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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

College unions, or university centers as they are sometimes called, are in the midst of a boom period. The larger universities in which they first had their start in the United States have been rapidly expanding or completely replacing their original union buildings. The small college, recognizing the educational potential in these institutions, has not been far behind in the planning and opening of new buildings. At present there are nearly 250 colleges and universities represented in the Association of College Unions and this does not include all institutions of higher education which have union buildings.

Physically, college unions range from government surplus buildings housing a snack bar and a tennis court to ultra-modern multi-million dollar buildings faced with stainless steel and glass. Educationally, the contributions of these buildings may provide little more than a place for students to meet and talk or may provide extensive facilities for all types of extra-curricular activity under the professional guidance of persons trained in recreation, the arts, counseling, and a variety of other specialties.

Although fuller clarification of the purpose of unions is considered later as one of the main objectives of this study, an
early definition of the college union is helpful. That provided
by Humphreys is as follows:

The term "college union" implies an organization
and a building. The organization, ordinarily composed
of students, faculty and alumni, is an informal
educational medium for individual and group self-
discovery and expression through a broad program of
social and cultural recreation adapted to the leisure-
time interests and needs of the college community. The
union building is the community center —— the physical
instrument for implementing the objectives of the
organization and for facilitating a community life.¹

Recognizing that during a period of rapid expansion, the
role of such an institution may change in crucial though perhaps
almost imperceptible ways, the purpose of the writer in this
dissertation is primarily to study the origin and objectives of
college unions and those areas in which the union may currently
express its educational responsibilities.

Specifically, the object of the study is three-fold. First,
in Chapter II there is an attempt to provide a historical review
of the college union movement, beginning at Cambridge University
and proceeding through the developing conception of the college
union as represented in the history of several unions in the
United States. Second, in Chapter III a history of the Ohio
Union at the Ohio State University is provided. The third
oldest existing union in the United States, the oldest in the

¹ Edith O. Humphreys, College Unions: A Handbook on Campus
Community Centers (Ithaca, New York: Association of College
Unions, 1945), p. 11.
state universities, it represents in its history two distinct eras in the evolution of college unions. Both in its original role as a men's social center and in its contemporary role as an institution with extensive facilities providing for numerous social, cultural, and recreational needs of the University, it has given leadership to the college union movement. A section of the history of the Ohio Union is devoted to a review of its contribution to the campus since the opening of its new and much larger building in 1951.

Third, in Chapter IV an effort is made to analyze various problems relating to the currently expressed purposes of college unions. The intent is to raise questions and suggest courses of action, incorporating where possible the findings of the still sparse studies on college unions. Following two sections on the clarification of the union's purpose are sections on the relationship of the curriculum to the extracurriculum, the personal development of the student, and training for leadership and citizenship.

The final chapter will include, in addition to a general summary, a series of proposals which seem to be feasible extensions of the Ohio Union's present role on the Ohio State University campus and ones which would lead to its more effective service.

The premise basic to the whole study is that college unions
should be educational institutions. Omission of references to the extensive food services, hotel or other commercial facilities is not a denial of their contribution nor certainly of their strategic financial role in supporting the union's operation. The omission merely derives from the premise. These facilities are not essential to the union as an educational institution and may by their presence basically alter its nature. In this regard, their bearing on the appointment and the development of programs in the larger unions which are expanding to include these facilities, while not the subject of this paper, merit study.

Research reports on college unions located by the writer have consisted of three unpublished doctoral dissertations, the book, College Unions, by Humphreys, and surveys conducted by the Association of College Unions. Extensive resource materials on the planning, operation, and educational programs of college unions are found in the quarterly publication, "The Bulletin of

---


the Association of College Unions, and in the proceedings of the annual conferences of the Association of College Unions. Certain publications of particular unions have provided supplementary material and the writer's visitations to various unions and participation in regional and national conferences have added both information and interest to the study.

Resource materials on the history of the Ohio Union have been found primarily in the files of the Ohio State University Young Men's Christian Association—an organization instrumental in obtaining the original building—and in the records of the Ohio Union.

---


7 Minutes of the Advisory Board and Cabinet of the Young Men's Christian Association, 1890-1913, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (in the files of the Association). Hereafter, Y.M.C.A. Board (or Cabinet) Minutes. Minutes of the two groups are bound together.

8 Minutes of the Ohio Union Board of Overseers, 1911-1956, the Ohio Union, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (in the files of the Ohio Union). Hereafter, Union Board Minutes.
CHAPTER II

THE HISTORY OF COLLEGE UNIONS

It is with justifiable pride that the college union claims as its ancestors organizations founded at Cambridge and Oxford universities. As student debating societies, the Cambridge and Oxford unions were established apart from the universities whose names they still hold. It might be said that they were established in spite of the two universities had these institutions not now for more than a century shared a concern for the fuller education of the university student. Had the topics for debates been innocuous ones, the two organizations could not have attracted to their membership and to their mind-sharpening activity men whose names have been known to the world for the outstanding leadership they have given their nation. Nor would they have found their relationship to their respective universities tempered for many years by active disapproval of their activities. The first debate of the Oxford Union, as pointed out by Humphreys, had as its topic: "Was the revolution with Cromwell to be attributed to the tyrannical conduct of Charles, or to the democratic spirit of the times?"¹ There has probably been little discussed on the American college campus which has appeared so threatening to the public relations of a university or, indeed, the nation as the queries traditional

¹ Humphreys, College Unions, p. 13.
with the Oxford and Cambridge unions.

Founded almost one hundred years prior to the development of the university club idea, common to early American college unions, the Cambridge Union Society, like that at Oxford and others to follow in England, was primarily a debating organization. The "Union" of three debating societies of Cambridge University held its first debate on February 20, 1815. It was the purpose of this society to provide greater freedom for discussions and, as a symptom of its intellectual exclusiveness, to provide also freedom from disturbance by those students who were not particularly interested in such an activity. For a brief period from 1817 to 1821, during which time the university refused to allow debates, the organization found itself with nothing to do. When the ban was lifted in 1821, the Cambridge Union began to grow again.

Meanwhile stirrings at Oxford resulted in the formation of the United Debating Society which, in 1823, became the Oxford Union. Actually the United Debating Society continued to hold debates on subjects of public interest until December 3, 1825, at which time the society dissolved itself in order to exclude from its membership certain students whose lack of serious concern for the discussions was found distracting. The organization was immediately reconstituted on December 5, 1825, as the Oxford Union and has had continuous existence since that time.
In 1829, the two unions met and on November 26 held one of their famous debates on "The Comparative Merit of Byron and Shelley." The association of the two societies led to an exchange of privileges in their unions.

Although concerned primarily with debate and discussion to a degree which distinguishes them from other English unions, these two unions were not without social characteristics. In addition to libraries, primarily for reference and study of debating members, facilities for general club life were provided. Certain provisions were made for the recreation of undergraduates, billiard rooms were added, and the prolonged discussions following the debates suggested the need for occasional sustenance, and hence the lunch room for the members.

Although the unions at Glasgow University, Edinburgh University, and elsewhere adopted the central purpose of the societies at Cambridge and Oxford, they did so with other objects also in mind, in some cases giving higher priority to club facilities and to establishing an organization with which student groups might affiliate in activities other than debating.

The place of these unions might best be typified by the remarks of the chancellor of Oxford University in 1873, at the fiftieth anniversary of the Oxford Union:

\[2\] Proceedings, 1925, p. 11.
I cannot forget that we are here this evening not to celebrate the University of Oxford, but a remarkable institution in it... I believe there is no educational instrument so valuable to the large class of students—I mean those who have to express themselves in public—as the Union Society...it is a great honor to the independence and self-governing instinct of the English people that a society, having had so great an influence for good, and producing so many distinguished men among its members, should be founded by the spontaneous action of the undergraduates themselves...though not established by the laws of the place, though not under the sanction of public authority, the Oxford Union Society has proved itself by its fruits to be one of the best institutions of this university.  

If the unions of English universities and the American universities are distinctively indigenous to student life in their respective countries, they none the less have their deeply rooted common characteristics. They have in common the outgrowth of a desire for a uniting place for members of the university with mutual concerns. If in the English union members were primarily concerned with the logical and studied expressions of intellectual difference on a great variety of timely issues, the American union has been as deliberate in

3 H. S. Morrah, The Oxford Union, 1823-1923, quoted by Edith C. Humphreys, College Unions, p. 13. There is occasional reference in college union literature to the chancellor having said of the union that "there is no educational instrument so valuable to the large class of students." However valuable the support given by such a phrase it is more interesting and less misleading in context than out.
professing the value of students with diverse backgrounds and experience coming together in ways conducive to their discovery of some common purpose. Also, as it was true that the Oxford Union was founded by "the spontaneous action of the undergraduates," the initiative and enthusiasm of the American undergraduate, limited only by the transient nature of his membership in the university community, has been crucial to the establishment of American college unions. In this regard, existing differences in the history of the British and the American unions seem more peculiarly related to the existence in England of student organizations separate from the university, and in America to their acceptance, official recognition, and support by the university.

Harvard Union, second only to the union at the University of Pennsylvania in having a building, was the first to be established as an organization in an American university. Although a society known as "the Harvard Union" had existed from 1832 to 1839 and again from 1880 until 1889, a donation in 1899 of $150,000 was for a club designed to enhance the social life of the university. While there is reference to the Oxford and Cambridge Unions in the early proposals for such a building, the emphasis was on the social advantages which the club facilities of these unions provided for their universities. In retrospect the Harvard Union was unique among American college
unions in its having existed separately from the university for its first twenty years, 1899 to 1919, a characteristic in common with its British counterpart.

In its underlying purpose, however, there is little doubt that it differed from the English institutions. Its statement of purpose in the constitution adopted in May, 1901, read, "Its object shall be to promote comradeship among members of Harvard University, by providing at Cambridge a suitable clubhouse for social purposes." Established as it was with the organization of the club in the hands of a governing board composed of undergraduates elected from the various classes and branches of the university, it was vulnerable to the conscription of World War I and was closed from 1917 until the fall of 1920. When it opened again it did so under the official wing of Harvard University, governed by a self-perpetuating board of graduates of the university and a student committee representing its various classes and branches. Until 1930, at which time it became a social center for freshmen only, it maintained its original purpose in serving the general social life of the university, sponsoring tournaments, dances, and visits by leaders in public life both

1 Humphreys, p. 19. Almost identical statements were found in the constitutions of Rockefeller Hall at Brown University, the Reynolds Club of the University of Chicago, both opened in 1903, and the Ohio Union, opened in 1911 at the Ohio State University.
in the United States and abroad. Humphreys points out the apparent reversal of the trend of development of college unions in this country, when, in 1931, Harvard introduced its "house plan." Actually, many of the efforts of the union for providing for the social life of the undergraduate were thereafter the responsibility of the various houses or dormitories. At this point, however, the Harvard Union parted company with the many unions which, while sharing the original purpose, had, on the contrary, become more inclusive in their efforts to bring undergraduates, graduates, faculty, and other members of the university community together in a common social experience.

If the Harvard Union deserves mention because its history was unrepresentative of the college unions developing in the early 1900's, Houston Hall at the University of Pennsylvania must be considered as an outstanding representative of the college union movement, the first to have permanent quarters on an American campus and the first to have been conceived with a comprehensive plan in evidence for the social life of the student. It contained a swimming pool, gymnasium, bowling alleys, billiard, pool and chess tables, reading and writing rooms, an auditorium and smaller rooms for religious services and lectures, and a large number of separate rooms for the use of student

---

5 Humphreys, p. 16.
organisations. With the exception of facilities for varsity athletics, the building when opened in January, 1896, made complete provision for the recreational and social life of the student. Initiating a pattern of student self-government, typical of most college unions of today, a house committee was established of students and one faculty member, ultimately responsible to a board of directors composed of the deans of the various faculties. 6

The original donation by Mr. and Mrs. Henry Howard Houston of $100,000 for the building was inspired by the Young Men's Christian Association of the university which had over a period of years sought to acquire a student building which might house religious meetings and be of general use to the university and to student organizations. Similarly, as will be noted in detail later, it was the continued efforts of the Young Men's Christian Association on the Ohio State University campus which resulted in the construction of the Ohio Union.

6 It might be noted that in the constitution proposed for the Association of College and University Unions in 1920, one of the purposes listed was, "promoting closer harmony and unity of effort in the advancement of student government among the member institutions." In meetings of the forerunner of this organization, the National Association of Student Unions, it was apparent that the name union sometimes referred to the student activity headquarters, sometimes to the student governing bodies on particular campuses, and sometimes to the organisation which was responsible for both student self-government and the supervision of union headquarters. The development of many of the later college unions was quite naturally spearheaded by the established student governing bodies on the campuses throughout the country.
In addition to the unions already mentioned, several others were established as organizations prior to World War I. Although most of these were founded on co-educational campuses, they were clearly established as social clubs for men only. All belonged to what Humphreys has referred to helpfully as the club stage (1895-1918). The provision of facilities typical of the private men's club of the day characterized the unions which had permanent buildings. As clubs they provided a place for the leisure time lounging, smoking, and reading of undergraduate men, a place for their larger meetings, and for lectures of distinguished visitors. They were places where, in the words of the 1896 University of Pennsylvania catalogue, students would find facilities "for passing their leisure hours in harmless recreation and amusement." Whereas in England there had been an apparent, if unofficial, relationship between debating and the education the student received in the classroom, the primary concern for the wholesome social life of the American student became and remained a distinguishing characteristic. The activities which consume most of the time of contemporary student governing boards were hardly known to governing boards during the club stage. The union was not considered as an educational agency, whatever the

7 Humphreys, p. 17.

8 "University of Pennsylvania Bulletin," 1901, cited by Humphreys, p. 20.
nature of its informal program. It maintained its facilities but it sponsored little. There was little relationship either intentional or coincidental between its responsibilities and those of the classroom, nor did the college union, any more than other embryonic agencies later known as student personnel services, fit into any plan expressing the university's growing concern for the "whole student."

Following World War I, a new chapter in the evolution of college unions in America began. The finest physical expression of the idea was the impressive Michigan Union, opened in 1920. The organisational expression of the idea as an intercollegiate movement was found in the first post-war meeting of the Association of College and University Unions held the same year in the new Michigan Union building. The representatives of twenty-one colleges and universities heard Dean H. M. Bates of the Michigan Law School emphasize "the need in our colleges and universities of some medium through which the diversified and much broken up student body might be brought together on the common ground of student fellowship, in a place where its relation to the university

---

9 The first organization of unions was formed in 1911 at the Ohio State University and was known as the National Association of Student Unions. At the second conference, held in 1920, the name was changed to the Association of College and University Unions. In 1923 it became the Association of College Unions.
would be stressed."10 The idea of bringing together members of
the campus community separated both by geography and by increas-
ingly diverse social backgrounds had been eloquently stated by
George Vincent, later president of the University of Minnesota,
at the dedication of the Reynolds Club of Chicago University in
1903.11 It was not until this later period, however, that the idea of a college union came to denote so fully an instrument for the democratic social life for the entire college community.
The increasingly extensive use of facilities provided in the
buildings and, indeed, the fact that they owed their existence to the contributions of faculty and alumni as well as students, tended to emphasize the need for cooperative control of the buildings. The early unions, while providing headquarters for existing student organizations, accelerated the formation of numerous others of all types. As Humphreys writes:

In the years following 1919, with a world supposedly just "made safe for democracy" the idea of campus unity, of a union for all, became a motivating force in the development of college unions. This was an era of school spirit, of coeducation, of the biggest of the big dances, of bringing independent students up to a social par with fraternity students, of breaking down class barriers, and of cooperative student-faculty government.12

\hspace{1cm} 10 Proceedings, 1920. Appears under "Proceedings of the Convention." No page number.

