Q. Good morning. It’s July 10, 2008. This is Kevlin Haire. I’m interviewing John Kleberg at The Ohio State University Archives. Good morning, John.

A. How are you?

Q. I’m good, how are you?

A. Good, thank you.

Q. For our oral history interview today, we’ll start at the very beginning, which is where I usually start. And if you’ll tell me a little bit about where and when you were born, and a little bit about your family.

A. Be glad to. I guess that ages me. I was born in Chicago, Illinois, in December, 1939. Lived in Chicago until 1946 and then moved to Indiana where I actually grew up, northern Indiana, Chesterton, which is just south of the Indiana Dunes. I’m actually a second-generation U.S. person. All of my grandparents immigrated from Sweden, different parts of Sweden, but all from Sweden. Consequently, Kleberg is a little bit of an Anglicized name from the Swedish. My grandparents all lived in South Chicago in what was then a very substantive Swedish community. I grew up in Indiana and worked variously in Indiana, and actually had my first law enforcement job in Indiana, which is part of how I came to Ohio State.

Q. I assume that was after you went to college?
A. Yes, I attended Michigan State University as an undergraduate student, in a relatively new program at the time, in law enforcement administration. It was a social science program but a concentration in the administration of law enforcement. The program was to prepare people through formal education to become involved in police, probation, and court administration.

Q. How did you become interested?

A. In the course of my studies, actually during one summer, I came back home and worked for the police department in a summer capacity as a deputy marshal for the town, which was relatively small. I’m not sure how I became interested in law enforcement. I guess it was, in a way, that I wanted to make a contribution, but I think it was also an effort to make an improvement in law enforcement, which wasn’t at that time what it ought to be. Education was an avenue to do that. I went to Michigan State with that in mind. Did some part-time work during the summer months in Chesterton, and then when I graduated, went into the Army as a military police officer for a couple of years, as a lieutenant in the Military Police Corps at Fort Lewis, Washington. So, again, that was a law enforcement experience. I finished my military service and returned for a short time to Michigan State and worked for the public safety department for Michigan State University while taking graduate classes. Then went to Virginia Commonwealth University, at the time Richmond Professional Institute, as Director of Security. And then to the University of Illinois, where I finished my graduate work and was on the faculty of the University Police Training Institute. We conducted the police certification training for most departments in Illinois, with the exception of
Chicago, Cook County and the Illinois State Police. We conducted specialized and basic training for law enforcement departments throughout the State of Illinois. While at the University of Illinois, after I received my master’s degree, I was appointed the police chief at the University of Illinois. So it involved both the training enterprise for police, and then also the administration of the police department. Interestingly enough, while at the Police Training Institute I was involved in what was relatively new at the time: breathalyzer training for police to measure alcohol in the blood related to driving under the influence of alcohol. This was a statewide program. We were providing instruction on the use of what was then a relatively early instrument, the Breathalyzer, and testing for blood alcohol concentrations in drunk drivers. Occasionally, we conducted programs outside the state. I remember one at Richmond, Virginia, for example, for Virginia law enforcement.

Q. What year did you become police chief at University of Illinois?

A. In 1970. I must say, before that, of course, I was married in 1962, right before graduation from Michigan State, and we then lived at Fort Lewis.

Q. Was that unusual – you were fairly young when you became police chief?

A. I don’t know that it was unusual. I think it was a combination of being in an educational environment in law enforcement as well as being involved in the police training program at the University of Illinois. The University was interested in making changes in public safety as well as the police structure. I think it afforded them an opportunity to bring in a different vision of what university
policing was all about. I was relatively young, but it was probably good for me, and I’d suggest maybe good for them.

Q. How long were you police chief there?

Q. From ’70 to ’73, actually a full three years, when I then came over to Ohio State. The person who was public safety director at Ohio State, Don Hanna, and I had worked together at the Police Training Institute at the University of Illinois. We were both instructors and we had co-authored some police training texts. I came to OSU in ’73 with the title of Associate Director of Public Safety. There were some structural changes in parking enforcement and emergency medical service, plus policing, and a department of public safety had been formed.

Q. And what were your first experiences and how did that meet up with your expectations?

A. It was interesting because there was a transition in the criminal law of Ohio at that time. There were new laws recently enacted so one of the first challenges was to train officers in the new code. It was initially a teaching task for our own officers. During this general time period, both in Illinois and in Ohio, there began a process of certifying police officers and requiring training. Previously, that hadn’t been the case. Chesterton, for example, when I began, it was a matter of, “Here’s your badge, go get your own gun and you can be a police officer.” That was changing during the early ’70s to require training and certification in almost all states. In addition, of course, was the administration within the police department. So it was kind of all one in terms of police and a broader public safety type of mission.
Q. So give me an idea of what your day-to-day duties might be, at least that first year.

A. I was on the operational side. The department was structured primarily into two broad areas. There was the director of public safety, Don Hanna. And then there were two divisions, two major operating areas. One was the administrative support side and the other the operational side, which would be the uniformed officers, investigators, and so on. On a day-to-day basis my responsibility within the police department or the public safety department was to ensure that the police tasks were being accomplished, that we had officers dispatched and assigned and working, and investigations were being properly conducted. And that special events or activities on campus had the proper police support. I directly supervised some of those and certain matters of administration.

Q. And then you were also training.

R. Yes, we were doing that initial training. In addition to Don, and certainly myself, there was another person in Public Safety at the time by the name of Gary Wilson who had also been at Illinois with us. We were all certified instructors by the State [of Ohio]. So we were doing training within our own department at Ohio State, but then we were also doing training for other departments or agencies or academies.

Q. How big was the department when you were here?

A. My recollection is that when I first came we had 78 officers. It was quite large and the tasks were a bit different. As a police department there were also some security functions as well as some emergency medical service types of tasks.
There were, of course, regular police duties, within a structurally divided department.

Q. When you say it later became divided, was that part of the team concept?

A. The department became smaller. The emergency medical service functions were shifted to what became fire prevention and emergency medical service, which was a nonpolice responsibility. And parking and traffic responsibilities were moved into a different department. The police department became a separated police department as opposed to a broader public safety structure. The team policing concept did occur in the ’70s, however, which was not unlike the idea today of community policing. Within the department we created teams of officers, small groups of officers, who worked together to provide a police service to a specific area. For example, in the hospitals and medical center was one team. There was a residential team in the south and a residential team in the north. The concept was to get officers who could work together effectively and become an important element or partner with the community that they were providing service to. So that they got to know the students and staff, they got to work with them. Officers could identify problems before they became police issues, and develop intervention techniques that would help to keep an issue from becoming a police matter. That team concept is a predecessor for what’s called community policing today; it’s essentially the same thing. We also used techniques which were not new, if you go back to the English models in the 1800s. We had officers on bicycles performing regular patrol functions. And more recently, I’m talking about 2000s, there’s a great emphasis of police officers riding bicycles. It’s not
new. It’s been around for a long time. We did it. And that was certainly true of other police agencies as well. So the team concept was an enforcement initiative, but to permit officers flexibility to develop crime prevention strategies that were unique to the environment that they were working in. To be proactive is the best way to characterize it. To get issues resolved from a standpoint of eliminating, reducing, and avoiding what could become significant police problems.

