Q. This is May 28, 2002. This is an interview with Dr. Richard Armitage, using questions prepared by Robert W. Butche, and the questioner is Richard Kipling Patterson. Good morning.

A. Good morning to you.

Q. We appreciate you taking time to come down once again for this final version, where we will have an opportunity to hear about your career at Ohio State and other places, I’m sure. We appreciate having this for the historical record.

A. I’m happy to be here.

Q. Let’s just start right in. What drew you to undertake an academic career?

A. It was by chance. As a result of World War II, I had intended after college to go to law school and prepare for a career in the foreign service. World War II came along, and waiting to be drafted, I decided instead, since I wanted to go into the foreign service, to continue with my Spanish. And so I came to Ohio State University, got a Masters Degree, total cost $450 for the year, which I borrowed. And did well enough to qualify for a University Fellowship and invitation to continue toward a Doctoral degree, which I did and that drew me into academic work, when I decided I would try to get a Ph.D. So it was the faculty of Ohio State and the attractiveness of it.

Q. And I think you’ve addressed part of this but what impact did the depression years have on your youth and on you career?
A. My father was born in England and came to this country from Huttersfield, England in 1911, recruited to head up a Cleveland _______ Mills Plant in Ravanna, Ohio. He brought up my half brother with him, age 17, and his wife died after two years in Ravenna. And so he remarried this schoolteacher next door, who was my mother. And everything was fine until the Great Depression came along. He lost his job. The money he had invested in the stock market and things like that pretty much went away. My mother and father and my younger sister and I began to live with and take care of my grandparents. So the Depression then influenced, I carried papers that my father moved from one job to another. He was in his 60’s. And made it difficult for me to compete in certain ways, socially, etc., because we lived with a very strict budget. It also influenced my later feeling about the importance of the New Deal and efforts to prevent another major depression, and to control the stock market, because my father had been cheated out of stocks, although the ones in his own company he kept and saved the family in the long run.

Q. In high school then, what were your interests and some in college?

A. I was fortunate to attend a high school where the Debate Team and forensics was as important as interscholastic sports, with a really fine teacher who was doing night work in Akron to get a law degree, and who later ended up being a very distinguished Probate Judge in Portage County, where I grew up, Ravenna, Ohio. And the Debate Team attracted me, simply because I wasn’t qualified for athletics and that sort of thing. And so I ended up being in 52 intercollegiate debates, National Forensic Society, state tournaments in forensic speaking, and it did lead
me in that direction, which would be viable for a career in the law. And I think that influenced me greatly, that experience.

Q. And how did Oberlin become your entry point into the academic area?

A. Well my mother was a piano teacher in addition to being an elementary school teacher, although she only had a high school degree. But before she went to high school, and she went there in Akron, she came from the country. Her parents were farmers. And so Oberlin became interesting to me. I knew that I could go to Kent State, which was only three miles away, and live at home. But they offered me a scholarship and a board and room job, so that I could afford to go there. And they accepted me and so there I went. And it was furthermore highly regarded liberal arts college, both in Ohio and throughout the country. It was very attractive for that reason.

Q. And it continues to be even today. How did linguistics, Spanish and Latin American studies come to be the academic focus of your education?

A. Completely by surprise. When I was signing up for Oberlin and they sent me my freshman registration materials, I had had two years of Latin and two years of French in high school and I didn’t feel very confident about my French. So I signed up for French I at Oberlin. The Registrar immediately sent it back and said, “Do you realize that if you do this, we’re adding these hours to your graduation requirement? You should move into French III or you can start another language if you want.” And so I thought, “Well Spanish.” And so I began my Spanish as a freshman at Oberlin and then went through and took the very minimum number of hours to have a major in Spanish, only two courses in
Literature I think. Because it afforded me the opportunity in pre-law to take many courses in political science and history, which intrigued me. And economics and even accounting and things like that.

Q. And after that, what attracted you to Ohio State?

A. When I was graduating at Oberlin, one of my professors, he was a chairman of a department, a real old timer, he was in his 60’s, said, “You know, Armitage, you have certain facility in learning language and Spanish and if you ever decided you want to go on and into graduate school, you are an Ohio resident and you have a great advantage because one of the finest Romance Language Departments in the country is at Ohio State. I hope you remember that because we think you’re qualified to do that.” I had no idea that I would do it until about mid-summer, it was ’39, the war was coming on, the draft came, I was admitted to law school at Cincinnati, had a job and a partial scholarship. And I talked to lawyers in the town and they said, “I wouldn’t advise going to law school and then being pulled out at freshman year after draft.” And so then we had a family, and they said, “Why don’t you go to Ohio State and try for a Master’s Degree?” And so I came down and visited with the Chairman of the Department, W.S. Hendricks, and came in and spent three quarters full-time, wrote a thesis, straight A’s one year and earned a University fellowship for the second year. And that is what got me into Spanish. One other thing: my father did get employed. I worked in the summer in a local mill and I worked in the summer of 1937 on the Great Lakes as a deck hand, because there was a strike in the mills at home. In the meantime, the President of the company had a new President of the company, Cleveland
_______, came down, visited my father and said, “We know you are in your 70’s, but would you for a salary come and be my personal representative in this mill and you have freedom, you’re an expert on all these things, and advise on changing, because we’re having problems precisely in the area in which you used to be supervisor?” This liberated my family so that we could return to our home, which we had rented during the Depression, getting back to the Depression, and enabled me and three friends to buy an old Ford for $150 and go to Mexico for the summer and earn credits at the University of Mexico. And that’s what turned me on to Mexico, Latin America, and everything else.

Q. So when you got to Ohio State, what was your impression of the level of the language program?

A. It was clearly top flight. It was a very interesting phenomena. I’ve thought about it several times recently, looking at certain universities. My wife is in university administration. Ohio State University, in many departments I saw there, but that department was with one exception composed of full professors. Most of them in a similar age group, World War I veterans some of them, and came from Harvard, Princeton, two from the University of Chicago, from the best graduate schools in the country, and had been moved up from Assistant through Associate Professor tenure, to full Professor to hold them there. And there were no Assistant or Associate Professors. Now later on, I looked back and saw that that was a pattern throughout Ohio State University. That is, a growth and improvement in quality during the 20’s. And then when we hit the Depression furthermore, people weren’t moving. And there was less mobility but they retained some of their top
professors in Chemistry, Romance Languages, English, History, and other places. And that became a problem after World War II because those people were hitting their 50’s and 60’s, and the younger people coming along were more mobile. And if invited to consider a job in another Big Ten university or Ivy League some of them went, moved out or could be moved.

Q. Let me back up. Who were some of the leaders in that Romance Language program?

A. The Chairman was W. S. Hendricks, whose field was contemporary Spanish literature and also 16th century, with a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, which was a prime, in the midwest the best graduate school without question. C. E. Anibal, whose Indiana University. He had taken his degree in classics but became interested in Spanish drama, the golden age of Spanish literature, 16th, 17th century. And became one of the top three of four authorities in American universities on Golden Age drama. Arch Havens in French was 18th century expert on Voltare, Johns Hopkins University Ph.D. He would go in summer school and teach in Berkeley or in the Ivy League, liked to stay in Columbus and published a great deal. Alexander Shotsky, University of Chicago graduate also, in old French language and literature, Pro________ literature, internationally recognized expert. Olin Moore, who was a character in campus, mentioned in the Anvil and Bellows history of the faculty club for being a very strange character. But known very well and highly published in Italian literature, for example, and again in 17th century and earlier French literature. A true scholar in every respect.
Bachelor to the end, walked every day after lunch from the Faculty Club
downtown, took a street car back, lived just off campus. A very interesting man.

Q. Well, speaking of publication, what role did your very successful textbook,
Beginning Spanish, A Cultural Approach, have on your teaching and your later
administrative roles at Ohio State?

A. I think in retrospect that it moved me away more from the work I was doing. I
was the principal Latin American specialist in Romance Languages. Because of
the revenue from that very successful textbook, surprisingly successful, I was able
with a family of six children to make sure they would get on to college and not to
worry about the financial side of a large family life in academic world. I think
also that it confirmed the fact that I had been right in choosing that as a career.
That I really was devoted to teaching other people about the vantages of Spanish
civilization, culture, and particularly Latin America.

Q. In 1955, you found yourself as Acting Assistant Dean of the College of Arts and
Sciences. What were the issues you faced in that job and how did it change your
career?

