

ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW
DAVID KETTLER

Q. This is June 24, 2010, and this is Kevlin Haire. I'm at the OSU Archives and I am doing an oral history interview with Dr. David Kettler. Dr. Kettler, please introduce yourself and tell us where you are since this is a phone interview.

A. Yes, this is David Kettler and I'm in Rhinebeck, New York, which is near Bard College, where I am presently employed.

Q. Okay, well thank you. And good to have you and I appreciate you taking the time to speak with us. Let's start the interview. I've made up some questions as you know and I'll just start with the first one. And if we go off track a little bit, that's fine. But the first question is, I'd like you to tell me about your background, where you were born and grew up, your family and your educational path.

A. Okay, it's a little unusual. I was born in Leipzig in Germany on the first of July, 1930. And I came to the United States with my immediate family, my father and my mother and my brother in 1940. We lived first in Bayonne, New Jersey, and then in Jersey City, New Jersey, and I went to a public high school in Jersey City until I walked out on the first day of my senior year and went then to a commercial accelerated high school for five months to get my degree or my high school diploma. I was inpatient, sort of a wise guy. But anyway, I then was lucky enough to be admitted to Columbia College. And so I commuted for a couple of years from Jersey City to New York to Columbia, and graduated from there a year early. I graduated in '51. I started in '48, then went on, stayed right in place and went on to graduate school and got my master's in Political Science, or Public

Law and Government as it was then called. And I got my master's degree a couple of years later in '53. The doctorate took a while. I finished all my coursework and was examined in '54, then had a year of Rockefeller pre-doctoral fellowship to begin work on my dissertation. Then came to Ohio State. So that's the story. I guess I'm leaving out all the coloration – the background in Germany being in that refugee generation – I'll just say it shaped a lot of those years. But we can get to those issues later if they become pertinent.

Q. Well, tell me how you became interested in an academic career as opposed to anything else and why in particular Political Science or as then it was called, I think you said, Public Government.

A. Public Law and Government was just a Columbia thing. Political Science is fine. I mean, the two sides of it are, in the usual ... the idea of an academic. Well, let me start with the subject matter. The subject matter became fascinating to me because of influential teachers. I've taught now for so many thousands of years, and the quality and the influence of teachers is something I'm very responsively aware of, or try to be responsive anyway. And that will be part of our story later, too. So I was taking a number of different courses. At Columbia at that time you didn't have to declare a major. You had to take a number of advanced courses. They gave credits for advanced courses, and I could collect it in various subject matters, in history and economics and philosophy, and government and political science, that I had an equal number. But the teacher in my political theory class made a huge impact on me. And then I had no idea what an academic career was like. People I knew in Jersey City went to college to be a doctor or a lawyer or an

accountant or a school teacher. I thought for a while I'd be a school teacher. And so I remember going around visiting a number of my professors and asking them whether someone without any money and no family backing at all could become a professor, and they split. Half said no and half said yes. But of course I was pretty stubborn and persistent. And so I just moved on to graduate school. I was working full-time or as close to it as I could in a proprietary secondary school. I started teaching, a little bit anyway, teaching adults when I was 18, 19 years old. So the teaching part of it was something that interested me all along. And that also provided me with a living. So I was able to simply stay on and carry on until '55 when I went on the job market.

Q. And how did you, did you pick Ohio State or did Ohio State pick you? I assume it was the latter.

A. I'd say Ohio State picked me. I had, what in retrospect was quite a funny experience of going to several places to be interviewed. I had never, like a good metropolitan-New-York-area person, had never been west of Philadelphia, and that only once. So when I went to apply for jobs, they were up and down the coast. And then I had a telegram, "Will you accept an offer?" And I called them and spoke to Harvey Mansfield Sr. – his son, Harvey Mansfield [Jr.] is a very distinguished political theorist at Harvard University – because Harvey Mansfield Sr. was then the chair at Ohio State. So I said, "Sure." Instead of my asking him whether it was really true that when you went to the Midwest you had to have a car. I had never driven one. But anyway, that's another anecdote. So I very

happily accepted the offer and then looked at the map to see where Ohio was and whether I could get there without having to fight off hostile people.

Q. Well then, tell me the quarter and the year that you arrived at Ohio State.

A. I came to Ohio State in the fall of 1955.

Q. Okay. And you were the lowest rank of faculty.

A. I was instructor. I did not have a Ph.D. At that time it was a period of ... [it wasn't] yet a period of great expansion [at universities], but it was not unusual for people to be appointed without the Ph.D. It wasn't quite the surfeit of qualified people that there is today.

Q. Okay, and you were teaching political science?

A. And I came to teach political science. So as is usual in a university with a post-graduate program, initially before I had my degree and before I had my first book published, I taught only undergraduates. But the two other people in political theory, David Spitz and Harry Jaffa, were very generous and immediately opened up a portion of the political theory offerings, so I didn't have to go through the usual waiting period of filling in with elementary courses only. So that although I couldn't teach seminars, which were for graduate students, I was from the beginning teaching some introductory courses and some political theory courses. I should say that the reason I was appointed – and there was a conflict about it within the program, within the department – was that Harvey Mansfield was very close to a whole development sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation to expand political theory, and he was extremely liberal and open-minded. He wanted to represent a variety of points of view. So you have Harry Jaffa, who was one of the

most distinguished of the students of Leo Strauss and one of the promoters of that very distinctive school of quite conservative political theory. And David Spitz was the most promising, the most highly rated of the liberal students of Robert McKiever at Columbia University. Then I was hired because I was a student of Franz Neumann, who was another like Strauss, another of the refugee exiles of the 1930s, whose position in politics was more to the left in general in his orientation – a life-long Social Democrat. And so Mansfield expressly wanted to have this diversity within the program.

Q. You said that was somewhat controversial. Was there some tension when you arrived? Did you feel any?

A. Well, it's not a nice story. It has to do with there being too many Jews in the department and having too many East Coasters. And so there was some pushing and pulling. The net effect, because Mansfield was a genius at compromise, was that they made a second appointment, so that the other man came from Wisconsin and was excellent, terrific person whom I liked enormously, Jim Christoph, who then went on to a very distinguished career at Indiana afterwards. And so that kind of balanced it, so there wasn't just this foreign force that landed.

Q. Well, since you were from such a foreign land in Columbus, Ohio – you were from the East Coast and particularly the New York City area – tell me some of your impressions when you first got to campus.