\hspace{1cm} 11 Humphreys, p. 25.

\hspace{1cm} 12 Appendix A, address of George Vincent.
Between 1919 and 1929, the enthusiasm of students, the addresses on fund raising at the Association of College Unions conferences, the interest in living memorials to alumni who had served in World War I, and a changing conception of the university's responsibility for the student resulted in the construction of thirty-nine new college union buildings. Although some followed the pattern of the Michigan campus and established segregated unions for men and women, a pattern recommended by the architects of the Michigan Union as late as 1931, there was at least recognition that if a common social life was of benefit to men, the opportunity should be provided for women students also.

One expression of the purpose implicit in these increasing institutions was that of J. E. Walters, director of the Purdue Union in 1925 and president of the Association of College and University Unions when he delivered his address, "The Idea of the University Union."

The rationale of a university union is the recognition of the fact that the university student is a complex being; that while he is differentiated from the animal world by the scope and free play of his intellectual processes, his emotional life is still the cornerstone of his spiritual being. As we have come to realize the bearings of this fact, we have come to see that along with a man's academic and technical education must go an education on the side of humanity. Some of us have even come to believe that the finest flower of spiritual development springs only from a wise blending of these two phases of education. And
as the best training of a man's emotional life is obtained through his activities as a social being, one of the functions of the university training is to provide opportunities for wisely organized social contact. The proper performance of this function for a university is the object of the union. 13

This period of growth of college unions could hardly be reviewed without recognition of Hart House at the University of Toronto. The vision of the planners is revealed in the Prayer of the Founders,

That Hart House, under the guidance of its warden, may serve, in the generations to come, the highest interests of this university by drawing into a common fellowship the members of the several colleges and faculties, and by gathering into a true society the teacher and the student, the graduate and the under-graduate; further, that the members of Hart House may discover within its walls a true education that is to be found in good fellowship, in friendly disputation and debate, in the conversation of wise and earnest men, in music, pictures, and the play, in the casual book, in sports and games and the mastery of the body; and lastly, that just as in the days of war this house was devoted to the training in arms of the young soldier, so in the time of peace its halls may be dedicated to the task of arming youth with strength and suppleness of limb, with clarity of mind and depth of understanding, and with a spirit of true religion and high endeavor. 14

Although the building was completed in 1919, the far-sightedness of those who conceived it is even more surprising when it is noted that the construction began in 1911. The inclusion of the university gymnasium, swimming pool, and

13 Proceedings, 1925, p. 10.
14 Ibid., p. 19.
undergraduate dining hall added to a scheme of extensive facili-
ties intended to provide for the whole life of the student out-
side of the classroom. While foreshadowing a plan which was
later to appear on the campuses of the United States, few today
approach Hart House in scope of responsibility.

The rapid social changes occurring outside the university
cannot be completely overlooked even in such a brief review of the
development of college unions. Many of these directly affected
the university's concept of responsibility to the individual
student. The great growth in university enrollment in the
decade following World War I was both a symptom and cause of
problems relating to the establishment of unions. The spurt in
the demand for higher education during and immediately following
the war period brought changes which were written into almost
every phase of the life of the college and university: increas-
ingly varied demands for specialized curricula; student bodies
with increasingly diverse social, political, economic, religious,
and geographic backgrounds; increasingly large and complex
university organization and its consequent de-personalizing
effect on the student; and increasing enrollment of women with
its effects both on the curricular provisions made by the univer-
sities, their specialized residential and advisory needs, and
the general effect of their presence on the social life of the
university. These and numerous other interrelated factors are
either implicit or explicit in the plans and purposes of college
unions founded during the period. College unions, while repre-
senting the largest single physical result of the university's
changing responsibility toward the student, found basic to
their growth the same problems which many other student personnel
services and agencies sought to solve. If on the one hand
student employment services were developing on the large univer-
sity campuses, attempting to meet a need of the student more
financially pressed than his predecessor of twenty years, the
unions on the other hand were attempting to minimize financial
stresses for the student both through their food services and the
provision of on-campus employment opportunities. Indeed, the
presence of a union building's facilities on a campus doubtless
led in certain cases to the earlier establishment of such
services. The student employment bureaus of Houston Hall and
the Ohio Union were early examples.\(^{15}\)

The overall rationale for college unions, however, was
provided by a changing philosophy of education, at the center
of which was a student perceived quite differently than his
predecessors by educational leaders. There was general concur-
currence between the experience of educators and the research
and writings of psychologists that there were specific major

\(^{15}\) Their primary function was simply to list jobs open to
students and maintain a file of students seeking employment.
Later reference is made to the service as it developed at the
Ohio Union.
needs during adolescence which were common to young people. Whether in or out of the college community they sought increasing independence from the home and other adults. They needed recognition and acceptance by their own peer groups and longed for emotional security. They wanted satisfying and maturing experiences in their intellectual, social, and emotional relations with the opposite sex. They also needed experiences which provided both a sense of achievement and the opportunity to develop "an aim in life" which, while greater in its dimensions than a vocational goal, would be related to this. Although the "whole student" was an abstraction, capable of conception more nearly in the mind of the student than anywhere else, it helped to provide for an evaluation of the student's experience in the university and the means by which the university might make the experience a fuller one. Faculty advisory systems and student personnel offices and agencies helped to provide for these needs, usually on an individual basis, while the college union, less specific in its plan for meeting these needs, provided opportunities for both individual and group experiences. The encouragement by the college of extracurricular activities, often leading to the construction of a building, made them as unions the centers of student social life and organization, and provided a physical symbol and human organization through which the student could identify himself with a
university and community.

Fifty-nine unions or similar student buildings, in some instances Y.M.C.A. centers, were in existence by 1930 and 145 by 1940. By 1956, 260 universities in the United States, Alaska, Canada, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico were represented in the Association of College Unions and union buildings were a recognized necessity in the life of both large and small university communities. The increasing number, size, and versatility of these buildings suggest a closer examination of their stated purposes. This will be done in Chapter IV.

It is in the context of this brief history of the development of college unions that the growth of the Ohio Union at the Ohio State University is now considered. While recognizing that such a history might well stand as a separate study, the existence of the Ohio Union throughout most of the evolutionary period of unions in the United States, and more particularly its own recent development, make its study pertinent to the discussion of problems currently facing college unions.
CHAPTER III
THE OHIO UNION

PART I  EARLY EFFORTS FOR A STUDENT BUILDING

The opening of the "students' building," the Ohio Union, was the culmination of the efforts of several generations of students, faculty and administrative leaders, and one student organization in particular over a period of almost twenty years. The first reference to a student building is found in the minutes of the Cabinet of the Young Men's Christian Association, March 20, 1891:

This was perhaps the most animated meeting of the year. Three persons present stated that they had become Christians through the influence of the Association work. Mr. Crooks (C. H. Crooks) moved that the Association pledge themselves for a $20,000 building at the end of five years. As this was the last meeting of the year a general farewell handshake was indulged in and all went away determined to make this next term's work count.¹

The I.M.C.A. was at the time an organization with over twenty-five per cent of the men students in its membership. Even though the total enrollment of the University numbered under 1000, the need for a place to call home was apparent. Not only was it the only campus organization which provided for the religious needs of the men students on campus, but its approach and conception of students' needs was a broad and inclusive one. While a review of the details of its varied contributions to the campus are not within the scope of the study, some are

¹ Young Men's Christian Association Cabinet Minutes, March 20, 1891.
directly related to the development of what we now know as student personnel services and specifically bear on the Ohio Union and its current responsibilities. Doubtless its breadth of purpose helped to bring into its membership students and faculty members whose varied abilities and religious and social concern found expression in its projects and services. The year, 1892, marked the first of four campaigns for a student building and was throughout the years of sporadic campaigning considered the date of the birth of the movement.

President Herbert Scott, in the words of the Y.M.C.A. minutes, "expressed the hope that all of us would keep continually in mind the furtherance of the Y.M.C.A. building project. He expected this of us."2 The first tangible evidence of progress came at a meeting held in Orton Hall and led by John R. Mott, later a world famous religious leader of the international and intercollegiate Y.M.C.A. movement. Whether he was invited officially to begin the building campaign as a keynote speaker or whether it just seemed an opportune time to plan for the beginning of the campaign while he was on campus is not clear; the results were clear, however. "The object was to start the canvass and it was started with a will. The students pledged

---

2 Ibid., February 5, 1892
themselves to $6500 but raised it to $8000 May 6 in chapel. The student body is fired by the movement.\textsuperscript{3} While the appeal to the whole student body did not really become apparent until a later campaign, this early reference to the support of students in general seems natural in the light of the role which the Y.M.C.A. played on the campus at the time.

Several progress reports were made during the following month and in September, 1892, the plan for the campaign for a building was presented at a regular meeting. At this point, however, the movement died or at least became dormant.

A new generation of students attempted to revive the idea in the spring of 1896. The informality of the Cabinet minutes again conveys the hopefulness of the group. In a May meeting held to discuss the movement, "A great deal of enthusiasm was shown and it was decided to push and have a new building."\textsuperscript{4} As in other campus causes the adjournment of the academic year resulted in the postponement of action; no further subscriptions were taken. With the exception of an entry in the Makio for the following year it appeared that the recurring wave of interest had ebbed again. The Y.M.C.A. page in the yearbook is significant in that it conveys a somewhat different conception of the

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., May 5, 1892. The minutes of the May 5th meeting were evidently written on or after May 6th and included this reference to the May 6th meeting.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., May, 1896.
building idea. "Suggestions are now current that the whole student body unite to erect a clubhouse which will combine the requirements of the Association with the various other student organizations." \(^5\)

The absence of any record of specific action on the building project during the following year may be considered a further indication of the need for continuing leadership, something which none of those working on the project could give it. Step by step the conception of the building for the whole student body and for the general use of the University evolved. Had fulfillment of the project been less remote, the Y.M.C.A. might have been able to give consistent leadership to it. The result probably would have been a smaller building of more limited service than was eventually constructed. This does not suggest that the building would not have been open to all. As is indicated throughout these early years the whole student body was the parish for whatever social or religious needs the Y.M.C.A. could satisfy. While for years their meetings were held in University buildings, in rooms of members, in the Columbus Y.M.C.A., and in rented space elsewhere, their first established

\(^5\) Makio, The Ohio State University Yearbook (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University), 1897, p. 225. The entry traces the history of the Y.M.C.A. from 1883, stressing the growth of the organization and its need for permanent headquarters.
although temporary, home in a former residence was considered a social center for all students.

Although the meager records of the campaigns of 1892 and 1896 are not in exact agreement, it is probable that of the $8000 originally pledged in 1892, between one thousand dollars and eleven hundred dollars had been paid by the spring of 1896. The contributions had come as class gifts of the student body, from the liberal donations of faculty members, and from the numerous cash gifts and pledges of individual students. Whatever the limited material reward of the efforts of several years, the idea of student building had been well planted in the minds of key university leaders and was enough in evidence to be picked up periodically by the more transient, though none the less concerned, students.

"When, however, the new building is secured..." reveals the optimism felt at the end of the 1898–99 academic year. The Cabinet and the Board of Trustees had concentrated on the building program. Progress had been made, if not in the collection of more funds, in making explicit the nature of the need. In the fall of 1898, the Cabinet reviewed the building

---

6 Makio, 1899, p. 261.

7 The names of the two groups changed from time to time. The Cabinet refers to student officers and chairmen. The Board of Trustees and Advisory Board are synonymous and refer to a faculty-administrative group.
movement and began to outline first, the plan of the building; second, the plan for collecting old pledges. In the minutes it is reported that, "the probable cost of the building eight thousand dollars to ten thousand dollars at the outside." The reference is that terse. The estimate was doubtless in keeping with the original 1892 plan for a headquarters building. Even at pre-1900 construction costs, it would not have provided the building which a few months later was being proposed.

While the incompleteness of the records leaves details to conjecture, the March 31, 1899 meeting was the scene of the earliest comprehensive report of the building movement. Signed V. H. Davis, W. E. Mann, H. P. Weld, and Ray McCallum as the "Committee on Investigation," it provides the best existing picture of the status of the movement at the time. Their report summarized the plans for renewing the student campaign for funds, indicated the social needs of the 800 men students then enrolled in the University, listed the campuses on which student buildings had already been established, and outlined the facilities to be included in the proposed three story building.9

Following McCallum's report the Cabinet passed a motion accepting his recommendation to establish a building committee

8 Y.M.C.A. Cabinet Minutes, November 10, 1898.

9 Ibid., March 31, 1899. See Appendix B.
consisting of one senior, two juniors, one sophomore, one freshman, two professors, one alumnus, and one trustee. The five students were elected but a motion was passed that the two professors, the alumnus and the trustee be left for appointment by the Executive Committee.

With McCallum as chairman of the new committee an outline for the building movement was developed and details of the plan announced at a general meeting in May, 1899. Again, however, the interruption of summer evidently prevented further action, and, with the exception of a brief entry in the minutes of the Board of Trustees of the Y.M.C.A. in June, there is no further reference to the building movement for several months.

In what was doubtless becoming an old story to the senior members in the Y.M.C.A., another effort was made in January of 1900, when the president was instructed to appoint new members who would reorganize the Building Committee and place it "on a legal basis."

The Y.M.C.A. page in the 1900 Makie states the need and the hope:

"...one of the greatest needs, not only of this Association but of the University in general, is a large building on campus devoted to the work of the Christian Association. The building movement has been agitated for several years, but little material results attained; however, efforts in this

---

10 Y.M.C.A. Cabinet Minutes, January 20, 1900.
direction are being renewed and it is hoped that they will be prosecuted to an early conclusion.\textsuperscript{11}

By the following year the Y.M.C.A. had a headquarters, a house rented by the Advisory Committee of the Association. The parlors of the house comprised the office of the general secretary and were the meeting place for the cabinet, committees, and the study classes of the Association. In addition, writes the secretary, M. W. Mumma, "the parlors are as far as possible to be the center of the social life of the members and the student body in general."\textsuperscript{12}

By this time the need for a building had become urgent; the long sought after headquarters building was crowded. The enrollment of men in the University during the year was 1221. Of these, 23\% were members of the Y.M.C.A.

In 1903, the Y.M.C.A. Board of Trustees met in the fall for preliminary consideration of a newly proposed movement to secure funds for a building for the use of the Association.

In the informal discussion the opinion seemed to prevail that the building erected for the above purpose should be large enough to provide for the rapid growth of the Association, should be built in keeping with the other University buildings and should if possible be located on the campus. Professor Cole and Secretary Warner were made a committee to investigate the conditions under which the building fund now in the hands of Mr. K. M. Woods is held by the Association and to arrange a

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Makio}, 1900, p. 194.