A. I don’t think I would have accepted the offer to do that had my textbook not been
so successful. But Bill Guthrie, they called him “Junior Deans,” which meant that
he was in charge of undergraduate advising, died recently. His father owned a
bank and he took over. He became the first, I think, Vice President for Student
Affairs at Ohio State later. But he was on a sabbatical and they wanted someone
to come in. The faculty wanted someone who was a faculty member. Bill never
was. And so he asked me. I was on a committee or something, if I would be
interested in doing that. So we talked about it and yes, I agreed to do it for one year. And I don’t think I could teach a course that year. That was a busy job.

Many years when I was an administrator I would teach at least one course a year.

Q. What sort of things did you end up doing in that position?

A. The faculty of arts and sciences were concerned about the quality of the advising, particularly old timers, counselors, in the college office, and their cavalier kind of attitude toward students and not really going out of the way to discuss with faculty the solutions to certain problems. In other words, it had become an ingrown bureaucracy in its way. And so since I had faculty rank and tenure, it was easier for me to begin to discuss those matters and to turn things around and have different ideas about what was successful counseling and would qualify one for high marks in the personnel department.

Q. What then led you to undertake your post-doctoral at the Latin American Institute at University of Texas?

A. One of the concerns in higher education in the late 50’s, was that GI’s coming back were into graduate school, getting their degrees and there were not sufficient job openings, even though university enrollments had grown tremendously obviously, from 1945-1950. So the Ford Foundation was approached and they decided they would provide money for two or three years to bring young Assistant Professors in the country to work on a project or do something, that you had to apply for it, and spend an entire year off. And then some of the younger people coming along could fill those positions and get experience at Assistant Professor. And I won one of those the first year it was open. A young Assistant
Professor of Political Science here did too. And the place I wanted to go was the University of Texas library. It’s the finest library collection of Mexican literature anywhere. And also they had very fine government history department at the graduate level. The man I worked with then went on and took the same post at Harvard.

Q. Were your teaching outreach activities such as classes at Lazarus and your nine part series of broadcasts on WOSU about Latin America unique among the Romance Language faculty at the time?

A. This happened during World War II. I hadn’t my degree yet. In 1940-41, I was University fellow; in 1941-42 I had my first year as a teaching assistant, and then early in the next year, just after we got into the war, in mid-year they made me a full-time instructor, which meant I had a full set of courses. But I could continue my graduate work but only part-time. During the war, the U.S. government became early on concerned about support from the Latin American nations, as they are now. For example, in the crisis after 9/11 in Afghanistan, who is supporting us in this? And so Nelson Rockefeller, obviously prominent New York and later into politics, was named Director of a Pan American friendship and partnership alliance, and to develop programs which would enable the Latin American countries to send their people to the United States interchange, cultural interchange, political interchange. And they granted money to certain universities to provide courses for journalists and teachers in Latin American culture. And also the University had had on WOSU, a Spanish language program for some time, daily Spanish language program, and I took that over. And then part of this
whole Latin American friendship program was carried for one winter quarter I think, down to Lazarus where we did Latin American affairs. And it was educating the public about the reality of the civilization that was there, from Mexico on down. And to understand what motivated those people and where they were having their problems. And furthermore their great contributions some of them had made already to world literature and philosophy and such. So it was the public and it was publicly supported. The summer seminars I would direct but I would have political science and we would have teachers and journalists come for the summer. It was not University credit. It was a seminar on Latin America to bring them up to date, so that in their classes and in their political writing they could understand better.

Q. So you were addressing much more than the language?

A. Exactly.

Q. Although later on you became aware of issues in graduate school. What was going on in graduate school that first brought its problems to your attention?

A. I think the faculty. And you can see in some of the discussions that were held in the late years of the Anvil and Bellows Club, and Faculty Club, these were prominent faculty members who would sit down and discuss University problems. And they refer back to the graduate schools being the kind of center of bureaucratic arrogance in the way in which it treated, not just students, but also faculty. And the head, the office manager there, was a very bright lady named Alice Moran, who had been there all her life. And increasingly faculty and students were having problems with the people who were trained there, who
would take all questions to Alice Moran. She would determine yes or no or how a problem would be treated, financial or schedule wise or whatever. And even upon appeal, I was involved in one of them, where an appeal was made, Alice would go with the student or the faculty member if it was a faculty, in to Dean Hudson’s office. He was the Dean at the time. And in every one that was ever reported, he sided with her. The faculty had had enough of this. They said, “One thing we need to do is have an elected faculty graduate council.” They had a study and recommended elected graduate council from all of the departments offering graduate masters or Ph.D.’s. And they codified finally a set of rules and regulations that could be referred to and altered only with the approval of this faculty council. And as a result of this, and the obvious, the faculty council had authorized this and the new graduate council would be elected, the Deans retired or quit the job and went back to academic work full-time. Paul Hudson was an imminent bacteriologist. And he had one engineering. And he had Everett Walters. Everett Walters was the son of Raymond Walters, a very distinguished President at the University of Cincinnati, young Assistant Professor in History, who had been called in to be an Assistant Dean. And he was the only administrator left. And that’s the way things were at the time I was there. I was aware of all this and as a student had been involved, and now as a graduate professor had been involved. This led eventually to my being there.

Q. You mentioned two things in the course of discussing that. Recognizing that people are going to be looking at this many years from now, perhaps you’d say a little bit about what 9/11 was your impression.
A. Well 9/11 was, and I being retired, saw it all in the morning on September 11, 2001. The flight of three airplanes into the destruction of the two most prominent buildings in New York City and the other headed obviously for either the White House or the Washington Capitol, which was brought down by its own passengers, who objected to the hijacking. And this hijacking being attributed to the Muslim extremists of the Middle East, headed by Bin Laden.

Q. Thank you. So you talked about the issues of graduate school. How did you become engaged in that administration? How would you describe your experience there?

A. Eppert Walters knew that I had been in the Arts and Sciences. And at the same time in the summers I was helping the staff of the College of Arts and Sciences in their summer program for freshmen students, representing the faculty and discussing faculty-student relations, and that sort of thing. And he came over and he said he was named Acting Dean. And he said, "I need help. You have the kind of experience that’s needed because so many of the problems are in that office itself." And I said, “No way. For one thing you’re from the Humanities and I’m from the Humanities, History and Romance Languages, and this is a University that covers a lot more than that. We’re unique in a way, Ohio State, all through its history, as having Ph.D.’s under one organization and all faculty involved in setting rules and regulations, whether its Engineering or Bacteriology or Linguistics.” And then we had another lunch and he said, “Look, in one year they’re going to spend looking for a new Dean. In the meantime, we can have fun.” This is literally the way he put it. “We can implement, we can get this
whole thing started, get all the rules codified, train the staff in ways the faculty want them to, and then go back to our Department.” He said, “Not only that, you’ll make more money over there.” So it was a very simple, we had become friends obviously, just through the Faculty Club and that sort of thing. And so I said, “Okay, I’ll come.”

Q. And what roles did you play in University policy matters, either as a faculty member or while you were at the graduate school?

A. Largely when I became Dean in 1962, Acting Dean in 1961 and Dean of the graduate school in 1962, but I was on University wide committees of various kinds. And involved with the administrators of the different colleges, and particularly departments in discussing problems with students and just the record keeping and the implementation of rules and that sort of thing. And deadlines and that kind of business in the graduate school. I can’t recall any until later that I became involved in University wide committees. I’m sure I was on two or three but I can’t remember. Could have been orientation committees and things of that sort. Because I had been involved in freshmen orientation in Arts and Sciences.

Q. You were a little modest I think perhaps, in describing the transition from Acting Dean to Dean. I believe you actually ended up being the Dean at the end of that period?

