee each showed me the letter from Seiberling. The letter to Stan said, "Because you are a true artist, this environment is no longer appropriate for you. We wish you well. Goodbye and good luck. Sincerely, Frank Seiberling, Director." Roy's letter said, "Because you are not a true artist, the Ohio State University is not the appropriate place for you."

- Q. Let me just get one thing clear. Hopkins had been the Director and he retired. And both Irwin Frey and Hoyt Sherman wanted to become Director, and the faculty lined up supporting each of them. Is that correct?
- A. The faculty mainly supported Hoyt.
- Q. But Donald Cottrell decided that neither one of them should get the job and brought in Seiberling.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Temporarily or permanently?
- A. Permanently.
- Q. So why was there still conflict? Was it still a question of somebody replacing Seiberling.
- A. Many of the faculty would go continuously to see the Dean and say, “We want to replace Frank Seiberling.” Dean Cottrell called a faculty meeting of the school and said, “There is no way that Hoyt Sherman will become Director of the School. I absolutely proscribe ...”
- Q. Why?
- A. Because he felt he was a contentious and unsuitable person for that kind of position. So at that point Donald was appointed temporary chairman while a search for a new director took place. And then Severino came in as Director.
- Q. All right. And how long did he last?
- A. Severino lasted a couple of years when the Dean took him into the College of Education to become his Associate Dean. And then we went through a very long

- period of turmoil until Jerry Hausman was appointed Director. And Jerry had a long tenure, until the break up of the school.
- Q. Before we get to that, there is a picture of you among several faculty members picketing at the University. I can't tell which building it is. What happened there?
- A. Well, the free speech issue came to a very divisive moment at the University. Several of us faculty from various ...
- Q. Well, first explain what the free speech issue is.
- A. Well, I forget which speaker at the time. It seemed to me a history, a prominent historian.
- Q. Is this [Herbert] Aptheker?
- A. No, no, well before the Communists were invited. I forget. But anyway, a very prominent historian was invited. And *The [Columbus] Dispatch* ran a campaign against inviting controversial speakers. And so the administration disinvited the speaker.
- Q. Was there a rule? Did the University have a rule?
- A. No. And the faculty, some of the faculty said, "We have to honor freedom of speech, the free of expression of ideas on the campus."
- Q. This was in the mid-'60s.
- A. Yes. In 1965, a crisis occurred. The administration disinvited a speaker who had been invited by the History Department. I don't believe the speaker was in any way Communist or anti-American. But he was considered controversial. Some of us felt that the University is based on the freedom of expression, the free

exchange of ideas. So a call went out to picket the administration building. And so I went out at the time and carried a sign as did my colleague John Wynn and several other faculty, Hugo Becker from the Department of German, Professor [Glenn] Goodman from German, several other people. I remember those names because they were in a picture that was taken by *The Dispatch* that I made a print of. Somebody, I don't know who, tore out the clipping and wrote, "Thinking of you," and so I made a print of that news photo plus the markings of *The Dispatch* and the writing. It was an anonymous letter. So I made a negative and positive photo image of that event. Well, that prompted a crisis on campus, where the faculty had to vote on whether to retain the President. So the Armory, which no longer exists, was the site of a very contentious all-University faculty [meeting], where an up and down vote of confidence was being held. The University recruited all of the Agriculture College faculty, Extension [Service] people, and the vote was very close, with the University faculty opposing the President's view was defeated.

Q. Opposing the President's removal.

A. Yes. So it was upheld. The President's tenure was upheld.

Q. And then what happened?

A. Then what happened, there was, I believe, a Committee of Alternatives was formed. And this committee contributed to buy an advertisement in the student paper, *The Lantern*, that ran every week, that simply stressed the fact that our belief that the University is a place where free exchange of ideas should take place. And we maintained that for several years.

- Q. During your tenure, the School of Art separated from the College of Education and became a series of departments in the College of the Arts. Who were the leading figures and what was the reasoning for doing this? Was there sentiment to maintain the status quo? Who wanted the change?
- A. Well, Hoyt Sherman told the studio faculty that Ohio University and several other universities, [such as] Miami [University] of Ohio, had Colleges of the Arts. And there was no reason we should be a part of the College of Education. And we thought that was a very logical proposal, that we have a separate College of the Arts, because art and music were two separate schools and could easily justify being a college. In the meantime, the entire University was being reorganized.
- Q. This was in the late 1960s.
- A. This was in the late 1960s. For example, anthropology was taken out of the College of Commerce and put into the Colleges of Arts and Sciences. So the proposal went through. However, some people in the Art History area felt that they had a separate function. They were historians first, and art historians second. And they should be part of the Department of History. History had European history and Contemporary History. They should also have Art History. Frank Ludden was one of the leading proponents of that.
- Q. What was his reasoning?
- A. His reasoning was, art is art, and history is history. And studio artists are not in the same intellectual group within a university as historians are. And many of us felt this was arrogant and denigrating to those of us who were involved in creating art and teaching art. But Frank was very persistent in calling for a complete