\textsuperscript{12} Y.M.C.A. Cabinet Minutes, "Record for the Year 1900 to 1901," following the January 20, 1900, minutes.
joint meeting of their board and the Board of Trustees of the building fund.\textsuperscript{13}

Only one member of the Board of Trustees of the building fund was present when the joint meeting was held. The only recorded action was a motion "that Dr. (William O.) Thompson be appointed a committee to lay the matter of the building before the Trustees of the University and if possible obtain from them permission to place the building on the campus."\textsuperscript{14}

Beginning in February, 1905, there was steady progress for a period of three years, culminating in the Ohio legislature appropriation for the building in 1908. During that period the relationship of the Y.M.C.A. to the projected building became more clearly formulated. As it became apparent that the Y.M.C.A. alone could not reasonably hope to provide a building sufficient to meet the growing need of the campus, alternative sources were sought to provide financial support for its construction. On February 2, 1905, the Board of Trustees of the Y.M.C.A. met to discuss various phases of the building movement, the minutes of that meeting indicating the range of their discussion.

As to the kind of building, i.e., Y.M.C.A. alone or united in a social building for college interests. Dual purpose building favored.

As to location on campus or on private grounds. Dr. Thompson personally favored private

\textsuperscript{13} Y.M.C.A. Board Minutes, November 24, 1903.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
ownership. The best location on the campus was decided to be the knoll above, i.e., north of, the spring.

As to having plans prepared by an architect for $40,000 to $50,000 building.

As to the legality of the building on the campus, Mr. Marshall was of the opinion that there could be no legal objection to a social and Y.M.C.A. building. Also that in the face of the absolute need of social centralization for the student life, the State could as well do a part or all of it.

As to the source of funds. Opinions unfavorable to the J. D. Rockefeller idea. Three policies: the people, the State, or one man.

A motion passed the Board of Trustees to the effect that a committee of 3 (three) be appointed by the chair from the members of both boards to secure a field agent for the building and to raise the funds to pay him. The committee was also authorized to determine the conditions necessary for locating such a building on the campus.15

While the conciseness of the minutes leaves uncertain the relationship between the various ideas expressed, the meeting raised problems of policy not elsewhere recorded. It is assumed that President Thompson's preference for private ownership meant building off-campus on private ground, rather than providing University ground for the building of an organizationally autonomous Y.M.C.A. The legal problems, even in the case of an organization so integrally a part of the campus life, were obvious. University trustee G. S. Marshall's opinion that there could be no legal objection to having a combination social

15 Y.M.C.A. Board Minutes, February 2, 1905.
and Y.M.C.A. building on the campus probably was not expressed with the hope of the State doing a part or all of it. While such buildings were then in existence on other campuses, they had not been financed by legislative appropriations. Financial support was the obvious key to the whole problem. A solicitation of individuals had failed to yield the funds necessary, the appeal being made of course to those sympathetic to the Y.M.C.A. movement and its campus program. While one later attempt was made to raise the funds by this method the effort lacked the permanent leadership and organization necessary and, indeed, with the idea of such a building being novel in the minds of many, the prospects of success through a mass appeal must have been dim. The opposition to the "J. D. Rockefeller idea" is also unexplained in any of the proceedings concerning the building.\(^{16}\) Whether the objections were to the donation of John D. Rockefeller in particular or to any one person’s contributing the building are unknown. In a meeting almost a year later Marshall expressed his wish "to go on record as voicing his objection to the solicitation of Mr. Rockefeller for the building."\(^{17}\) In this same meeting, December 21, 1905, he moved that the Board not solicit Rockefeller for the building funds, but the motion was lost. The idea of one


\(^{17}\) *Ibid.*
person donating a campus building was certainly not new to the group. A quite specific precedent was found in the donation by Rockefeller three years earlier of the Rockefeller Hall at Brown University.

In the June meeting of the Board, Eno reported on the progress of the committee, suggesting that a man be hired as an executive secretary for the work. In the following October at a meeting called for the consideration of the building movement a motion was passed that two of its members act as a committee to meet with M. O. Williams with authority to appoint him as secretary of the building campaign. A week later Copland, one of these two members, promised to personally guarantee Williams' salary and expenses "for one month, commencing November 3, 1905, at rate of $2000 per year." The Board accepted with thanks Copland's liberal offer to support Williams for one month "to investigate the conditions as to the advisability of undertaking a building canvass."18 Following a general discussion of the building movement, the Board on November 15, on the recommendation of Williams, authorized him to take a trip "to the Eastern or Western institutions with buildings or such movements in view,"19 and to determine specifically the plans for campaigns and equipment for such buildings.

18 Ibid., November 3, 1905.

19 Ibid., November 15, 1905.
While some of the funds of the 1892 building campaign were eventually used to pay the expenses of continuing the building movement, it should be noted that this board in November requested K. D. Hood, trustee of the building fund, to divide the balance of the fund equally between the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A.

Immediate progress was made and in December, "the report of Mr. M. O. Williams' investigation of social and religious conditions at Ohio State and of the Eastern colleges was than given."20 There followed a general discussion of plans and possibilities of a building. It was noted that there was "no objection to securing if possible a gift from Messrs. Rockefeller or Carnegie."21 President Thompson, Williams, and Cole were appointed a committee to confer with the board of directors of the Columbus Y.M.C.A. and businessmen in the city. Williams was invited to continue as secretary. In accordance with a suggestion made by President Thompson the Board asked at a meeting on December 21 that he send a personal letter to each member of the instructional staff stating the essential features of the plan to raise money for the building and calling a meeting of the staff following the holidays.

20 Ibid., December 11, 1905.

21 Ibid.
It was also at this meeting that Marshall voiced his objections to the use of Rockefeller funds.\textsuperscript{22} However, in agreement with Williams' plan, it was already apparent that the Board would attempt at least one more time to solicit funds from students, faculty, and friends of the University.

By the end of the school year, with some twenty-one thousand dollars in pledges for the building, President Thompson called together leading businessmen of Columbus to discuss the idea with them. It was suggested at this time that the matter be taken up with the directors of the Columbus Board of Trade. Williams notes in his minutes of the meeting of June 15, 1906, a joint session of an enlarged citizens committee and the directors of the Board of Trade, that the directors "voted unanimously to endeavor to raise one hundred thousand dollars with which to erect the student building at O.S.U."\textsuperscript{23}

The optimism of the Y.M.C.A. Board of Trustees, a short-lived optimism, is apparent in the first fall meeting of 1906. "After discussion it was voted that the results of the canvass for the building had been such and the outlook for the future seemed such as seemed in the judgment of the Board to assure the success of the enterprise."\textsuperscript{24} At this meeting Williams was

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., December 21, 1905.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., June 15, 1906.

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., September 25, 1906.
instructed to prepare a statement to send to subscribers requesting the first payment. Arrangements were also made for the solicitation of new students. Meanwhile, the "Joint Committee on the O.S.U. Student Building" proceeded with the formulation of plans for a financial campaign. Its subcommittee in particular, chaired by President Thompson, worked on the preparation of the report submitted on December 4, 1905. In the light of the subsequent history of the campaign it is interesting to note that no doors were closed on possible sources of support, including the possibility of "a final appeal to the Legislature." It is apparent also that the subcommittee recognized the need for full-time leadership in the campaign.

From this, one would hardly have foretold the release of Williams by the Board of Trustees one month later. The report recommended undertaking a campaign for $100,000 for the student building. Of this amount, $25,000 was to be secured from students, faculty and friends, $50,000 from Columbus citizens, and $25,000 from alumni and friends throughout the state or, as a last resort, through an appeal to the Legislature.  

The report was received and the subcommittee discharged. The motion was passed that the joint committee undertake to raise one hundred thousand dollars as recommended in the report. A committee of four, chaired by Thompson and including Williams and

25 Y.M.C.A. Board of Trustees Minutes, December 4, 1906.
two others, was appointed to proceed with the solicitation of those who were assumed to be able to contribute most liberally.

With little action during the succeeding month, on January 6 the Board resolved to "express its appreciation of the services rendered by Mr. Williams and of the (Y.M.C.A.) state organization in the cordial relations sustained to the canvass for funds." Whatever the cause for the release of Williams, this must have been the beginning of the end of this phase of the campaign.

PART II THE 1908 STUDENT BUILDING COMMITTEE, 1908 - 1910

By the fall of 1907, the Ohio State Lantern was raising the question as "to whether the prospect of a student building is a dead issue at Ohio State."26 The failure of the two previous campaigns was blamed on the methods used. The article cited the Michigan Union as being already organized with a residence near the campus serving as a student center while funds were raised for a union building. The suggestion was made that property near the campus might likewise provide temporary headquarters at Ohio State. It referred to the testimony of a Dartmouth student regarding the influence of their building upon the life of the campus and to the similar experience at the universities of Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

---

26 Ohio State Lantern (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University), October 30, 1907, p. 6.
The regularity of articles on a student building found in the Lantern during this period was later credited to the energetic work of F. E. Baylis, newly appointed Y.M.C.A. Secretary, and a group of students who had independently taken up the cause. On December 13, Baylis and two faculty members on the Advisory Board of the Y.M.C.A. were asked to determine the status of the student building campaign. A summary of their report made in January, 1908, was noted in the minutes in three divisions.

I. A student building of any sort cannot be located on campus unless such building be owned and controlled by the University.

II. The Board of Trade only endorsed the student building project and in view of the present financial uncertainty will not aid in carrying on a campaign.

III. The committee as advised by Dr. Thompson recommends that the students go before the legislature and work for an appropriation for a student building.27

The report was accepted. The Board agreed to turn over to the student committee all pledges toward the building and "lend their moral support to having them paid, provided that the appropriation from the Legislature be secured or assurance thereof."28 Baylis was instructed to act with the student committee in securing an appropriation from the Legislature.

The committee began the new building movement and outlined

27 Y.M.C.A. Advisory Board Minutes, January 18, 1908.
28 Ibid.
its plan. Every student was encouraged to write at least one letter home either to his parents or some influential citizen encouraging them to call to the attention of the representative and senator from his county the need for an Ohio State student building. The committee picked a student from each county to act as chairman.

Only six weeks after the plan was announced, a Lantern article noted that a bill for a student building was in the hands of a House of Representatives committee in the Legislature. It again urged all those who had not written letters to do so immediately to assure support and passage of the bill. By March 25, 1908, the Finance Committee of the House had recommended an appropriation of seventy-five thousand dollars. In an era when there was controversy over the duplication of the facilities of the state universities it was perhaps natural that the article emphasized that the Ohio State University was to be kept in the front rank, with the implication that if any facilities were provided anywhere they would be provided on the university campus at Columbus. This was to be Ohio's union for students.

29 Aaron B. Cohn, H. R. Reigart, Herbert J. Schory, W. P. Earle and Henry W. Vaughn, with Baylis as advisor.

30 Lantern, March 11, 1908, p. 1.

31 Ibid., March 25, 1908, p. 1.
With the leadership and support of Representative Clifford E. McGinness and Speaker of the House Freeman T. Eagleson, the student building bill passed the Senate on May 2, 1908. In the next issue of the Lantern the campus read,

The successful movement now brought to a close by the granting of this appropriation had its origin in a suggestion made by State Secretary of the Y.M.C.A. to Secretary Baylis of the Ohio State Y.M.C.A. early in the school year. This suggestion was to the effect that one more trial be made to provide the much needed addition to our campus. Baylis gave heed to the suggestion and great credit is due him; in fact, we have to credit him more than any other one man with the successful outcome. Numerous efforts finally resulted in the organization of the committee of Cohn, Baylis, Haigart and Vaughn.\footnote{Ibid., May 6, 1908, p. 1.}

Regarding the location of the new building, it was stated that "perhaps some point within the circle, which location would indeed make it a 'student center' in every sense of the word,"\footnote{Ibid.} would be appropriate. The announcement closed a sixteen year chapter of the quest for one of the first student buildings in the country.

When students returned to the campus following fall plans were laid to "form a union or club similar to Reynolds Club at Chicago or Houston Club at Pennsylvania."\footnote{Ibid., September 22, 1908, p. 1.} The immediate responsibility of the proposed board of control was the
raising of twenty-five thousand dollars to equip the building and to provide a sinking fund for its maintenance. As provided for in the legislation for the building, an honorary commission was appointed by Governor Andrew L. Harris to approve plans for the building. The group, consisting of Senator U. F. Brandt, Paul Jones, Representative McGinness, Speaker of the House Eagleson, and Professor Thomas E. French, reviewed the sketches of George Mills, a Toledo architect, during the summer.

By September 30, 1908, the Student Council, an exclusively men's organization, had decided upon immediate selection of a committee to be known as the Student Union Committee. It was suggested that similar student organizations at Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Chicago would serve as patterns to be followed in developing a governing board. The frequently recurring statement of the student body's responsibility to the University and to the people of Ohio to raise twenty-five thousand dollars to equip and furnish it is coupled with the closing plea in another article in the same issue of the paper: "This is a students' building. Let us make it so from the start, and in the performance of our duty remember that, 'a thing worth doing is worth doing well, and a thing worth doing is worth doing mighty well.'"35

The college union being a rare phenomenon in 1909, it perhaps would have been surprising to find many specific statements regarding its purpose or the responsibilities it would be expected to assume. With the exception of such services as the building and the organization were committed to by the inclusion of certain physical facilities, such as a billiard room, there was little explicit precedent to be found on other university campuses for either a purpose or a program. As was apparent prior to the opening of the building and its early years of operation, it seemed most easily identified by referring to its counterpart, the city men's club. On the other hand, its unique and continuing characteristic—its inclusiveness and its democracy—was a live contradiction of the philosophy and organization of such clubs. This is not to suggest, of course, that women were accorded the privileges of the recently established student clubs. If, as increasing numbers of persons believed, their capacity for education was no longer doubtful, at least coeducation was not to yet be their right.

If such matters were issues at all they were at least not real enough to preoccupy the planning committee or merit attention in the records of the period. The major task of the Student Union Committee was to raise funds to furnish the building. As it became apparent that the twenty-five thousand dollars needed
would not all come from the student body, the plea was made to
the students to raise a substantial amount of it to show their
determination in the project prior to the solicitation of other
groups. These would be, in order, the faculty, the alumni, and
friends of the University.

Adding to the confusion of the campaign was the knowledge
that the Y.M.C.A. had earlier obtained subscriptions of some
twenty-one thousand dollars. About two thousand dollars of this
had been contributed and expanded, some of it being used to pay
the full time campaign secretary, M. O. Williams, and the balance
being equally divided between the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. The
committee publicly declared that these were separate efforts,
that the books of the Y.M.C.A. were in order, and that its
campaign had long since been ended.

In proceeding with its own campaign the new Student Building
Committee recommended to the Board of Trustees of the University
a plan for the collection of the fund. It was their first act
officially relating them to the Board and the approval of the
plan was the first official action denoting that the Ohio Union
derived its power from the Board of Trustees and was recognized
by it. The plan provided: (1) that funds collected be turned
in to the treasury of the University through the secretary of the
Board; (2) that funds be placed to the credit of the Student
Building Committee; (3) that all disbursements have the approval
of the president and the secretary of the committee; (4) that the committee draw up a statement defining the policy and purpose of the student building, subject to the Board of Trustees approval; and (5) that the committee be empowered to formulate a plan for the permanent management of the building, subject to the Board of Trustees' approval, at such time as the building should near completion.\[36\]

As has been previously noted, there were few statements regarding the purpose of the building. One of these appeared on March 3, 1909, as a separate section of a comprehensive article on the progress of the Student Building Committee.