A. When I very first came to the campus, we arrived at 4 o'clock in the morning. I had never passed my driving test. We hired a history graduate student, and we had a squalling infant in the car. And the driver was very careful. So I got there at four

in the morning and ended up in what was still a kind of a one-room hotel across the street from the entrance on High Street. But we were saved later by Harry Jaffa, so all was well. There was a very interesting cohort that arrived in my generation. So it was a very exciting place from that standpoint. I immediately had people to talk to, and we argued and we had lunch together every day in various departments. So it was one of those lucky moments where a number of people, many of whom then went on to have great careers, all arrived on the scene at the same time and were contemporaries with one another. So I never felt, “Oh my God, I’m not at Harvard and I’m not at Yale,” and so on. I never had any of that sense of deprivation. As far as the students were concerned, there were colleagues of mine who were quite – especially the newcomers – were disappointed in sort of the overall, general level of students. But in the first place, the undergraduate arts college always had a pretty lively subset of people among the students. And then I think teaching veterans who hadn’t finished high school for, you know I’ve been teaching them for four or five years, and to me the Ohio State students were not a problem at all. I got along well with them. They were not very cultivated, the best students. They didn’t have a whole lot of sophistication, but they were smart and they were willing to work. I never had problems with students, sort of the... I never had the sense that... I was an enthusiastic teacher, still am. Maybe that is sort of over-the-top excitement just remembering about it. So yes, we liked it. Columbus, Ohio was, as a political setting and especially – you guys don’t know – in 1955 it was a very, very closed shop. The most immediate political issue that had most recently upset the

community was when the faculty refused... honored the commitment then to the Big Ten [that the] faculty had made to break the connection with the Rose Bowl. And they didn't let the team go to the Rose Bowl. And people had death threats and had garbage and worse put on their porches, and so on. This was all in the background, this kind of local rage. But you know, people live in enclaves, and the faculty enclave... we were really very comfortable there and interested in... a lot of intellectual and social life. And so we were very happy there. I won't discuss the usual personal complications – a divorce and remarriage and so on.

Q. Well good. Now you were involved, became involved, I've never quite sure of the timing of this, but there is the issue of the Speaker's Rule, inviting certain speakers to campus. And you did become involved in that, correct?

A. Right away. I mean, the Speaker's Rule was extremely restrictive. And I had come from a student career as somebody interested in issues of academic freedom. You remember the McCarthy period was just ending, and we had to protect faculty, as we saw it. I was chairman of a committee for academic freedom at Columbia as a graduate student. So I had a background of interest in that. And then the organizational rules at Ohio State required student groups to have advisors. As we know, they don't really care much for advice. So I did play those sort... of a record of my being the advisor to this committee and that committee or some other committee, all to do with this issue over the years. I mean a wonderful student that I recall because I just looked at some documents of his, who had also a very fine career in Washington afterwards, Jeff Schwartz, who was a chairman of a free speech group and so on. So I supported them. I gave

them what advice that I could. Advice was always prudent. One of the things, one of the reasons I'm very glad to have this chance to talk with you also about the events later, is that for me the distance between the student and the teacher was an essential part of being a good teacher. And so the idea that I would be one of the students, that I would try to play the role of a student leader, is very offensive to me. It goes contrary to what I think about teaching. Teaching depends on distance but it doesn't depend on warfare. And so you're always... you have to let them take the responsibilities for the choices that they do. And I think I carried that consistently, and I must say that I've never had the experience and I don't think there's anywhere on the record, a single instance of a student who felt that they had been treated disadvantageously or discriminated against because they didn't agree with my politics or what have you. I had, as a young person living in that community, obviously I had a political profile. I was not only a student of political science but a political intellectual. And so that would be natural. But almost never were the organizations I was involved with also open or natural places for students to go. At most it might be that there would be some upper-graduate students directly involved in the civil liberties union. I guess there were none in CORE [Congress of Racial Equality]. Out of a whole list, that was my political decade, 1960 to 1970s. And so I was on more damn committees and organizations, promoting welfare levies or whatever there was around. And I was very active in the early states of civil-liberties and civil-rights campaigns and actions, and picketing the roller skating rink that discriminated against blacks, having separate black and white hours and so on. And so I was involved with that

stuff beginning really in the very late '50s. But those were not organizational efforts among students. In fact, as I recall, there were no students on those picket lines. It was people from the neighborhood and a couple of us coming from the university. So that, yes I had a presence as a political person in Columbus, in this kind of marginal trouble-making mode, at least by local standards. But on campus, I think, as I look back over it now and I've been looking at a lot of the record of it, I really think that I have nothing to apologize for the kind of support and help I gave to the students who were promoting things that I thought were worthwhile. In all of them, they were all professionally proper. But anyway, that's my view of it and I'm sure that that's not universally shared.

Q. Meanwhile you're trying – as are all junior faculty trying – to get tenure. Did you feel there were any misgivings about your role with advising students on campus because of your academic career, or no?

A. Not a lot at Ohio State, especially at that time because it was kind of a period of modernization, which involved the modernizing group putting a lot of faith in chairmen. And I say chairmen – I don't have to say chairs because there weren't, as far as I know, in any of the arts-and-sciences programs, chairwomen. And so the decisions... and the chairman of political science was a politically quite conservative, skeptical, wonderful guy, very savvy. And he had a lot of confidence in me. He had my back. I worked for him. After a year, he appointed me as his assistant, he was the editor of the American Political Science Review, which was the principal journal of the profession, and my job for five years was to read every article submitted to that journal and write him a recommendation. And

so he had a lot of faith in my abilities. He gave me a lot of encouragement. And indeed, when I recently wrote an article about my six outstanding teachers, I put him on the list simply because I never studied political science in that way before. So I had really a very good standing. And there was a liberal understanding that these interests – that’s what academic freedom is about. And I also maintained my professional career. It took me a while to get the dissertation done, but then it became a book which still... it just was recently republished. It’s a standard in its very tiny field. And that was recognized. [I had two Fulbright years in Europe during that time—once as a fellow in a prominent institute in Germany and once as professor at Leiden University in Holland.] So I would say that... I was promoted, actually a lot of the records I saw on your Web site [“Spring of Dissent”] speak of me as an associate professor. Actually, I had been promoted to full professor and that’s within 15 years, and given that it took five years for me to get the dissertation done, I think that that indicates that I wasn’t having any struggles within the department, as long as there was a broader representation of political theory within the program, and that’s a complicated theme to explain. We’ll probably have to say something about it later on. The relationship between political theory as a subfield and the larger political-science community and certain tension and tug-of-war, which had nothing to do with politics, nothing necessarily to do with politics. So that Harry Jaffa was a very, very conservative speech writer for Barry Goldwater, [but] he and I were on the same side with regard to those issues, having to do with the internal politics of the discipline, what it’s direction was to be and so on. And so I was increasingly active in that.

And then the constellation within political science within the department changed – Harry Jaffa went to the West coast, David Spitz went to New York City – and they were not replaced by people with similar views. And Larry Herson was a very wonderful chair but then became the dean... [he] came no longer to be so directly involved. My situation within the department changed, which then culminated in my deciding to accept an offer from Purdue, which is another story that we'll talk about later on.

