

March 7-10, 2002

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

Responses to questions posed by Robert Butche

To

John E. Corbally, formerly Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

And

Member of the College of Education Faculty, 1955-1969

1. To what degree did your father's career in education attract you to that field? It was an extremely important factor in my career choice. It really meant that I had grown up in a university atmosphere, admired the work that my Dad did, and had little doubt that the field of education would be my career.

2. What motivated you to write about non-pedagogical matters, writing instead about school board-community relations, in your Ph. D. dissertation at Berkeley? By the time of my graduate work, I was certain that I would be involved in education as a school administrator either in being one or in being in a faculty that prepared school administrators. School board community relationships are important factors in educational administration and in 1955 the general topic of school-community relations was a "hot" topic in education. Accordingly I was drawn to the topic and to a research method known as the "critical incident technique" which was designed to isolate the most critical elements in an interaction. I had written about pupil failure in my Master's thesis, which I finished while I was a classroom teacher, but by 1955 I was out of the classroom, and in the principal's office.

3. How did you happen to come to Ohio State in 1955? There were a number of faculty positions in 1955 at which I looked. It finally boiled down to assistant professorships at Minnesota and at Ohio State. Ohio State had a Kellogg grant which, coincidentally, focused on school-community relations. My major adviser at Berkeley knew the faculty members at both Minnesota and Ohio State and he was particularly impressed with Roald Campbell and John Ramseyer. It was his view that Ohio State would be my best choice. With the grant, his recommendation, and my general impressions of the campus and of the people, I chose Ohio State.

4. What was the state of school administration studies at Ohio State at that time? Ohio State was a leader in the field. Ward Reeder and Hy Lewis were two pioneers in the field and had established Ohio State as a leader. They both retired in the early 1950's, but they had recruited Roald Campbell and John Ramseyer who were continuing the leadership role. Arch Heck was in the final years of his career as a leader in personnel administration. Roald and John were carving out a new approach to the field - more

science-based than based on experience and anecdotes - and were perceived by their colleagues at other institutions as leaders. With the Kellogg grant there was some budgetary flexibility to work with school boards and other community groups. The graduate student group was excellent - quite a few students and of high quality. It was a great and exciting place for a new assistant professor to get a start.

5. What are your recollections of John Ramseyer? 6. What are your recollections of Roald Campbell, John Ramseyer, T.J. Jenson and others you worked with in the College of Education?

John Ramseyer was a great colleague, mentor, and friend. His wife, along with Della Campbell, was a wonderful source of strength for new families coming to the Department and we became close friends of the entire Ramseyer and Campbell families. He was a very quiet man -- in contrast to Roald Campbell --, but a very persistent man. Students admired both Roald and John, but when they had some kind of real problem they would go to John for help. Roald and John were a great team -- they could disagree, argue out points of difference, and come up with good solutions. They had great relations with workers in the field of education in Ohio and elsewhere and made the department a valued asset in Ohio. Roald had to work hard sometimes to deal with a tendency toward temper, but he did a good job of mastering that tendency. I am sure that some people found him to be quite fearsome. Fred Staub, Walter Hack, and I arrived in the Department around the same time. Ted Jenson came in later and was an interesting addition to the faculty because he had spent most of his professional life as a successful school administrator and he brought a lot of reality to the program. The entire group was a most congenial group. Our families did quite a bit together; our children grew up knowing each other quite well; and it was an exciting and pleasant place for professional work. It was a real challenge because we knew that we were on the cutting edge of a major change in the teaching of educational administration and our work was quite visible among our colleagues at other institutions. The loss of John Ramseyer too early was a real loss to the work and to the group.

I should mention that there were some fascinating people in the College of Education when I arrived there. Harold Fawcett, Hank Hullfish, Harold Alberty, Ruth Streitz, and Earl Anderson are among those that stand out in my memory as real leaders in the Ohio State College of Education and in the professional world both nationally and internationally. It was an exciting, never boring, introduction to the academic life for me.

7. By 1960 you began to develop interests outside the college, and academic life, as you moved into university administration. What do you recall of this period of transition?

In a real sense, starting in 1958 opportunities began to arise to broaden my role at Ohio State. It was not so much that I developed new interests, as it was that I followed the new opportunities that came to me. The first was around 1958 when I was asked by Don Cottrell (Dean of the College) to assume a new position as Coordinator of Field Studies in the College of Education. It was a part time position and was to be equivalent to an assistant deanship. I am not sure that either Don or I knew exactly what this position was, but the general idea was to foster the outreach of the College into the educational systems outside of the University. I have few memories of this position except that it gave me the opportunity to work closely with two other assistant deans -- Ross Mooney and Paul Klohr -- and with Don Cottrell. I continued teaching and working

in the educational administration area and did manage to get a flavor of academic administration.