Now what is the Union to be? For what will it stand, and what will it hope to accomplish? As its name indicates it will be an organization for Ohio State men, graduates, undergraduates, faculty and alumni, which shall grow in size and influence with each year, and be a never-ending influence for the good of Ohio State. Its avowed purpose will be to promote university spirit, and to increase social intercourse and acquaintance with each others work among the members of the different departments and other university organizations. One of the principal benefits which it is hoped will accrue from this organization is the increase of a proper university spirit. The advantages to the students as individuals and to the University itself from such increased spirit are too apparent to require mention. For those who realize that human nature is essentially social, that the social instinct is wholesome and commendable, that it is never more strong and insistent than at the student age, it is difficult to comprehend how anyone can doubt the wisdom of providing an adequate and wholesome outlet, which

shall lead this instinct along healthful and inspiring lines, rather than let it waste itself, or find expression in ways and places deleterious to student welfare in every respect. It is this purpose which the Union proposes for itself and its clubhouse. President Woodrow Wilson, in an address, gave admirable expression to this whole idea, when he said in substance that, "after all, perhaps the greatest education, mental and moral, is derived from that attrition of mind upon mind which takes place in the companionship of student with student after recitations are finished." 37

There is interesting similarity between the words of Wilson and those of a later college president, James B. Conant of Harvard, currently used in support of the contribution of college unions, that "the most important single factor in modern liberal education is the education which students receive from one another." 38

By this time, March, 1909, there was more tangible evidence that the day when these hopes might be fulfilled was not too far off. The ground had been broken the previous December 16. After one postponement the date for the laying of the cornerstone was announced as April 12, 1909. The four o'clock afternoon ceremony was witnessed by fifteen hundred people who heard brief talks by B. Frank Miller, president of the Student Union Committee, and the Honorable Freeman T. Eagleson, Speaker of the Lower House of the General Assembly at the time the appropriation was granted. President Thompson

37 Ibid.

38 From the inauguration of President Edmund Ezra Day of Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, August, 1937.
presided over the remainder of the ceremony, finally proclaiming when the cornerstone was lowered, "I pronounce this stone plumb, level and true and properly laid."\textsuperscript{39}

Articles placed in the cornerstone were:

...a parchment giving a brief history of the attempts to get the student building and a description of the equipment of the building; a program of ceremonies; a roster of the Seventy-seventh General Assembly; a copy of the booklet and literature used in the campaign for funds; University bulletins and catalogs; alumni catalog; 1908 Makio; eight copies of the Agricultural Student, the Lantern, and the Ohio Naturalist; copies of the daily press; a list of the stonemasons who had worked on the building; a city directory and a student directory.\textsuperscript{40}

Chiseled on the cornerstone were the inscriptions: "For the students of the Ohio State University from the Seventy-seventh General Assembly of the State of Ohio" and "Erected 1909."\textsuperscript{41}

With the building dedicated the Student Union Committee returned to the struggle to raise the funds to equip and furnish it. An appeal in one college convocation had previously resulted in gifts averaging ten dollars apiece from over one hundred students and ten dollars was suggested as a minimum subscription. This was compared, evidently without productive results, with

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Lantern}, April 14, 1909, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
pledges which had ranged from twenty-five to two hundred dollars made in the 1905 campaign under the Y.M.C.A.

Little help was given to the enterprise by an article in the Cincinnati Inquirer which had

openly announced that the building, upon its completion, would be a clubhouse for the fraternity men of this school, that the fees and charges were to be placed so high as to exclude a large percentage of students from enjoying the benefits of building intended by the State to be of equal use and benefit to all students at this university.\(^{42}\)

The editor of the Lantern, questioning the sanity of persons who could believe such a thing, made the defense on behalf of the campus.

Despite the hope that the students would be able to contribute liberally before help was asked from faculty, alumni, and others interested in the University, the latter groups volunteered their assistance. The local promoters of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra arranged in February, 1910, to allow the sale of specially priced tickets to students for concerts to be given February 28 and March 28 "under the leadership of Leopold Stokowski, a Polish conductor."\(^{43}\) All proceeds from these tickets were to go to the Union. Proceeds from the two concerts

---

\(^{42}\) Ibid., April 21, 1909, p. 2.

\(^{43}\) Ibid., February 23, 1910, p. 1.
amounted to two thousand dollars. In the meantime the Ohio State Panhellenic had held its own show and raised $250 for the furnishing of the building, and concentrated efforts were being made to get students to make payments on the six thousand dollars already pledged. Alumni organizations had agreed to pay for equipment for the bowling alleys and the billiard room.

When the students returned in the fall of 1910, plans for a housewarming for the new building were announced, the celebration to be under the supervision of the Student Council and a committee of representatives of other University organizations. The student committee pointed out that the building could be used by all-school societies, class organizations, and clubs and fraternities for dinners, dances, banquets, conventions and meetings of all kinds. Such an invitation to use the building did not, of course, extend to women except under certain conditions. In this regard it was announced that "another nice feature in the regulation of the building will be the setting aside of one day each week known as ladies day on which day the women of the University will be extended the courtesies of the building." Again we are reminded that "for the students of the Ohio State University," the inscription on the cornerstone of the building, and other references to the Union as a building for all students was not assumed to include the five hundred young ladies who were then

Ibid., October 12, 1910, p. 1.
enrolled in the University. 45

As the day of the hoped-for housewarming approached, pride in the new building grew, an article in the Lantern reporting that "when fully equipped the students of Ohio State University will have at their constant disposal one of the finest types of a typical city club, the like of which no other college or university, except the University of Pennsylvania, will have." 46 While the Ohio State building was to be similar in many of its facilities to Houston Hall at Pennsylvania, the latter, in addition, included a swimming pool, a gymnasium, and darkroom facilities.

Late in October the Student Council appointed the 1910-11 Union Committee, a group which became the student members of the first Ohio Union Board of Overseers. With Professors Edward Orton, Jr. and W. W. Boyd and Secretary Steeb of the Board of Trustees, work began on the constitution of the new building.

45 The idea of building separate unions for men and women persisted, on the recommendation of architects and professionals in the college union field, at least until the early thirties. Special privileges for men and restrictions for women continued to be practiced in established unions (and in certain cases still are) until the 1940's. To suppose in the case of Ohio State University that the Student Council responsible for appointing the first union committee would at least provide a hearing for the women is to ignore the fact that all members of the Student Council were, of course, men. Even among the women there were anti-suffragettes, as well as suffragettes!

46 Ibid., October 12, 1910, p. 1.
Its first printing was in the Ohio State Lantern, December 21, 1910, at which time it was announced that it was still to be approved by a committee of three members of the Student Council appointed by the Ohio Union Committee. It was ultimately printed in booklet form and dated to go into effect on January 20, 1911.

During the same period a more urgent or at least more immediate problem still faced the campus. With the housewarming postponed once because of a lack of electrical fixtures, appeals to students to pay up their subscriptions became less subtle and more desperate. The activities of President Thompson and others to solicit funds from alumni and friends of the University were used to make the point that the students had still not done their share. Suggestions that the building could not open without having the money in hand to furnish and equip it began to look like reality as the weeks went by.

The date the building was to be opened officially was still not known when it was decided that at least a housewarming would be held on January 13, 1911, for alumni, faculty, and friends, and one for students on the following night, a Saturday. The student event was to include entertainment by the Men's Glee Club and Mandolin Club, the University Orchestra, the University Quartet, and the Girls' Glee Club. As further attractions two orchestras were to be on hand for dancing, and refreshments were to be served in the dining room. According to the preview of
plans in the January 11, 1911, Lantern, "entrance to the building will be on the east side for both carriages and those on foot."47

The Saturday night celebration turned out to be the largest social event in the history of the University. President Thompson, W. J. Sears of the Board of Trustees, Aaron Cohn, and Frank Hunter spoke on Saturday evening, all of them conveying the spirit of rejoicing over the fact that the students now had a building "which will improve the social atmosphere by knitting the student body into a unit."48 Cohn, who had led the group of students in their request to the Legislature, told how, under the leadership of one student from each of the eighty-eight counties of Ohio, the students of the University had secured the appropriation with which to erect the building. Hunter, on behalf of the Union, accepted from the Sophomore Class a presentation of four framed campus scenes.

The first issue of the Lantern following the event carried a complete review of the history of the movement, a description of the exterior and interior of the building, and comments on the leadership of the campaign in 1907 and 1908 engineered by F. R. Baylis, secretary of the Y.M.C.A., and Aaron B. Cohn, Class of 1909. If not officially open, at least the building had been visited long enough to see what it might provide, and that it

48 Ibid.
badly lacked furnishings. Completed or not, however, it was soon noted that private dancing parties, formerly held off-campus, were being scheduled in the new building, the main hall being engaged almost nightly.

The seemingly endless campaign to complete the interior of the building continued for the rest of the year. On February 22, 1911, in a statement to the student body the Finance Committee announced that the building would not be opened until pledges were paid.\textsuperscript{49} It was pointed out that the full seventy-five thousand dollar appropriation had been used in the construction of the building, the Board of Trustees having acted on the assurance of the students that they would provide the funds to furnish it. On this date two thousand students still owed three thousand dollars on their subscriptions. About four thousand dollars had been pledged and paid by undergraduates. On March 22, Professor Boyd, acting manager, reported that the building would be opened in six weeks, but that thirteen thousand dollars was still needed.\textsuperscript{50}

The original estimate of twenty-five thousand dollars had been cut to twenty thousand dollars by the elimination of checker tables, book cases, some furniture and miscellaneous items. Interior decoration alone had already amounted to seven thousand dollars.

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., February 22, 1911, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., March 22, 1911, p. 1.
To raise additional funds a huge carnival was planned for April 7 and 8 to be held in the gymnasium, in Page Hall and along a midway extending between the two buildings. Far exceeding all expectations, the event netted the Union three thousand dollars. By the middle of April, there was a handful of students and faculty members already deeply involved in the purchase of billiard tables, bowling alley equipment, and kitchen ranges. There were decisions to be made on the hiring of a building manager, a cafeteria manager, and the leasing of a barber shop. Commitments had been made to serve a commencement breakfast and an alumni luncheon following it, and to provide facilities for the meeting of the Press Club and the numerous other organizations which had sought reservations. With many problems to be worked out, the Board announced that the building would be in use by May 13. Its actual opening as "exclusively a men's club"51 was on May 15 with all areas except the commons equipped and in operation. Doubtless with grateful anticipation of the less pressing summer months, the Board adjourned, placing a going organization in the hands of the newly elected manager.

51 Ibid., May 17, 1911, p. 1.
PART III  OHIO'S UNION FOR STUDENTS AND THE UNIVERSITY

In the early years perhaps no one union was more influential in many aspects of the development of the college union movement than the Ohio Union.52

While several other college unions preceded the establishment of the Ohio Union in what Humphreys has called the "club stage" in the evolution of the union movement, the Ohio Union proved unique among these for three reasons. First it was the result of direct legislative appropriation. Second, in none of the other unions did the club concept persist so long. Third, its conception as a club exclusively for men was established on a campus which had many women enrolled. While it might be said that the exclusiveness merely followed the pattern established by the English universities and by Harvard, Brown, and the University of Pennsylvania, it should be pointed out that, with the exception of the University of Pennsylvania in which only a few women were enrolled, these universities were in themselves exclusively for men. Despite evidence of the emancipation of women, the college union was officially defined in the constitution of the Association of College Unions as a men's organization until 1931.

While there is little doubt that the Ohio Union for its first thirty-five years fulfilled its earliest conception as a club for men students, explicit statements of its purpose are

52 Humphreys, p. 21.
rare in the publications of the University or in the records of the Union. Excluding descriptions of the building and its facilities, which in themselves imply the types of recreational and social services available, the fullest statement of its original purpose is found in an article by Carl M. Baldwin, one of the early managers of the building:

Ohio Union is a club. Its privileges are limited to its members and it is not unlike the ordinary city club. Everything that the members may reasonably and properly want in a club of this kind should be supplied at a minimum cost. Every member or class of members must receive equal consideration. It is our hope that the students particularly will come to regard Ohio Union not as a commercial enterprise bidding for their patronage, but as the university club to which it is a considerable privilege to belong, and which they may find it desirable and convenient to use for every kind of social activity that it may serve. To this end serious endeavor will be made to find what the members want, and then to supply that need. This is a general purpose.53

Baldwin further suggested that faculty members could dine with each other and enter into games with the students in the building or even join together for an evening with a whole class, and that such social contact would "be getting to the finer parts of a university education."54

While earlier reference has been made to the problems which faced the first Ohio Union Board of Overseers immediately following the opening of the building, a more detailed review

53 Carl M. Baldwin, "Ohio Union, Men's Club," The Ohio State University Monthly, Vol. IV, No. 2 (October, 1912), p. 5.

54 Ibid.
of its early months is helpful in the understanding of its later history. First, matters which were basic to development of policy and procedure later followed were considered during these early months, whereas, they were naturally of less consequence, becoming routine and not deserving of mention in the later records of the organization. Second, the nature of the services to be provided for the students and for the University as a whole became clear during this period. The administrative authority of the staff and the Board of Overseers and the joint and separate responsibilities of the two groups were established along lines which appear to have changed little over a period of three and a half decades. Policies relating to the financial responsibility and the autonomy of the Union were established, which, despite evidence of their inflexibility and their bearing on the educational role of the building, persisted through the years. If the role of the pioneer in the development of a new institution in the university life of America brought with it the satisfaction of solving problems with profit of precedent or experience of others, it likewise meant that the institution might be bound by the precedents it set, be they the design of a building, the needs for which cannot be exactly foreseen, or in the establishment of written or unwritten policies, not sufficiently adequate for the changing conditions of the community which the institution attempts to serve.
The first meeting of the Ohio Union Board of Overseers was called February 1, 1911, by Acting Chairman Professor W. W. Boyd in Boyd's office. The four student members of the seven man board were Frank A. Hunter, Merle G. Summers, Harvey A. Shuler, and Donald Kirkpatrick. Walter J. Sears represented the Trustees, Professor George W. Rightaire, the alumni, and Boyd, the faculty. Carl E. Steeb, selected by the Board of Trustees and acting as treasurer of the Union, was also present, having already given long continued service throughout the early efforts to obtain the building. With Hunter elected president, Summers vice-president, and Kirkpatrick acting secretary, the Board proceeded to appoint its first committees: Rules and Operation; Costs Study; Ways and Means; Furniture and Equipment; Accounting System; and a committee to consider applications for the position of manager. Temporarily Boyd was named manager of the building and was authorized to take care of such miscellaneous matters as charging ten dollars per night for the use of the dance hall and establishing fees for janitorial service needed by renting organizations.