Q. Well, tell me about that progression. When did they leave? When did you see the tide turning in the department?

A. Well, really it got quite serious only after Professor Spitz left.

Q. And when approximately was that?

A. That would be in '69. I've been looking at some recent correspondence with a confidante overseas whom I had been keeping informed of all these things. And I reported to him in January of 1970 suddenly my shock of coming to department... of there being department meetings where I suddenly found myself isolated. And the paradox there, and I realize this sounds very self-serving, but the record is there, so it can be checked by a researcher. I had become the chairman of the chairmanship search committee in 1969. The chairman had been Jim Robinson, then he became the provost, so I became the chairman, and it was up to me, and again, this was overall the corporate culture at Ohio State [which] gave a lot of play to chairs, the chairman. That was the way it was structured. And so as chairman, I was faced with, in the end, a choice between two candidates – both inside candidates. One was a very interesting, lively, but intensely committed,

scientifically oriented professor, Tom Flynn, who had a constituency of younger, very able people behind him. And on the other side was a man named Randall Ripley, who was more of an institutionalist, was more in what I assumed to be the tradition of people like Harvey Mansfield. And I supported his candidacy and the less conflictual one (laughs), with the result that Tom Flynn left to go to Case Western. No, I guess he went to Cleveland State, and his followers bitterly, bitterly, bitterly blamed me for this, and from then on it became really extremely unpleasant to be there. And since I did have alternatives: I had turned down three other offers in the preceding three or four years, in one case by virtue of having a very major counter-offer made to me by Ohio State. So I took the opportunity to go someplace that would be more congenial, where I wouldn't have to fight to protect students from requirements which distracted them from the work they had come to do and other things, at least as I saw it. Again, these inside stories are complex and to bring it down again: Within political science there was a split between people who saw that political science had to go the way of psychology and economics to become very rigorously quantitatively scientific. Another older tradition was a mixed bag of people interested in institutional developments or the whole area of political thought and political theory. And that's where I came from. There was a tension, and it was a productive tension for most of the time. And I always insisted that the students who worked with me also studied statistics and so on. But you know, you can't control the side-taking among students. And so we were getting discussions at faculty meetings, of people saying they'd gone home to cry because they had overheard one of my students say something

disparaging about one of their best friends and so on. And kind of pathetic, at least as I recorded it in my letters at the time. I can't now claim that I have a moment-by-moment recollection of the last 40 years. I've thought about a few other things. But in anticipation of our conversation, I have been sort of immersing myself a little bit in at least my side of the story as I recorded it at the time. So that it became, this had nothing to do with what I spoke of earlier, the little tension at the outset. Ohio State had three phases, so to speak: There was the traditional Ohio State, a really attractive, pleasant, very local place with very localized faculty people interested in the governance of Ohio and of Columbus and so on. And the same in philosophy and sociology. Then, there was a kind of modernizing wave that began in the mid-'50s and carries on into the '60s, where you brought in more people. It was a more professionally oriented development in the social sciences and humanities. And there were people pushed out or encouraged to leave or put on sidings of the older generation, of the more localized orientation to Ohio State as to what it meant. But then, in the course of the '60s, this more modernist view was being challenged in various ways, both in political issues, about how does the University make political decisions and how to handle political conflicts, and those range of issues. So you had that whole challenge to the modern phase. For most of the time, there was kind of an alliance between the people who wanted the University to become more national in its standard. And it was always at a cost. It becomes less of a local service. And there was resentment, and a lot of that can be understood. In other words, I'm not, especially at this stage of my life and this stage of the game and reflecting back

over so many years in the past, I still retain my partisanship but I don't fail to see that there was always something to be said for the other side as well, although in context to end the fighting. So within our political-science program, although when I first arrived it was kind of a local versus modernizer, I mean I was a good candidate from professional perspective. I had a degree from a very... I come from a metropolitan center. I was a student of a very influential and highly regarded professor of a certain importance. None of that would be worth very much to the editorial page of The Columbus Dispatch as it was run by the Wolfe family at that time. But from the standpoint even of other people, yes, that's a good appointment. Mansfield is a national figure. You bring him in after his Washington career because he's a national figure. He's one of the modernizers. You do the same thing in philosophy. You do the same thing,... in sociology. It was done late and then it ended up one of the fights that feeds into the 1970 events. They brought in someone, a modernizer quite late, and it was already the other set of issues that were also in play. And so a kind of purification that was done elsewhere earlier was done at a point where there was a new set of conflicts, a new set of issues in place. Am I making sense?

Q. You are, definitely.

A. I'm trying to explain a lot of complicated stuff. Most of the things I'm referring to are... [for] people who want to investigate or inquire, [they] can find records of this in documentation in the archives.

Q. From what you've been saying it sounds like the period of 1969, 1970 was quite a turning point for you professionally – career-wise – and in your, I guess, your reputation on campus as well.

A. I think that that period,... I think there's the question of what was internal to the political science department among the faculty, the issues crystallized, as I say, around my choice of a chairman or my key voice in the choosing of a chairman. And then the chairman showed the good qualities that (laughs) I selected him for, or making compromises by doing everything to placate the people who had been beaten. And so from that point on I couldn't get change of a dime from him because he was a person... you know, and he thought there was so much anger and aggravation at that point on... so that, for example, they were doing a search, and here I was a full professor, and I was the only person left doing political theory, and they were doing a search to replace the political theorist, and I wasn't being consulted on it. So we're talking about that kind of exclusion. That has nothing to do with the view of students, either graduate students or undergraduate students about me on campus. Obviously, most undergraduates don't care one way or the other. But I'd say I was a reasonably well-liked teacher. I didn't have trouble filling my classes. And then I had a number of quite talented graduate students who were working with me. And again, there was not a politically homogenous group, especially after Jaffa left. As long as Jaffa was there, then there was a kind of liberal-conservative split. The students would go with Jaffa or they'd go with Kettler or Spitz. But you're certainly right that that period, and things became, I mean, changed character fairly substantially with the change in

personnel and the change of power relations within the department. As far as my standing in the profession outside... No, the real change came after '70, and this whole story really was a major effect on my professional life. I moved first to a tiny undergraduate school for shelter, and then I accepted an appointment in Canada in an undergraduate university, and it meant that I was no longer a player in the national professional issues that I had been taking a position on. I had been chairman of something called the Committee for a New Political Science... caucus, or whatever it was called. But all those things really faded away. And I deliberately backed off them. I was now in Canada. I was no longer part of the American political scene, but also professionally. I was now involved in an undergraduate university, oriented to a profession that had a different configuration than the American one. And so it doesn't mean I ended my professional development, but the attempt to engage in the internal intellectual politics of the political science profession, the grounds of that were withdrawn from me. And because of the nature of the conflict at Ohio State and the newspaper reports about me a million-dollar lawsuit and so on and so on – essentially as a full professor I was not employable at any major American university. I had support everywhere and I interviewed, and there would always be one person who would say, “Well, why do we need this trouble?” And for practical purposes in university hiring full professors, everybody has a veto. You don't hire somebody if somebody says, “We don't need this problem.” And so I was effectively blacklisted in the United States in the aftermath of these events. I recovered. Obviously, counting, I've written 13 books, published 13 books since I

left Ohio State. And the Ohio State library has 11 of them. It isn't as if I suddenly folded up and disappeared. But one kind of career was no longer available to me.

Q. Well, let's talk about your activities of that period then, 1969-70, because it was such a great effect on your career. Just take me through that time a little bit. As you're dealing with these internal struggles of the political science department, there's also a lot of conflict going on, on campus. And you are more involved in it than a lot of the faculty.