A. Everett Walters was named Dean after the first year. In other words, the faculty and the administration were sufficiently pleased with our performance over there, that they asked Everett to become Dean. And he then made me his Associate Dean. And we then built a staff with Engineering and Science Assistant Deans to
handle that. And changed the whole, and even within another year, they had Alice Moran and top office people were retired. They retired in a friendly manner. They felt that we were handling things reasonably so that they could leave. And so it was that kind of turnover. In 1961, I think it was, Everett Walters had an invitation to spend a year in Washington, in the Office of Education, doing a study of something or other. And while he was there, he was offered the Vice Presidency of Boston University. I was Acting Dean while he was gone. And that was the spring of 1962. And at that time, Fawcett was President. As I understand it, a representative group of faculty graduate council asked for a meeting with the President, and suggested to him that the graduate faculty would be pleased if he would name me permanent Dean. I didn’t know about this. And he did. Invited me to be Dean. And I said, “I’ll take 24 hours,” because this meant permanent commitment for a period of years, beyond what I already had. And no teaching. So we had an agreement. I said, “I will be graduate Dean but I would like to suggest to you that, for example, I be consulted but not have veto power, in the appointment of all department chairman, in those departments which offer Masters and Doctoral programs, that are administered through my office.” And I said, “Even more important in certain ways, in the selection of Deans of the Colleges, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Agriculture, that I be on the interview list. That I interview candidates as for Department Chairmen, I interview those candidates when they are brought through. And have some voice, that is, but not veto power, in the selection of those people. For a variety of reasons. I get to know them and will have to work with them. And number two, they will
understand that they have some obligation to the graduate school in certain areas of the work that they will be doing as Chairmen.” He agreed to that. I also said that I had some suggestions to make about, and it was the payment of graduate teaching assistants and why they have to pay fees. Why couldn’t they just put the money in an account? A newly arrived graduate teaching assistant doesn’t have money to put into fees. We’re paying the anyway. Why don’t you just subtract it from their miserly monthly contracts and then they won’t have that? And also, it would be a good idea if we can eventually have a graduate residence hall, which eventually we did. He saw he reason for that. And we agreed on other things. We had very open conversations and friendly relationships and were usually on the same beam, so to speak.

Q. One University wide committee you did get involved with was the Athletic Council. How did that happen?

A. In a similar way. The faculty here became upset in the late 50’s, not at Woody Hayes. I’ll discuss that later if you wish. Woody got along fairly well with the faculty. Better than many. And he admired them and he admired the fact that he considered them. But the continuing emphasis on football and Rose Bowls and this sort of thing, which while at the same time we were having problems in the 50’s in raising the kind of money, both externally and through the state, to rebuild some of our departments, which had lost their prominent people who had been there for years and we were having to recruit. Open admissions. You bring someone with his Ph.D. from Harvard and want him getting interested in the Chemistry Department or Humanities, and he wants to look at the total
University. We were the last Big Ten university to have selective admission, and this was beyond that time. The faculty felt that if the University of Michigan and Illinois an Indiana and Purdue and Iowa and Minnesota and Wisconsin, Minnesota didn’t either but we were the last. And Wisconsin, why couldn’t we set some standards for admission of freshmen and not be wasting our time on students who should be in a community college. Issues like that. But athletics, the Director, it was called Secretary of the Alumni Association, Jack Fullen, listened to faculty on these issues. And listened also to some of the alumni who were having a hard time getting tickets. And in the meantime, we were involved with the Big Ten in the Rose Bowl. Now the Rose Bowl, Pasadena, had a contract with the West Coast Conference at that time. And the West Coast Conference had a contract with them and with the Big Ten to send a team. We would send a team. There was a reorganization of the West Coast Conference. States like Iowa or Idaho didn’t have their team there anymore. They had two teams from Arizona and they reconstituted the whole Washington State, Oregon, U Cal, UCLA, Southern California, Arizona, Arizona State. Brand new, all similar universities, similar size. Mostly state supported and some of them the highest quality in the country. No problem with that. But they had to negotiate them a new contract. And the faculties in the Big Ten had not been happy about the Rose Bowl for a variety of reasons. One, it took administrators on train rides to the west coast during Christmas and New Years season. There was alumni unrest because they couldn’t get tickets to the Rose Bowl. And we would get a letter from an alumnus in Florida who would say, “I can’t get a Rose Bowl ticket to take my wife to the
Rose Bowl. I’m retired down here but the local Ford dealer is publishing the fact that he has tickets and is having a local raffle or lottery,” which was true. More important were two factors. That if you sent your band, and we had a large one, you sought the support, get it out there. You had to pay for the people, the official party which went. The block of seats available to your alumni and controlled by the Ohio State Alumni Association was very small, considering the size of the stadium and the size of the University. So a committee was formed to look at the whole Athletic Department. And I think the Rose Bowl things had a lot to do with this. And they recommended, it was called the Fullington Committee. He was the Dean of the former Chairman of English, Dean of Arts and Sciences. He was totally neutral. He was not really interested in athletics. But he had a faculty committee. They studied those problems and others. And they noted that, you know the true name of the Big Ten is the Intercollegiate Conference of the West or West Intercollegiate Conference, or something like that. And when it was founded back in World War I days, University of Chicago being the principal founder, it was written into the regulations that each university’s intercollegiate athletic program would be governed and run by a board on which a majority were faculty. And Ohio State was doing that. The faculty were appointed by the President. And so they proposed that that rule be expanded so that you would have elected faculty members on the board. And that the board, the athletic board, be composed of two alumni, student I think, and it was five to four. Five faculty members and four alumni and other administrative. And the Faculty Council approved this with one, they did arrive at a compromise on the way it was to be
elected to prevent I don’t know what. That the President would select three or more candidates and the faculty would vote on that. The Faculty Council. And I was called from the President’s office, John Mount called me. And I said, “Do you realize what you’re doing? I’m opposed to the Rose Bowl the way it is now. And I think there is an over-emphasis and a certain amount of hypocrisy in the program. And I tend to agree with some of the things that Jack Fullen is saying about what Ohio State’s reputation being not improved by its athletic program.” And he said, “The President is fully aware of that. He wants to nominate you anyway.” And I said, “Well let him go ahead.” And they elected to me to the Faculty Council. And so there I was. And this was gradual. In other words, each year as a new faculty member of the five came on, there would be the similar. The one who followed me was the Dean of the College of Pharmacy, who had come from the University of Wisconsin, for example. One of the first issues was the Rose Bowl. And we had discussed it. And then unfortunately in a certain way, maybe fortunately, the Big Ten faculty representatives, you had to have a faculty representative of the Big Ten that ran the Big Ten, were approached by the west coast, and the vote was five to five. Five universities said, “Yea, let’s go ahead without the Rose Bowl. Five faculty said no, it’s a waste of time, it prolongs the season.” Some of the football players themselves said, “It just takes too long. We want to be through with the season Thanksgiving. There’s no reason for us to stay another full month on this.” This is hard for the public to understand now days, particularly. So it was five to five. Very interesting that I’d find out one time that those states in which there were rival universities, Michigan/Michigan
State, Indiana/Purdue, they got four votes right there, because I think one institution feared the public reaction to their being no, and the other university being I and no. Northwestern was against, Minnesota was against, Illinois I think was against, and Minnesota was against. There were five. So we’re at a deadlock. So Ohio State won the Big Ten unexpectedly in the final Michigan game in 1961 when this was all being explored and how do we get through this anyway. And we got a call from the members of the Athletic Council saying, “We have a message from Pasadena, not official, they don’t want it publicized, but if invited, would you come?” Well, that meant that the Athletic Council which reported to the Faculty Council, had to come to some determination. And the Athletic Council voted yes, we would go except for one vote. And that was me. So it went to the Faculty Council and there it was recommended and it was cameras, TV, the Faculty Club always met in the lounge of the Faculty Council. And outside there were people carrying signs. So we had a debate which is recorded in various ways, and I spoke against it for the reasons that point and report and based upon studies and that sort of thing. And to our surprise, the faculty … and then there was a motion for secret ballot. And when they counted the ballots, it was, I think, 28 to 23 against going, which led to a very interesting night for those of us on the Athletic Council that were known to oppose it, as well as faculty. Faculty were called in strange language. My family were answering the phone, by the time I got home, because they were getting these phone calls. And then I took over and I answered every one. And I had one, a man who identified himself, and said, “You’re ______________. I said, Well I’m an Ohio State grad and I
understand you did a lot of work in Mexico. University of Mexico.” I said, “Well I attended summer school there and have been back several times.” He said, “Is that where you became a Communist?” That sort of thing. Well, a lot of this, and that leads us to another issue later about McCarthyism and Speakers Rule in the 50’s, which led to faculty Board of Trustees tensions. And this was part of it too. I mean, the vote on the Rose Bowl. The next day, the Minnesota faculty had a meeting and they voted to change their vote and the went to the Rose Bowl. They were number two team in the Big Ten that year. I might add one more point here. You’re going to ask me later, I would assume, about Woody Hayes. But it’s appropriate right now, I think. We set down, some of us on the Athletic Council, Dick Larkins, the Athletic Director. Ed Weaver was his Associate Director, formerly Associate Director of the Alumni Association, and later Director of Athletics, recently deceased. And a strong Ohio State supporter. And Larkins and Weaver and I and there may have been a couple members of the Athletic Council, other faculty members, aid, “Now where do we go from here? We do not want permanently to stay out of the Rose Bowl. But how do we now get out of this predicament?” And we agreed that what we would do would be to sit down and begin to resolve certain questions like the ticket and insist upon certain new rules and regulations that would meet the objections that our studies had made. And make it a fairer kind of relationship for the Big Ten school, no matter which one it was. Such as pay the expenses of the band and more tickets for the visiting team, and things like that. But more important, what were we going to do about what amounted to a Woody Hayes/Jack Fullen feud. Each of
them very good at what he did. Each of them very articulate in pursuing people in public relations. Woody with his bad temper. But good relations with faculty. And Jack with his kind of aggressive, people wondered if he really wanted to eventually become President of the University or something. He was an ambitious kind of fellow. And his predecessor had become President of the University of Minnesota. But Jack, listening to faculty and understanding our concerns, and Woody obviously a very successful coach and highly popular. And deliberating we decided this is what we would do. That Ed Weaver would sit down with Woody and I would sit down with Jack Fullen, and we would say, as I recall, something like this: “Look, the University is going to stay in the Big Ten, so Woody don’t worry about it. And Jack, you’ve just go to live with it. Number two, we’re working on a way to move into an affirmative vote on the next question we get, because obviously six out of the Big Ten schools are going to sign a new agreement and to get improvements. The local situation as such, given the publicity, that you Jack, on your side and a lot of people support you obviously and did on this vote, and Woody on his side, inflamed public opinion of their supporters, and it’s not good for the University. We’re not asking that you suddenly become bosom buddies and friends and that Woody go with you to every alumni meeting,” (which he refused to do you know to go to an Alumni meeting because he and Jack just collided in every way), “but just to let it be known that you were burying the hatchet. There weren’t going to be anymore personal feuds and speeches and inflammatory stuff. And that we’re all going to work to make this new contract for the Rose Bowl a successful one and one that
we would be proud of and that our alumni could enjoy, and the students, and the teams, and Woody. And that Woody, for example, would stop his …” Well Ed and I had lunch the following day. I convinced Jack. Jack said, “Okay.” And we sat down and said, “For example …” Woody was adamant. Ed spent part of an afternoon with him. He said, “It would be dishonest of him to do that.” I defended him on the west coast as being inflammatory and a terrible temper, but an honest guy. And so, it didn’t work. But we tried. And then we went on from there.