Then in 1959, President Fawcett invited me to his office for some conversation and indicated that he had been impressed with my remarks at the Faculty Council (I had been elected to the Council in 1957, I believe) and had inquired about my work with some school administrators in Ohio with whom I had been working. He asked me if I would be interested in becoming the Director of Personnel Budgets at Ohio State and indicated that Sam Beitler was leaving that position soon to return to the College of Engineering. By this time I had decided that I enjoyed doing administration more than I enjoyed teaching about it and the opportunity to work in the central administration in the President's Office seemed too good to pass up. President Fawcett indicated that he had talked to Dean Cottrell about this possibility and that he had his reluctant approval. So, here was another opportunity and I took advantage of it.

8. In 1959 you accepted the position of Director of Personnel Budgets under President Fawcett. Did this prove to be an especially challenging beginning to your administrative career at Ohio State? It was a challenging position, but I was young and confident and did not find the challenges too great. We were transferring the budget system at Ohio State to the computers from what was a hand typed system. The computers did not favorably impress the people in my new office and we did have some difficult days in the transition. I had great support from President Fawcett and from some of my new colleagues in central administration. Bob Ringer who directed the payroll system and I worked closely together as did L. C. Stephens who directed the civil service system that existed at Ohio State for non-faculty staff. John Mount was a great source of information and of help. I did find that working with all of the deans of the colleges (they were responsible for completing college budgets within guidelines which were formulated centrally, primarily by President Fawcett, Vice President Carson, and me) was the greatest challenge of all. Some of the deans were excellent administrators and had little difficulty with the complexities of budget development and others had little or no management experience or in a few cases, interest and had a great deal of trouble getting their budgets completed. I also found it difficult working with Fred Heimberger, Vice President for Academic Affairs, because he refused to have anything to do with budgets even though it is obvious that budget decisions are crucial in shaping the academic programs of an institution. The position was also an excellent way to learn about the entire institution because it involved the entire institution from every academic college and department to every support unit from the Library to Physical Plant.

My wife and I also began to notice that my new role in the central administration changed our relationships with many of our faculty colleagues. We were beginning to be a part of "the administration" and we seemed to be viewed slightly differently than we had been when we were in and of the faculty. My daily contacts with the College and the Department no longer existed and a somewhat uncomfortable distance began to emerge. This change did not take place with our close colleagues and their families in the educational administration program. Roy Larmee, who joined the faculty around 1958, and his wife were particularly close and continued to be as long as Roy lived. Dorothy still lives in Columbus, but is a victim of Alzheimer's disease. Our relationships with Roald, John, Fred Staub, Walter Hack, and Ted Jenson continued to be strong, but other

College relationships grew distant. We discovered as our career went on that this separation is a key fact of academic administration and needs to be recognized by those who choose to enter the field.

9. What is your recollection of the Speakers Rule controversy at Ohio State? The Speaker's Rule was a cold war product that existed at Ohio State before I arrived in 1955. It banned Communists from having any speaking platform on the campus. A key difficulty with the rule -even if it had made substantive sense -- was that it was impossible to tell who was a Communist unless a person admitted to the fact. To administer the rule, then, one would have to determine if a proposed speaker was a Communist -- a determination which depended upon rumor, finger pointing, unsubstantiated charges, and firm denials. The substantive problem, which was well illustrated by a student event, was that the writings of known and admitted Communists were readily available in the University Library. The students invited Herbert Aptheker, one of the few admitted Communists on the lecture circuit, to come to University Hall to stand silently while a student ran across the street to the Library, took out one of Aptheker's books, and ran back to the lecture hall to read from the book while Aptheker stood by silently. This performance continued until we received a threatening phone call in the President's Office from an irate citizen who indicated that he was on his way to the campus to shoot "the Commie." When I informed Mr. Aptheker of the threat made he decided that the point was made and ended his appearance.