separation. Well, as it turned out, we did become a College of the Arts. There were two directors of two schools of music and art. Jerry Hausman had an excellent record as a very wise director, who governed fairly, evenly. And the director of the School of Music, I can't recall his name at the moment, [Harold Luce] were each considered to be candidates of the Dean of the newly formed College of the Arts. When the Dean of the School of Music was chosen, Jerry Hausman left to go to NYU on a research professorship, and we became a contentious faculty during this time, searching for a new Director.

Q. I believe you mean a new Chairman now, because you were no longer an individual school. So you were looking for a new Chairman. Of the Department of Art. Is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. Okay. Let me ask you, you had very high regard for Jerry Hausman, the leader of the school. What was your feeling about him leaving?

A. Well, I was really disturbed because from my point of logic, with two large units, a School of Music and School of Art, each having a Director, and the Director of Music being appointed the Dean of the new college, I assumed that the logical choice would be to name Jerry Hausman as the Associate Dean. Instead, the Director of the Marching Band was named Associate Dean, and I really got very, very angry. And I wrote an intemperate article in the Columbus Design publication that the appointment of the Associate Dean being a marching band director, was absolutely insulting and unfair. The newly appointed Director of the School of Music came to see me while doing the publication and demanded that I

apologize. I told him I had nothing to apologize for and to leave my studio, which he did, very, very angry at me. Well, after Jerry left, the Dean brought in a one-year Chair whose mission was to get the studio faculty to think in terms of consensus, that our decision shouldn't have to be worth dying for. We had to reach reasonable compromises in our choices.

Q. The Dean of the College of the Arts was [Lee] Rigsby. Was that his name?

A. Yes. Rigsby proved to be an inadequate Dean. There were many questions of his evading tenure questions within the Department. He finally left for the University of Texas Tech, I believe, and was replaced by Dr. Bruinsma, who was a music man, I believe, from southern Illinois. And he was a very effective Dean, who left and was succeeded by Andy Broekema, who became an excellent Dean during his tenure. Well, Tom Moran, our sculptor, became our Chair and had a short tenure.

Q. Do you know what year that was?

A. I don't. Frank Ruzicka came from the Parsons Institute in New York, and he had a short tenure, and was replaced by Bob Shay from our ceramics faculty, who proved to be an effective Chairman for a long time. Now, I have to go back and tell you about Jerry Hausman. I thought Jerry Hausman was unfairly singled out for my sins. Recently Jerry Hausman told me that the administration blamed him for allowing me to exhibit my academic satires. Now I remember that the administration had probably good cause. When Fawcett was appointed, I made a print based on Braggles the blind leading the blind, showing an academic procession with a horse's ass in academic cap and gown leading a procession of

sheep and crippled other creatures. I called that “Story without Words titled in French (histras paroles??). I don’t know why I got used to using French titles. Anyway, both John Corbally and Ned Moulton came to view the academic satires with me. I pointed out one wood cut titled, “Men of Good Will” that truly represented my faith in the University, that professors were basically honest, passionate about their field of discipline, and excellent colleagues. However, I had the most direct satire on Fawcett showing someone who strongly resembled him dressed in academic gown, but with an Uncle Sam’s cap on his head, seated on a cow saying, “The University is me” (then something in French). Thinking back now, some of my stuff was not benign.

Q. You mentioned that during the time that people were thinking of how to create the College of the Arts and where everybody fit, that some of the faculty, at least the studio faculty and the art historians were in conflict. Is this sort of universal in academic circles?

A. I don’t believe so. Other art departments get along very, very well with their colleagues in non-studio fields, such as history and education, but ours was unique in its contentiousness. Frank Ludden was a leading proponent of separating the Art History department, the Art History area from the studio department. He arrogantly proclaimed that historians are foremost intellectuals, while artists are people who create stuff that may or may not have importance.

Q. Were his colleagues in Art History supporting him in that?

A. His colleagues may have supported him but he was out front in speaking for complete separation.

Q. What about the leadership of the Art Department following the change? Who was the chairman? We went through this, didn't we? I think we did. Bob Stull.

A. When Bob Stull came in as Chair, after a couple of years he was made an Associate Dean and we had a succession of people, Tom Moran, who was a sculptor from Rhode Island School of Design, came in. And Frank Ruzicka came in as Chair. And he had a short, contentious tenure. And finally, the faculty chose Bob Shay, one of our ceramics professors as the Chair, and he was an excellent Chair.