Q. What was your relationship with President Novice Fawcett and others in his administration?

A. With President Fawcett, excellent relationship. He was accessible to me whenever I wanted to discuss a problem. He frequently consulted with me on questions that were appropriate, whether it was athletics or graduate education or whatever. I can say the same about the Academic Vice Presidents who served under him. Fred Heimburger who lasted the first three years, I remember the Anvil and Bellows Club. Grew up Columbus, got his degree here, Political Science. Dean of Arts and Sciences after World War I and then Vice President for Academic Affairs in the last years of Beevis. He and Fawcett did not see alike on the issues and it took about three, maybe it’s three or four years until Heimburger, I don’t know whether he was told to leave but he retired. The people who followed, Ohio State really had excellent Academic Vice Presidents. John Weaver, one was a friend of mine, he was a Graduate Dean at Iowa when I was Graduate Dean here. And he left here to become President of the University of
Missouri and invited me to come to Missouri. And I spent a year at the University of Missouri, Kansas City, as Vice President for Academic Affairs. John Corbally, first rate, went on to become President of Syracuse and then the University of Illinois. Ned Molten, who was there during the final years I was on campus, who was my Assistant and Associate Dean of the Graduate School before moving into President Fawcett’s cabinet in a way. I think a long with a considerable number of faculty members, Gordon Carson, who had been the Dean of Engineering who was Business under Fawcett in the middle years, was not very popular with academic people in general. I don’t think he had the capacity to listen for one thing. And to engage in a meaningful dialogue, he was always right about things. But I didn’t have to deal very much with him. John Mount, I didn’t have to deal with because he was principally devoted to undergraduate students and orientation and that sort of thing. By and large, the record will show that the people who were appointed to the Vice President positions during the years that I was here, were fully competent and they demonstrated that by going elsewhere and becoming distinguished Presidents in places like Oregon and others. University of Oregon and I can’t remember his name, he’s now President of the University of Indiana. In other words, there is a history at Ohio State University of really quality people as Academic Vice Presidents over decades.

Q. Is that Miles Brand?

A. Yes. He came here after I left in ’78. I think he was here shortly after that.

Q. Well you hinted at the Anvil and Bellows Club and now is your chance to talk about that. We were delighted when you did that during the informal portion.
Please tell us what the group is, how it came about and what were its contributions to the University?

A. When I became an instructor, it would have been in winter quarter of ’42, Professor Hendricks, the Chairman of the Department, took me to the Faculty Club to lunch and then said, “You know, now you’re full time staff. I would advise you to become a member of the Faculty Club. It would be in the best interests of the Department. Most of us all, all of us are, the full professors. And I think you’ll learn a lot about the University that way.” So I did. On my small salary and recently married. And I knew that the Faculty Club had had its meetings for years on the top floor of what’s now Beevis Hall. No, the administration building. What do you call it now? Named after our governor and senator?

Q. John Bricker.

A. Bricker Hall, yes. Alright. And the building had just opened in ’39. It was only three years old. Sitting down there and belonged to the faculty. So I joined. I ate my lunch there regularly. And got to know people. You sit at different tables. It was a very democratic place. There were large round tables with six, I think. Cafeteria line in the basement and a place to play cards in the basement. And long tables where you could come in there, there would 10 or 12. But with student waitresses handling everything. First rate place. And you meet people, interesting people in various ways. And someone that I met said, “Do you know about the Anvil and Bellows Club? You know those old guys that sit down in the lounge there in the sofa after lunch? They call themselves the Anvil and Bellows
Club because of all the hot air.” I said, “What do they say?” He said, “Oh, they just talk. They tell stories and they gossip about the University.” So I began to go. And I was the youngest for a while there. You know, at the end of the War and before the faculty came back. And it was a unique group. I had submitted a list to the campus of 35 members, all the way from Jack Full, for example, where he picked up a lot of faculty opinion. Various chairmen of Engineering Departments, strong men, E.E. Dreese, distinguished engineer in a distinguished department. Electrical Engineering. Mechanical Engineering, Mike Marco, strong faculty. One of the anti-Rose Bowl people. Engineering, true physicist, the Chairman of the Department, Dudley Williams, a distinguished faculty member, who later went on to North Carolina. He is a personal friend of mine, still living in retirement in southern New Mexico, where his son is a member of the faculty of New Mexico State. And just people who came in, came out. And someone said one time, “You become a member here if you come in and someone says hi.” And there would be a week when you wouldn’t be there. And it would start about 12:00, 12:15, the early people. And a central figure in all this was Professor Robert Nickeljohn. Professor of Engineering Drawing, I think he came to Ohio State in 1908. He designed and actually prepared all of the diplomas for decades, including after he was retired, for all of the Colleges. He designed the first scoreboard in Ohio Stadium in 1921. Had no family, a wife who was ill and he would carry lunch home, no, dinner home at night after he had eaten. Apparently she was bed ridden, confined to her bedroom or wheelchair or whatever. But he took care of her. And he always drove a nice shiny Oldsmobile or it was alleged a
Cadillac. And he would sit at the table. He was short and wore thick glasses, was bald. And I sat down at a table and he said, “Young man, how tall are you?” And I said, “I’m only 5’19”.” And that tickled him. So for the next 20, 30 years, he referred to me as 519. If I came in, he said, “How are you today, 519?” The Air Force and Naval ROTC commanders, who became members of Anvil and Bellows, while we were ROTC and both of them returned to the University later, Merwin Potter, Colonel Potter, and the Naval. He greeted Merwin Potter and called him “Corporal. Hi ya Corporal.” And I don’t know, midshipman or something to the Naval, Adam Jordan. And interestingly enough, Jordan, after retiring from the service, came back to Ohio State and worked in the Mechanical Engineering Department. I think he had a degree from Stanford. And Potter, the Air Force, he was very popular. Came back and was Assistant Dean running the Student Affairs in the College of Commerce, what they called it at that time. There were administrators there too, Ned Molten, was introduced to it after he became my Assistant Dean, and he became a member of the Anvil and Bellows. For several years, we had social occasions, annual convocation, two or three times at Jack Fullen’s house, in which we would … it was totally disrespectful conferring of imaginary degrees on people for something they had done during the year, including the worst story told or the best story told. The most disgraceful public appearance, or whatever it would be. It was total fun. Very friendly group. Became identified in certain quarters as liberal. I think it was because of Jack Fullen being there and I think, whereas it was predominantly conservative academic people. A people like Harold Grim, distinguished
internationally for his authority on Martin Luther, and Chairman of the History Department, and very reserved, quiet, but regular member of the club. Only told one story in the 20 years I can remember and surprised everyone. But it was a group which was terribly sensitive to the reputation of the University. There were department chairs there who were constantly involved in recruiting or retaining faculty. And developed over the years a distrust of the Ohio State University Board of Trustees actions such as the Speakers Rule in the 50’s, during McCarthyism, where we were the only major University in the country where you had to go all the way to the Board of Trustees to invite someone to speak on campus. They didn’t do that in Wisconsin or Indiana or Purdue or Illinois, or any of those places. And a faculty member would come in and it got publicity. They’d say, “You mean I have to plan ahead of time and have the Board approve anyone I want to come in here and speak on any subject?” “Yea.” Things like that. And the Anvil and Bellows Club were pretty adamantly opposed to it. And it had nothing to do with their political, but just their feeling about University citizenship and the need to consult with faculty on the organization of the University. Consult with them. And consult with them, the Board. The administration did but it somehow didn’t fit with the Board in the opinion of these Anvil and Bellows people. Not all of them. A few of them agreed. It wasn’t any Communist group. Far from it. But they had an influence because as they met people and exchanged information, it was good and it was a good relaxation time after lunch. Some people would stay for five minutes and like Uncle Bob, as we called him, Nickeljohn would say, “You __________.” On one of his birthdays
we gave him an award and Woody Hayes came in and presented it to him. And we had The Lantern reporters and photographers there. We’d do things like that. Foolish but also I think, I can remember issues coming up and someone would turn to me or Ned Molten, who would then say, “What would the Anvil and Bellows think if we did this?” In other words, it was a spread of opinion through the Chairman of Psychology and the Chairman of Bacteriology and the Chairman of History, and prominent faculty members and scholars, who just liked to sit there and relax instead of playing bridge after lunch or going back to the lab. So it’s faded now but it held its meetings through the 80’s after I left, I am informed.