A. That's correct. I think that, my view about what the opening up of the university for the next phase should mean was certainly a minority view. And I actively pursued it. Most of it really didn't have that much to do with the students. We had faculty politics as well. We had a Committee for the Study of Alternatives, where we published a couple of times a month in The Lantern an editorial of some kind. We had about 200 faculty who were prepared to have their name listed as sponsoring the value of having that forum. We didn't consult with all of them. We had subcommittees make the actual text. So we had Committees for the Study of Alternatives. There was an ancient Ohio State faculty institution called The Conference Committee of the Teaching Staff that dated back to the '30s that had actually initiated the creation of Faculty Council back before my time. And I ended up being the chair of that. It was one of those things where you were elected but there wasn't (laughs) a hell of a lot of competition. And so we tried to make something of that. We did an inquiry into – we discovered – a lot of discontent in the department that we always thought to be the height of placid conservatism. We were the first to find that women, for example, in home

economics in the ag department and elsewhere – the nursing department [for example] – were being retired as instructor emerita, that their salaries were shockingly below that of the men in their departments. And so we campaigned on those kinds of faculty issues and tried to create interest in that. My own political background and subsequent work as well tends towards a kind of trade union mentality about faculty unions and socially conscious faculty unionism. In fact, I unionized the faculty in the Canadian university and negotiated the collective agreement for them in 1981-82, which they still live under. So that was my general orientation. So I engaged in a lot of that. And one of the issues for faculty as well were what we consider to be provocative and stupid rules involving speakers, that involving the disruption rule. And if you look at the record, it's clear that whenever faculty, not only the small liberal or radical, whatever you want to call them, sub-group, but Faculty Council, other agencies, it was always clear to the faculty that this was really self-defeating stuff, that the Board of Trustees kept insisting on these rules that were creating crises where none were required. The absence of flexibility, lack of openness. And there were always people in the top administration that could see – John Corbally, [for instance,] always understood that it was being crippled in flexibility and adaptability and dealing with new kinds of issues and so on, by a kind of mechanical control that looked only ... luckily they left the University alone for most things. But they had a list of symbolic issues. No, you can't have a communist speaking. Who give a damn about having a communist speaking... and so on. So we were as faculty concerned with that, concerned with the standing of the place. After all, Ohio

State had actually been on a AAUP [American Association of University Professors] blacklist before my time. And it didn't stop me from taking the job, although that's what I'm supposed to do. But in any case, I was certainly active in those things. Now as for the student movement, the two issues that involved students that I was also involved with, first of all, was the whole racial issue. My activities in the community were different from those on campus. In the community I was a leader until about 1961, '62, when with the Black Power movement it suddenly became an anomaly to have a white guy be a chairman, the action chairman of CORE. And so I backed down from that. And so after that, we did supportive things. We had the famous case of the 34 students who signed their names after an occupation, while it was negotiated at the end by Corbally, and the 34 list was used as a basis for criminal charges against them. There are some photos around of me with a button that says "34" on it. And I went around churches and organizations to advocate on behalf of those students. But as far as, ... I never was involved in the deliberations of any student group, I can say that categorically, as they decided what they were going to ask for, what they were going to "demand," to use the language of that time, what they were going to do. That was never part of my life. That would have been inappropriate from my point of view, from my understanding of participatory democracy or whatever you have, you don't have an old guy, and at that time comparatively speaking, I was already 40 years old, and so it never made any sense to me. And I always bitterly resented it on behalf of the students if nothing else, the idea that I was telling them what to do. Because a lot of what they asked for seemed stupid to me

or hopeless or pointless. But that wasn't my concern. My concern was to legitimate a process of dispute, debate, yes, utilizing such peaceable, nonviolent means of demonstrations and so on. Now what would happen at the margins of this, there was pushing and shoving and fire thrown. Obviously, the more you demonize the responsible leadership of the students, the worse this is going to get. And that's exactly what happened. The second day of this demonstration, all the responsible student leaders were saddled with injunctions that they couldn't get involved. And so amazing enough, things got very undisciplined and out of control. But again, I'm suddenly re-living some really, extremely peculiar days in my life. I have never before or since sat on the ground between several thousand fewer students and a row of terrified National Guards standing there with weapons in their hands, seated facing the students with backs to the guards between University Hall and Denney Hall to prevent some kind of clash and confrontation. So that big question of trying to protect the ground, create a political process, foster some kind of discipline, yes it had me out on the streets and on the Oval for... I was packing up to go to a conference and writing a paper on Hegel, and yes, I had to stop and get involved in all that stuff. And it seems 40 years later and lots of things that were thought and believed at that time were either mistaken or one-sided or partial, but I've never regretted any of that.

Q. You just said you were writing a paper on Hegel and you were obviously trying to lead your academic career, but then you chose to get involved in this. Was that even a choice to you?

A. No, I've been trying to think about how to explain this. But my work in political theory has really been about how ideas were,... what the responsibility of people who have ideas, and what kinds of, ...and so it was lab experiments. These were not separate universes for me. The major motif in my work, and I just published a book on it, has to do with political education and it involves how you get people to study and to understand realities, and at the same time how you get them and how you get yourself to use the knowledge you have to control aspirations and desires and designs and perspectives on things. And so there really wasn't a..., this was part of my, it was integral to my teaching and to my scholarship. And yes, I then wrote an article at that time called "The Vocation of Radical Intellectuals" in which I argued, the world of the political leader and the world of the intellectual are different. They have reciprocal responsibility and you don't try as an intellectual to take over as the leader. You can't do that. But the idea that I could work on the kinds of things that interested me on problems with democracy, and watch this happen out there, you know, people breaking glass. I mean, I was sitting in my office on the first day of the demonstrations. Somebody had come in and said, "Oh my God, we have so many students. We had no idea there was so much anger that they would all come out for these demonstrations." And so I said, "That's nice," and continued with my work. I was getting ready for a conference. And then I heard glass breaking and then I went out. And then I spent the rest of that day sitting on the steps of the Administration Building or standing at the Administration Building together with two or three other members of the so-called Green Ribbon Commission, in the hope that on the one hand, the police

who were inside the building and fondling their sticks and playing theatre and the students would not clash, and that we would put ourselves between them. That's not something that I could, I couldn't in good conscience think that I was serious about the work I was doing, if I didn't also accept those responsibilities. That seemed clear to me then. Conditions changed. I went to Canada. I didn't have those responsibilities. It was a matter of courtesy as well that I did not... Their political processes were not mine. So I had a time of distance and reflection. But in terms of [being] an American and working in the tradition I came from, and especially as an exile [from Europe] to the United States, I felt that those.. They were never really hard for me. I mean it was a nuisance in the sense that I had a great wife and infant children - twin daughters, lovely twin daughters at home that I wasn't seeing a lot of in 1969. They are both great women now. There was obviously a cost. But as far as not being out on the street and trying to interpose myself where I thought it might do some good, that was simply not an option. I walked around on the day they were blockading buildings. So I went from one group to the other and I said, "Look, if you want to be arrested, passive resistance, then do that. If you will obey the order when the National Guard comes" – they were reading some sort of an injunctions to disperse them – "then disperse peacefully. But decide now what you're going to do and all do the same thing because one frightened guardsman shooting a gun off is going to be horrific. Decide what you're going to do, take responsibility and do it." I went from one to the other. That was the epitome of the kind of work I did. I could never sit down the next day and continue my academic writing if I had not taken that

responsibility. I'm not saying that everyone should do that. I don't think physicists and chemists and biologists have to do that. But somebody who does the kind of political study that I do, had no alternative as far as I could see. That was not hard for me. Obviously, I was terribly disappointed and terribly bitter with the amount of cost I had to pay for that. But that doesn't mean that I would reverse it, that I felt that I had made some kind of ghastly mistake, because there are other ways of making a living than being a university professor. Given the kind of work I do and the kind of interest I have with theoretical questions I was exploring... I do have a memoir where I talk about having twice being advised to work on Plato instead of a politically explosive issue. One time I did it and the other time I didn't. So I don't know if that answers your question.