Q. And how was that approach met by officers themselves, by the department? When was that instituted?

A. I believe we began the program about ’74, ’75, in that area. There were officers who embraced it, who thought it was a good approach. And then there were those who believed it was not the way to approach policing, who thought it was more important to be responsive. To wait for a situation to develop and to deal with it. One of the things that we were doing at the time was to try and recruit officers with a formal education, a bachelor’s degree, which was not common practice at the time. There also were other agencies that were looking for candidates with a formal education. But in terms of this level of policing, that was not common. We felt that was important in an educational environment to have people who could effectively communicate with students who were maybe on the same level, who understood some of the academic pressures and some of the complexities of the living environment that students have on campus. For those officers, for those people who were members of the department, I think they saw this as effective, imaginative, a good initiative. There were those who didn’t think it was good. That, of course, is not uncommon.
Q. I see. There were, from what I’ve read, there were not a lot of women on the force at the time, but I don’t know if that was an issue.

A. It wasn’t an issue. In fact, Norma Walker was an officer with the department when I came. She generally had responsibilities associated with investigations, working with women who might be victims of offenses as well as doing crime prevention work. But she was an officer and had been for several years. She did everything every other officer would do. We had a concerted effort in the ’70s to try and diversify the department, recognizing the diversity of the University community, the need to have women and have various ethnic and racial minorities represented, to try and recruit individuals with a diverse background to become members of the department. It was difficult because they had other opportunities that certainly would pay more. They weren’t necessarily inclined to see this as a career opportunity. But we did have some success. And we did have various members of the department from the very beginning, from the 70’s on, with a more representative background of the community at large. It’s interesting, I think, too, to recognize that there was some kind of a police or security function on this campus from the 1880s. There was a guard force, if you will, there was a famous officer, Bill North, who was here for years and years. So the idea of police on campus was not a new one.

Q. Stemming from that, you came a couple of years after the riots. What was your sense of the relationship between the students and the police when you came? Do you think the riots affected that relationship, and did you all have any kind of concerted effort to better the relationship?
A. I think clearly there was a little tension between all police and large segments of the community at that time, and probably more particularly younger persons. I was not here when we had the war riots, Vietnam-type riots, with one exception in the early ’70s. But I was involved with that in Illinois as a police chief. And the attitude I think on both sides of the question, younger members of the community and the police, was a strained type of relationship. We recognized in the team concept for example, that the only way that you’re going to be successful in ameliorating that strain is to get people to know each other as human beings – as individuals. To interact as individuals, as opposed to interacting by virtue of position was important, and in fact still is in policing. So that if you could get officers to work in a closer environment in a narrower setting with students, you’d break down some of these barriers. You’d break down some of these communication barriers. And that effectively happened. It’s kind of like, if you’re standing in a confrontational line as we did in some of those demonstration periods, the best thing an officer could do was to tell the group that they’re facing their first name. “My name’s Bob, I’m not Officer Smoltz, I’m Bob, I’m like you.” We found in some cases that it really diminished the tension, because all of a sudden they were human. It was more personal. They could talk about things. I would say if you arrest somebody, arrest them with a smile on your face – not a smirk but a smile. What does that hurt? And it may really take the wind out of somebody who’s going to otherwise be resistant. By saying, “Hey, I’m just doing my job.” And smile about it. You’re not teasing them. You’re just simply being nice about it – professional. It isn’t a matter of me against you, it is the duty that
must be performed. And things move on. You can avoid some physical confrontations if you do that kind of stuff. Doesn’t work with everyone, of course, but in a student population it is worth the try. In working with officers and working with students, we tried to promote those kinds of communications. It’s not easy, especially if you’re talking with a person who’s been an officer for 25 years and didn’t grow up in that kind of environment. You don’t change those things overnight.

Q. In 1977, there were guidelines put into place that restricted the campus police jurisdictional duties. Can you explain that move, first of all, and then we’ll follow up with some questions.

A. Yes, it’s peculiar but was simply this: An officer executed or served a warrant on a traffic offense for a student off campus late at night or early in the morning, I don’t remember exactly. In the process, my recollection is that he actually took custody of her. I think she ended up in jail for a short time because of the warrant, then posted bond. She was the daughter of a legislator. The legislator apparently got ticked and promoted legislation to limit the authority of university police. That law change, which still exists, deals with the execution of warrants by University police off campus. It was a very personal thing. Whether or not the officer exercised good judgment, you can, in retrospect, question that, I suppose, and whether or not the circumstances warranted the legislation change, you can certainly question that. But it was a response, through the General Assembly, to a very personal situation. That shouldn’t have happened. Whether or not the arrest should have occurred is questionable, I guess. It could have occurred at some
other time, and the matter certainly could have otherwise been resolved. But that’s how those things happen sometimes.

Q. So how did the law change affect what officers did? Give me an example.

A. They just simply couldn’t execute those kinds of warrants off campus. So in terms of day to day, practical, on campus, it didn’t change a thing. It was just one of those, “You arrested my daughter that night off campus, you’re not going to do it again.” It was one of those unusual things that happened in the creation of legislation. It’s like the old saying, if you really respect the law and [you] like sausage, don’t watch either one being made – however that saying goes.

Q. So practically speaking, if an officer is dealing with a student, and they moved across the border of campus, if they were chasing a student or whatever, that student was then out of their jurisdiction?

A. That actually didn’t change. What changed was simply the service of warrants off campus. So the jurisdictional constraint, the idea that the University police policed the University property, that didn’t change and remains the case today with the exception of mutual aid compacts. That was the case then and that continues to be the case. You just couldn’t go outside the jurisdiction and initiate an enforcement action based on a traffic offense warrant. I think that’s the language. I’d have to look at it again but it’s certainly along those lines. So it didn’t make significant changes in terms of activity. And indeed, that didn’t change until, or wasn’t modified, until the 1990s, when we were able to get legislation which provided for mutual aid compacts between University police and neighboring jurisdictions as well as other state universities.
Q. So why then did officers resign?
A. I don’t remember that there were many. There may have been some, certainly, but I think it was more just pride, a vanity type of response more than anything else. People do that sometimes. It’s not a thoughtful reaction; it’s an emotional reaction.

Q. Did that cause any staffing shortages? Were you affected in that way?
A. No, I don’t remember it being significant at all. I remember some emotional and verbal reaction to it, but I don’t think it made any significant difference. It was kind of frustrating for some.

Q. Were there any staffing shortages during that time? Because you said you started out with a big department.
A. No, the initial size involved having some people with police authority but they were actually doing security functions, checking doors after hours and things like that. They really weren’t doing enforcement or investigative responsibilities, didn’t have those kinds of responsibilities. As those functions changed and as the fire prevention emergency medical service operation developed, the department just naturally shrunk to a size appropriate for policing the University. It strikes me that when I left the police department we were probably in the low 50s or high 40s of sworn officers. And that’s about where it is today. Is that adequate for the size of the campus? Yes, I think it probably was.

Q. Now you may have worked under a third director but you did work under Donald Hanna and Allan Miller. Did you work under a third?
A. No.
Q. Okay.