Q. You were on campus during the student uprisings of the 1970s. How did you handle that? What was it like?

A. Well, it was a terrible time. [James] Rhodes was the Governor at that time. And following Nixon's tough on crime dictums, he wanted to shut down student protests on campus. At that time, we had gates on Neil Avenue. Iron gates that could be closed off campus. And he brought the state police in to close off the campus when there were student protests. And he also barricaded Fifteenth and High, and all the other entrances to the campus. So many students were unaware of the closing off of the campus. Many students in the Art Department, for example, were working in their studios and completely unaware of the shutdown. And so when they came out, they were fired at with rubber bullets and tear gas. And the scene at Ohio State was terrible but compared to what happened at Kent State, it obviously wasn't as severe. The faculty then selected a Committee of Alternatives. We wore green ribbons on our outside clothing and we tried to calm students down, tell them we would support them in their protests, but we would

try to do it peacefully. That going up against the police and state police was futile, because they had weapons and our students did not. It was a fearsome time.

Q. Did you continue your classes?

A. The University closed down for several days while this Commission was ameliorated. Several students who had been in the building working and unaware, when they came out of the building, were arrested. And it was a terrible time and when the Kent State killings took place, it was a shameful few days in American academic life.

Q. You were on campus during the tenure of several Presidents of Ohio State, from [Howard L.] Bevis through, what, Gordon Gee? I believe you were there for Bevis, [Novice G.] Fawcett, [Harold L.] Enarson and [Edward H.] Jennings. What was different about the campus during those administrations?

A. After Fawcett retired and was replaced by Enarson, the University experienced a much-needed period of quiet, growth and progress. He was succeeded by Ed Jennings, who also proved to be a very able leader of the University.

Q. Over all, if you could compare Ohio State, let's say in 1948 when you came, '48 or '49, to the University of the '80s when you retired, what were the key differences?

A. Well, when I retired the University had experienced tremendous expansion. Physical plants mushroomed all over campus. New classrooms, new facilities. And the faculty got younger, and, I think, improved considerably. When I came

there had been quite a bit of inbreeding. At that time it seemed the faculty was comprised of Ohio State University graduates.

Q. In the School of Art or throughout?

A. Throughout the University. I belonged to a campus-wide faculty organization, and I was surprised how many of my colleagues in that organization were proud Ohio State graduates, and were teaching in the fields in which they had majored. And, in fact, I was the first non-OSU graduate to be granted tenure in the Art Department.

Q. Anything else, so size and quality and faculty that you think made the biggest difference? When you came, I believe there was a Ph.D. in art?

A. Yes.

Q. What happened to that?

A. We had the only studio Ph.D. in the nation and it was a source of pride to some of the older faculty, senior faculty. However, those of us who had come from the outside questioned the validity of the Ph.D. in studio, since we argued that criticizing art is a subjective. And we looked at the doctoral exhibitions and we were disappointed in the quality, the ineptitude of so much of the work. A lot of the research was done in Art History, but painting and ceramics were the fields in which, and sculpture, were the fields in which the degree was awarded. All told, there were less than forty degrees granted.

Q. Forty Ph.D.s.

A. Forty Ph.D.s granted. And the majority of our graduates went to very small institutions which needed to show Ph.D.s to gain some credibility. So many of us

new faculty challenged maintaining the degree. And we were told, “Keep your hands off this. This is something that our faculty has and we don’t want to question it.”

Q. But it was eventually dropped.

A. We dropped it by simply forcing a resolution through the faculty saying that we will no longer offer the Ph.D. program in studio for the following academic year. And we kept on renewing that resolution until eventually it was dropped out of the academic catalog.

Q. Another thing that was dropped over the years was courses in weaving, courses in jewelry making. How did that all happen?

A. Well, there was a period under Bob Shay’s leadership in which he questioned the role of craft in the studio department. And this was strange, because he himself was a \_\_\_\_\_. However, we usually associated the ceramics department with utility wear as well as decorative works, small sculptures and so forth. However, Bob was doing casting – high-heeled shoes in porcelain, ladies shoes. And he was very, very contemporary minded. And through his leadership, both weaving, which was a bread-and-butter course in terms of enrollment. I think we had a large room full of several looms. And the enrollment from home economics as well as art students, was always filled. And jewelry had an excellent facility, was taught by a well-trained professor who had done graduate work under Danish craftsmen. And this whole facility was dropped. In fact, after I retired, I had to go and meet with the faculty and defend the retention of print making in the curriculum, stating the long history and the tradition of print making, and that you

could not disassociate that element of image making from painting or from sculpture. And I think the faculty recognized my passion and we still have print making, although it is no longer the program that I had established.