Q. In the latter years of service to the University, you became deeply engaged in the University’s athletic programs. What is your appraisal of the issues of that era and how do you see today’s athletic programs at Class A institutions?

A. Well, as you know, I left the University for a year in 1970 and was invited back in 1971 by President Fawcett, after the Kent State problems, to open an ombudsmen’s office, which would handle complaints from faculty, administration, students, but with no power to tell what to do. We can discuss that later if you wish. If was at the end of my term there that I was appointed Vice President for Student Affairs. A complete surprise. The previous occupant became ill and was hospitalized and had problems that needed attention more than he had realized or we had realized. And he went later, after his recuperation, stayed at the University. And I was asked to do it, the Student Affairs, because I had had the experience I had described with graduate students, with undergraduate students in Arts and Sciences, had taught undergraduate courses
almost every year, particularly when I was ombudsman. Was known to students. And because they felt that I could use the information and experience I derived from that, including athletics, which reported to the Vice President for Student Affairs. I don’t know whether it still does. At the time, it was one of the two that did in the country. That is, they had started out as Student Affairs but then became attached to the President in ways that are curious. So, here I was again dealing with the Athletic Director, whom I had not appointed. Ed Weaver reporting to me. And I remember the first meeting we had was about budget and Ed brought in, I asked him to bring in salaries of other coaches in other institutions to bring me up to date. Because I had been out of it for three years, four years, well longer than that. And Woody’s salary was fourth or fifth in the Big Ten to my amazement. And I said, “Well why is this?” This was 1973-1974. “Woody doesn’t want to.” I said, “He wants the money to go to his assistant coaches, so he can keep them. He doesn’t need the money, doesn’t want it.” And I said, “Well, he is the prime coach along with is former assistant coach up in Ann Arbor in the Big Ten. I think other people who would see this would wonder what’s the matter with Ohio State University. We’re so niggardly that we won’t spend money. I want you to raise his salary to the top. And when he objects you tell him that I have no objection to his returning that money to the athletic fund, but that we don’t want to disgrace Ohio State University in the eyes of other institutions by not to appreciate what he has accomplished for the University and his public relations.” Then of course we went on and actually one of the problems I had was to select a new Athletic Director. My relations with the Department
were fine. They invited me and I would sometimes make some remarks to their annual dinners, at the post-season dinners and things like that. But then Ed Weaver decided to retire. And so we had to find a new Athletic Director and I was responsible. And so I set out to have an interview in my office with the head coach of every mens and womens team, as long as they wanted, completely confidential, and I would take notes on it before I would take the matter. And I agreed to this with the Athletic Council. I said, “This is what I would propose we do. Then I’ll report back to you. And then you can decide, do we go on a national search?” In the meantime, the local newspapers were, you know… And so that’s what I did. And finally, one afternoon while I was over a period of obviously ________, it was Woody’s turn. He had, by the way, and I still have, given me a book “You Win With People,” and put “To my friend, Dick Armitage, even though you didn’t let us to go the Rose Bowl. Regards, Woody.” That says something about our relationship. And the first thing he said was “Is that young fellow with the beard out there really your secretary?” By the way, much later, when I was in Iowa, my long time secretary, who took over for Alice Moran in the Graduate School and came out of retirement for me during my first year as Vice President, died. Had a funeral here. I was in California as a matter of fact. And I came back for the services. She had never had a college degree. Sent both college through college, graduated from Ohio State and all that, and was just wonderful with students. Grew up in Columbus, kind of rough in certain ways. Great football fan and that’s how Woody got to know her. Woody was at the funeral and the family appreciated that. And he would do that, quietly, never
noticed in the press. Attend events or visit people who were ill in the hospital. Just various kinds. Faculty members or people that didn’t get that much attention. He said, “Is he really your secretary? With the beard there?” This would have been, as I said, 1973. I said, “Yea.” And he said, “Well, sure is different from the way it used to be around here in the Graduate School.” I said, “Well, Woody, his father was the head of Army ROTC here at one time. And he followed his father. He did service in Europe, somewhere in France. As a result, this young man came to Ohio State because his father had been ROTC here and got a degree in French and is qualified to teach French, and he couldn’t get a job. And so I met him some way. He had been on some student committee and he came and asked me if there was any possibility. I put him on as a kind of assistant in the office. We did have an opening. Very low paying job. And he kind of wants to get married too. And he’s turned out to be the best I could possibly encounter. He’s just great. He’s bright. He likes working here, etc. and he can’t get a job teaching French right now. It’s hard.” He said, “Well, okay. What are we wasting our time for here anyway. Why are we having a meeting. Why don’t you just appoint Hugh Hindman and let’s be done with it? He’s qualified. He’s the Associate. Should be no question. He has support from alumni, most of them I would guess.” I said, “Let’s stop right there, Woody. The last time that this position was open, I was not here. I was at University of Missouri for a year. And when I was gone, Larkins retired and I got a report later from Al Kuhn, who was Chairman of the English Department and on the Athletic Council, and later became Vice President for Academic Affairs and a friend of mine. I headed the Woodrow Wilson
selection committee in the late 50’s while I was Associate Dean and got to Ann Arbor and he was on the selection committee. We would meet with students from, graduating seniors, from all over Ohio and all over Michigan. So I knew him very well. Al Kuhn told me that a meeting was held of all the coaches. And that Al Kuhn, who was Chairman of the Athletic Council, got up and said, ‘I want to inform you that we have decided and offered the job to Ed Weaver, the Associate Director, and he has accepted.’ Woody, Al Kun told me that you got up and you said, ‘Well what in the hell were we invited here for anyway,’ and stomped out in anger. Now does that explain why I am inviting you?’ “Oh yea, and listening to you taking confidential notes.” And so we appointed Hindman. But it’s an example of his uncontrolled suspicious nature.