Q. No, it does actually. You couldn't ignore the realities of what you were teaching.

A. That's right. That was my view about always with respect to the... I think, obviously that was my aspiration, what kinds of signals I may have given off, my aspiration always was... I tend to always think in terms of negotiation and bargaining situations, and that means respect and recognition of the other people as well. And so somewhere in the record I made at the time about the Ohio State events, I remember I listed – and I had forgotten this conversation – but I went to Randall Ripley [political science professor], and I said, “Look, you guys think you know that the students who are anti-Vietnam war activists, they are going to have a demonstration, that it's going to be the same 100 people, it's not going to be a problem, but please notice, they have made an alliance with the black students. The black issue is one that everybody felt huge guilt about. It's going to

be different. Pay attention to this. Tell your friends in the administration, this is not just the same old 100 students that they think they know about.” And I was really pretty consistently right. I recently re-read that article I wrote in the Ohio State Monthly some months before. I was a little taken aback by the kind of contentious tone of it, [I was a] provocative wise guy. But it’s all right. It was within the style of the time. But I was right. I said that if they didn’t pay attention to the fact... There really is a lot of the policies of the university [that] were having consequences. And this had not only to do with left-right issues but had to do with the costs of the professionalization, which meant that more and more undergraduates were being forced out of classes. We certainly had thousands of students out on the Oval. It’s true, it’s April and the end of spring, and everything. But there was a lot of anger there that they had no idea existed. And that was tapped by people who had this kind of mish-mash of issues, but there was suddenly..., and they were totally astonished by the turnout and by the anger among many of the arts college undergraduate students, about what the price that was being paid for the kind of modernization that was very intentionally in progress at the University.

Q. You mentioned at the beginning of the demonstrations you were in your office. You thought of it as a nuisance at first.

A. No, it was their business. I thought they were always going to make posturing. The idea that they were going to give an ultimatum. Often there was so much improvisation done ,as always happens with these kinds of movements, so that the young woman who is now no longer so young, is professor of sociology in New

York, Lorraine Cohen, there she was on the... with a group of demonstrators and they had turned in some demands. Then the students themselves, among themselves, who were conflicting about whether anyone should go in to negotiate. So finally she said, "Well, we'll come back for an answer." So there was an improvisation which suddenly crystallized into a kind of ultimatum. But those are the dynamics. I laugh... In the lawsuit against me, there's an extract from a speech I made about how the University has been closed for years, now it has to be open. And this was brought to court to say what a rabble rouser I was. But that was really the speech for which Woody Hayes embraced me afterwards. There must have been several thousand witnesses to it. But it was because it was a speech I was making to prevent a fight, a three-way fight. There were the black students demanding that they go back on strike after the school was re-opened. The white students of the radical group were very unhappy but they felt they would have to go along. And there were a lot of angry other students. And so I got up and [talked about] this formula [about] free university blah, blah, blah, and so on. And there wasn't then a fight or riot. And he knew it and I knew it. And then were a bunch of affidavits afterward that said so. And yet there it sits dead on the page and here's Kettler agitating the students, calling them out to protest or to be against the University. So a lot of it depends on context, which of course the extracts from language can't give you. It was an interesting time. There were some very dramatic and in some cases quite funny scenes. But I think I better let you focus me, although as I get into it, that is one of the things I am entitled to do

as I approach my 80th birthday in a couple of days, is to sort of get off into reminiscing and anecdotalizing. But I think that's kind of a waste of your time.

Q. Tell me though, one anecdote I'm interested in, that I was sort of leading up to about the first day of the demonstrations, is that later you find yourself named as a defendant in this lawsuit. I want you to tell me how you found that out, what you thought of it, what the effect was on you.

A. Okay, now the legal action. Let me just say, and I guess maybe this is the point to introduce the complication in my personal career prospects, which is that some time around the third week of May I get notice that there are problems with my appointment at Purdue.

Q. Now let's back up a second. You had already been offered a job at Purdue, correct?

A. Right, I had. In January I had accepted an offer, a position: full professor with tenure, wages worked out, additional incentive of their financing a research trip to Europe for me. So that we had a deal in terms of the normal usage of academic life. I had enough of ... a firm commitment, and on the grounds of that, I resigned my position at Ohio State. So I resigned from Ohio State in January or February of 1970, to take up the position at Purdue. And so sometime, in fact, since we didn't know that my wife was going to have... No, I guess that was another trip, I don't want to mix things up. So we went to Lafayette, Indiana, and bought a house. I think we only leased a house. And so we were ready for our move. And so that it came as a shock in May that there had been, that there were some signs, that there was pressure on the Board of Trustees at Purdue, not to validate the

contract. And so the difference between professional usage, where the deal is closed at the point where an offer is made and you accept it, and that offer can't be made without clearance on to the deans and the president and so on. And normally the Board of Trustees' approval of these contracts may happen sometime in September or October of the following year; they're automatically rubber-stamped. The Board of Trustees doesn't interfere with the personnel policies of the university. And yet, so here suddenly comes this caution, and then there are news reports that the Attorney General of Indiana had proclaimed me to be the leading revolutionary voice in the middle west. (laughs) I'm sorry that I was limited only to the middle west. If I'm going to be Lenin, I might as well be Lenin to the whole country. So there were bad signs and there was rumbling. And then on top of that comes then... Initially there had been other use of civil action. There had been injunctions against the student leaders, and so on early on in the demonstration, which paralyzed them and helped to worsen things, as I've said earlier. But now comes this lawsuit. And the lawsuit, it should be understood that there are two sides to it. On the one hand, there's the injunction, precluding people doing a whole host of things with the sanction of very massive contempt-of-court violations and prison and fines. And then there was for publicity purposes also the million-dollar-damages claim. Now this lawsuit was filed by a nominally student group which was, well we don't have to get into the whole history of it, but in any case I was listed among the students. I was listed there as the only faculty member. But it should be said that at the time the whole mythology was that these student demonstrations and so on were the work of

these faculty agitators, these outsiders who came in and agitated the students. So that was part of the legend. Vice President Agnew at that time, before he was found guilty of tax fraud and required to resign his office, was a leading figure in it. And so the theatre of that lawsuit required my presence. I know I have a record of it here, that my lawyer, in speaking with the lawyers for the other side was saying, "Look, this faculty person, you're not going to win that against him. Why don't we just make a deal and take him off?" And they said to him, "No, the funding was conditional on Kettler being on the list." So it was okay. It was a very major political move. So it turned out with regard to the Purdue business, it had a dual effect. On the one hand, the publicity did work and so there was a story in The New York Times, about the million-dollar lawsuit. A million dollars at that time (laughs) seemed like a lot of money. And so it was a great, sort of propaganda thing, so that you had [the story] on the news wires and so on, and so people don't read those things very carefully, so Kettler and these students were being sued for a million dollars. So, on the one hand, it consequently helped to poison my name, whatever the outcome, because the labeling was done and the association was done. In the smaller universe, where people looked more closely, the fact that the judge threw my name off the list at the first intervention by my lawyer, helped me to get the settlement from Purdue in the end, although the judge made some gratuitous remarks about how he didn't like me and I did terrible things. It's not the job of the judge, unless they're running for office, which he was. And so he made some remarks disassociating himself from what he had as a legal matter to do, because there was absolutely no basis whatsoever for