President Fawcett disagreed with the Rule on both substantive and procedural grounds, but he also had a policy that he would not take a matter to the Board until he was sure that his recommendation would pass. The Rule was a Board rule and could not be amended or dropped without Board approval. President Fawcett could not count enough votes to change the Rule so he let it stand without any visible effort to make changes. This led the campus to believe that he favored the Rule and I urged him to make a recommendation so that the campus would see that it was the Board, not him, that was continuing to support the rule. He did not do that and the controversy dragged on until changes were made finally which allowed Communists to speak as long as there was time for a rebuttal and for questions and discussion. The controversy was unfortunate because the Rule was bad, President Fawcett's apparent inaction created a negative view of him on the part of faculty and students, and the Rule created a focal point for a whole variety of real and imagined problems raised by both faculty and students. The support of the Rule by the Board and most notably by John Bricker created a negative view of the Board members on the part of faculty and staff when, in fact, while I was at Ohio State the Board was made up of strong individuals who were supportive of the University and of almost every proposal put before them for constructive change. While I did not follow the matter after I left Ohio State, I believe that the whole idea of controlling who could speak on the campus slowly sank into oblivion.

10. The Fawcett administration was made all the more difficult by open, but often covert, opposition from a vocal group that met daily at the Faculty Club. This group included Vice President Fred Heimberger and Alumni Association President Jack

Fullen, Graduate School Dean Richard Armitage and others from several colleges. To what degree did such groups or opposition complicate, enrich or weaken the Fawcett administration? 11. Were there other detractors of Dr. Fawcett or his administration? Who were they, and what, if any, impact did these detractors have on the University? The Faculty Club group (which sat around a couch in the lounge of the Club after eating lunch) was a sort of old-timers club that was irreverent to almost everything they observed. In and of itself, this group had no real influence and much of what they did and said was for their own entertainment. Several of them did not like nor admire President Fawcett, but the group itself disliked most figures of authority.

The difficult opposition came from individuals and mostly from Fred Heimberger and Jack Fullen. The Academic Vice President in a university is the faculty's person in central administration (a fact which makes my subsequent appointment to that position upon the recommendation of the Faculty Advisory Committee all the more amazing.) Fred Heimberger felt that Novice Fawcett, a school superintendent without an earned doctorate, was not a fit person to head an institution such as Ohio State. Accordingly he seemed to have decided that he would not participate in Nov's administration, but instead would play a constant role of critic. Because the position is viewed by the faculty as "their position", an incumbent is virtually untouchable by even the president of the university so President Fawcett was left with a disloyal person in what is supposed to be the second most important position in a university. Jack Fullen was elected to his position by the Board of Directors of the Alumni Association and was completely independent of the administration of the University. I am not certain just why Jack Fullen disliked President Fawcett so heartily although there were strong rumors that Jack was prepared to become President if asked after Howard Bevis retired. In any event, Jack and Fred formed an untouchable team that second guessed every action of President Fawcett, criticized him at every opportunity (remember that Jack had his own magazine -- the Alumni magazine -- which he controlled completely and which went to thousands of Ohio State alums), and did not ever raise a finger to assist in difficult situations.

While these individuals and some other detractors made life difficult for President Fawcett and his administration, they did not impede the progress of the University. It was a difficult political time in Ohio for higher education, the Ohio Board of Regents was established to "control" the universities, budgets were tight, and yet Ohio State fared well during the turmoil. The efforts to deal with student dissent, with the Viet Nam situation, with the aspirations of minority students would have been much easier with strong support from the Office of Academic Affairs and from the Alumni Association, but even without that support we managed to deal with them as well or better than many institutions. President Fawcett developed strong relationships with the members of the Ohio State University Development Fund (major donors) and their support offset some of the continuing criticism from the Alumni Association.

I guess in sum I would say that these detractors and particularly those from whom one has a right to expect either loyalty or departure made a difficult job more difficult, but did not play a major role in the real affairs of the University. In many ways Fred Heimberger and Jack Fullen lost their opportunities to play major roles and to be remembered as pillars of the University rather than to be somewhat lost in the history of the Fawcett administration.

12. To what degree do you recall the ongoing conflict between President Fawcett and Trustee John Bricker over the Speakers Rule? John Bricker was a staunch conservative who was a firm believer in the principle that Communists had no right to access to students on an American, tax-supported, university campus. He was, therefore, a believer in the Speakers Rule. As I indicated earlier, Novice Fawcett, as a matter of administrative policy, did not force trustees to take votes on matters where he believed his views would not prevail. While I was not privy to private conversations between Nov and John Bricker, I know that there were many and that John was unyielding. It was also clear that John was not the only Trustee with that view and it was equally clear that Governor Rhodes was supporting the Rule with the Trustees (most of whom he had appointed.) The conflict, then, was not really between two men but between two conflicting views and Nov did not choose to push his view against the overwhelming view of the Board of Trustees. (I still believe that he should have pushed that view and had my own opportunity to do that at Syracuse where I lost an attempt to establish faculty control over the athletics program, but in losing ultimately raised the noise level to a point where the Board had to make the change the faculty and I wanted.)