A. Don was a personal friend. Like I said, I knew him from Illinois and we worked together.

Q. He basically recruited you.

A. Yes. He called and said, “Do you want to come over here?” And I said, “Well, if it’s more money and a winning football team, sure I’ll go.” I had known him for years. I think you can honestly characterize him as, not necessarily a visionary, but certainly progressive. He had very good ideas, new ideas, about policing and about organizational policing approaches to things. He was articulate and wrote very well. He was very effective, I think, in the way he ran the department, the way he structured it. When we were shifting in the organizational model from the public safety structure to the police, and back to a public safety structure, Don left to go to Champaign, Illinois. Al Miller, who had been a public safety or public service director in one of the northern cities, came down. I actually had an opportunity to be the director of public safety, but it was going to involve some broader responsibilities than police, which I wasn’t interested in at the time.

Q. When was that?

R. I would guess that it was in the early ’80s. Don was chief and Al was Public Safety Director and I had moved to Internal Audit. I’m not certain of timing without doing a little research. Different personality and different kind of management style. Al was less involved in the direct operations of the police department. Good communication skills that I think worked effectively within the
University community. He actually started the Buckeye Corner. He and his wife started that business, which is now a four- or five-store business.

Q. Did the officers in general like Don, then?

A. Yes, I think within any kind of a structure, you have the people who like the management and people who don’t like the management. And I think in most cases, they appreciated the vision, the organizational skills, the direction that Don brought to the department. I think, in most cases, for Al Miller they appreciated the openness and the communication ability to approach him and talk with him. There were certainly people within that department, and any department, who don’t like management for one reason or another. But by and large, it was a relatively smooth-running type of department.

Q. What was the reaction by the department from going from the public safety and policing and back to public safety? Is this something that the department decided to do, or was it a directive from above? And if it was a directive from above, what was the reaction?

A. It was a University decision, and a lot of it interesting enough was title, organization title as opposed to functional distinctions. So while it was public safety, in the first place, it was a police function within it, and then it was broken out so that you had the police over here and then you had public safety in a broader organization, another element that dealt with emergency medical service, fire prevention, and so on. The police were still doing the police job they always were doing. And the public safety elements were doing their tasks. So I think organizationally it didn’t make much difference to the individual officers. It didn’t
change their visibility with the community. It didn’t change the way the community saw them as University police.

Q. All right. Now let’s get to the fun stuff. Let’s talk about the things that happened on campus while you were in the police department.

A. Some of those fun things weren’t fun.

Q. Well, let’s go to the stuff that wasn’t fun. For example, the murder of Beverly Lee, which was probably huge at the time.

A. Well, it was. Actually, it was in November of 1973. I had only been here since April. I had responsibility for the police operation, uniformed and investigative functions at the time. It was the first murder that had ever occurred on the campus. She was a researcher and working on an ERIC project. Beverly was working in Lincoln Tower and was discovered on the floor of her office, I think maybe early afternoon, murdered. Obviously, the police were the first over there to find out what was going on. This was on the fourth floor of Lincoln. Interestingly enough, I guess, directly above it, on the fifth floor, we had a team policing office, and officers were there at the time the incident occurred. Of course, there was no noise, no confusion, nothing. So there was no way that they would have had any idea that this was going on in the area. She was discovered by another person in the office. One perspective on this, my recollection is that it was the mayor, but it may have been someone else in Columbus city government like the public safety director, called the president, President [Harold] Enarson at the time, and wanted to know whether or not they should come up and help, whether or not they should conduct the investigation, meaning Columbus Police. I
remember Don Hanna asking me, because he had been asked by the President, should they, in fact, be involved, or were we comfortable with investigating the murder with our own resources and people. I told him we were fully capable of investigating the murder. We had the skills, we had the ability to investigate this offense, and we did. In December, about the second week in December, which was about five weeks after the offense had occurred and at the time of fall commencement, we arrested the person responsible. We had done all the crime scene work. She had been stabbed three times as I recall, and died virtually instantly. The crime scene work was done. The laboratory work was done. The photographic work was done. We began an investigation as you would in something like this, people who worked with her and so on, to determine whether or not there were motives, or whether or not there were persons who might be identified as possible suspects. But about five weeks later, in early December, about midnight, we received a call from the Delaware City Police Department, who indicated that a girl had come into their office and reported that her boyfriend or man she had been dating, had mentioned something about a murder on the Columbus campus of the University, with the suggestion that he had been involved in it. Delaware PD called the University Police and two officers and I went up to the Delaware Police Department in the middle of the night and talked with her. It certainly seemed credible, the information this person had told her related to the specific offense of the Lee murder on campus. We were able, with taking a statement from her and interviewing her, to get enough information, to get a warrant for his arrest. He lived near the Ohio Wesleyan campus, as I
remember. So in the middle of the night, or the middle of the early morning, he was arrested. Subsequently, we got a search warrant for the house, to see whether or not there was evidence of the crime. I was able to interview him with regard to that offense, when he admitted to committing the murder. We did find some evidence in the house, a knife with residue of human blood under the handle that was of the same type of the victim and the knife of a size used in the attack. At that time the technology wasn’t as sophisticated as it is today; no DNA. You couldn’t say that this blood actually belonged to Beverly Lee, but it was of the same blood group or type. He was indicted, went to trial, and convicted of that murder.

Q. He murdered her, lived near Ohio Wesleyan in Delaware, and came all the way to OSU to murder someone. He had no connection to her. It was just one of those random events with a tragic consequence.

A. Exactly. No connection with her. No connection with Ohio State. My recollection is that he had never been on campus before. He had indicated to us that he had parked the car just east of High Street, walked across the campus, walked across the fields south of Ohio Stadium, walked into the east door of Lincoln Tower. Right in front of him. If you go through that lobby, right in front of it is a stairwell. He went up one set of stairs and entered the corridor through the first open door. He went straight into the first room and that’s where she was sitting. She was working with her back toward him. He stabbed her three times and left and went back to his house. His explanation in the interview, his confession, was simply that he always wanted to kill somebody. And I remember him looking at
me and saying, “I could kill you.” Absolutely no remorse, cold as a fish. In any event, that was the first murder on campus. He is still serving his life sentence in prison. The entire investigative file has been given to University Archives.

Q. What was the reaction by both the campus and the larger community?

A. One, it hit several detective magazines. Tabloid types of publications, all of which I have a copy of. I think the University community was probably really shocked. I’m not sure I could appraise it. But probably really shocked. We were so involved in trying to deal with this and to solve this case. But I think they were really shocked, and a sense probably of relief, when he was identified. Maybe even a greater sense of relief when he was found not to be affiliated with the University in any way at all. That he was truly an outsider. And it probably sensitized the community more to the reality that these things do happen on campus. That it’s a unique environment, yes. It’s not a cloistered environment. In fact, there are safety concerns that need to be dealt with on campus just like any other place. I don’t know if you remember, but there was a case also in the ’70s of a person responsible for kidnapping and rapes in the campus area, three of them. A guy by the name of Billy Milligan, multiple personalities.

Q. The Columbus Dispatch recently did a story on him.

A. They did, yes. And one of those incidents, the first one, happened to an optometry student in the Medical Center. And one of them happened to a student in the parking area of her apartment on Lane Avenue, just off campus. So it was a joint investigation between the University Police and Columbus Police. The third was in the campus area. We worked cooperatively with Columbus and were present –
myself and one other officer, Elliot Boxerbaum – when we arrested Milligan off
campus in an apartment after he was identified. His identity was confirmed
through multiple fingerprints, plus a photo line-up. So there had been those kinds
of unusual cases. That incident brought more attention to safety concerns on the
campus than did the murder. And I think it was because there were multiple
events, that it did involve students. These offenses took place over a period of
time, both the sexual offense plus the abduction piece of it, as well as the
robberies related to it. People were really afraid, the community at large. Have
you seen the book, “The Minds of Billy Milligan?”