my being on that list. Anyway, these were not fun things. I mean, it was really an extremely difficult experience to move from being somebody who has judgment and makes mistakes, to being a victim. A victim is a terrible condition to be in. If nothing else, then for the helplessness and your dependency on what other people will do for you. So I was sitting on the telephone because I had two infant children crawling around boxes that had already been packed for us to move to Lafayette. So I'm on the telephone with people I had opposed on principled ground of all sorts in my profession, "What can you do for me?" I had to have a job. So it took some years for me, it was really a very difficult demoralizing experience. At the same time, the story with Purdue gets kind of funny because, I mean at least in retrospect, they actually went so far as to have two vice presidents and a dean come to Ohio State to hold a kind of hearing about me, although they didn't notify me that they were there. Neither I nor my lawyer knew that they were interviewing the head of student government, interviewing faculty, interviewing other students about me.

Q. This was before the Board of Trustees decision?

A. The Board of Trustees never made a decision.

Q. Oh, that's right, because they offered you [a deal].

A. It was clear they were, it was trouble, but we're still struggling back and forth. And so then they go back and make their report and the president of the university supports me. Says, "Well, there's no reason not to make this appointment." So that even with this kind of tangled cord and so on, the basic fact is that, I'm sure I did some and said some stupid things and made some mistakes in the excitement,

but basically the record was perfectly clear. What I was doing, if I had been doing it at Columbia or California, the students would all denounce me as a liberal fink, as somebody who was trying to pull the fangs of their radicalism and trying to make deals and so on. But at Ohio State, of course, (laughs) they were less demanding. Radicalism was a less demanding fable. And so I was counted as the campus radical. Okay, the style and so on was there, and I can't really do much about that, especially 40 years removed. But anyway, but yet when you actually said, now what did he do and what did he say and what was his role, and where did it fit, and what is his standing, they came back and said, "Yeah, okay, there's no reason not to appoint this guy." So there are all kinds of reports at Purdue and their faculty and so on, but we needn't go into that. But the upshot for me was that, on my 40th birthday, on the first of July of 1970, I had a phone call. We were having a little party and I had a phone call that there was a possibility of a financial settlement.

Q. Oh, wow.

A. And so this is a very nice birthday present in the sense that I was heartily sick and tired of the idea of Purdue and to go there as some kind of suspect person, even if we could have won it, would they have retained me the following year? Would the Board of Trustees eliminated the position? Some crazy thing I didn't want anymore. And so I very cheerfully, actually the Indiana papers were all up in arms about things, but they had the figures wrong. They paid me \$31,000, which at that time was okay. Almost \$7,000 went to my lawyer. And I took the settlement. And then I had no job, and I was sitting in Columbus and it was very hot. And then I

had a handwritten letter from someone saying that he had heard from a very distinguished Harvard professor, Judith Shklar, that he heard that I might be available, and he was coming in as the President of a little college, and did I want to come there. And so I wrote him back a letter and said, “No, I may be hard up but I’m not that hard up.” I didn’t quite say it so rudely. In fact, I recently found a copy of the letter [after I] ended up having a student assistant catalogue all my correspondence. And so I said, “Well, I’ve been so involved in graduate training and with the professional work,” and it was correct. All of these things would go by the boards and did go by the boards. And so I mailed the letter and then I was sitting the next day, and the children were...we had one of those plastic tubs in the back yard, by the city park in German Village, and it was very hot. And I was sitting in this tub and suddenly I realized exactly that it was exactly how hard up I was So I got off the telephone and I called this man who is unknown to me and said, “You’re about to get a letter from me. Tear it up. I’m putting my family in the car, we’re coming to New Hampshire. Let’s sit down and talk about this.” And so that’s how I came to work for Leon Botstein, who was at that time the 23-year-old college president of Franconia College. And that was the story of its time. And it was kind of an interesting year and we became... He was a very loyal person, I have worked for him here at Bard College for the past 20 years after I took early retirement from Trent. But at that time it was a very strange setting in an old resort hotel. And we sat on the floor with our students. And I spent a year, until I had an offer then from a new Canadian university, which moved me on. So the lawsuit in a sense – to go back to the original question – it really did serve [as

a turning point] in the sense that it did derail me from the kind of professional career in academics. You're not developing a group of graduate students and doing research with them and so on. You're a different kind of character. And so I have functioned since then pretty much as a lone wolf working in specialized in interdisciplinary areas, [such as] sociology, with historians and others. And you know, I've generated work, but I never had a chance to see whether I could become someone important in my field. Probably it wouldn't have worked anyway. (laughs) I'm a limited ordinary guy. And you know, I looked up out of some kind of vanity to see how many of my books are in the Ohio State University Library, and there are 13 entries but two of them are really only chapters in books. So 11 of them are there. So it can't be all bad. Probably if ... I meant to look up some of my enemies sometime, to see how they did, but then I also inherited some good genes and have lived longer than some of the other people did, and am able to continue working. So that's pretty much the story. I'm trying to think whether, you had a number of other questions.

Q. You've actually answered most of my questions. I want to get back, just briefly, to another, I guess, sort of anecdotal question about the "Free University" classes. Explain that whole episode and then we'll move on from there.

A. The "Free University" idea was something that was current at the time. It's like the teach-in business. So the idea was that students, that rather than having set curricula, that there would be some kind of negotiated terms of what it is that was going to be taught, what did they need. And then faculty would put themselves at the disposal of that. So that was in the air, and for some people some sort of

utopian notion that that's how University should be. But I had never had any talent for utopianism anyway. And so from that standpoint, as some kind of grand transformation of the University into these sort of natural learning communities, I was never specially interested in it. But it was an available formula at the time. And so the idea, so it came up, in fact, in the context of the struggle about whether to have the University re-close. And so I, as part of the rhetoric, [used the language of] the closed University and the open University: It's not time to close it but it's time to open it. In that speech that I made that time, I then said that I called on the students and faculty to create a free University. As far as I can make out, I don't remember anything coming of that. It was a formula, there may have been some informal meetings of people asking questions about Vietnam of somebody was who an international relations teacher, or these kinds of... Everything was too fluid. People were not really focused on these matters. So I'd say it was more kind of an escape hatch. It got us off the Oval. It was an idea offering something, offering... You don't ask people to do something without offering them something in return. And so it was kind of a fresh idea. It gave the leadership a chance to calm people down. As I remember from one of my memos, that one of the leaders of the black students then made some gesture of a different kind, that they were going to separate themselves from these honkies and so on and so on, which was also very brilliant so that a lot of people spontaneously found ways of preventing what would have been a very, very terrible and ugly business. And so I think the "Free University" was an artifact of that, as best as I can remember. And as I say, I saw in the [June 1970 issue of the] Ohio State