Q. This is Saturday, March 11. You wanted to say a little bit more about the University's response to your work. What was that?

A. In April of 1963, I had an exhibition of academic satires called, "University Views." I realized quite later that the University administration was very much offended by the exhibition because it was very heavy satire as I look back on it now. There were references to cow colleges, Mickey Mouse courses, and inane faculty meetings. Much of this was inspired by the School of Art at the time being part of the College of Education. We used to attend the College of Education meetings and the meetings themselves lent themselves to absurd comedy satire. And I could not resist making images based on sitting through these very, very dull repetitive inane meetings. I often wondered why the College of Education never seemed to address the problems of society and the schools. At that time, Columbus was a very heavily segregated school system and the black students were routinely put into black schools, and nobody ever doubted that there could ever be change. I always felt that minority students were treated with a great deal of condescension. I also was offended by the buildup of the administration beauracacy. The lack of University faculty input into any of these appointments I thought was really not quite the way a University should be operated.

Q. What appointments are you talking about?

A. I'm talking about appointments to administrative assistants in the president's office, appointments to the provost office. These were based not on faculty input it seemed, but just merely for the convenience of the President's office.

Q. You're talking about the 1960s now?

A. Yes, I'm talking about the 1960s. Also at that time there was a great many departures from the University at large. The California education system was expanding, and it seemed that the English Department en masse departed for San Diego. And Bob Elliott and several others from the department, together with their promising graduate students, left to staff the new university in San Diego. Also people who left who became prominent while they were here, and left for other positions, were Harvey Mansfield from Political Science, David Spitz, and Harvey Goldberg from History. Kurt Wolff from Sociology, Andy Sessler from Physics, who later became the head of the [Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory]. I was dismayed that the University let so many of these people go. But let me say, too, that I was happy to be able to finish my career here at Ohio State, which has been a productive time for me, and hopefully for the many students that came under my tutelage.

Q. You were involved with the Logan Elm Press. Can you tell us about it? First of all, what was the Logan Elm Press?

A. The Logan Elm Press was a book arts and paper-making facility that was devoted to producing fine art books, \_\_\_\_\_ and also ephemera broadsides, posters, etc., printed from hand-set type on hand-made papers made at the press. The Press came about because Ken Marantz, who was head of the Art Ed Department,

was very much interested in book making, and particularly in children's books. And so he sponsored the idea of the Logan Elm Press initially. And it had a long successful tenure until Ken retired from the head of the Art Education Department. At that point, the Art Ed people said, "Look, we're art educators. We're not into the business of producing fine books and paper." And so the Press looked around for a new sponsor. Eventually, it came under the umbrella of the University Press and Peter Givler. But Peter Givler at that time was also being threatened with the loss of the University Press. And so he could no longer sponsor us. Well, [after] a 13-year tenure, I believe, the University finally suspended operations at the Logan Elm Press, where the new Provost was appointed by President Gee. And he saw this unit without any academic umbrella and simply got rid of the operation, closed it down.

Q. Can you tell us some of the things that the Logan Elm Press did publish, whether it was with you or other people?

A. Yes. The Press was directed very ably by Robert Tauber, who was an MFA in print making under my tutelage. Also, I was also the resident wood cutter and illustrator. During that tenure we also had works commissioned by Barry Moser, Naoko Matsubara, Kiki Smith, David McCauley, who were among the many well-known artists and illustrators who did work at the Press. Among the retirees were, who were volunteers at the Press, were Dr. Ralph Rosenblum from Dentistry and Robert Boyce from Journalism. It was an active and exciting program.

Q. During your time at the College of the Arts and the Art Department, many notable artists came as visiting artists. Who were they and what did they do?

A. Well, when the print program was given the okay to get started, I went to the Graduate School and asked Everett Walters for some seed money to bring attention to the print program. And he gave us \$900 in the summer of 1959 to bring in artists, well-known artists, such as Stanely Hayter, Misch Kohn, Fred Becker, and Carol Summers. It was a town-and-gown open workshop affair and created a lot of interest in print making. Got us off to a very good start. The Art Department also had a very ongoing visiting artist program. Malcolm Morley, for example, taught for a full year with us. Other artists who presented presentations and critiques were Munakata [Shiko].

Q. Who was Munakata?

A. [He] is a world-famous Japanese print maker who was declared a national treasure in his lifetime by the Emperor. Others who came were Dan Flavin, Roy Lichtenstein, and an ongoing list of continuing well-known productive artists.

Q. You included the sculptor David Smith.

A. Yes, David Smith was one of the visiting artists who not only lectured but came around to the classes and worked with our drawing students. My mind does not recall so many of them. I know who they are but I can't put a name on them.