Q. Why don’t you say some more about your recollection with Woody and Richard Larkins.

A. Larkins was first rate. The faculty got along with him fine. The faculty got along very well with Woody. Woody ate lunch there. He ate dinner there frequently in the evenings. I never, ever heard in all the years he was here any allegation that he had brought pressure, even raised serious concerns about grades or grade changes. He dealt with his, Woody and Larkins backed him in this. The faculty was aware of the fact that he did not recruit certain students who in the present circumstance probably would be and who wouldn’t be qualified to take the kinds of courses they were required to take. They were very proud of Woody’s graduation rate of his players. He had excellent relations with the faculty in that sense. The questions, in other words, about the appropriate administration of athletics at that
time were not focused on Woody. He happened to be very successful at the time as a coach and truly they admired the fact that he really was a historian. I visited him the last time I saw him when I came back here. He was in his office. He had had a stroke and we talked for about a half an hour, in the office that they made available to him after he retired, and he had an impressive library of history books. History texts. And he used to attend lectures in history. It was a kind of hobby with him, but a serious hobby. It wasn’t something he publicized but you knew about it because faculty knew about it. They admired him for that. He was an intelligent person and a first rate education and all that. And I think Larkins and Woody complimented each other. Larkins could tone down Woody in certain ways. Also interpret Woody to the faculty and the administration. My guess was that was a very good relationship. I think Woody worried about that because he trusted Larkins and Larkins trusted him. He did not trust Jack Fullen, getting back to our earlier talk. I know he trusted me because he went out of his way not to persuade me about things, but to be friends in various ways and to discuss things and differences of opinion in what was going on in the University and things like that. And Woody was popular with the Anvil and Bellows Club. They made fun of him and his temper and all that. But they enjoyed friendly relations. I defended Woody very much after I left here and spent several years at the University of California at UCLA. And I defended him for those qualities. His honesty and the fact that the faculty at Ohio State including those who felt there was over-emphasis in football particular, and other sports, nevertheless had confidence in him, while recognizing that he had a problem with his temper. He
couldn’t control his temper, which is what of course led to his eventual problems, serious problems.

Q. In that vein, what happened at the Michigan-OSU football game in 1976 that caused President Enarson to order you, Coach Hayes, and Athletic Director Hugh Hindman to resolve this?

A. Before the game, the Michigan game, Woody was in the end zone talking with two or three of his Assistant Coaches while the players were warming up on the field. A television cameraman and another, I forget his name, he’s quite prominent now on ESPN, approached them and came up with the camera in the end zone. They were in the end zone, they were on the field, and the players were back here. Woody turned around and saw him and took his right arm and hit the camera with his elbow and knocked the fellow down and his camera fell. And that was on national TV and in the papers. So we had a meeting on Monday, after the Michigan game, and Woody came in and Hugh Hindman. I had informed him. Enarson and I had discussed and we agreed ahead of time that Enarson was going to handle it. So Enarson told him, told him in essence, “Woody, the University can’t afford this kind of publicity for all kinds of reasons.” And explained to him why and said, “We’ve discussed this and we’re asking you to do three things. As soon as this meeting is over, we want you to go into my outer office and call and apologize personally to the person that you hit. Deserved or not.” And he said, “Alright.” “And number two, tonight’s the football banquet and we’ll be there, Dick and I and you. And we know it’s several thousand as usual. We want you to publicly apologize for that where the press can cover it, in
the way you consider to be appropriate.” Woody said, “Alright, I’ll do that.”

And then Enarson looked at him and said, “And Woody, number three, we want you to promise us here and now that there won’t be anymore of these displays of temper and violent displays of temper that are so damaging, both to your reputation and the reputation of the University.” And Woody sat there for at least a minute, I would guess, in retrospect. And he looked at President Enarson and said, “President Enarson, I can’t promise, but I’ll try. I promise I’ll try.” And we looked at him and said, “Good luck. I hope it works out.”

Q. Then moving on from that to the 1978 Gator Bowl. What happened?

A. I had left the University then. So I was not here. I retired from Ohio State in the first of July, 1977, 1978. Alright? However, I’m an Ohio State football fan, didn’t miss. I was really at the Snow Bowl they talk about. Friend of mine once said, it may have been Jimmy Crum who said, “You know I’ve run into at least 200,000 people who are at the Snow Bowl at the Michigan game 1950.” But my wife and I were watching the game. I was living in California. And I had left the room to get a Coke or something and while I was filling it with ice, my wife called and said, “You have to come and see what’s happened.” I said, “What?” She said, “Woody did it again.” I said, “What do you mean?” She said, “Come see. There will be a replay.” So they did a replay. Woody was standing on the sideline which he did and I think a linebacker on the opposing team had intercepted a pass and was running it toward the sideline, right in front of Woody, and Woody stopped him and hit him. And my wife looked at me and I looked at her. She knew about what had happened the previous fall. She said, “He’s gone,
isn’t he?” I said, “He has to be. The University’s honor is at stake now. Plus the agreement that he had made.” And so sure enough, in the morning papers the next day, a meeting had been held and as I understand it, the President and Hugh Hindman, it must have been very difficult for Hugh because he had been obviously one of Woody’s favorite assistant coaches along with Bo Shembechler, people like that.

Q. Stepping back to when you were the ombudsman, one of the thorny issues you faced I believe related to faculty unrest in the College of Veterinary Medicine. How did you become involved in that and how did you orchestrate its resolution?

A. It was, I think, it was the only event of its kind. My three years of ombudsman were the most interesting in so many ways but I don’t want to talk about that because I’m not supposed to for one thing, because it was all confidential. But in this sense it wasn’t. Curiously I was visited by two members of the faculty of the College of Veterinary Medicine, whom I knew as Graduate Dean. They offered Ph.D.’s there. And they said, “We have a problem. You know our current Dean. He was named, you weren’t involved when he was named. I think he was named while I was away. But you were consulted.” A standing scientist and researcher, the most distinguished nationally I suppose, from what we could gather. And wanted to be Dean. And at the time he was appointed Dean there were, we discovered later, people who weren’t too happy about it. Not because he was nasty or had a bad temper or did things Woody Hayes would do, but just didn’t think that he was the kind of person who would listen and allow them really to be involved in decision making seriously. And so they said, “It’s getting worse all
the time. And we wonder what can be done about it? We don’t want to just some
of us go and complain and then have this reported back to the Dean and then if
we’re wrong, our reputations, known as causers of trouble and disruption and that
kind of thing. But it’s a serious problem.” And I said, “You have a faculty of
how many? How proportion of that tenured faculty would you think would vote
for him today?” He said, “Well, not very many.” And I said, “Well why?” He
said, “Well, tell you what, we’ll have some faculty over, you’ll come over to my
house tonight. Can you do that after dinner?” And I said, “Okay.” Because my
office is in the Student Union, very visible. For obvious reasons it should be. So
I went over. And when I got there, there were three or four. Within the next
fifteen or twenty minutes, virtually the entire tenured faculty was in the living
room. And I started from the left and went around and said, “You know, state
your case.” And it was this and that. I mean, there was a clear consensus. I didn’t
know all of them personally. I said, “Alright, I’ll take the center advice. As you
know, I can’t make any decisions. You’re not an ombudsman if you can’t. But
I’ll decide what I thought out to be done about this. But you’ve got to be firm in
your feelings and I think you have been and you convinced me. So I’ll see what
can be done. I will make a recommendation.” So the next day I went in to the
Vice President for Academic Affairs, a younger guy, went on and became
President of Western Florida. He was a political scientist. And in his second year I
think, or third year. Fairly inexperienced. And I just said, “This unusual thing
happened. What do you think should be done about it?” And he said, “I’m
amazed because I haven’t gotten that.” I said, “Well I think they were afraid
about being trouble.” And I said, “I will send you a memo recommending that you interview personally the tenured faculty of the college, because the ombudsman has done some responding to, etc., and I’ll take the blame and then you decide.” He did and he got the same response and took appropriate action. Passed it on. I don’t think there was any trouble. Someone told me later the Dean was glad he could get back to more research time. Not terribly offended as some had thought he might be.

Q. How do you evaluate the quality and productivity of the working body of your colleagues at Ohio State? While at Ohio State.