Q. Part of it.

A. The first name mentioned was me because we were involved in the case and the
arrest. In fact, there’s a movie script based on the events but never produced. My
wife said I could sign a release as long as Paul Newman played my role!

Q. There was a time security was becoming more of an issue because of incidents
like that. Did you all initiate any kind of campaign or need to get people to think
more about security, or was there just an overall sense because of incidents like
that, that people needed to be more careful?

A. I think there was a greater awareness on their part, but we did have various safety
programs. We did have initiatives that dealt with personal safety as well as
property safety and security. In these particular instances, especially with the
Milligan incident, they were very directed. Here is what’s happening, here is what
you need to do to help protect yourself. And there was a very receptive audience
to it. One of the difficulties with crime prevention programming in a University
environment is, when things like that happen, there’s a consciousness about the threat, and students are receptive and responsive. And then it goes away because something else captures the front page. Then it comes back up. And with a population that’s constantly changing – 20 to 25 percent a year – it is always a challenge to come up with some type of program that students, particularly students, will listen to. They must hear the message, understand the issue and importance and then respond in a way that helps prevent crime. That is truly a challenge.

Q. Good morning. This is Kevlin Haire. This is side 2 of tape 1 of my oral history interview with John Kleberg on July 10, 2008. John, you were talking about initiatives about personal security, how it sort of went up and down, and that kind of thing. In terms of equipment or logistical things. A man walks into a building, he can just walk wherever he wants, and he ends up stabbing some woman. Did you see a change in security systems throughout the campus, more initiatives to get people to have identification and that kind of thing?

A. There were certainly changes over time. In the ’70s, in the early ’70s particularly, there was still a reaction to the late ’60s, where there was more social activism. For example, at that time on the second floor of Bricker was the bursar’s office where you paid your fees. Above the counter in the bursar’s office was a huge clock, which actually had four video cameras hidden in it. They really weren’t hidden very well and weren’t in use at the time. That was obtrusive to students. It was a spin-off from an early time. Its real benefit was if there was a robbery. It wasn’t that anyone was watching students coming and going. If there was a
robery it was possible to capture the robber on tape. Those type of applications of security equipment went away. There was a greater appreciation and sensitivity to the need to lock residence hall rooms, doors, for example. And eventually there were some applications for video surveillance in different places, public spaces, parking lots, to deal with issues of theft from cars. Card access was installed for residence halls, where only residents could enter the buildings. And most of that was designed for property security as well as personal security. Theft has always been the major issue on a college campus – Ohio State as well as other campuses. So as technology changed and became available, there were certainly applications on the campus. Students went from a perspective of, in loco parentis, doing everything for them, to don’t do anything for me at all, don’t watch me, don’t take care of me, I can take care of myself, where now it’s kind of coming back to, “Well, it’s your fault if something happens to me.” So again, it’s just a curve in time, I guess, that represents a change in attitude or a change in perspective.

Q. In addition to the murder and the Milligan episode, were there other unfortunate events on campus, suicides?

Q. Probably the most significant other major criminal event was the murder of a University Police Officer, Michael Blankenship. In February 1997, Mike and another officer went to the Wexner Center in response to a suspicious person. While talking to the person he drew a gun and fired at both officers. Mike was struck in the face and died shortly thereafter. The other shot just missed the second officer. While the person escaped the scene he was subsequently found dead of a self-inflicted gunshot wound in Upper Arlington. The campus
community really came together over that murder, showed great support for University Police, and demonstrated a willingness to be supportive of police efforts. The current Public Safety Building, Blankenship Hall, was named after him by the Trustees. We estimated that on a daily basis on the campus, there were between 80,000 and 100,000 people. That involved residents, students, faculty, staff, University hospital visitors, people who were tourists, library patrons and others. There could be an infinite number of reasons why they would be here. But that there were as many as 80,000 to 100,000 people on campus made the University a significantly larger community than many cities in the state. In fact, if you looked at that total number, it made us the third or fourth biggest city in the state. So it was and is a busy place. Some of the places on campus were an attraction to people. We had a couple of persons that committed suicide at the University Hospital, Doan Hall and the stadium by jumping off, and one off the north residence halls. In some of those cases, the people weren’t affiliated with the University. In some cases, they were students who were ill or persons who simply selected the campus to end their life. The campus attracts people for various reasons, some of whom have no affiliation with the University at all – never have and never will have an affiliation. In every instance, within the police structure anyway, we certainly investigated those thoroughly to make sure that indeed it was a suicide and was not an act of violence directed against the person by somebody else.

Q. We’ll get off this morbid topic, in a second. But tell me about the suicide in Mirror Lake, because that seems like an especially interesting one.
A. It was in the fall.

Q. Fall of what year, do you remember?

A. Probably ’77 maybe, a student was walking along the south side of Mirror Lake and saw something which looked like a mannequin in the lake. Being near Halloween they thought it was a prank. I can’t remember if it was a student or someone else, reached down to check and realized it was somebody’s head, because they were perpendicular, so it was just the top of the head at the surface. University police and the emergency medical people were called and pulled out a body who was a student who had committed suicide in the lake, which was difficult to do in Mirror Lake, since it is very shallow. He was in a standing position at the deepest end and had been in the lake for maybe as much as 24 hours. There was a picture on the front page of The Lantern with myself and another investigator and EMS people looking at this body. We looked like three ghouls standing there looking at the poor student, who was an international student. Unfortunately, he had taken his own life.

Q. Were you the one who had to notify the family?

A. The family was, I believe from India, and I think it was done through the State Department, as I recall. We did have an incident of a Chinese national who committed suicide off campus. Her parents came from China because they were really concerned about what had happened and the totality of the circumstances, which were not clear at all. I remember meeting with them with President [Edward] Jennings to try and explain what had happened and what we knew about
the circumstances. So we were involved in that interaction with parents of an international student. Those are unusual.

Q. Now let’s go to a happier topic, although I’m not sure this is. Let’s talk football. The fans are always crazy, but were they crazier then or are they crazier now, I don’t know.