13. How do you recall your working and personal relationships with President Fawcett? Novice Fawcett is one of the three most important men in my life along with my dad and Edgar Morphet who was my major adviser in my doctoral work at Berkeley. He and I became a great team. We were both educational administrators and former teachers and had many life experiences in common. He understood politics and fund raising much better than I did and I understood the faculty much better than he did. He was a masterful administrator and if you demonstrated some ability he delegated responsibility to you and let you go your way. He supported me as I learned the business and, while we had some great private disagreements, he never differed with me in public. He permitted me to become the spokesperson for the administration on campus and did not second-guess me as I worked my way through a variety of conflicts and confrontations. He was my professional mentor and he and his family were great friends to my family and me. There were some major conflicts on campus when it seemed that the Fawcett's and Corbally's were almost totally isolated and we survived those times together due to our admiration and affection for each other. He had told me when I came over to central administration to be the Director of Personnel Budgets that he was going to prepare me to be a university president. When the time came for me to go and try that role, we both regretted the necessity of separation, but he gave me a good shove and I was off on my own.

14. Your many years as President of the University of Illinois give you special insight into the issues facing the Chief Executive Officer of a major university. What do you see as the major successes of the Fawcett administration at Ohio State? On the management side, Nov developed budgetary systems which placed the academic rather than the business officers in the predominate role. If Fred Heimberger had wanted to cooperate, he could have been the author of the shift from the power of the business office to the power of the academic office. He chose not to do that and so I was able to be the author. But without the strong support of the President who withstood pressures from the business side, the shift would not have taken place. Nov was an excellent political

operative and maintained the legislative and executive support of Ohio State during some difficult times. (I now know that times are always difficult.) Nov built the Development Fund as a source of private support for Ohio State from a somewhat insignificant activity to a strong and major source of both funding and political support. He accomplished this fact in spite of the opposition of the Alumni Association, which did not view fundraising as a responsibility of such an organization.

On the academic side, Nov fostered the development of the University College to deal with some major problems of enrollment, the development of the branch campuses that assisted in both enrollment and political support, and supported my efforts to reorganize the College of Arts and Sciences into more manageable units. He generated support for capital projects which laid the foundation for the greatly expanded medical programs at Ohio State, which created the foundation for a greatly expanded set of programs in veterinary medicine, and which created the agricultural campus on the west side of the Olentangy River. He worked hard to foster continuing education activities and it is fitting that the continuing education center be named in his honor. With the leadership of John Herrick, Ohio State developed one of the pioneer offices of campus planning and the growth of the University since the days of Novice Fawcett still follows the procedures and many of the plans developed by John.

15. Applying the same standards of judgment, were there areas where Ohio State was noticeably weak or ineffectual in its administration in the period 1960-1969?

While I mentioned the University College and the branches as accomplishments -- which they were -- it is clear from hindsight that the University should have been actively fostering the development of a community college system in Ohio. In Illinois and in Washington, I have observed the degree to which a strong community college system assists young people in deciding what they want to do and why in their postsecondary education. Ohio State could have concentrated more on its role as a major, comprehensive, [and] research university, had there been a strong community college system in Ohio.

Had we taken the Speakers Rule head on we might have solved that problem earlier and even if we had not been able to prevail we would have increased our credibility with faculty and students. Academically, we probably did not push the social sciences and the liberal arts as hard as we could have while we concentrated more on professional schools and the sciences. But in general and perhaps immodestly, I do not believe that there were large areas where we were weak or ineffectual during the 1960's and I do believe that our accomplishments far outweigh our failures.

16. In 1964, you were named Vice President for Administration -- effectively placing the administration of Ohio State in your hands. What are your recollections of taking on this position?