It was announced by Steeb that the Board of Trustees had approved the request of the old Student Building Committee to attach a membership fee of one dollar per semester to the registration of each male student in the University, this to go

---

55 Union Board Minutes, February 1, 1911.
in effect the second semester of the 1910-11 academic year.

In the months immediately following the seven members of the Board divided into the several small committees and, advised by Steeb and the Board of Trustees in matters relating to finance, laid the ground work for the operation of the building. Boyd and other members of the Board of Overseers supervised the planning of a carnival to raise funds for equipment and furniture for the building. Sears, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, solicited students for their unpaid subscriptions and mailed four thousand letters to individual alumni and special letters to alumni associations asking for their contributions.

Richtaire, in a tentative report from his committee on operations and rules, estimated that five thousand dollars would be required for the fixed running expenditures of the union, not including the dining facilities. Boyd was responsible for the hiring of the first employees of the building and on his suggestion the Board approved the hiring of two students to do the work of janitors in the building in return for rooms in the building.

The first request for office space in the building came from the Agricultural Student.56 It was decided that the Furniture and Equipment Committee take up the matter of assigning rooms to different organizations which might apply. Previous arrangements had been made to have organizations seeking office space provide

56 The organization still has an office in the Ohio Union.
the furnishings at their own expense and as specified by the
architect. The equipment, however, was to become the permanent
property of the Union. Any such assignments, it was determined,
might be terminated at any time by resolution of the Board.

While the Lantern, the Agricultural Student, the Hakio, and
the Y.M.C.A., for which a room was marked on the original
blueprints, were attempting to raise money to furnish their own
offices, the Board resolved to set aside two thousand dollars
per year of the Union fee for payment on the principal of a loan
to be negotiated for the purpose of furnishing and equipping
the building, this loan not to exceed twelve thousand dollars.
The request was made to the University Board of Trustees to
"authorize and direct the bursar to set aside each year the amount
of two thousand dollars and in addition, an amount equal to the
interest which would accrue on the loan."57 This was the first
and the largest of several loans made during the first three
years of operation of the building. None of the others, all of
which were for the rather necessary purpose of paying the Union's
bills, exceeded two thousand dollars. Unlike other college unions
in operation at the time, the Ohio Union, despite a union fee
lower than those of all but one other union, received no subsidy
from the University to cover the deficit at the end of each year.58

57 Ibid., March 17, 1911.

58 The Ohio Union, as was true with most other existing unions,
received free gas heat, light, and water. This is still the case.
As a criteria of successful operation, however, the comparison of deficit or surplus balances with other union operations tells us little. University support in the form of hidden fees or free utilities, local wage conditions, the adequacy of the program and services provided by a union and its revenue producing potential must all be taken into consideration.

The Board members were relieved of some of their many managerial responsibilities when, on April 14, 1911, the committee which had been appointed to interview men for the managership of the Union made its report, recommending H. S. Warwick for the position as manager at a salary of one hundred dollars per month. Warwick had been a popular student and cheerleader on campus and in the year following his graduation had become the proprietor of the College Inn Bowling Alleys near the campus. It was only a few months later that he assumed the position as the first manager of the Ohio Union, a responsibility which he held for six months.

During his tenure as manager and secretary of the Board of Overseers, arrangements were made for the first conferences held in the building, a service which has increased greatly over the years, strengthening the relationship of the University and its departments among many professional, educational, commercial, and agricultural organizations and, as equally important in more recent years, providing crucially needed revenue for the support
of the operation and program of the Union.

There is nothing in the early records of the Union to indicate that any schedule of service charges was used or that, with the exception of the rental for the assembly and dance hall, any charge was made to conference groups for the use of the building. During the early years there was a standing agreement that facilities for conferences and events of direct interest to the University would be provided at no charge in return for certain University maintenance services which the Union could not then afford. The informality of the conference arrangement seems typified by a request presented to the Board in September, 1914, that, contrary to the usual practice, the building be left open for four days of the Christmas vacation for the national convention of Cosmopolitan Clubs which was to be in session on the campus. The Board, in authorizing the manager to make the arrangements, requested only that these arrangements assure no financial loss to the Union.

If working out the procedures for University-sponsored conferences was a major responsibility of the new manager, the installation of a "tobacco wall case," a magazine rack, and a seat in the barber shop, the purchase of a typewriter and fireproof safe, and carrying out the Board's request, "to do away with housemen participating in the pool and bowling games" were likewise on
Warwick's list of responsibilities.⁵⁹

Staffing the new building in almost any of its key positions was a continuing problem. In August, 1911, the bookkeeper of only two months experience resigned. There still had been no success in arranging terms with applicants for the position of steward of the dining facilities, although negotiations with one candidate had continued over a period of four months.

With the invitation of the Alumni Association to become its first full time secretary, Warwick submitted his resignation as manager of the Union on October 20, 1911. When it became effective at the end of the month, Donald Kirkpatrick, president of the Board, was appointed acting manager of the Union. In what was supposed to have been a temporary position, Kirkpatrick served throughout the year. It was not until the following August that a new manager of the Union was appointed. In a similar circumstance during the previous year, Kirkpatrick, then president of the Y.M.C.A., had been appointed acting secretary of that organization until a new full time graduate secretary could be found. At the same time he had been secretary of the Union Board under the acting manag ership of Boyd, business manager of the University yearbook, the Makio, and a student representative on the University Athletic Board. Prior to the opening of the building he had been one of the active leaders in the campaign.

⁵⁹ Union Board Minutes, June, 1911.
for the building while the movement was under the leadership of
the Y.M.C.A.

The academic year of 1911-12 opened with 2832 students on
the campus. Even those who had visited the new student building
the year before had found their use of it limited by the lack of
equipment and the late opening in the middle of May. The newly
equipped commons was soon reported to be serving three hundred
students a day, and a "night owl service" from 8:00 to 11:00 PM
had been started in the dining room. From the standpoint of sheer
quantity of service, dining facilities of the Union, then as now,
reached more different people than any other facility in the
building and were by far the greatest single source of its income.
With previous assurance that the Union would provide meals at
moderate cost, students, whose cost of living according to a
Lantern survey in 1911 ranged from $320 to $450 a year, took
advantage of the new facilities in increasing numbers. It was
1915 before a report to the campus indicated that the Union finally,
in 1913-14, had made a profit of slightly over one thousand
dollars. The total receipts of the Union had exceeded its
disbursements in the first three years by only $145.00.

In September, 1912, when Carl M. Baldwin opened the building
for its first academic year he did so as both the house manager
and steward of the commons, and as was true of his predecessors,
his tasks still involved getting the building operation financially under control and encouraging use of its facilities. A few days prior to the date on which he assumed the position the Board had found it necessary to borrow six hundred dollars from the City National Bank for thirty days to pay current bills. Three months later it borrowed another two thousand dollars, also for general expenses. In many instances the establishment of fees for the use of any or all of the building for special events was left to the discretion of the manager. It becomes apparent as the pattern of administrative authority unfolds during the years that the manager, lacking especially trained staff assistance in all areas except the food operation, was dependent upon his own experience and the advice of the Board on all matters concerning the building, its maintenance, its program, procedures, prices, and arrangements for its use.

With the building having been in operation for one full year before Baldwin became manager, comparatively few policy matters entered the minutes of the Board meeting during his short term of office. One of his first responsibilities and the first evidence of a Union-sponsored program for students was his authorization on September 16, 1912, "to give a reception for the freshmen class at such time and in such manner as he should see fit." While there are no records of other events sponsored by the Union during the period or by other organizations in the building, it was
recommended that the rental of the commons and services provided for renting organizations be officially contracted for and that a reasonable deposit be required at the director's discretion. With the exception of the ten dollar rental for the third floor assembly hall, ordinarily used for dances, there were evidently no established fees for the use of parts of the building. During Baldwin's managernship there was a request by the junior class to lease the whole building and other such applications for the use of the whole building were made during its history. On no occasion is there a record of such a request having been granted, although on one occasion the detailed proposal of the Y.M.C.A. to make use of the whole building for a dance and open house for all students was carried out with mediocre results under the sponsorship of the Union, the Union Board feeling that if such a need existed on the campus the Union should fulfill it.

Some twenty references to the privileges of ladies in the building revealed the nature of one problem which faced the Ohio Union and, indeed, the unions on many other campuses and the Association of College Unions itself. While in its earliest years the Ohio Union, being on a coeducational campus, waded alone through the problem, it should not have been expected that any policy, however flexible it seemed, would be adequate in a situation which overlooked one of the basic facts of campus life.
and its organization. Typical of the many problems which the Board or the manager faced is the request of the manager for instructions "regarding the admission to meeting rooms of organizations including women in their membership." In this case, as in so many others, the solution was left "to the discretion of the manager." 60 Shortly before the opening of the building women had been assured that they would be able to use all of its facilities on Wednesday afternoon. This privilege was later extended to Sunday afternoons or to various combinations of one or two afternoons or evenings during the week. Under some circumstances and at announced times the ladies were admitted to specific areas of the building when escorted by a member, and were of course able to attend dances and other scheduled social events when accompanied by a member. Without prolonging the discussion unduly, or over-emphasizing its importance, the problem persisted until 1946.

At this time preliminary statements about the nature of the new union building indicated that it would be a student building for men and women. It was 1941 before women were officially allowed in the lobby of the building, the manager having been requested by the petition of men students just several years earlier to deny this privilege to women. The difficulty of enforcing such a policy when so many women were participating in the student organizations having offices in the building was obvious. The

60 Union Board Minutes, October 9, 1912.
main lounge, however, was declared off-limits to women, and it was not until 1946 when, in following the example set by the women's union, Pomerene Hall, in allowing men in its lounge, women were welcome in the lounge of the Ohio Union.\textsuperscript{61}

The early resignation of Baldwin which took effect shortly after the hectic flood period on May 1, 1913, was accepted with the resolution of respect that,

\begin{quote}
Whereas his services have been eminently satisfactory both in placing the Union on a sound financial basis and in making it more than ever before the center of students' social activities, now therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Overseers of the Ohio Union that we accept his resignation with regret, and that as an expression of our appreciation and esteem we do hereby confer on him honorary membership in Ohio Union for life.\textsuperscript{52}
\end{quote}

Fortunately, Baldwin had announced his intention to resign early in February, giving the Board sufficient time to consider possible successors. Baldwin's return to the real estate business after a brief but successful effort to get the struggling building on its feet closed a twenty-two month period in the Union's history during which it had two acting managers, one a professor and one a student, and two full time managers, Warwick, Warwick,

\textsuperscript{61} Following the opening of the Ohio Union in 1911, various women's groups campaigned for similar facilities for women. Pomerene Hall, including some of these facilities and providing social programs for women, was first used in 1923-24. The building was not completed until 1926-27, serving from then until the opening of the new Ohio Union in 1951 as the headquarters for women's organizations and social activities.

\textsuperscript{62} Union Board Minutes, April 30, 1913.
just graduated from the University, and Baldwin.

By coincidence Professor William B. Cockley, a member of the College of Law faculty and the faculty representative on the Ohio Union Board, was then sharing quarters in a rooming house with a young man by the name of Edward S. Drake, an assistant manager of a chain of twenty-six company retail stores. In the words of Drake, now manager emeritus of the Ohio Union, "Cockley invited me to dinner at the Union—a quite natural thing in as much as we ordinarily ate there together anyway—and asked whether I would be interested in becoming manager of the building."63 Drake's response led to a meeting with members of the Board the following day and to an official offer of the job by Carl E. Steeb, Trustee member of the Board. Steeb and Drake met again one day later and confirmed the appointment to the position which Drake held until his retirement in 1946.

In the fall of 1913 the success of an open house held on October 25 led to appointment of the four student members of the Board and the manager as a permanent committee, the first program committee. While only one other open house was held during this academic year, thirteen were held the following year and became a regular part of the program of the Union and the only one which continued throughout the years. This was the first standing

63 Interview with Edward S. Drake, June, 1956.
committee responsible for what would now be known in most unions as "Union Activities."

The first survey of the activities sponsored by college unions, made at the Association of College Unions conference in 1923, indicated that the open house and the men's smoker were the only programs which almost all unions sponsored, although cooperation was given to all campus organizations and in some cases there was joint sponsorship of particular events. Few unions prior to 1930 had programs of a scope which foretold the more recent conception of college unions as agencies for informal education. In most cases the programs sponsored were an extension of the club concept, a building with a variety of facilities conducive to the congenial fellowship of its members. The union had no clear cut educational role.

Whatever its responsibility for financing and giving leadership to programs in the building, the Board and the manager were able to encourage its increasing use. By the end of Drake's first year as manager, the Board was already faced with the problem of the overcrowding of student offices and was for the first time obliged to table a request for office space, in this instance made by the Students Intercollegiate Prohibition Association, until the incoming Board could determine policies which would assist in apportioning the rooms for the coming year.

A year later a report by Drake and Steeb indicated that
rehearsals, dinners, dances, and open house programs had totaled 972 events during 1914-15. Of these events, meetings and rehearsals alone totaled 663 and dinners 274. The only apparent decline in any type of event was the decrease in the number of dances from 42 to 22 which was due, according to the report, to the faculty rule limiting such functions to Friday and Saturday nights.

Perhaps one of the most significant events in the early life of the Ohio Union was its invitation to other university union organizations to send representatives to the Ohio State campus for a discussion of their mutual problems. The initial suggestion of the conference had come in correspondence to Drake from the University of Illinois, a campus with a union organization but no building. Meeting at the Ohio Union building on December 4 and 5, 1914, delegates formed the National Association of Student Unions, an organization which returned for its second conference to the Ohio State campus the next year and laid the ground work for what after World War I became the Association of College and University Unions (1919-1922) and eventually the Association of College Unions (1923).

The more immediate effects of the entry of the United States...
into the war were apparent in the loss of student Board members
entering military service, the increase in food costs, the conse-
quent increase in the Union’s food prices, and the campus coal
shortage and general conditions. The Union’s biggest responsi-
bility during the war, however, came with the request of
President Thompson that it feed a large number of cadets due to
be trained on the University campus. In the Board meeting of
January 16, 1918, “it was decided to recommend to the Trustees
the building of a temporary kitchen, to move the billiard room
to the second floor, and the cafeteria to the present billiard
room, this being a temporary arrangement.” The numerous problems
relating to the enrollment of an estimated eleven hundred military
students tended to monopolize the meetings of the Board, called
every two weeks during the war period rather than at the customary
one month intervals. During the peak enrollment of the trainees
the Union was feeding 1100 men three meals a day, the meals being
eaten in three shifts in a dining room designed for a capacity
of 100. During much of this period the Union was reimbursed $1.00
per day per man, a rate later raised to $1.25 on the basis of a
recommendation made by Drake after a visitation to Cornell to
study the food service operation of the school of military
aeronautics there.

In the decade which followed it appeared as though the Ohio
Union had settled down to its continuing responsibility as a
popular and busy building, true to its original conception as a social center for men and, on special occasions, women. It was not a dozen years old when it was already being reported in the proceedings of the conferences of college unions as inadequate for the needs of the growing campus. References to the over-crowded Ohio Union were made in the publications of the Association of College Unions years before the present building opened and discussions of the need for a new building are found as early as 1923 in the Ohio Union Board minutes.