A. Generally it’s good crazy. In the ’70s, we were in the 90,000-seating capacity. Now we’re over 100,000-seating capacity, and the traffic was always an issue. In the 1970s the Athletic Department actually supported special police for traffic control as far north as [state Route] 161 and Olentangy River Road, with the Highway Patrol. We involved the sheriff’s department, the Highway Patrol, the Columbus Police, and the University Police and employed about 300 per game. That changed over time. We reduced those numbers and locations. But there were always three considerations regarding public safety and a football game. One is the traffic, parking. The second is the event itself, with the crowds and the people in the stadium, enforcement of reasonable regulations within the stadium, and then the third, of course, is the frivolities that occur afterward. And there were all kinds of those, from winning seasons to losing seasons. Each game was, of course, different. Michigan was always a challenge. I regret to say that there were times when I would hope we would lose because it was getting so tense at the end. If we lose this game, there aren’t going to be any problems. If we win, it’s going to be awful. Events ranged the gambit from relatively modest, rushing the field after the game, to tearing down wooden goal posts and marching them down High Street to the [State] Capitol building, and efforts to control those kinds of
behavior. And it’s a difficult decision-making process, as to when and to what extent you intervene. After I was in business administration with public safety responsibility, we made some significant changes in our reaction to on-field demonstrations after games. Athletics replaced the goal post with a non-destructible goal post that would not come down. We also evaluated the benefit of protecting goal posts, which was done to prevent injury, and assessing what was a reasonable confrontation between police and fans. It was very, very difficult to know what’s best to do and what not to do. Those things also are transitional. In the mid-’70s, I don’t remember exactly the seasons, but we had some really bad demonstrations, destructive around High Street, blocking streets, turning over a bus, dumping cars, carrying goal posts, tear gas released in the Ohio Union, and one thing or another. And then there was a concerted effort to redirect after-game activities. Rich Hollingsworth in Student Affairs and Public Safety worked together to find alternate ways to celebrate, to keep fans from being destructive on High Street. Rich was the primary person with the good ideas to have South Oval events after the game, which involved, in some cases, selling beer, which was controversial at the time, but it was done. And that really diffused, we think, much of that destructive type of behavior. In the early 2000s – 2001, 2002 – we started to have some really destructive off-campus behaviors again. We organized and hosted, Ohio State Student Affairs, a national conference on campus – the first, I think, that was done nationally – to try and find ways to deal with fan behavior at athletic events. There haven’t been any significant off-campus incidents since then. A campus committee was formed – Eric Busch in Student Affairs and I
chaired – to deal with the issues after games. We brought together members of the campus community, our neighbors, city officials and others to work on various approaches to stem destructive behavior. It was a concerted effort working with the Columbus Police, Student Affairs, Residence Halls staff, community organizations, community business organizations, student government, Off-campus Student Services, and student organizations, to work with them to try and avoid these kinds of destructive incidents. Because it’s destructive to the individual, destructive to the image of the institution and property and the city. No one benefits. Over time, from the early to mid-’70s, to today, it’s been up and down, but there’s been a relative era of peace over the last four or five years, which was welcomed.

Q. How did they get to the point, do you as a department feel any responsibility or, I don’t know what the words might be, when it gets to the point where fans are marching down High Street to the Capitol? Did you look at it later and say – I’m sure you did – “We should have done something.”

A. You always look retrospectively at things and say, “If we had done this it would have been different.” One of the most fascinating, I think, fascinating phenomenon with this – if you look at the data based on arrests and police operations, statistical information – many of the problems after football games are not caused by students. So that if you had 50 people arrested, maybe 10 of them were students. There’s not much you can do with those other people. It’s fan behavior. If you look at fans and this behavior, very often they are not directly affiliated with the University – not students, faculty or staff. Indeed, often not
alumni, either. The reality is that, it’s sometimes a social phenomenon that takes place, people find this as a place and an opportunity for this kind of behavior, often fueled with alcohol. So you can always retrospectively look at it and say, “If we had done this, it would have been better.” And clearly the initiatives off campus now with parties and alcohol control, where students are involved, have been successful. The students are responsive to logical arguments and discipline. They are going to behave differently than the nonstudent, the person unaffiliated.

Q. Well, there probably also is the aspect that the officers, at some point in officer training, an officer has to say to himself, “I’m going to get seriously hurt if I try to stop these people.” I assume there is discussion in training with them.

A. And you hope that you could successfully instill that. One of the dilemmas you have in policing is that – and I’ve said this before when talking about arresting someone – it becomes personal. The confrontation is between Bob Smith, the officer, and Bob Smith, the offender. It’s not between officer and offender. And once it’s personalized and the officer is challenged, and if they don’t have the constraint to deal with that, sometimes they become overly aggressive in responding. They don’t withdraw when maybe they should, or they become physically aggressive with people when maybe they shouldn’t have. That’s really difficult. It really is. It’s kind of like a car chase. You don’t know when to quit because it becomes a personal challenge. It is an important part in both recruiting the right candidates to be officers and then in training them. You really want to find the right person who has the ability to differentiate between what’s professional and what’s personal in an enforcement situation. It’s not easy. It’s
not easy at all. You see that in riots and confrontations and misbehavior after athletic events. You look at Europe and soccer matches and realize our problems are manageable.

Q. Can you think of any other events or memorable investigations? I mention in my questions to you about the man who brought he scarlet and gray ribbon into your office.

A. I’d mention first that when I was in the police department we began the first white-collar crime investigative effort at the university. Instances of theft and fraud, working with internal auditing, were our targets and we had some significant success. I think many universities, indeed many departments, now have such investigative initiatives. With regard to the ribbons, when I was in business and finance, one day a fellow came into the office and dropped off ribbons which you now have in the Archives, of scarlet and gray, with a description of how these were the ribbons used to select the University colors. I asked him if he represented the owners. I asked him, “Where did they come from?” And he said, “Well, the person would rather not say and not be mentioned.” Indeed, it looks like they probably are the ones that were actually used to make the selection and the story seemed reasonable. As we did a little research on it, all the pieces fit. These ribbons are most probably used to demonstrate the selection of scarlet and gray.

Q. Why do you think the gentleman came into your office?

A. I was on the first floor of Bricker Hall. I think he came in the front door and turned right and they we were. Our office was business and finance
administration, probably made sense. I have to say, fortunately, that I have an
interest in University history so I made sure we took care of them and got it over
to Archives for preservation.

Q. Let’s talk about your progression from the police department to that position. I
think in 1981 you were promoted to director of internal auditing.

A. Right – ’81 to ’83 I was Internal Audit director. We were doing some transitions
in Internal Audit. We had previously, while I was still in the police department,
created a white-collar crime investigation effort, as I’ve noted. We had a few very
significant and notable cases. We had a decent article published in the FBI Law
Enforcement Bulletin on our evidence presentation techniques, which were really,
I think, exceptional. The prosecutor’s office really liked them.

Q. Did you come up with those?

A. I was instrumental in it. I did an outline on a case that involved a theft in fees and
deposits with various transactions. I was looking for someone who could visually
present the details so that a jury would easily understand the complexities of the
transactions. There was a fellow, [C.] Allen Shaffer, who worked in the media
section of Veterinary Medicine, who was able to get involved with the
presentations. He had great talent and was interested in such issues. He just did an
exceptional job. He’s since retired and is now an attorney. We were able to get
evidentiary materials, explanations of evidentiary materials in a visual way that
were really successful. In any event, I remember in this particular case going
down to the prosecutor with these huge graphics, three-foot-by-four-foot graphics.
And the prosecutor calling in several assistants, saying, “Now this is the way we
need to do this.” Because it was the first time anybody had taken, I think the first time locally, anybody had taken that kind of an approach with white-collar crime. It was new. It was a new concept. We felt very good about it, that we were a step ahead. In Internal Audit then, we became involved in investigative audits and operational audits, more than just the financial audits which had happened previously. I think, in part – Dick Jackson was vice president at the time [of Business and Finance] – I think, in part, the reason I went over there was that there was an interest in expanding the audit functions beyond financial audit. Because of my background and interest, I think he saw that as a role I could help develop. I was there for two years, and then in ’83 I went over to business and finance and became the assistant vice president for business. It changed from business finance to business administration.