First, it was clear that Nov Fawcett was the President of Ohio State and that the amount of administration that was in my hands was because of his delegation. In 1962, I was named Executive Assistant to the President in addition to continuing as Director of Personnel Budget and my office moved from the third floor of the Administration Building to the office next to President Fawcett in the President's office suite. Most people from inside the University who had business with the President started by talking to me and I reviewed all of the mail that came into our office (including

a regular flow of mail from people suggesting that the President needed a good executive assistant and that they were ready to serve.) Because the President and I talked regularly through the business day and in the late afternoons, I was able to get answers to questions and to proposals and ultimately to make my own decisions about answers that I reported back to people. It soon became clear that I really did speak for the President and that he would back up my answers except in extremely unusual cases. The President was extremely busy with outside constituencies -- legislative and executive branches in Ohio, Federal government contacts, major or hoped-for major donors, professional associations in higher education, Big Ten presidential groups, and so on. Increasingly, I managed the internal affairs and he managed the external affairs and it worked because we were in regular contact to insure that I was on the right track or that I could convince him that my track was the right one. This work took more and more of my time and in 1964 I became Vice President for Administration and dropped the budget responsibilities. There was, however, little change in my work with this change in title. My job description was changed to indicate my role in acting on behalf of the President, but this change was much more a part of a steady evolution than a major change in responsibilities.

17. What do you consider to be the major advances at Ohio State during your tenure? Much of my response to this question is included in the response to number 13 above. I believe that we rationalized the administrative structure so that the academic administrators had priorities rather than the priority being with the business administrators. The creation of the University College and of the branch campuses was a major step although not perhaps the best way to deal with enrollment problems. Probably the key step in my tenure as an academic administrator was the creation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences. This recommendation had been semi formed during John Weaver's tenure as Academic Vice President, but was finalized and enacted during my tenure. The five new colleges formed then still exist, as far as I know, and the faculty with a formal review supported the structure at least once after I had left Ohio State.

We weathered some difficult times starting with the Free Speech Front which was followed by the beginnings of the Viet Nam protests and the protests by African-American students and included a strike by the classified employees of the University. We were able to weather these events without heavy-handed actions and without alienating the entire campus community. We also prevailed fairly well in a difficult political climate to support salaries, to provide facilities and equipment, and to maintain the quality of our academic programs. Interestingly enough, it was also during this time that Ohio State entered the computer age with the installation of an RCA computer that took up the entire first floor of a large building on Neil Avenue and which probably had less power than the desktop that I am using to type this material.

18. What role did the University play in the establishment of DCLC? The University played a critical role. We provided the University Library and Fred Kilgore with the funds to get what became OCLC started and continued to provide support both for the on campus activities of OCLC and for its development throughout higher education in Ohio.

19. What role did you play in the establishment of the colleges of Arts and Sciences and of the University College? I played the key role in the former and a support role in the latter. When I became Director of Personnel Budgets it became clear to me that the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences had an impossible task in formulating academic plans and the budgetary support for those plans. With one single appropriation to the College from the central administration, the Dean had to balance nuclear physics with classics and microbiology with foreign languages. It would not have been in keeping with the organizational structure of the University to have the central administration allocate budgets to units within the College, but it was clear that some better form of allocation decision-making was essential. Thus the concept of creating several colleges from the single College began to take shape. If it was to work, each of the new colleges would have to have a Dean who could argue effectively for the cluster of disciplines included within his or her college and the allocation authority of a single dean for the entire group would need to be eliminated. With the support of the Council on Academic Affairs and ultimately of the Faculty Council, we created five colleges with a sort of nominal coordinating structure called the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences to preserve some institutional recognition of the overall liberal arts. However, this unit was actually created in part to preserve a deanship for the Dean of the College -- Dean Fuller -- who had many supporters who believed that the entire effort was aimed at his removal. When Dean Fuller secured a university presidency this opposition drifted away and the importance of the Colleges diminished. Each of the new colleges had a dean, each became a member of the University Administrative Council which discussed budgetary policies among other things, and each received a direct appropriation from the central administration which was his or hers to allocate within the college. While the Arts and Sciences division of the Land Grant Association was critical of this whole idea and of the educationist who dreamed it up and forced it upon an innocent faculty, it seems to have worked and the programs of Ohio State within the arts and sciences have apparently continued to grow and to flourish.

One of the key problems at Ohio State was the so-called open admissions requirement for graduates of Ohio high schools. Any youngster who graduated from an Ohio high school was deemed eligible for admission to Ohio State with few restrictions. This requirement led to very large freshman classes, the need for much remedial work, and heavy dropouts after the freshman year when young people discovered that they did not have the attributes for college or did not really want to be in college. It also led to large inter-program transfers as students discovered that they were not interested in this, but would like to major in that. I am not certain who came up with the idea of the University College that would be the point *of* entry for all freshmen at Ohio State and would provide basic core courses and remedial work that would prepare students for all curricula. There were certain refinements *of* this idea for students who were excellently prepared for college and who wanted to enter programs such as engineering which had a highly prescribed five-year curriculum at the time. My role was not central in the development *of* the College. Dick Zimmerman from the faculty was given the assignment to work *out* details and to develop a plan that could go to the Faculty Council for approval. He worked mostly with John Mount. As I have said earlier in these responses, the idea was a substitute for a state community college system and while it met some of the objectives in

terms of remedial work and cutting down on program transfers, I do not believe that in the long run it has been considered a complete success.