As indicated elsewhere the conception of the union as a club did not imply its sponsorship of a variety of activities or a program. While some of the early unions rather regularly sponsored dances, lectures, and musical events, many of them reported in the meetings of the Association of College Unions that their programs, if they could be called such, were limited to occasional dances, smokers, and periodic open houses. The Ohio Union was typical of these. While the first permanent committee established by the Ohio Union Board in any program area was called the Social Committee it sponsored only those programs which the Board considered worthwhile from time to time. When set up on December 16, 1916, it consisted of the four student members of the Board and the manager. The fact that it was reestablished the following fall called an Entertainment Committee and was periodically revived several other times during the first decade indicates
that an organized and regular program was not in existence during this early period. Some of the responsibilities for extra-
curricular programs begin to appear in the records of the Board in the early twenties. In the winter of 1923 and 1924, the Social Committee, in addition to sponsoring several open house programs, attempted to sponsor weekly entertainment by such groups as the Men's Glee Club. Investigation was also made of the possibility of showing moving pictures but, as had proved to be the case with other unions as well, arrangements between distributors and nearby theaters prevented the development of on-campus programs. The first reference to Union Activities, presently an organization comprised of more than thirty student committees supervised by the Board, is found in the minutes of February 13, 1926.

The increase in the number of students working on Union-sponsored programs and in providing office services to other organizations housed in the building led the Board, in 1927, to establish the position of activities director. The procedure adopted for the selection of a qualified student called for competition among sophomores, three of whom were selected to serve for a quarter each during their junior year as assistant activities directors. At the end of this period the outstanding student was appointed to the senior position of activities director.

The primary purpose of the position as indicated in the reports of several of these men was to add to the congeniality and
friendliness of the Union. In addition they assumed the responsibility for the organization of indoor baseball teams, bowling teams and billiard, bridge, and chess tournaments. From time to time the Union also organized among unaffiliated students intramural swimming, basketball, and pistol teams. Other subsequent developments led to the appointment of three standing committees, these being a Social Committee, an Art, Music and Library Committee, and a Publicity Committee.

Other matters of concern to the Board in 1933 included the proposal to establish an "auxiliary board, to be composed of one man from each organization having an office in the Union."65 It was hoped that such a group might in joint session with the Board of Overseers each quarter bring before the Board opinions of the student body on matters concerning the Union. Although the plan was studied and adopted during the following academic year and representatives were appointed from the organizations housed in the Union, there is no evidence of activity by the group. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the suggestion was that it was symptomatic of the periodic suggestion by various students and student organizations of the need to get more representative student opinion about the Union. Attempts were also made to do this through surveys, and on other occasions student organizations proposed to the Board their plans for programs in the building.

65 Union Board Minutes, June 7, 1933.
With the exception of one comprehensive report on the social and recreational needs of the campus submitted to the Board by the Y.M.C.A., there is again no record of the details of any of these proposals. Some of the survey proposals were made in conjunction with almost yearly attempts during the twenties to initiate a campaign for a new building, but while there is evidence that some of these surveys were made, their results are no longer available.

It was also in 1933 that the Union, at the request of the University administration, assumed the responsibility for the Student Employment Bureau which for many years had been run by the Y.M.C.A. The position as director of the bureau was filled by senior students employed by the Ohio Union for sixty dollars a month until the service was taken over by the Dean of Men's Office in 1936.

The development of extracurricular organizations and events led to the discussion in the Student Senate in 1935 of the need for the coordinated scheduling of all-campus events. At the Senate's request, the Union Activities office assumed the responsibility as the registration center for all-campus affairs. A function common to many college unions, it later came under the jurisdiction of the Dean of Men's Office and the University Social Board.

With the Union taking on an increasing number of responsibilities in a building which was both overcrowded and outdated,
attempts to stimulate interest in a new building recurred in 1938
when the Student Senate, as a demonstration of their interest in
the project, began to accumulate a Union building fund by setting
aside a percentage of the profits on all dances they sponsored.
While it was the opinion of some of the members of the Senate that
it would take too long to accumulate funds sufficient to provide
the building needed, it was felt that the funds should be kept
intact to help finance the campaign for a new building when such
a project seemed feasible. Alternative uses for the fund were
also discussed. One suggested by the Senate was that the money
be used to remodel the Union by adding a one-story section at
the west end of the building for a billiard room and by renovating
the existing billiard room for office use for student organizations.
A second alternative was proposed by a group of several students,
the Dean of Men, the Dean of Women, and the manager of the Union,
this being to use the Union building fund for the establishment
of a University camp available for use by any campus organization.
At this meeting the group

...asked the manager to discuss with the Board the
subject of placing such a camp, should it be decided
upon, under the management of the Union. It was the
opinion of the Board that a committee in charge of
such a project should make to the Union Board definite
proposals including statements about policing
responsibility for building and equipment and such like
before the Board would definitely express its opinion.66

66 Union Board Minutes, December 14, 1938.
There is no further evidence of action on the matter.

With little prospect of a new building, the Union sought to meet the increasing demands for its facilities by refurbishing and remodeling the building in 1940, a project costing over thirty-five thousand dollars.

Following curtailment of many of the activities of the Union at the onset of World War II and due to the loss of many of its Board members to military service, it was decided on April 26, 1943, that those members who were available would constitute a committee to advise the manager on the operation of the Union for the duration of the war. The retirement of the "War Board" and the regular appointment of Board members was resumed on November 19, 1944. As noted in the Ohio Union Board minutes of that date, the manager suggested that due to the increase of the number of men in school it seemed the proper time to replace students on the Board. This was done without delay. Four were recommended by the manager and unanimously elected. Two of these men were eating in the dining room with the football team at the time and were called in for introduction to members of the Board. The Board was again at full strength.

Nor was time being wasted on another matter, the renewed agitation for a new union building. On January 17, 1945,

Mr. Steeb said that everyone recognized the fact that there should be a new building as soon as it
was possible to build, but it would be impossible to do any building for two or three years. In the meantime he thought the Ohio Union Board, through the manager, should take part in the discussions and lend all possible assistance in the planning. 67

In the following fall Vice-President Bland L. Stradley reported to the Board on the work of a group of students for which he had been the advisor. During the previous year they had compiled a scrapbook containing correspondence, newspaper items, and information about the newer union buildings in the United States. The group had asked him to present the book to the Board of Trustees but it was his suggestion that it be examined first for the information it might provide to the Ohio Union Board of Overseers.

Calling attention to the impending retirement of Drake, for thirty-three years the manager of the Ohio Union, Steeb in the Board meeting of March, 1946, suggested the need for the immediate election of a successor, if possible. Several candidates were discussed and Stradley informed the Board that he had talked to Frederick Stecker, at the time in the Navy and a former assistant dean of men at the University, concerning his interest in the position. Stecker had indicated his decision to accept if the Board should elect him. Following discussion of the candidate's

67 Ibid., January 17, 1945.
qualifications there was unanimous agreement on Stradley's recommendation and Stecker was appointed. At the same meeting Drake was informed that he had been elected manager emeritus of the Ohio Union at a stipend of $2500 per year, approximately half of the amount to come from the State retirement system and half of the amount from the Ohio Union. Drake as secretary of the Board wrote in the minutes, "the manager was too overcome to say more than a very thankful acknowledgment of this very fine treatment which he felt was more than he deserved."68 Retiring June 30, 1946, Drake ended thirty-three years of service to the Ohio State University and leadership to the Ohio Union and to the college union movement throughout the country.

Summary

The initiative of the Y.M.C.A. in the efforts to obtain a student building and its broad conception of its campus need and purpose left indelible marks on the Ohio Union. In its religious concern, the Y.M.C.A. saw the whole campus as its parish and believed that a building was especially needed to provide a religious affiliation for the many students who did not find near the campus a church of their denomination, or who for various reasons did not attend these churches. In its social concern it hoped to provide a wholesome environment for the leisure time

68 Ibid., March 11, 1946.
life of all students, especially for those who, not being affiliated with any campus fraternity, had few opportunities for organized group life. The plans which the Y.M.C.A. proposed in 1899 had even included facilities for the special use of women. Provision was likewise made for offices for student organizations and for the Y.M.C.A.'s Bible study meetings, the latter being the most apparent educational interest expressed either in the planning or reality of the eventual building. The writer feels it unfortunate that not even this much specific educational concern was in evidence, for religious or other reasons, in the life of the old Ohio Union. The Y.M.C.A. provided what there was of this and evidently contributed, in addition, to much of the personal warmth and congeniality which characterized the Union throughout this period.

Before the Ohio Union materialized, several factors became apparent which it is believed have continually affected the role of the Union on the University campus. Despite the repeated attempts and personal sacrifices of students, faculty, and certain members of the administration to obtain funds for the building, neither the Board of Trustees nor the president of the University recognized its need to the extent of either proposing that the building be constructed with University funds or giving the project their direct leadership. It became truly a building for Ohio's students, provided for Ohio's biggest campus by Ohio's
legislature. The Y.M.C.A. could not raise sufficient funds; the University would not.

The University belatedly deciding that the Y.M.C.A. could not be granted authority over a building on the campus removed from the picture the one group which had conceived what the building's relationship to the University campus might be. In the first thirty-five years of its existence, there is no evidence that any plan for the Union's integration with the educational objectives and program of the University was proposed by the Union's governing board or staff, or that such was ever requested by the administration. In its general effects on student life, there is no lack of evidence that the Union provided a social headquarters for many student organizations and a wholesome gathering place for individual students who might otherwise have remained alone in a crowd. It is of interest to note, however, that during this period of thirty-five years the Y.M.C.A. initiated a dozen projects affecting student life and deemed important enough to be adopted as official University-sponsored programs or services. Unfortunately there was no such evidence of leadership from the Union. The question posed still remains to be solved on many campuses. Are college unions to be considered buildings with a variety of facilities or educational institutions with specific purposes related to the purposes of their respective universities? The writer believes
they should be the latter and that they should be designed, supported, and staffed as such.

In its internal organization and administration the old Ohio Union followed patterns immediately abandoned following the retirement of its long time director, Edward S. Drake in 1946. The organization and tone of the building had been an extension of the informality and friendliness of Drake. If the relationship between the staff and students was paternalistic, or occasionally autocratic, it was always characterized by apparent congeniality. The readiness of the Ohio Union Board of Overseers to approve physical changes in the building to suit the functions of particular organizations and the continued emphasis of student directors of activities on their obligation to make students feel at home are characteristics difficult to duplicate in the new Ohio Union.

As might be concluded from the failure of the University and the Union to spell out the latter's role, the Union was free to assume the responsibilities which seemed appropriate to it. These were few except as would have been expected from the use of its facilities. This use, of its billiard tables, reading room, and lounge, for example, bore out its being typified as a city men's club. Although it assumed a leadership position in the early development of college unions, the possession of a building rather than the sponsorship of an effective program of informal education
probably was the main reason for this. The progress made in initiating a variety of social and recreational programs on other campuses contrasted with the rather static nature of the Ohio Union's activity. Any imaginative re-thinking of the Union's responsibilities might have come from the Board of Trustees or the President or a faculty committee representing the Board or from the director or governing board of the Ohio Union. There is no evidence that the former took any interest in this and the lack of turn-over in the Union's top administrative office eliminated the possible introduction of new points of view from within the Union. Enveloped in a friendly conservatism, it concluded its first thirty-five years doing much the same as it had done its opening year.
CHAPTER III

PART IV - THE NEW OHIO UNION, 1946-1951

Culminating the first year in a five year period of transition, President Howard L. Bevis in a meeting of the Board of Trustees on June 30, 1947, declared the new union a "going project." The bulging walls and taxed facilities of the Ohio Union had found no relief from the increasing enrollment which reached the unprecedented total of 25,456 students in 1946-1947. Prior to the arrival of the new director in August, 1946, Stradley had spoken to the Board concerning the desirability of a meeting of prominent men and women students and administration and faculty personnel who would be concerned with the planning of a new union. Following Stecker's arrival there were immediate discussions concerning the financing, location, and services of the proposed new student center. Plans were made to establish a planning committee which, at the suggestion of Stradley, was to include representatives of the student body, faculty, alumni, and Board of Trustees, with one or more of these persons to be women.

Meeting with this group on December 4, 1946, President Bevis told of the difficulties of proceeding with the project in 1944 when student enthusiasm was high but that now "everything depends upon student response."69 Urging that student committees be

---

69 Union Board Minutes, December 4, 1946.

85
formed to work with the Ohio Union Board in the planning of a new Union, he requested that petitions be secured signed by at least 10,000 students. At the same meeting the Business Manager of the University, Jacob B. Taylor, reported on plans to finance the construction through self-liquidating bonds.

In addition to President Bevis and Taylor, others in attendance were: President of the Student Senate, Virginia Turner; President of the Women's Self Government Association, Marjorie Miller; Social Director of the Ohio Union, Martha Brush; Dean of Women, Mrs. Christine Conaway; Alumnae Representative, Mrs. Clara Rader; Dean of Men, Joseph A. Park; Editor of the Lantern, Robert G. Groome; Professors Eugene Weigel and James Pollard; Assistant Manager of the Ohio Union, F. O. Tresemer; Activities Director (student) of the Ohio Union, Richard Laiko; and Manager of the Ohio Union, Frederick Stecker.

Following an intensive campaign to acquaint students with the need for a union and to gain their support in signing a petition indicating their willingness to pay a five dollar quarterly construction fee, about 900 student solicitors obtained in three days time 14,235 signatures. These were presented by a student committee to President Bevis on March 3, 1947. Without discounting the extent of the interest in the new building, the presence of 14,473 veterans on the campus, each with his fees paid by the Government, obviously gave support to the campaign.
With high priority given the project in the University's building program, Stradley expressed to the Ohio Union Board the President's confidence that the University would soon have a new Union and that construction would begin as soon as there was some leveling of construction costs.

Following the recommendations of President Bevis, the Board of Trustees, on June 30, 1947, voted:

That the new student union be declared a going project by the Board of Trustees and that the following recommendations be approved:

A. That the Cabinet be instructed and authorized to recommend to the Union Board a suitable site for the proposed union.

B. That the Cabinet be designated as a steering committee for the project. An advisory committee to the Cabinet for this purpose should be appointed by the president and consist of representatives of the Ohio Union, the student body, and the faculty.

C. That outside architectural assistance be secured on the recommendation of Mr. H. Dwight Smith, University Architect, to the Cabinet.

D. That a student activity fee (Union building fee) of $5.00 per quarter be established, effective the beginning of the Autumn Quarter, 1947, as requested by the students in the petition presented to the Board of Trustees.70

Board of Trustees Secretary Steeb noted that student activity fees from the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, amounting to

70 Letter to Ohio Union Board of Overseers from Carl E. Steeb, secretary of the Board of Trustees, July 29, 1947.
$150,000 would be available for architectural and engineering services and that an equal amount would be available at the end of the following year. The total of $300,000 was to be transferred to the building rotary fund for the new Union. According to estimates, $560,000 would be the amount contributed by students by December 31, 1948, as provided by the five dollar quarterly fee.

Another source of funds which it was believed would amount to $3,500,000 was to come from payments of $45.00 per quarter made for each veteran in attendance at the University by the Veterans Administration. It had been indicated by the proper authorities that this money might well be used for the construction of self-liquidating projects such as a new union building, the rotary fund so established to be replenished by the quarterly student union fees.