A. Ohio State, coming out of World War II to the Association of American Universities, and you had to be invited to join. There were 42 in the country. I think all Big Ten universities except Purdue and Michigan State were in. That was derived and is still in existence but 70 or 80. That was derived from another council that was a national body that was created, Association of Graduate Schools. And you had to be invited to that. It started with the Ivy League. You couldn’t apply. You were suddenly, you got in. John Hopkins Dean would be at the meetings. And the University of Chicago Dean obviously. UCLA but not USC. It was distinguished. And then it became the basis for membership in the AAU. Before World War II, they commissioned the Dean of the Graduate School of Chicago, who was in the field of Spanish and I can’t remember his name because I’m too old to remember such things, to do a study of the reputation of the doctoral programs in the various universities. And that was the first such study ever done. And as I recall, Ohio State’s departments, many of them were
quite well regarded. Chemistry, Physics, English, History, Romance Languages obviously, not classical languages, not German at that time. Later German was second or third in the country, while I was Dean as a matter of fact. And the faculty were aware of and highly sensitive to this distinguished older faculty, their reputation, and the reputation of the University. How good its library was, what kinds of research were going on, and what support came from exterior ________. And Ohio State didn’t. And Ohio State was probably the only one of all those that had as an undergraduate edge of its campus open admissions. Bring a high school diploma, you’re in. And we could brag about it for good reason. I did sometimes. But there was a reverse side of that. And so, the problems after the World War II were that certain departments, due to resignations or in my own department for example, the best Hispanist was a Princeton graduate and full professor here at age 35. And he went on to Harvard. The English Department, some of them moved out during the 50’s and we couldn’t replace them. In the meantime, we’d established in the graduate school. That’s another thing, Everett Walters did that, the University Press was established because of the Graduate School. And the Graduate Dean’s office was centrally involved in this kind of thing. And in monitoring the reports that came every five or six years updating the reputation of the individual departments, right or wrong, among their colleagues throughout the country. And so it was a constant battle, not with the President’s office, but I sensed that in the Vice President for Academic Affairs, to communicate to the Board, which is done splendidly at University of California, where I was and Iowa State University,
where my wife worked after I retired, and I was there for five years, not professionally, but listening to the politics of the institution. That in order for, some of the issues that were in the paper this morning or yesterday morning here in Columbus about the need to put money into research institutes, Battelle was fine but it was not Ohio State, and this sort of thing, to develop the brain power and the kinds of patents and all kinds of things in addition to just a distinguished University in everyone’s mind that we weren’t. And we’re losing ground on moving into the 20’s and the 30’s, in a state that could afford to compete with Michigan, for example, or Wisconsin or Illinois, which had the top universities in the Big Ten and were always ranked in the top dozen or so, particularly at public universities along with California and UCLA. This was a constant source of unrest in the 50’s, and then you followed it with student unrest in the 60’s because of Vietnam, and I think during my years, as I’ve looked back, mainly in the 50’s and the 60’s and then terminating in 1978, was this constant preoccupation and worry, as a Department Chair, as a Dean of a College, about your ability to compete and recruiting top brains. And in would bring in bring money to support. Our English Department was so distinguished that the University President immediately got a big contract, for example, in publishing the poetry of a distinguished American poet. Things of that sort. At the same time Wisconsin and Michigan were getting these kinds. I don’t know whether it’s the Germans from up in Grand Rapids that were conservative in their politics, but insisting on quality and had pride in the academic reputation of their university. Does not mean that we didn’t have competing highly rated departments. There just weren’t
enough of them to compete successfully for total reputation. And faculty
members are sensitive about this. Who you are and whom you represent. And
this again explains some of that, football, they know us for football and we win
Rose Bowls. But do they know that we have a great mechanical engineering
group or whatever it might be? Or infrared spectroscopy group in the Physics
Department who are distinguished internationally? Stuff like that. And so it was a
constant feeling of unrest on the faculty because a feeling that somehow they
were let down. When the Board of Regents was created, the President of Miami
University became the first chancellor of it. It’s no longer. And he set up an
advisory committee on the approval of permission to grant doctoral degrees on all
campuses. And I was on that committee and I voted frequently “no.” There were
too many History Departments offering Ph.D.’s and their graduates couldn’t get
jobs anyway. Let me give you an example. The Graduate Dean at Bowling
Green and I were pretty good friends and went to meetings together and
everything like that, and the President of Bowling Green was about to retire. A
good man, very successful. And the Graduate Dean had somehow told him that I
might be a good candidate to be President of Bowling Green University. And
nominated me to the committee. And so he arranged for me to go to Bowling
Green and sit and have dinner with the President (I can’t remember his name
now), we had a very friendly dinner and discussed university issues and that sort
of thing. And I left and came back. I never go any correspondence or anything
like that. And then there was an Oberlin fellow student who was an athlete in the
Athletic Department at Bowling Green who was a quite prominent old-time
professor up there. Called me one day and said, “I want you to know Stretch (that was my nickname, I played basketball at Oberlin) I’m on a committee and your name has come up and I want you to know that they’re not going to write you. The Chairman of Sociology is the Chairman of this committee. And your name came before the Board today and that SOB voted against our doctoral program in Sociology and I’ll never work with him.” Well, again, the Board of Regents, you no longer have them I understand from reading papers here it wasn’t noted much in Michigan, where they don’t have one of those. The feeling of the Ohio State faculty was that the money that they could hire two or three guys who would really make them top of the Big Ten was going for a new doctoral program, buying books and history in the library, Sociology or whatever. Education. There was a need for school superintendents and people like that to be educated and doctoral programs were convenient for them to do that regionally. And some of the campuses, Miami and Cincinnati obviously, had thriving and good programs. And we weren’t opposed to that but we felt that it was being done politically rather than based on sound judgment for the quality of the entire system. And including the need to establish community colleges in Ohio, which had already been done in Michigan and Illinois and other states, which would have helped places, doctoral granting institutions like Cincinnati and Ohio State to have more money to do what was their primary objective. So moving forward and back and it was interesting to see some units move ahead and others back. But there was unrest totally. I think one of the most remarkable things that happened to me in my last job at University of California system, in their Board of Trustees meeting
the first place they had something like twenty, incredibly prepared for meetings. People who had run through all of the reports and the level of the discussion of the appropriateness of this or that or what should be placed ahead of this or that and priorities for expenditure of funds, etc., was really impressive. Politics didn’t seem to enter in. Some were Republican appointees, others Democrat appointees. Nor did you see, I didn’t in the meetings I attended, see examples of extremism asserting itself for reasons. There has been some of that in California since occasionally but by the far right, I think. But anyway, in other words, the Board appointed in the minds of most faculty qualified people to be President and that the Vice Presidential levels and Deans, with some exceptions, but to fund what needed to be funded in order to rise to the next level. Same problem apparently that is being addressed effectively nowadays. Just in the political climate of McCarthyism and the Vietnam War and then Kent State 1970’s, student unrest that continued. And all that time increasing money going to athletics and money being spent for facilities and twenty coaches instead of ten coaches for a sport, in order to remain competitive with another institution. So that the athletic departments support each other in a sense. As soon as we get a faculty, they have to have one. If they have a linebacker coach who coaches only the middle linebacker, we have to have an extra linebacker coach, specialists. You see? And athletics succeeded in doing that. And this is one of the things that’s the matter with athletics, together with others. On athletics, the expansion of personnel and facilities and expense of salaries and follow that, have reached a stage where I just don’t know what the future will be. Ohio State, while I was on the Athletic
Council, was among those universities that went on to aid programs, direct grants to students, rather than getting them fake jobs. Why? Because the fake jobs were an evidence of the hypocrisy associated with the program at that time. We felt that we brought things above board. You are a student here, you don’t have to go out and pretend to have a job and take that money to support yourself. We will pay for your education. In many institutions, including University of Michigan, distinguished academic institution, they’ve had problems, alumni or supporters have given cars to them. They then wreck the cars and one on wild parties and gotten bad publicity and that kind of thing. So some controls need to be. When the night commission was formed in 1990, 1991 and Father Hesberg was a member of it, to study intercollegiate athletics and make recommendations, and it was at that time that they recommended that more university presidents get involved in the national NCAA, and begin to establish more controls and to reform what needed to be reformed and find out what needed to be reformed. I wrote a letter to Father Hesberg, through Father Hesberg, to I think he served as Secretary to the Notre Dame President or retired Notre Dame President. And I had actually had had, making a far out proposal. The basic problem from the point of view from a person who has been a faculty member and a teacher and a scholar on a campus, about what’s happening in athletics is the hypocrisy that’s involved. Look at the graduation rate. It’s gone down, down, down over the 70’s and 80’s institution by institution, except for the Ivy League and Stanford. That we are finding ways somehow to keep students eligible who really don’t belong on campus. And even community colleges in some cases. So the basic hypocrisy is,
that you’re pretending that the original British University model, that these are students who have activities outside of class which are good for their health and enjoyment. And if you want to come and watch, okay, but if you don’t we’re having fun. As in the intramural programs, whether your intramural program be at Oberlin College or Ohio State or Harvard or Miami or Ohio U. But that’s not what we’re doing now with the intercollegiate program, particularly in football and basketball. And I made a proposal. I probably have a copy of it somewhere. I might have brought it. I should have brought it with me. Formal proposal which they acknowledged. And later I sent in shorter versions of the Chronicle of Higher Education and a letter of mine was published one time. I said, “Why don’t you recognize that you are bringing these students here because they possess a skill, just as my son is a piano player. He’s taken ten years of piano. He has a skill as a pianist. I could send him to a music conservatory and on the basis of his skill, they would develop these skills further. It has nothing to do with his preparation in chemistry or physics or history or English literature, or a foreign language, to prepare one for college out of high school. So why don’t we create on campuses an institute of athletics or athletics institute. And you can do the same thing in drama and in music. They are skills, entertainment skills, and require practice, etc., and are related, music and drama to be sure more closely, but the argument could be made equally, as athletics to the central, because we do teach anatomy and kinesiology and things like that on the campus. Require these students who didn’t qualify for admission as regular students at the University, however. You require them because you are helping prepare them for a possible
future professional life with English for them only. English. Basic skills. And some of the things they’ve missed in high school and those who are successful in these, if they want to move over and become regular students they may. Equally regular students, if some all star quarterback is a B+ student, he should be allowed to attend University and graduate as a B+ student and go on to law school or medical school or whatever. But he should be allowed to participate in athletics too, if he qualifies for the skill. Then what you have done is you have isolated those students who are not regular students. You’re giving them an opportunity to qualify as students if they want, or if they don’t, they don’t. And then you have a time limit of whatever it takes, three or four years, make up your mind that they can be members there. But no more than three or four years. And then you’ve clearly identified what it is that they’re there for primarily. That’s the point. They’re primarily there for that. Whereas, the guy in the business school who is also an excellent baseball pitcher, is there for business school and also pitches on the baseball team, which is the way it used to be. In the Ivy League, who invented all this across the Atlantic Ocean from the British institutions. You don’t have intercollegiate athletics in Germany and France and Spain. Even in the Soviet Union. I mean, you have athletics but not the way we do. I mean, it’s unique to the United States. And furthermore, we’re faced with the reality that we have so much money invested in stadiums and 20,000 capacity Enron centers, supported some of them by industry, for advertising purposes, we can’t just let those … we have an obligation now to use them. But let’s use them honestly without the hypocrisy of pretending that these are bona fide University students,
all of them, because they’re not. And separate them out. There’s a professor at the University of Indiana, and English professor, whose written several books, criticizing intercollegiate athletics. I forget his name, Gorby or something like that. He heard about this and he wrote. And we were on the telephone one time. And he just wants to cut out of intercollegiate athletics in their present state and start over again. And he just says, “I don’t think is possible. I said, “Well, I don’t sometimes either but on the other hand it seems to me it’s a way to start without damaging what you already have.” So it’s the hypocrisy that bothers me most. It’s dishonest. And the hypocrisy of pretending you’re not supporting players in certain distinguished universities, when they’re obviously suddenly driving a $40,000 SUV and you ask him, “Wow, where did you get that?” And he says, “It belongs to my mother.” And these questionable situations all over the country. It’s dishonest. It’s telling the public one thing and the support is the University but doing everything you can to compete successfully in hope it will raise money for the University. And I admire. That’s why the University of Chicago dropped out of the Big Ten. When I was a senior at Oberlin College, I was on the basketball team and we played Michigan State, which was not yet a university, on a Christmas tour. And played the University of Chicago. They both defeated us but University of Chicago had the highly respectable teams in football. And they just said, “Enough,” and went back to Division III. A philosophy professor of mine named Marvin Fox at Ohio State, wonderful teacher, Jewish rabbi and University of Chicago, Northwestern graduate and went on to another college. We lost him later but he introduced me to a group of students and faculty. I forget
what the subject was that I was to, and he said, “My friend Armitage said he was not just a scholar at Oberlin College but he was the captain of a basketball team. I found this out through friends of his. A basketball that won four out of fourteen games.” And that caused a … and he said, “And the friends of his point to that as an example of his capacity for leadership.” It’s a joke. Fine. We had fun. I give money to Oberlin College but I do not earmark it for athletics. And that’s the way it ought to be at Ohio State and every university. The largest part of your alumni donations should be generalized and trust the institution to determine where it’s most needed.