Monthly [OSU's alumni magazine]... I did look at the review of the events. They did list that several hundred students showed up. So there must have been something. And it also was a way, one of the things that I was always looking for in my capacity as faculty organizer... That's where I did have an organizing thing, was to find something for people to do that wouldn't jeopardize them. So it gave a chance for some faculty who were sympathetic to do something, and it would be completely appropriate and they wouldn't be demonstrating. They would be doing some kind of ad-hoc improvised classes with interested students. Faculty were also eager to teach interested students. So I think that was part of my... I was pretty good actually as an organizer. I was never any good as a leader. I could never get elected to anything, if there was any opposition. (laughs) But I think that those kinds of ideas I had at that time. So it had a kind of multipurpose objective but it was never dreamed of as a competition to the Ohio State University (laughing, unintelligible). There are lots of things you have to teach students that they don't want to know, or that they don't know that they want to know. Anyway, so that was the "Free University" episode. You have to really ... it's hard 40 years on to recapture the kind of improvisational quality of this. A lot of humor, on one side, [but] there was such a terrible ghastly humorlessness on the other. A group of students said they were going to stay all night. They were on the Oval. And so naturally I felt I had to stay there, too. And there were the National Guards there. And at some point, one of the officers took off his pistol belt, he took off his belt, put it on the side, got up on a little rise, and said, "You know, I'm with you. You have a right to protest and so on." Well, they took him

away. It was so stupid because he was doing absolutely what needed to be done. This is the National Guard. We're talking about kids from the next street who were being put in this totally false position of having to stand there with their bloody guns confronting their neighbors. But that it should have occurred to him to do that was part of the times, that they acted so stupidly in response to it, was also part of the times. So that arrangements would be made with John Corbally, but then John Mount would go... I mean even the business of their having a tape of what I said at that speech was because they provided loud speakers but then equipped it with a tape recorder, so that they could pick up these incriminating statements that people were making, which is all really a total disconnect between the kind of language and rhetoric and so on that's used in this setting, and what you're actually doing. So anyway, that was a free University as an example of the improvisations of that time. I actually had three of the student leaders... I invited them last October/November, [and] we sat around and talked for a couple of hours about what all that had been about. Quite independent. Again, the anniversary thing was hitting us, too. So that was quite interesting. We kind of matched, compared information and I heard about their subsequent lives. And their lives were also basically changed by the disruption, especially those students who were thrown out in the proceedings of that summer.

Q. You were talking about signs of the times and the National Guard member who took off his belt and sided with the students, because they were all so young but they were on different sides of the fence and the National Guard was put in, those young people were put in a position of authority when perhaps they shouldn't

have been. Were you surprised by what happened at Kent State, and did you agree with closing our campus after that?

A. Well, actually I'm glad you raised that because I was going to correct your formulation of the question. I'll take it one at a time. Obviously, the terrible events at Kent State happened, as you recall, after the Ohio State demonstrations started before the Cambodian invasion, actually.

Q. Right.

A. And the Kent State was part of the national on-campus response to that. So there was some..., the Ohio State themes were more mixed. The way that played out was certainly one of the primary reasons why I engaged as much as I did with regard to the National Guard on the Ohio State campus, because my assumption was that if one soldier fired maybe even in the air, and that's all it would take to have people who are themselves faced with totally incomprehensible set of events and didn't really know what was going on, to fire. On the day that we sat on the ground, as I recall, the Kent State people... the University had been closed there, and they came to Ohio State or a number of them did, which was part of what made that whole scene so threatening, and people [were] picking up concrete or pulling stuff from building blocks or whatever, and that's why we sat in between them to try to, and successfully, to avoid that, any kind of a clash or confrontation. To put the Guard in that position had to do as well, I mean... We were on an election calendar. We had a primary election coming up. Rhodes acted precipitously, I thought, and so that Ohio State was not closed in the aftermath of Kent immediately. It was open at least another two, three, four days, until I think

the dates are... I'm confused, I don't have the thing in front of me now, but I think it was May 12th or something that they actually closed Ohio State, and Kent State was even as much as a week before that. The closing of the University, the whole theatre of military occupation and so on, that had to do, I was convinced at least at some level, with the governor's embarrassment about having this happen at The Ohio State University and all these universities, where these kinds of things aren't supposed to happen, right? I mean, if you look at the myth and the fiction of what Ohio State means... I mean why was Woody Hayes there? Because the bloody football players were demonstrating. I mean, in the black group, big team guys. So that couldn't happen. That's why it was so important also to have the idea of the professor who was the instigator, the outsider. And if it was a Jew from the East Coast, all the better. Recalling that whole issue, which by then was not an issue anymore as far as the life of the campus was concerned. But in the world of mythology, where people who – the lore of the alumni of the older generation... Nobody sent the National Guard when people rioted on High Street after a game.

Q. Right.

A. That was not a riot. That was students, right? I mean, they didn't throw gas bombs at them and so on. I mean, you know, even if a couple of windows were broken. So it was, I don't know, I lost my train of thought right then.

Q. Are you saying it was as much, well, it was to avoid another Kent State. But for reasons other than just safety?

A. Well, my view was always, my efforts were motivated by the notion that dispute [or] conflict for some things was appropriate, and that the vocabulary of conflict, especially at that time and in that place, there had to be tolerance to let it be expanded. Again, I come out of a trade union orientation. After all, what's a strike? A strike is really disruptive. People can't go to work. Businesses can't make... I mean, all kinds of abnormal things happen. And in the course of the 20th century, it became recognized that it could be constrained. There was a difference between violence and picket lines – and a whole bunch of other things were developed as a kind of law. And I have become a student of that and published on that subject. Flexible law for those kinds of situations. And that was what was needed, was that capacity for accommodation, a playfulness, a certain amount of imaginative capacity for negotiation, which is scarce. And what you can't have... If what you're going to do is to bring the police, if you bring the Guard, because that's not what they're... It's a clumsy instrument in its nature. That's what a military force is. You can't, I could understand why this officer was then disciplined, because he was acting as a citizen soldier rather than [a soldier]... And he wasn't actually joining the students, he was simply saying, "We really are not going to give you a lot of grief because you're demonstrating. You have a right to demonstrate." And even that kind of flexibility is not what soldiers are about and what they're trained to do. There was a hilarious scene in some ways, if you had that kind of sense of humor, when the students discovered on one of the days of this demonstration, there was a big ceremony to give commissions to the ROTC cadets. And so people poured down there. And again, me and my little

cohorts, we rushed there, we came and we formed a line, a security line, to try to prevent physical confrontations. And so then you had a kind of circus, it was more like a hippie occasion or yippy occasion, in that the demonstrating students were mocking the soldiers and so on. One point of view is not very pretty. The other point of view, hell, at that time and in that setting and with what people were watching on television and what music was like and all the rest of it, it was only outrageous if you weren't in any way capable of seeing what the state of the youth culture at that point was, and having, however unhappily, having a measure of patience. One of the great moments, really interesting moments for me... and it's early on in these demonstrations, these whole events of 1970... is that I was on the first or second day of the demonstrations, [and] there was also a humanities conference which I was attending on campus – another world – and then at a reception I ran into Jim Robinson, the Provost of the University and political science colleague, and I pulled him aside and said, “Look, this disruption rule that you have is really very stupid and arbitrary and you really don't need it.” So he said, “Oh well, our work was disrupted this afternoon for several hours.” And to me, if you have a large number of intense students who have a major concern, that's your job. That's not a disruption. You turn from one part of your job to another part of your job, which is to deal with that. The idea that you are a machine or a factory... You're not a factory, even though at one time you had a promotional leaflet that said, “Our product is people.” But even though our product was people, it really isn't a factory and you have to deal with those things. Anyway, now you know my saintly version of myself. I'm sure that it