Following the appointment of the Advisory Committee on the Building of the New Ohio Union by President Bevis on October 21, 1947, a concentrated year of planning the building and its facilities began. Consisting eventually of fourteen persons, six of whom were students, the committee, with the director of the Ohio Union as secretary and coordinator, solicited the opinions of students and faculty members regarding the facilities they believed should be included in the building. The collection of most of the
data took place during the month of November. The first step was a meeting of leaders of eighty student groups who were requested to ask their members to fill out and return questionnaires on which they were to rate 52 facilities as being essential, desirable, or unnecessary. Twenty-seven organizations returned a total of 2637 questionnaires. A classroom survey on November 21 resulted in an additional eight thousand completed forms. Students were also encouraged to suggest facilities other than those listed which they believed should be included in the new building.

Faculty members were also asked to complete the questionnaire but there appeared to be a general feeling that it was a matter involving a student project and a student building. Although their cooperation in making the classroom survey was excellent, only forty faculty members filled out the questionnaire. In addition the Advisory Committee sought suggestions through boxes placed in campus buildings for two days in the middle of November and arranged for 1001 students in freshmen survey classes in the College of Arts and Sciences to write suggestions for the new union. Submitting its report to the University Cabinet on December 16, 1947, the Advisory Committee had completed in less than sixty days one of the most intensive study projects of the opinions of a campus which has been carried on in conjunction with the planning of a college union building.
The report was approved on January 10, 1948, and by June the firm of Bellman, Gillett, and Richards of Toledo, Ohio, had been selected as architects, the firm commending the Advisory Committee at the time for "one of the finest jobs of planning, detailed description and accuracy of thinking"71 that had been prepared for them.

Within six months the wishes of the campus and the Advisory Committee had been combined with the designs of the architect, and on January 19, 1949, a mass meeting was held in University Hall to show the plans and a model of the building. The six hundred persons in attendance were led on an imaginary tour of the new Union by the architect, John Richards. Students and staff members discussed the plans for its operation and program.

With construction under way by June 14, 1949, attention was turned to other matters. The transition from the old to the new building involved, in addition to a much larger building, a much larger plan of operation and organization and a new and broader conception of the services and programs which the Union would provide for the campus. As the study of both personnel and program needs got under way it became apparent that there would be a new division of responsibilities between the supervisory staff and the Ohio Union Board of Overseers. Whereas the Ohio Union Board of

71 Union Board Minutes, March 2, 1949.
Oversers, as originally constituted, had as a whole given approval to the plans and policies and the general operation of the old Ohio Union, both the size of the investment and the financial implications in the operation of the new building led to the closer attention and control by administrative members on the Ohio Union Board and the Advisory Committee. Further, as the attempt was made to establish programs which might be carried over into the new building, student Board members found themselves pressed by these new responsibilities.

One specific reference to the concern which both the administration and the students felt for their union is found in the report of the Ohio Union Board's Student Senate representative who informed the Board that a plan for the revision of the Senate constitution would, if enacted, result in control by the Senate of the Ohio Union Board elections and social program. It was stated by Business Manager Taylor, a member of the Ohio Union Board, that, "the University's investment in the new student Union building was a tremendous one and that as a result the administration's and the Trustees' concern and interest was not casual." 72

72 Ibid. The original constitution of the Ohio Union became effective January 20, 1911, following approval by the University Board of Trustees. It explicitly stated the responsibility of the Ohio Union Board of Overseers to the Board of Trustees. Later revisions were not so explicit. The omission probably has been due less to oversight than the changed role of the Ohio Union Board of Overseers. No longer the governing board of the Union, its direct responsibility is for the Union program only, acting
He suggested that if it had not already been done, the Trustees specifically provide that the Ohio Union Board of Overseers is responsible through the administration to the Trustees.

One of the first steps taken to prepare for the development of an expanded union program was the reorganization of the Board of Overseers. As presented to the Board of Trustees, the plan provided for the annual election of three students elected for terms of one year each and two students, having at least six quarters left in the University, for two year terms. In addition to adopting a method which allowed for continuity among student members, it was recommended that two of the seven students be women. The reorganization incorporated several of the suggestions recommended by the Pomerene Board of Control but did not provide for membership on the Ohio Union Board of Overseers of the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women as was requested. The request had been made on the basis that these two "were most closely associated with affairs and problems of students," and in this capacity could interpret to the students the philosophy of the Union and interpret to the Board the needs of the students.73

72 (cont.) in an advisory capacity on managerial matters only on request. The actual responsibility for the total operation of the Union rests with the director who is immediately responsible to the Vice-President and Business Manager of the University, and through him to the President and the Board of Trustees.

73 Letter to the Ohio Union Board of Overseers, February 15, 1950. The Pomerene Board of Control was the governing board for Pomerene Hall which served as the women's union.
Approved by the Board of Trustees in their April, 1950, meeting, the Union Board also included, as non-student members, the University vice-president and business manager, the University vice-president of student affairs, one alumni member, one faculty member, and four non-voting members: director of the University physical plant, treasurer of the Ohio Union, director of the Ohio Union, and one honorary member.

To assist the student members in the development of new programs, the Ohio Union Directorate, composed of six major committee chairmen, was established prior to the opening of the new building. Members of the Directorate supervised the work of the Art Committee, Dance Committee, Games and Special Interests Committee, Music and Library Committee, Office Committee, and Public Information Committee.

Another committee particularly active during the period was the Statement of Union Purpose Committee. Following study of the purposes of many other large unions the committee presented to the Board a list of twelve statements relating to the Union's purpose:

1. The Union is the center of the University community.

2. It promotes social education and permits the student to coordinate his classroom hours with his leisure time.

3. It encourages and develops interest in student activities which are for the welfare and
and enjoyment of the student body.

4. It is a place where a person may participate in special interests and hobbies.

5. The Union is a place where an individual may develop social skills and become aware of cultural and recreational opportunities.

6. Through the social contacts made in the Union men and women learn to work together as a group and are better prepared for their future lives.

7. The Union affords an opportunity for the student to try himself out in real life problem situations.

8. It provides sufficient variety of events and services to interest the greatest number of the general student body.

9. In determining policy and rules the primary concern is the welfare of the individual student.

10. The Union directs a program which covers those areas not provided for elsewhere in the university community.

11. It provides an environment which is conducive to better student-faculty relationships.

12. The Union cooperates with the university in educating a more mature, well-rounded individual.

At the request of the Board the committee condensed its list and presented a revision on March 13, 1951:

"The Union is the student center of the University, cooperating with the University administration in educating a more mature, well-rounded student. The Union directs a program which covers areas not primarily provided for elsewhere in the University community.

1. The Union provides an environment in which an individual is encouraged to develop social skills."
2. It is a place where students may participate in their special interests and hobbies.

3. It encourages and develops interest in student activities which are for the welfare and enjoyment of the entire student body.

4. The Union provides an environment which is conducive to better student-faculty relationships."

The report was passed with high commendation by the non-student members of the Board.

Difficulties on the building site led to the postponement of the completion date from July until early fall of 1951. Instead of a breaking-in summer operation which would have allowed the expanding staff to get used to the complex building, it was necessary to prepare for a section by section opening of the building as it neared completion in September. The basement floor of the building, including the bowling lanes, billiard room, game room, and table tennis room, was the first area to open. On the morning of October 1, 1951, President Bevis officially opened the bowling area when he rolled the first ball, followed by sixteen representatives of the students, faculty and alumni of the University each rolling a ball down one of the new alleys. The billiard room opened the evening of the same day and the game room later in the week. The whole new building was officially opened at 7:00 A.M., November 1, 1951.

The weeks immediately following were filled with programs intended to introduce the campus populace to all of the building's
facilities. An opening dance attended by nearly four thousand persons was held on November 8. Billiard and bowling exhibitions and instruction were given by nationally known experts. Other programs previously developed with the hope of transplanting them to the new Union got under way. The student-faculty Kaffee Klachtch and the Candlelight Inn dance in particular drew record crowds.

Dedicatory exercises for the building were held on the morning of November 17, 1951, with President Bevis presiding. With proper tribute paid to the many students whose work and interest had led to the petition for the new building, to the designers and craftsmen who had built the then largest of the modern college unions, and to the members of the University administrative staff whose personal interest had been so apparent at every stage of the planning and construction, the Ohio Union, an organization already forty years old, began an era of unprecedented influence in the life of the campus.

Summary

In Part IV, the writer has attempted to review briefly the evolution of the campaign for a new building and the development of the plans, the organization, and the purpose of the new Ohio Union. Because of the significance of decisions which were made, or not made, during this transition period and their bearing on
the consequent role of the Union on the campus, several of these
deserve summary and elaboration.

1. As has been true of other well planned college union
buildings, the extensive participation of students in determining
what types of facilities and activities were most desirable
resulted in the intensive use of the building both as a leisure
time and extracurricular activity center.

2. The initial cost and anticipated large scale financial
implications of the building operation led to a tightening of
the relationship between the University Business Office and to
the loss of all but token control by the Ohio Union Board of
Overseers over the basic financial policies of the building and
the matters which such policies directly influence. The role of
students, whose only official representation in the management of
the Union is through the Board, was thereby greatly reduced.

3. By comparison, either of the actions during the period
or the consequences of these actions, the tie between the Office
of Student Affairs and the Union was weak. There was no evidence
of any major effort to incorporate the Union's program in any
comprehensive plan for the social, recreational, and cultural life
of the campus.

   a. Although the offices of the dean of men and the
dean of women were historically responsible for student
organizations and extracurricular life in general, those holding these offices were excluded from membership on the Ohio Union Board of Overseers. In general, the exclusion of these deans on union governing boards does not preclude the possibility of close cooperation in the development of related responsibilities, particularly if the dean of students or vice-president for student affairs is on such a board. It is the writer's belief, however, that the failure at the vice-presidential level to initiate a plan for an over-all program, for whatever reasons, combined with the deans' and Union's lack of authority for or interest in doing so, is the basis for the continuing separation of effort on matters of common concern.

b. Related to the above problem, the statement of the purpose of the Union in both its preliminary and final form reveals the restriction of its educational program to "areas not primarily provided for elsewhere in the University community."
CHAPTER III

PART V - THE NEW OHIO UNION'S FIRST FIVE YEARS, 1951-56

As indicated in Part IV of Chapter III, extensive planning was carried out to insure that the new Ohio Union would be tailor-made for the campus. While geographic location on a campus, leadership of the union, and the university's financial expectations of a union are major factors in its success, few which are designed without careful study of conditions peculiar to the university are able to give optimum service.

Several problems are faced immediately in attempting to evaluate the contributions of the 1951-56 period of the Union. The new building in its conception, size, and facilities is so different from the old that there is obviously no value in comparing the achievements of the two. No basic objectives were set at the beginning of the period with the exception that the Union should be able to sustain itself with a minimum of support from the University, and that it would attempt to provide all-campus social, cultural and recreational programs which would supplement those already in existence on the campus. Comparison, at least of tangible achievements, with other large university unions provides some means of determining how well the Union has done its job. Even this method is of limited helpfulness except in providing comparative financial
statements or records of the use of union facilities. The existence of residential facilities, the capacity of food service areas, revenue from the university's theater, the union's relationship to the total extracurricular program, or direct subsidies to the program or operation from university fees necessitate extensive interpretation of information at present being submitted for comparative purposes. For example, the fact that the amount of bowling done in the Ohio Union far exceeds that done in any other union may be due to its greater number of bowling lanes than most, the use of completely automatic pin-setting machines, the excellent supervision of the bowling area, or the use of these facilities by the university physical education department for accredited bowling instruction, or, more probably, a combination of these factors.

With the exception, therefore, of the section concerning the development of the Union program in which the findings of Wolf's study are applicable, there will be no attempt to make comparisons. Discussion of an evaluative nature will be included where pertinent in the sections which follow. These sections will concern the general use of the Union by the University, its financial status, its services to the campus, and its program development.

The University's Use of the Union

The records of any one of the five years in the period being considered would indicate the extensive use of the Union by
students, faculty, and university personnel, and by organizations meeting there under the sponsorship of departments of the University. The year 1955-56 will be used throughout the chapter as the sample year, primarily because it is the final year in the period and represents the extent of the development in the various functions of the Union. It is not necessarily either a typical year or a peak year, although in some respects it was typical and in other respects record-breaking.

The use of the building by the university community can only be measured in those areas where records can be easily kept on how many people are doing what. This means those areas where there is staff supervision and where attendance may be regularly recorded, such as in the music lounge or game room, where there is a cash register count in commercial areas, or where a person either individually or on behalf of an organization registers for the use of one of the building's many facilities. During the fiscal year 1955-56 the summary on the use of the building based on figures derived from such counts of individuals involved gave the following:

- Meetings (Room Reservations) 251,269 persons
- Programming Areas 222,504 persons
- Commercial Games (Bowling, Billiards, and Table Tennis) 218,439 persons
- Food Service
  - 1,652,259 persons
  - 2,344,471 persons
Room reservations were provided for 917 organizations or their affiliated groups or committees. Of these, 592 student groups sponsored over 82 per cent of the meetings or related events. Non-student University-sponsored groups, whose right to the use of the building has been a perennial question of students, totalled 395 and made reservations for 829 events. The students, by comparison, sponsored 3,680 events. All of the events were by no means meetings. They included, for example, reservations for the use of the Union ticket booth, the special use of the game room for bridge instruction, and the use of the Joseph A. Park Memorial Room for two weddings.

Although later reference will be made to programs sponsored by the Union, an hourly count is made in program areas by the attendant on duty, thus giving a man-hour count on the use of the areas. Such areas include the game room, browsing library, music lounge, and, with variations on the counting method, the craft shop and photography laboratory. Attendants of the game room, which has a seating capacity of 112, recorded 102,880 student visits and checked out decks of cards over 17,000 times, with chess sets running a strong second place in popularity.

One of the most popular areas has been the music lounge which is equipped both for listening to records requested over a high-fidelity system and for the use of records in five listening booths. From a record collection including drama, opera, and a
wide variety of classical and popular musical works, records were requested or borrowed nearly 18,000 times for use in the area during 1955-56. Counting as indicated above, the area was visited 79,000 times during the same period. In some cases the number of different students using a facility has been determined. By counting different signatures of those using music lounge listening booths, for example, it has been found that nearly eight hundred individual students may enjoy this facility in a single month. Like the game room, the music lounge is filled to capacity many hours of the day.

The browsing library was visited thirty-six thousand times, serving primarily as a periodical room and providing 61 magazines and 35 hometown newspapers. With a count of 3,721, the craft shop, in addition to being a source of instruction on a wide variety of arts and crafts skills, makes available equipment used in many organization projects, and in 1955-56 was the planning center for 67 exhibits. Physical restrictions brought about by the increasing interest in the craft program and the consequent addition of equipment have been lessened somewhat by enlargement of the original shop area to include an adjoining check room.

The least used and least successfully supervised area is the photography laboratory, used only by members of the Ohio Union Camera Club. While the use of the area in terms comparable to those
above has ranged from fifteen hundred to two thousand hours per year since it was equipped in 1952, the program, lacking needed advisory help, has remained static.