20. Having been a major player in both the college and the administration, what are your recollections about the origins and disposition of the University School matter?

The University School had a distinguished history as a laboratory school and a number of national and international figures in education (including John Ramseyer) had worked there for long or short periods. It was a budgetary unit of the College of Education and was a major cost center in the College. It was my view after reviewing a variety of materials about the School and discussing the influence of the School with educators in Ohio that it was no longer serving a laboratory purpose, but was, instead, an excellent private school provided by the University at less than full cost to the students. The problems of diversity, of multiculturalism, of parental involvement and support, and many others common to the urban public school were not present at University School and its use as a laboratory was both minimal and ineffective. (These are my views and were not shared by my very good friends and colleagues, Paul Klohr and Herb Coon and others who fought vigorously to defend the school.) In the last analysis, it was a question of the amount of his limited budget allocation that Dean Cottrell wanted to devote to invigorating and supporting the school so that it resumed significance in the field of education and in Ohio. The Dean felt that I was not allocating enough to the College and was dooming the school; I felt that he had enough funding to support the school if it, indeed, was a high priority for the College. In the end, the College chose to use its funds for other purposes and the school was closed. (I was also coincidentally an observer of a campus battle at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign where an effort was made to close Uni High School, which had become a private school for faculty children. In this case, the High School won and, I believe, still survives.)

21. In 1967, John Corbally takes on the leadership of the Council on Academic Affairs. You also made a dramatic “Let’s move ahead” speech at an AAUP meeting – and were later inducted in Bucket and Dipper. To what degree do you believe the Fawcett administration, and more importantly the University Trustees, were ready to embrace the changes you saw coming?

I had the distinct feeling that we (the academic community of Ohio State) had been wasting our time and energies in mostly imaginary battles between the faculty and the administration. Now I – an active member of that administration – had been chosen by the faculty to be their academic leader. Fred Heimberger had used his academic leadership position to fight President Fawcett and John Weaver had not been at Ohio State long enough to overcome the gap which Fred had created. It seemed to me that the time had come to stop wasting our time and to address the difficult problems that faced us -- budgetary problems, lack of organizational clarity, increasing student unrest over a variety of issues. In general, setting aside for the moment distractions such as the Speakers Rule, the Board of Trustees wanted a vibrant, excellent, academic institution and was willing to be persuaded of what it would take to create or maintain such an institution. President Fawcett was himself an educator and his aspirations for academic excellence at Ohio State were as strong as were mine. Unfortunately, my departure and the ultimate Viet Nam protests brought this new period of striving to a temporary halt. Academic considerations had to give way to survival

considerations throughout the system of higher education in this country and the momentum that I think we were gaining was temporarily lost. But the changes I felt we needed had the full support of President Fawcett and with strong faculty support would have also prevailed with the Board.

22. In April of 1967, a group of black students formulated a list of demands seeking to cause Ohio State to encourage minority enrollment of students, add minority workers to mid and upper levels of administration, and to institute a black history program. What are your recollections about how these demands were received and considered by the administration? One of the real problems with "demands" is that they quickly lead to irreconcilable differences and get in the way of making progress toward difficult solutions. Another problem with "demands" is that they are usually simplistic and fail to take into account the variety of people who must be involved in the creation of solutions. An academic vice president at Ohio State, for example, does not create a curriculum all by himself. That is the expectation, however, of those who make demands. Unfortunately, any group is made up both of individuals who want to solve an institutional problem and of individuals who are striving for group leadership and prominence. The University worked with a number of the former types and made good progress in minority hiring, in setting in motion enrollment programs for minority students, and in beginning the process to consider what a black history program might encompass. That is quiet and hard work and does not impress the crowd you wish to harangue each afternoon on the Oval. And the harangues scare off many of the people who are trying to work to solve the problems and they give up. For much of my administrative tenure at Ohio State whenever any group from on or off the campus demanded to meet with "THE ADMINISTRATION" they met with me. I know first hand, then, that work on the demands of the black students was steady and was moving ahead, but was constantly sidetracked by performance theater. The problems that were raised were real, but the nature of the approach and of the timetable was totally counterproductive.