Q. So what did you actually do over there?

A. The assistant vice president for administration was like a chief-of-staff position, where I coordinated the activities of all the business and finance department, did all the central budget work for business and finance programs and materials, developing programs, coordinating the efforts between departments, and any other kinds of tasks that would come down the pike. It was the central office that pulled all of these administrative functions together. We had responsibility for just about everything except the medical center and the academic programs.

Q. It sounds like kind of a departure from what you were doing before.

A. It was. It had nothing to do with law enforcement. One, it was a promotional opportunity that brought on new responsibilities, new things to learn, new things
to do. Then I think you also get to the point where, career-wise, your horizons expand a little bit and you say, “Do I always want to be a policeman?” Or, “Do I always want to be an internal auditor?” And this is an opportunity to do other things but still work in an area where those functions existed. Internal Audit was still part of B&F [Business and Finance]. Police were still part of B&F. So it wasn’t like I had lost contact with them. It was just an opportunity to meet other challenges.

Q. Now, you could have left the University and gone to a bigger police department or something. But you didn’t want to leave.

A. No, I really liked working in this environment. Campuses and universities are attractive. They have a tendency to keep you young. Kids drive you crazy sometimes. But it’s fun being around students. They think young. They challenge you. It’s the place where things happen. I like the academic environment. I would take classes from time to time. I just liked the environment. It was a nice place to be.

Q. Now talk about university administration during the ’80s. Of course, you were here in the 2000s. What notable changes do you think there were other than presidents?

A. I was here when Harold Enarson was president. Enarson, Jennings, [E. Gordon] Gee, [William] Kirwin, [Karen] Holbrook, and Gee. So I saw lots of variation, and the organizational structure of the University would change from time to time. There would be different vice presidential areas, or different divisions within the University. But with no offense to presidents, the reality is that if they
are there or not, the institution is going to keep going. I recollect a conversation I had with Dr. Gee one time. My office was directly below his in Bricker. He came down one day, which he had a tendency sometimes to do, and sat down and asked, “What’s going on?” [That] type [of] conversation. I don’t recollect what it was that brought the topic up, but I remember, and you could do this with him, you could joke with him. I remember saying, “It really doesn’t matter who’s president. It’s people at my level who run the University. We can shut it down and keep it going.” Jokingly. He’d kind of laugh and walk off. And about a month later, I was in one of the cabinet meetings and he said, “Oh, and by the way, this is John Kleberg, who runs the University.” He would pick up on those kinds of things. But the point was that, regardless of the overall direction, as important as that was for the research interests and direction or the funding issues associated with it, the day-to-day operation was still with many members of the University staff. We decided when the snow was so bad that you had to close. We decided what street was going to be plowed. We decided when the grass was going to be cut. We decided what new building would be refurbished or scheduled. We always joked about that conversation.

Q. I don’t know why I had this question about Jennings because I realize now you were actually with a lot of presidents. I don’t know if you want to say this, but maybe you could talk about their leadership style or who you liked best.

A. My interaction was different with all of them. Enarson – I had a very limited interaction with. He was president when we had the murder, of course, and when I was director of internal audit. I was director of internal audit when President
Jennings came. But my interaction with them was limited. I probably interacted more with Dr. Gee than anybody, only because some of the incidents we were having with football and off campus. He was a very personable individual, so we’d be in contact sometimes. Less with Kirwin and Holbrook. I found all of them approachable. I found all of them willing to listen. Never found, in my role – of course, I wasn’t vice president – but in my role I never found them unwilling to listen to a perspective or view. I always felt that I could express my perspective on things. They were all, as presidents, they were all good to work with. Dick Jackson, I worked with as vice president for business and finance most, who was an exceptional person. Really committed to the University, a good human being, just a really decent person to work with.

Q. What was your reaction when you heard that Gee was returning?

A. I was in Germany.

Q. You heard it in Germany?

A. It was interesting because we were with a group and there was interest by some of the members about who might be the president. I was asked by some of them what I thought was the possibility that Dr. Gee might return. I said, “I don’t think there’s a chance in the world.” Most just ordinarily wouldn’t come back to a position previously occupied. And the next morning I read in my e-mail the announcement that he came back. I was surprised. Ordinarily you don’t see that happen. I haven’t seen him since he’s been back.

Q. He seems to be everywhere, though.

A. Yes.
Q. You are officially retired, right?

A. Yes, for the second time. I retired in 2000.

Q. Now why did you retire then and why did you come out of retirement?

A. It just seemed like the appropriate time considering everything. You just know it’s time. I was assistant vice president of business and finance and we had made some organizational changes. So I was doing more than I had done previously. I did have other interests. Right about the time I was leaving, Bill Hall was the vice president for student services. He and I talked about the restoration of the Cooke Castle up at South Bass Island, which I had been involved in for several years in Business and Finance, which was assigned to Student Affairs. Bill and I agreed that I would return to work on the restoration project and help out with some safety issues in Student Affairs. That was in October 2000. The initial plan was about a half-time position. I was going to come back February 1, so I would have been fully retired for four months. About the middle of January, there were some troubles with off-campus problems. In the fall of 2000, after the Michigan game, Bill called and said, “Would you consider coming back full time?” He wanted to build a committee to work on these off-campus problems. So I came back in February at 80-percent time to work on this committee to deal with off-campus initiatives, the after football riots, and things like that. And then to also work on the safety issues in the residence halls as well as the Lake projects. That evolved into six and a half years, although I reduced my time gradually over that period. I fully retired again the second time, if you will, the end of September 2007. So I’m out. I’m retired, for sure.
Q. Let me ask you about Cooke Castle. How did you get involved with that project in the first place?

A. In the ’70s, I had been up to the lake in my police capacity. University police have jurisdiction throughout the state on University land, and we were looking at things we needed to do. So I became familiar with the castle. I knew where it was and I knew a little bit about the history of the building and Jay Cooke. Then in ’84, after I was in Business and Finance, I had a meeting with Academic Affairs and Business and Finance about the condition of properties up at the lake. In effect, they were coming apart. The academic program wasn’t able to properly take care of the properties. So they were assigned, with the exception of the research laboratories, to Student Affairs to try and get them improved. We prohibited students living in the castle because it simply wasn’t safe. If there were a fire or something, they wouldn’t make it safely out of the building. We closed the building as part of this change. I became interested in it historically because of Jay Cooke and his importance in the Civil War, as well as the people that had visited there of notoriety and so on. So in ’85 I think it was or late ’84, we had a business and finance retreat at Gibraltar Island. And I got the director of Physical Plant, Jim Stevens, and the University Architect Jill Morelli to review the castle and said, “Look, we need to do something about this property. It’s an historic landmark. It’s on the national registry. The only one the University has, it’s coming apart, etc.” And we simply needed to do something about it. They both became interested, or at least supportive of the needed preservation. We were able, through the finance process, to get an allocation in the budget for half a
million dollars to do some work on it. So in the late ’80s, early ’90s, we were able to do the roof and some mortar repair and things like that. Stone Lab was able to influence the legislative inclusion of a line item in the capital budget to get another half-million dollars. We were then able to have the porches reconstructed. We spent virtually $1 million to protect the shell of the castle. I was able to have it listed as a “Save America’s Treasurers” project. We were never awarded any federal grants, although applications were submitted. We worked at trying to find resources to preserve and restore it, without success. In that process, I became friends with descendants of Jay Cooke, particularly James Harding, the great, great, great grandson, who I still stay in contact with. He hosted, and the University supported, a Cooke family reunion at Gibraltar. There were over 100 descendants attending. So we’ve got some family interested in the project, too. I stay in touch with [Harding] about it. The University Archives has some of the documents and records from the Castle when the University acquired it in 1925. Other records are located at other centers. But it’s just one of those treasures that, unfortunately, the University really neglected. And I understand it: When you compare budget priorities, is it more important to educate 100 students in a specific discipline, or is it more important to restore an old building? The 100 students have to come first.