Q. You remarked about going to California. How did you come to leave Ohio State?

A. I was 60. I was five years which in my own mind, from 1973 to 1978, as Vice President for Student Affairs. The University of San Diego, of California at San Diego, founded in the late 1950’s and now among the top ten universities in the country in research grants, wonderful medical school, Scripps oceanography and all that. In the English and Linguistics Department out there, and in Romance Languages, were people who were recruited and left Ohio State. Some of the most distinguished, the Chairman of Linguistics and all that, and they were referred to out there as the Ohio State Mafia. And one of them wrote me and said, “You know, you have a catacurious degree or a career starting out in Arts and Sciences and administration, ombudsman and student affairs, we’re about to look for a new Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at San Diego. And we want someone who has faculty background, understands the faculty, and who is open to new ways of approaching things. And we have created five colleges,
undergraduate colleges, and each one has a Dean of Students who reports to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. And has its own residence halls and its own faculty in a sense, who also teach in the others. And would you be interested in coming out here and at least interviewing for it?” So this was in January or February. As it developed they offered me the job and I accepted the offer. It was an appropriate time for me to leave, for personal reasons too. And I did not regret it obviously. It was a very interesting experience and I forget who was appointed as my successor here. No one on my staff as I recall. Oh I know. They appointed a committee and a really fine African American, professor in the College of Education, was named Chairman of the committee. And they deliberated for a year or so and couldn’t come to any conclusions. So they asked him to be Vice President, which he agreed to do. And then got out of it after two or three years. He was very unhappy with the experience. I forget his name but he was highly qualified, no question about that.

Q. Is there anything else you would like to add at this point?

A. No, just to say I think it’s an excellent idea that you can record all of this because I increasingly can’t remember names or what really happened. In so many ways an institution like this should put it away in the lock box, because it might be needed sometime to straighten out … Obviously you’re recording my opinions and also some facts that I’m sure, for example, the meeting, certain meetings that I mentioned that are not on the record. The one about what to do about the conflict between Hayes and Fullen. We’ve never told anyone. I doubt if Ed Weaver did. But it indicates for a historian that there was concern that we bring
them together and that the faculty and administration, meaning Dick Larkins and Ed Weaver agreed it should be done. It was Woody’s personality that stood in the way. And things of that sort. There are others that are not that important.

Q. Well clearly you’ve put a lot of effort into preparing and presenting this material and we want to thank you for that. We appreciate everything you’ve done and continue to do. And I’d like to make note that today you contributed some notes from your fine Faculty Club association to the archives. And I’m sure they appreciate that also.

A. It’s unique. Oh, one other Faculty Club. Are you ready? The second year I think, or third year that I was a member they held a Faculty Club meeting in the main lounge, the purpose of which after only five years was to tear up the mortgage on the place. In other words, the faculty had paid off all the money that the faculty association owed on the building, and it was now theirs. Alright? And they promised that they had devised a unique and appropriate way to accomplish this. So we all had dinner upstairs and we came down and the Chair was Harold Burt, who was Chairman of Psychology, wonderful, wonderful. He must have lived close to 60 because I notice he was attending Faculty Club meetings in the late 80’s and he would have been in his late 90’s I think. And I forget who else had on a long table a kind of, what was the name of the guy that devised for the comic pages?

Q. Rub Goldberg.

A. Rub Goldberg. They were going to burn that mortgage and they had it attached over here. And the had an arm built with a match on the end and a sandpaper kind
of a curve, leading up to under the bottom edge of it. And then they had a series of contraptions, twelve to fifteen feet across the table. And on the other end with a lever on it was a cup. And they brought out water and they dipped, they poured water into one end and you sat and watched across various arms and things until at the end, up swooped the match on the end of the arm and lit, set fire to the mortgage, to great applause. All male in those days, all members of the Faculty Club. And most of the faculty, 99%. That’s changed for the good.