wouldn't be hard to find someone who would give you a (laughs) different version of these stories. But you know, I think that I can back up the main outlines of it with contemporary evidence. I know you're an archivist, and I'm a scholar who depends on archivists. So we usually are on the same side on these things. And so I'd be happy to send you copies or documents. I think this is an interesting story about Ohio State because every university had to deal with this pressure. And there were adjustments made everywhere. Obviously you can do things now at Ohio State... The idea that someone would come along and enact a Speaker's Rule as to what kinds of people student groups could invite... You would look at each other and wonder what world they were coming from, even with the conservative government and so on. It's a different character. And in fact, the whole style of things like the "Tea Party" and so, all indebted to the style, not the content, but to the style of '60s demonstrations and movements and protests and chanting and shouting. I mean, it's just change in the political culture. That was an effect of that time, not necessarily the best possible. But I think the people who went through it... I did make a study, a small study in 1980 of what happened to the radicals. And you know, the record is pretty good. It's true you have some dramatic ones who became sort of either very angry at that past and at the people, but overwhelmingly they went into teaching and social work. They tended not to go into business but they tended to do kinds of social... without being necessarily politically left or radical. So I don't think that the experience was bad for them, or that it was bad for our society, that a cohort of people had that experience.

Q. Well, given your own experience, one of my last questions on my list was, what is the lasting legacy of your experience at OSU? Is that hard to sum up?

A. Well, it is hard to crystallize it. I am right now, as you can imagine, I'm doing a lot of work that has a kind of little bit, that involves a certain amount of retrospection and thinking back over what I have been trying to do and what I accomplished and what I didn't. So, I think it's mixed. On the one hand, in talking to my daughters about these things, I'm rather proud and I thought that I did okay. I showed courage when it was needed, which I hadn't known. I never had had the idea that I would be between armed soldiers and furious people, and that I would be there, that I would have the courage to do that. And those kinds of tests – and that I maintained my judgment by and large, I thought. And from that standpoint, you say, "How do you reflect, think back on that point in your life?" I think that on balance it was a constructive thing for me, as part of the (laughs) endless maturing process that we try to go through. As far as my work was concerned, it was a major disruption. It was two, three, four years before I was able to really settle back in to work, but I was able to do that. Do I have regrets about having been put out of one kind of career configuration to another? Well, then you get into these kinds of ...and the whole thing.... (Laughing, intelligible). So I can't on balance regret or say that that was very negative. As far as the larger issues of the time, I think that the things I stood for were pretty much beaten. I think we are not the better for it. I said trade unions aren't... But that's also obsolete. The direction... But that's appropriate for my age and generation. You look around and say, "My God, we really messed up. We had such grand aspirations. We now talk

in terms of a cohort and we really didn't such a great job on it except to make a lot of people lastingly angry." You try to push people to go beyond their moral imagination. I mean, I worry, especially about the core issues, the initial issue about blacks and so on. We have now, yes, we have a black mayor in Columbus, or we did the last time I was there. I had walked across the campus a lot with the first African-American studies professor at Ohio State. And we worked together, worked the street together for a while. So when I was back giving a paper at Mershon, having to do with my current studies on exile, we had dinner together and I got briefed a little. But at the same time I think that community, the bulk of it is more isolated and less hopeful and more damaged than in our time, with the hope and expectations [we had]. A lot of mistakes made, but still movement... So anyway, since you asked me to do that kind of reflection, I get into it. But it changed my life. But something was going to change my life anyway. I might have gone to Purdue and been miserably unhappy there. I had been offered the job there several times. There was a lively group of younger people. There was also a chairman who was an old acquaintance of mine and he's a very demanding person in personal terms. And it might have turned out to be a terrible period of my life. So who can say? We raised... We have fabulous children. One daughter is a chief program officer for the global health people at Gates, with a doctorate in Economics. The other one is a social worker and lawyer. A third daughter has a doctorate in another field and works on public health issues. I'm very proud of them. I've managed to maintain a marriage for 48 years. I've published 15 books. What the hell? I can't say that this did damage to my life. It may have blocked

some aspirations I might have had, some hopes and projects. It was certainly painful at the time. More painful for a student, especially... There are some students who if they are thrown out of school it is not a problem. You go to another school. But for students in a state university, they were there, that was their opportunity, I think there was harm done much, much worse harm done to a number of people. And in fact, of the three people who were in my living room in October, November, whenever it was, one of them had a life career as a bus driver. He's retired. He had been a doctoral candidate in Political Science, and then just never really got back into it. The young woman did, after enormous struggle and continues to be a trade union activist, as well as a college professor in New York City – and you should talk to her – Lorraine, because her name appears everywhere. She's really a smart, thoughtful, unrepentant person. And then the third had kind of improvised life and in the end ended up where intellectuals end up when they really don't know how to do anything: He became a psychotherapist. (laughs) So people had to restructure their lives, but things do have consequences. And then the question is always, yes, there was obviously harm done but you know, I just never found, I mean, in my life... I was looking at a photo the other day of my cousin Marion, there's a picture of me and my brother with her and we're in Leipzig in 1940. I had a student this year, and she looked at it with me and I said, "That's Marion. Marion is my age. She and Lilly died of typhus in a prostitution place on the eastern front where they had been taken by force." And so you know, my idea of what counts as injustice has a different scale. And these were my friends. These were my cousins. These were the people

I was really close to, uncles, aunts, cousins, who had these absolutely horrendous, horrendous fates, which I escaped only by some sheer constellation of luck. And so for me to think, well, I didn't have this career but had that career, that this is some kind of lifetime catastrophe, as I get to the end of the story, I can't possibly do that. I can't possibly do that. I now spend a lot of time thinking back about those people, and to escape that... and I'd write about that now – for the last 10 years, the question of the exile generation – as being my major research subject, organized conferences, and held workshops, and just off to Germany in a couple of days for a guest professorship in the University of Mainz, working again on these issues. And so the question of priority of issues of injustice, and of people's survival and struggle and so on – it's moved far beyond my comparatively benign experience. In a sense, I was in exile in Canada. But I can't say that without giggling... [It's a] hugely civilized place. Kids went to school there, wife sang in a chorus and was an orchestra manager, and I played the cymbals and the bass drum in the community orchestra. (laughs) I mean, what could be wrong with that? I mean, in Lafayette, Indiana, would I have ever played the bass drum in the symphony orchestra? (laughs) So you know, it's _____.

Q. Well, Dr. Kettler, I so appreciate your time and your reminiscing and your philosophizing. This has been truly a wonderful interview.

A. Thank you very much.