Q. Maybe it’s out of sight, out of mind.

A. It is out of sight, out of mind for many. If one were to ask 1,000 people on campus about the whole program up there, I doubt if 15 would know.
Q. I saw in an alumni magazine, in the most recent magazine, I’ll show it to you afterward. You know what it is. You talk about the Cooke Castle and the Lighthouse.

A. Oh yes, haven’t seen it yet. I’ll have to take a look at it.

Q. Because I started reading it and I didn’t see the name yet, but I thought, “This has got to be John.”

A. I had seen that; my daughter gets the magazine.

Q. So you’re still spending time basically trying to raise money?

A. Yes, sometimes so unofficial now I don’t even know. I certainly can’t represent myself as being part of the University to do it. If I could find somebody with $3 million, I’m sure the University would respond quickly. I have made some excellent contacts, and as I mentioned to you, I was at Cooke’s fishing lodge in Pennsylvania, where everybody from Herbert Hoover to Dorothy Lemore has visited.

Q. This is Kevlin Haire conducting an oral history interview with John Kleberg on July 10, 2008. This is tape 2, side 1. John, you were talking about Jay Cooke. Has anything ever been written about Cooke?

Q. In 1905, there was a two-volume history written by Ellis Oberholtzer. This is kind of the authorized biography, because Cooke actually saw it, although it was published after he died. Cooke apparently saw the manuscript. There’s a memoir of Cooke’s, which he wrote in the early 1900s which was never published, which the Hayes Presidential Center has the original text. I have a copy of it. And there was a book by a graduate student at Harvard Business School, I can’t think of the
name of it, but it’s on Cooke and the financial dealings during the Civil War, a thesis or research project. There are chapters in various books. There is a book recently written about two years ago, called “Jay Cooke’s Gamble,” which was about Cooke’s involvement in the Northern Pacific Railroad. It’s really a history of the railroad, but there’s a lot about Cooke because he had a lot of money in it. A couple of things are factually incorrect. And then there was a book about four or five years ago on the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, which mentions Cooke. And it’s clearly factually incorrect. But Cooke is mentioned in it. I think those are probably the ones. There’s a very nice painting of him, oil painting. I can’t think of the artist off the top of my head, which was given to the United States Treasury Department and hangs in the gallery at the U.S. Treasury Department, of Cooke in about 1904, before he died, which was given to the Treasury by his daughter’s husband. So yes, Cooke’s a known person. His brother, Henry, was the first governor of the District of Columbia and was the owner of The Columbus Journal, I think it was called at the time, in about 1860, 1861. He was also the publisher of a Sandusky paper. And his son, one of his sons, an Episcopal priest who became a canon when he died in Cleveland, was an avid photographer. He documented much of the history at Gibraltar Island. Those photos are primarily at the Hayes Presidential Center.

Q. How much of your time are you spending on Cooke now?

A. Not much. I continue to find information and have developed some really good relationships with the folks up at Hayes Presidential Center, and also at Sandusky Library. So as I acquire things that they might want, I always make sure they at
least receive copies. I was able to pick up some items from Pennsylvania, original materials, that I’ll pass on to them that I know they don’t have, just to make sure they are preserved. I do have an autographed picture of Cooke.

Q. How did you get an autographed photograph?
A. Jim Harding and I were going through these materials and there was a stack of about 10 or 15 photos of Cooke, prints that were probably [dated] 1878. But three of them were signed. And there were also a couple prints of etchings or engravings of Cooke’s father that were signed. They would have been from about 1864. I need to make sure they get passed on.

Q. Now what is your, if you have one, what is your connection to the University?
A. Probably none. I’m a has-been. There’s no official connection at all. I’m a retiree.

Q. Are you part of the retiree association?
A. No.

Q. How often do you find yourself on campus?
A. I’ll use the library facilities. Of course, the archive facilities. And I still have a lot of friends on campus. So occasionally we’ll get together for coffee or something like that. I still provide some materials as I acquire them that I think might be beneficial to the University police. I’m good personal friends with the police chief and some of the folks at student affairs. When I came back and worked in the risk assessment area for Student Affairs for those six-plus years, I developed a lot of good friends. There’s some contact but I’m down here maybe once a month at the most. And most of that is to use the research facilities. I’m doing private consulting on my own time, and that’s what I do, to keep out of my wife’s hair.
Q. So if they ask you to come out of retirement, would you?

A. I doubt it. If there was some specific project where I thought I could really help with, that would be a benefit, maybe; but to come back to work, no. I think you need people with new ideas.

Q. We always ask this question at the end. What accomplishments and disappointments have you acquired over your tenure here that stand out or you’d like to discuss? Maybe not disappointments but things that you regret happened, either with the department or the University?

A. I don’t know that there are any regrets. In looking back to say, “I wish this hadn’t happened,” there aren’t any of those. I don’t think you can live in that kind of existence. You’ve got to be more positive about things than that. If you look back and say what accomplishments, I suspect there would be none that would ever be attached that would say, “John Kleberg did this.” That’s not important to me. But if you look back and say, “What’s the direction that the University Police took, or what’s the direction that Internal Audit took, or who made an effort to preserve Cooke Castle, or who created an awareness of the importance of looking at deferred maintenance, who created a model to provide for increased funding for safety forces,” all those kinds of things, those were significant, I think, significant contributions. Yes, I did some of those things. I worked on some of those things. But would I be remembered 15 years from now? No, no. But that’s part of the pleasures of contributing to a place, because in 100 years the University is going to be here and in 100 years nobody’s going to remember my name. That doesn’t matter one bit to me. But the fact that the University is here, and I think maybe, in
small measure, it’s a little bit better because of my efforts. That’s what’s important.