23. After a year of inaction, the minority students begin to first picket. When their demands were neither received nor acknowledged, they take over the administration building in March 1968. What are your thoughts and recollections about the events leading up to and during the student occupation of the administration building? First, I take strong exception to the concept that there was "a year of inaction" and that the student demands were "Neither received nor acknowledged." I cannot remember how many hours I spent meeting with John Evans who was one of the leaders of the black students. He and his colleagues spent more time with me during that year than I spent with my family. While most of the "noise" was made by John and his followers, a number of other students and faculty members worked hard to develop efforts to increase both minority student enrollment and minority employment and to lay the groundwork for academic offerings in the field of Black History. In some ways, if some of the students admitted that efforts were underway to develop solutions to the problems they were raising, they would lose their visibility and the fun of leading demonstrations. OK, so much for defensiveness.

While my memory of details of the Administration Building takeover are somewhat

indistinct, I do know that the affair had nothing to do with enrollment, academics, or workforce diversity. A group of Black students had been riding a campus bus in the evening before the takeover and had, in the opinion of the driver (a white) been making too much noise and using inappropriate language. He finally ordered a female student off of the bus. The organized Black student group took this as a sign of disrespect, claimed that there was no cause for the bus driver to have ejected the student, and claimed that the driver had been abusive to the students. They demanded that the driver be fired immediately. The driver was a civil service employee and the bus system reported through the Physical Plant Department to Vice President Carson. The appropriate response was made by Physical Plant that there were procedures which needed to be followed in reviewing an event such as this one and that the review would involve both statements from the driver and from the students and a resolution would be reached in due time. It was this response that led a group to appear in Vice President Carson's office demanding that the driver be fired immediately and that he (Carson) apologize to the student. Gordon Carson was convinced that the administration had been much too tolerant of student unrest and protest and he was not a man to whom one made demands. Before long, the group of Black students increased in number and in belligerence and went about the building ordering people to leave. President Fawcett was on his way to Columbus from a meeting in Cleveland and was not in the building, which left me in charge. Because it was about 3:30 in the afternoon it seemed prudent to dismiss the staff in the building and to be able to concentrate on the large group, which had Gordon Carson and his secretary, Janet Bettis, jammed in his office suite. One of the Black students came to my office and asked me not to leave the building -- this was not a demand, but rather a request for me to try to solve what a number of students now knew was a mistake on their part. This leads to questions (24) and (25).

24. What role did you play in negotiating an end to the unrest? 25. What commitments did you agree to end the takeover? I was well acquainted with the leaders of the group who had entered the Carson office and they were well acquainted with me. I was able to move freely about the building, to enter and leave Gordon's office, and to use the phone. I used the phone in a successful attempt to hold off those who were outside of the building in the Alumni House (which was across the street from the Administration Building), including a Trustee who visiting campus at the time (Don Hilliker), who wanted immediate and large-scale police action to end the affair. I also worked hard to convince Gordon Carson that we were intelligent adults who could end this thing with as little damage to our students as possible. Gordon was understandably angry and was a bit more inclined toward the violent approach than I was. After interminable discussion with John Evans and others in the group and with Gordon Carson, we developed an innocuous statement that we agreed to sign if they agreed to leave peacefully. The statement included such items as: "1. The Negro (we actually used this word several times in the agreement) in America faces special problems. 2. The Negro at Ohio State faces particular special problems. 3. The University will continue its efforts to increase minority enrollment and employment 4. The University will continue its efforts to develop an academic program in Black History." The list went on with a total of about ten statements similar to these and, much to my surprise, the students -- after a caucus -- told me that if we signed they would declare victory and leave. After my

own somewhat difficult caucus with Gordon Carson, we did sign the statement at around 5 :00 p.m. and the students immediately (and with great sighs of relief) left. There was no agreement to shortchange the civil service review procedures and no agreement to any time deadlines for any actions. The students were able to declare our statement as a total vindication of their concerns and I was pleased that the whole thing ended with no injury to either person or facility with the exception of some administrative pride. John Evans and his group were intelligent enough to see that this approach could only lead to both trouble with the law and with the University and during the rest of 1967-1968 and all of 1968-1969 there were no similar episodes. Gordon Carson did bring kidnapping charges against a number of the students who were under Ohio law technically guilty of kidnapping because they had barred his ability to leave his office. Also under Ohio law the penalty for kidnapping is life in prison. The lawyer for the students subpoenaed me as a witness for the students, which led the judge to meet with me in chambers to attempt to work out a solution short of a kidnapping trial. We agreed that because no police were called perhaps the worst the students did was trespassing and that perhaps it would be helpful for the judge to suggest that the police should have been called. This result worked out and a number of students received one-day sentences (I believe) for trespassing that were suspended. This result pleased me, but not, I am afraid, Gordon Carson.

26. Were you supported by President Fawcett and the Trustees in how the matter was settled? 27. A special trustees meeting was held two days after the end of the takeover. What are your recollections about what transpired at that meeting? The entire affair posed a difficult problem for President Fawcett. Outside constituencies were unhappy about student protests and he carried the responsibility of dealing with all of these groups -- government, alumni, donors, etc. On campus, there was general support for the way it had been handled although some conservative student groups and faculty members thought that we were being "too soft" on protesters. President Fawcett supported me 100 per cent although privately he (and I) wished that such things did not happen on a university campus and he (and I) were distressed that there were no better ways to deal with such events including some ways which would discourage them more effectively than seemed to be the case. The Trustees were first of all embarrassed. They had to face their friends and colleagues who asked them "What is going on down there?" "Who is running the place?" and similar questions. Not living on the campus, they wondered the same things. Several of them were angry because they believed in punishing wrongdoers and they characterized the students as particularly bad wrongdoers who apparently would not be punished. It was their legitimate concerns and their need to try to understand the event that led to what I call the Scioto Country Club meeting. They raised hard questions of both President Fawcett and me and it was clear that some of the Trustees had little agreement with the way the event had been handled. At one point, one or two were particularly critical of President Fawcett and I indicated that if there was to be criticism it should be addressed to me. I indicated that if it was their view that I could not handle this kind of event, then I would quickly and quietly go and do something else. At this point, Senator Bricker said, "Now John, just calm down. No one is going anywhere because of this event. We just don't want it to become a habit." There, of course, was no way to guarantee that it would never happen again, but we did discuss

various possibilities that I might have followed and that might help if there is a threat of such a takeover again. The meeting ended with expressions of support for both President Fawcett and for me and we all went about our business as best we could.

28. When you returned to the Ohio State as Commencement Speaker in the spring of 1980, you stated that there are three types of people: Those who are unconscious, those who are critics, and those who volunteers. You went on to admonish the class of 1980 to be volunteers – to do great things and to live life to the fullest. Looking back on the 21 years those baby-boomers have been in our society, what is your appraisal of their success as volunteers? I am afraid that our society is not in very good shape right now and I assume that much of the blame for that condition belongs to the baby-boomers. There have been a number of great volunteer efforts in the last 21 years and philanthropy is booming. But in many ways I fear that the unconscious effect has prevailed with too many people. Or perhaps we have been conscious of the wrong things. We have developed great senses of individual freedom with an almost complete loss of a sense of community. We have generated great wealth and have allowed our schools and other public agencies to starve. It is certainly not fair to characterize any generation with one term, so I will indicate a sort of rating which I think provides my view of what happened to my audience: 50 percent unconscious, 30 percent critics, and 20 percent volunteers. The difficulty of arriving at this answer demonstrates why one should be cautious in accepting invitations to give commencement speeches.

29. How did you come to leave Ohio State? For some time it had been apparent to me that I was ready to try my hand at a university presidency. However, I had such a fine position at Ohio State and such a great relationship with President Fawcett that most positions held little attraction for me. I had received inquiries about my interest in positions for several years prior to 1969 -- some I had examined carefully and ultimately rejected and some I knew instantly did not fit. In one case, I threw my hat in the ring and it was thrown back. When the inquiry from Syracuse University came along, it did require examination. I discovered that Syracuse had just become a member of the American Association of Universities (sort of the cream of the crop of comprehensive research universities) and that it appeared to offer the kind of challenges (succeeding a president who had been president for 27 years, for one) and opportunities that were appealing. I enjoyed the members of the Board who came to visit with me and in subsequent visits to the campus I enjoyed some of the people who would be my new colleagues. Syracuse is a large university, which is the kind of university I had always experienced, and it seemed to have good resources. So my wife and I decided to become candidates for the job and I informed President Fawcett that I had done so. He indicated that he thought it would be a great fit for me. Ultimately I was elected to the position and a great fourteen years at Ohio State came to an end.