Q. Bill Studer had mentioned about the lights at University Hall.

A. And that’s an example of something really, in the long run probably insignificant. But in the larger sense of things, maybe it’s important. University Hall was taken down in 1970. And it was reconstructed basically on the same model as the old one. But it will never be the same. But when it was torn down, the two lamp posts on the south outside of University Hall were saved. They were moved to the Fawcett Center in the alumni area. Bill Studer, who was director of libraries, whose office faced University Hall, and I were talking on the phone one day about something. In the course of that conversation, I’m sure it had something to do with facilities, he said something about the lamps outside of University Hall. He said, “Do you know, they’re over at Fawcett Center?” I told him I had no idea, but I’ll get them back. And we did. We were able to get those repositioned outside of University Hall. But if you’re at University Hall today, the two lamps at the entrance on the south side are the original ones from the old building. Does anybody know that? Probably not. Do many care about that? Probably not. Just Bill Studer and I. Is that important? Yes, I think that is important not that we did it or will be remembered but that it happened. I think if you protect those kinds of things, save those kinds of things and you put them back, they’re important. I remember in the University [Main] Library, now being renovated, at the 300th commencement recognition, we decided to get a time capsule for the event, which I did. I worked on and got people interested in it and we collected items and
placed it near the circulation desk. But in the course of all that – I think it was Bill again – we were talking about where the old catalog was, which was covered with carpet. Bill noted “There’s a floor under it, terrazzo floor.” We took up the carpet and restored the floor, which is excellent. Now if you walk through there now, 99 out of 100 students would never look down and see the floor or see any significance. But we were able to do that. I don’t know if it will remain in the current restoration. So there’s lots of little things that you do over time that, in the grand history of the institution, probably most people would never know about. It all gets lost to history.

Q. Well, you are perpetuating the history of the University in very small ways.

A. In small ways, and I think that’s important.

Q. So do you have any overall thoughts about the University or about your time here that we haven’t discussed yet?

A. A good experience. Really, really enjoyed my time at Ohio State. I think you develop an affinity for the place. We developed, when Dick Jackson was [vice] president [of Student Affairs], a program called, “A Quality Environment for Learning,” because we were in the accreditation process with the North Central Association at the time, which was in about ’87. Paul Young, a professor of architecture, was involved in facilities review, and by virtue of his profession obviously was interested in university facilities. We developed a program around the idea that space teaches, the quality of the space in which you learn is important. So that if one were to ask a student in later years, “What do you remember most about Ohio State?” The answer is often, “It’s the Oval, it’s Mirror
Lake or University Hall.” It’s not Professor Schmoltz or Class X. It’s space, a sort of pride of place that has left an impression. So the importance of place became the theme around the symposium, which we developed. We decided if we were going to do this, why not look at the oldest academic spaces, which were in Europe. I went over to Europe in ’87 and made university contacts with representatives from Denmark, Sweden, England, the Netherlands, Germany, Austria, and Italy, to look at facilities and see if we could get an interest from folks who were responsible for University facilities in those countries regarding a symposium. They were extremely interested. Dick was able to raise private funds to support this effort. If representatives who we then invited could get here, we covered all of their costs while they were here, which included a tour of some educational facilities in the United States. We took them to Ohio State, the University of Michigan, Michigan State, and the University of Illinois-Chicago. Then we travelled to Washington, DC. Took them to West Point, the University of Virginia and William and Mary. Which, if you looked at all those facilities, we had selected ones that were all very different. They were enthralled. The next year we took a group of architects and planners from the US to Europe. We visited universities in Denmark, the University of Copenhagen, the Universities of Uppsala and Stockholm in Sweden, University of Utrecht in the Netherlands. We were at Heidelberg in Germany as well as other sites. We never worked out Italy although I did get to see the Vatican, but we never worked that visit out. Our interest was Bologna, the oldest continuous university in the world. So people from this country who were involved in educational facilities were able to visit
both new and old universities in Europe. The exchange of ideas was excellent, good ideas for classroom furniture and classroom design. Even heating and ventilating differences between the countries, and flexible laboratory space. Just all kinds of good ideas. In fact, there are two publications that resulted. I’m sure you have copies of them in the Archives. I guess, in retrospect, if you were to say, what is it that you remember that was a significant contribution, maybe it was that. So removed from law enforcement. So removed from the day-to-day humdrum. But so important, I think, both the international exchange plus the learning about very different, yet in some ways similar, issues regarding University facilities. It was a wonderful experience and we still know these people. I later made a presentation on the program in Vienna at an international symposium. Maybe that was the significant contribution. And because of that, I’m just rambling, but because of that, I think there was an appreciation of the space on campus, so we devoted more attention to the little things, as another example. Before the Wexner Center was built on the west side between Mershon [Auditorium] and College Road, there was a court[yard], an honors court[yard]. When Wexner Center was being built the courtyard had to be reconstructed, which was done. But there were class bench gifts in that space which we took all of those, and moved them to the south side of Thompson Library. They could have been plowed under, or just discarded; however, we were trying to preserve something of the memories of the campus while facilities expanded or were constructed. The horticulture gardens, which were on the south side of the Stadium are gone now, but we reconstructed that area into a rose garden. Dr.
Minton, who was a physician at University Hospitals and faculty member, was killed in a traffic accident. His wife supported the rose garden financially, the Minton Rose Garden, which now is gone again because of construction. But you just need to do those things. So as I think of it, what was the contribution and what do you remember most, and what is it that you really accomplished? Maybe it was those things. Again, it will never be attached to me, and that is not important. But I think they are important for students of yesterday, today and tomorrow. They are important for the learning environment, for the memories that will outlast us all. And 100 years from now some kid’s going to be asked what he remembers about Ohio State, and it will be the Oval.

Q. That’s true. For example, when you were talking earlier about the police model you developed, as you know the University, they implement a new structure or a new program or a new model, and then they go back to the old, and then they go to the new. It’s very cyclical. But it’s the space that changes, but you need to keep those elements that show that it’s the same.

A. The Oval was partially designed by [Frederick] Olmsted, a famous landscape architect, who also designed Central Park in New York. The University has a remarkable art collection, most of which is in galleries or in the Wexner Center. But across campus, there are paintings all over the place. Until we started a program in the 1990s to identify those and protect them, there was no good record of them, and certainly no adequate protection. Orton [Geology] Library is just an excellent example. There’s a painting in the Orton Library which is worth about $5 million. It was not protected. There was some damage. There were no alarms
on it, nothing. So we started, because of personal interest to develop a program to identify, record, preserve and restore such items as well as provide appropriate security, a program called Reducing the Risk. In other words, the Bellows [painting] in the Faculty Club, which is worth about $3.5 million. There’s a Bellows out here in the hall. Valuable art is across campus. There were Fannings all over the place. There was Carolyn Bradley, all of whom became famous artists. There was no effort to do anything about it. That was another program that I was able to provide some direction and guidance to. It really is rewarding to know that some small action today will protect such valuable resources for generations of students and faculty yet to come to Ohio State.

Q. So the program is still ongoing?

A. Still ongoing. It’s called “Reducing the Risk,” as I noted. Security Services still goes out and photographs and documents, records, and has a small budget to support the restoration of some of them, when needed. Clearly, they belong to the University but they are not part of a specific collection. Carolyn Bradley, we found out about her watercolors in our collection when a student was removing one of them and the police became involved. The security staff working on the program were able to assess the value of the art. Carolyn Bradley, for whom Bradley Hall is named, was on the faculty here. She became a noted artist. Each of her paintings is worth about $5,000. We now have 11 documented.

Q. The student had taken it out of a dorm?

Q. It was moved to a room within the residence hall when the police became involved, but who knows where it might have ended up at some later time or date.
That watercolor belongs to the University, but was not part of the University collection so it was undocumented as were the other 10 [paintings]. So the more I think about it, those are the things that have been the most interesting and most beneficial. That program and space. The importance of the space. Our conversation made me think about the program.

Q. I’m glad you did. And I’m glad you came in.

A. I appreciate it. I very much enjoy history; I guess you never know what you’re going to be part of.

Q. I think you will. Thank you again.