Reference to the student classroom survey taken before the Union was designed indicated that bowling lanes, like all of the other presently busy areas in the building, was thought essential by a majority of those responding. With a 40 per cent lead in the number of lines bowled in 1955-56 over the college union running second in the amount of bowling activity, the inclusion of this facility has been well justified. As contrasted with the bowling lanes of the original 1911 building which were torn out after sixteen months because of lack of use, an estimated 115,456 persons bowled 230,912 lines during 1955-56. Although purely recreational bowling accounted for most of the use, co-operative programs with the Women's Physical Education Department and the intramural program were responsible for 20 per cent of the total.

The table tennis room was used by an estimated 29,151 students, obviously including many repeat users as is the case in all of the figures. Again with interest in billiards stimulated by classes in physical education, the billiard room provided for games involving a total of 73,832 student visits.

Obviously, while these figures indicate extensive use of the areas and capacity use many hours of the day, they tell little of
the number of different people served, whether they make use of other areas of the building, or other things which would be of interest. Two studies of limited scope have been conducted relating to the usage patterns of students in the building.\textsuperscript{74,75}

From the conference of the American Cancer Society to the meeting of the Zeta Beta Tau Mothers' Club, the meetings of non-student groups representing all sorts of industrial, scientific, social, civic, educational, labor, and agricultural organisations have been considered by the University a source of public good will, by the Union as a necessary source of income, and by many students as a source of interference in their normal use of the building. Any consideration of the contribution which the Union makes to the University community would necessarily include its record of service, however, to the numerous organisations to which sponsoring University departments act as host.

Accepting the amount of use as a measure of the degree to

\textsuperscript{74} Roger A. Myers, "A Survey of the Game Room of the Ohio Union," (unpublished report in files of the Ohio Union), March, 1955. A study of characteristics of users of the Game Room and determination of a usage index based on the frequency and patterns of use of eight other areas in the Union.

\textsuperscript{75} Union Activities Research Committee, "A Survey of the Use of Ohio Union Food Services," (unpublished report in files of the Ohio Union), June, 1956. This includes results on frequency of use of all building areas by students in random sampling by mailed questionnaire.
which the Union fills the needs of individuals and organizations in the University, the Ohio Union's contribution has been great. Not all areas are by any means used to capacity, however, at all times. Certain dining facilities and particularly the cafeteria could greatly increase their service. The greatest number of persons served in the dining areas in a single day was 8,459 in 1955-56 while the average was 4,845. Although there have been apparent increases in the use of the lounge areas of the building, no count is available and only observations can be noted. Use of areas where a count is made has shown a leveling off following a rather rapid increase during the first three years the building was open. As has been implied previously, increased use of some areas will come only when there is readjustment of certain patterns of use. The lack of a place to sit or a billiard table to use or the unavailability of meeting rooms will necessitate use of the facilities at less popular hours. In short, thousands of students requested the facilities which were incorporated in the new Ohio Union. They and their successors have used it sufficiently to indicate the validity of their suggestions.

The Financial Operation of the Union

The students of the University have been paying for the construction of the Ohio Union building since the fall of 1947. Their five dollar quarterly fee contributions as of June 30, 1956,
totalled $2,900,000, nearly three-quarters of the cost of construction of $4,086,000. Unlike the majority of other union buildings in the country, the Ohio Union receives only token support for its general operation. Direct subsidy has continued to come to the new Union as it did to the old from the University's general activity fund. This amount has been decreased regularly by more than half in ten years, however, and in 1955-56 totalled only $20,000. Indirect subsidy comes to the Ohio Union as a University department through the provision of utilities for the building and certain types of maintenance services by the University Service Department. 76 Until 1955-56, the salary expense of the director and the three members of the program staff were paid from the University's instructional funds. This is no longer the policy, this expense now being borne by the Union. Previous to that year, also, the pension costs of the Public Employees Retirement System of Ohio had been paid for Ohio Union employees from general funds of the University. It is now required that this expense, amounting to approximately $80,000 annually, be borne by the Union.

With the exception of the assistance mentioned, the total financial operation of the Union is dependent upon its commercial areas and miscellaneous income from programs and building services. Of a total income of $1,203,764.39 for 1955-56, $961,315.50 was

76 Utilities were estimated at $89,000 for 1955-56.
received by the foods division. The second greatest source of income was the commercial games division with $114,123.68. With no other alternative within its control at present, it is obvious that the financial health of the Union is primarily dependent upon its food services. A 10 per cent margin of profit in this area is considered necessary to support the general operation of the building. With every effort made to cut costs and increase efficiency during 1955-56, the year ended with a surplus of $8,101,400. The total expense for the year was $1,195,659.99 as compared with the income of $1,203,764.39.

Considering this section more nearly a report than a critique on the areas discussed, the implications of current policies, financial and otherwise, will be the subject of a portion of the final chapter. In summarizing the Union's financial condition, it may be said that efficient management has kept the Union in the black with a minimum of support from the University. In the experience of those unions represented in the Association of College Unions, this is rarely done except by large unions having hotel facilities. The Ohio Union has so far been an exception.

**The Ohio Union's Service to the Campus**

The contribution of any union to the life of its campus involves primarily the services and facilities it provides and the programs it sponsors. The use of the Ohio Union's services and
facilities have been mentioned and a section on its program follows this one. There are, however, various responsibilities it assumes which, though sometimes related to one of these other areas, deserve special mention. Several examples should be sufficient.

On behalf of the University, the freshman orientation committee, major student organizations, and certainly the freshmen, the annual fall Open House program sponsored by the Union is attended by over seven thousand students. The planning committee and its subcommittees involve the services of over two hundred students. In addition to introducing students to the Union, it is an attempt to introduce the new student to student organizations and recreational and social activities through which he may more quickly and closely identify himself with a university which is obviously huge and apparently impersonal.

Unofficial advisory help is provided by Union staff members to many organizations with which they have no direct tie but which use the meeting facilities or are housed in one of the student activity offices. Materials prepared for the use of Union Activities, the official student organization of the Union, are often of help to other groups. A handbook on publicity, prepared by staff members and the first of its type on the campus, is already in use by student organizations and other University departments. The Ohio Union Deskbook, financed through the Office
of the Vice-President of Student Affairs and published by the Ohio Union, is used as the freshman orientation manual on all student activities. Interdepartmental co-operation on the planning of exhibits involves the students and faculty members in horticulture, electrical engineering and numerous other departments, including, of course, fine arts, in the Union program. These services may only be illustrative of certain areas in which the Union should be expected to give assistance. Beyond this, as will be mentioned elsewhere, it should do more to unite the efforts of various organizations and departments in matters of common concern.

The Union's Program

The program of the Union might be looked upon as the total of the events sponsored in the building and the total participation in those areas which directly contribute to various recreational, social, cultural or educational needs of the student or others on the campus. This much has been done in the section on the use of the building. The purpose here is to describe briefly the extent of the program sponsored by the Union and then, using as a standard the "core activity program" derived from Wolf's study of college union programs, determine wherein the Ohio Union has fallen short.

Programs sponsored by the Union are under the immediate supervision of the eleven student members of the Ohio Union Board.

of Overseers. Of these eleven, the president and four members-at-large have no working responsibilities with any of the thirty permanently established Union Activities committees for which the Board is responsible. The guidance of these committees is the assignment of six Board members known as department directors, whose responsibilities were outlined in the previous section of this chapter. About half of the committees are program planning committees, while the other half are involved in providing office services for other student organizations, giving assistance to other students in areas such as the craft shop, or performing personnel functions for the whole Union Activities organization.

Emphasizing again that figures can tell us only how many and not with what effect students are participating in the Union's program, Union Activities committees during 1955-56 sponsored 293 events, exhibits, projects, tournaments, and instructional programs which were attended by nearly thirty-five thousand people. Based solely on the records of committee meetings held in regular meeting rooms of the Union, Union Activities committees planning for events and services held 218 scheduled meetings. Eliminating duplicate counts for those committees which met more than once, the twenty-three groups involved had a membership of 484 persons. Not included in these figures are the students who are members of some of the larger seasonal committees, such as the Open House Committee, or those whose committees met in lounges or
the Union Activities office.

By comparing the program of the Ohio Union with Wolf's list of essential activities, both the nature of the Union's activities and the adequacy of the program, at least by Wolf's criteria, can be seen. Wolf classified the programs sponsored by 96 unions according to the number of unions sponsoring various types of programs and ratings of "essential" or "supplemental" activities by each union director. In addition to the judgments of the directors, the activities were evaluated on the basis of evidence in union literature indicating that they were of time-tested interest. They were further examined by the following criteria:

1. Does the activity broaden social and cultural experiences and develop social competence?

2. Does the activity stimulate creative self-expression and develop new leisure time skills?

3. Is the activity geared to the leisure time interests and needs of the campus community and/or does it open up new possibilities?

4. Does the activity bring into action leadership from within the group?

5. Does the activity provide fun; an equality of opportunity; a balance between passive and active participation? Is it readily accessible?78

Of the 239 activities being sponsored by the unions participating in the study, 44 were judged as core activities or services by Wolf. These are listed below, preceded by an index

78 Ibid.
number indicating the nature of their sponsorship as follows:

(1) indicates sponsorship by the Ohio Union
(2) indicates sponsorship by a University organization or agency other than the Ohio Union
(3) indicates that the activity or service is not sponsored or is too inaccessible or restricted to meet the criteria above.

**Essential Activities**

**Dance**

(1) Regular evening date dances
(3) Periodic evening dateless dances
(2) Folk and square dances
(2) Special celebration dance
(3) Cabaret dances
(1) Social dance instructions
(3) Square and folk dance instruction

**Social (non-dance)**

(1) Acquaintance parties for freshmen
(1) Open house for all students
(1) Student-faculty coffee hours
(3) Instruction for student hosts and hostesses

**Games**

(1) Billiards
(1) Billiard tournament (campus)
(1) Billiard instruction
(1) Intramural bowling leagues (if alleys are available)
(1) Bowling instruction (if alleys are available)
(1) Table tennis
(1) Table tennis tournaments (campus)
(1) Chess and checkers, cards (space for informal playing)
(1) Bridge instructions
(1) Bridge tournaments
Art

(1) Art exhibits (professional and student)
(1) Photography exhibits
(3) Picture-lending library

Crafts and Hobbies

(1) Workshop for craft activities
(1) Instruction in craft skills
(1) Darkroom facilities

Music

(1) Music listening room
(1) Concert record library
(1) Popular record library
(1) Classical record concerts
(2) Group singing

Film

(2) Regular schedule of 35 or 16 mm. feature films

Discussion

(2) Public forums or discussions (faculty or off-campus speakers)
(3) Informal discussions fostering faculty-student relations

Literary

(1) Library for recreational reading
(1) Popular magazines for leisure time reading (free use)
(1) Wide selection of newspapers (free use)
(2) Book talks (faculty or off-campus speakers)

Personnel

(1) Orientation for new students in union activities
(1) Special interviewing sessions for committee applicants
(3) Training programs for Union committee members
(1) Training programs for Union committee chairmen
(1) Recognition or merit award plan for Union committee members

79 Ibid., pp. 353-56.
Of 239 activities and services sponsored by the 96 unions completing the questionnaire, the Ohio Union makes available 71. On the basis of popularity or frequency of sponsorship only 99 of these activities or services are sponsored by ten or more unions.

Of this group the Ohio Union or another University agency or department sponsors 80 on a basis making the activity open to all students. The Union provides 55 of these. Other activities are offered by the Union which are unique or rare among college unions. Dates and Data, an orientation manual and assignment book, including reference information on the University's history, regulations and student services, is an example. Film Fair, a program of 16 millimeter films exploring the use of experimental, travel, art and documentary movies, is another.

Despite the provision of a wide variety of activities and services available to the student there is at present little coordination of the programs provided by the Ohio Union and campus agencies except as is done on an informal basis. The possibilities for a closer examination of the total program of the campus, and more important, the means by which the campus is informed on what is available will be considered with other suggestions for the future in the final chapter.

With whatever measure of success, there has been an attempt to keep the total development of the student at the heart of the
working philosophy of the Union's program staff. The individual student may derive his greatest benefits from the program as a listener to music or a player of chess or, on the other hand, as one who actively helps to plan the musical program or organize the chess tournament. While general statements of the values of student activities are often heard, few attempts have been made to ask the student specifically what the effects of his participation have been or to determine the nature of the content of such activities.

Because of the obvious relevance of the problem to any study of unions, 73 students who had been active in Union Activities were asked for their comments on their relationship to the Union. The request, made in letter form, was sent to committee chairmen and student members of the Ohio Union Board of Overseers who had been in office during 1955-56 or had been recently elected to office for 1956-57. Most had been active in Union Activities in some capacity for a year. No attempt was made to avoid their identification of the letter with the Union or one of its staff members. It was deliberately personal in style, recognizing that overly favorable bias could be detected because of the working relationship the writer had had with the students. It was, of course, expected that the respondents would tend to think well of an activity to which they had given considerable time and for which they had assumed leadership responsibilities.
The core of the request is in this excerpt from the letter.

Tangible contributions of the Ohio Union or any college union are fairly easy to measure. We can count people and what they come for. We know how many meals we serve. When we begin talking about the objectives of a college union, however, and try to determine how well we've achieved them, we run into all kinds of problems. Here is where you can help. Would you jot down what your participation in the Union has meant to you, what attitudes, skills or insights, for better or worse, have been a part of your experience in your association with the Union. Be as specific as you can, illustrate where possible, and don't hesitate to be critical. If you wish to distinguish between your relationships to Union Activities and other organizations in the building, feel free to do so. You may wish to suggest how your experience in the Union might have been more profitable to you. Your estimate of your own personal development is what is needed.80

The following paragraph in the letter suggested a five hundred word limit and that a signature was not necessary.

With no follow-up attempted and a period of only three weeks during which the students were requested to respond, 26 replies were received. Ten of the 39 men and 16 of the 34 women on the mailing list answered the letter, one letter running over two thousand words, and most giving in some detail experiences illustrative of their relationship to the Union. Several students compared values of participating in Union-sponsored activities with those of other student organizations. Comments which could be sorted and classified into distinctive characteristics, factors, or values in their relationship to the Union were so

80 Letter from the writer, July, 1956.
No factor was counted more than once in a single letter, regardless of the recurrence of comments relating to it. Twenty-seven different positive factors appeared a total of 126 times and different negative factors were listed 13 times. In order of frequency and with elaboration where necessary, these factors are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Positive Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Acquired leadership and organizational skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Developed friendships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Developed a sense of responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Developed self-confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Found that experience led to general personal development and self-understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Developed pride in the University (frequently derived from pride in the Union).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acquired work skills (use of office machines, tools, organizational and planning techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Acquired ability to cooperate and work more democratically in group situations. (This was in some cases related to good citizenship below.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Found opportunity for and satisfaction of service to the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Acquired understanding of the University, its organization, and its problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Achieved general maturity, primarily through relationship to older persons (Union staff,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Positive Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>faculty, and administrative personnel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefited from freedom to join and participate in Union Activities regardless of class or other affiliation or previous experience. Felt responsibility was based on merit and interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valued the personal concern shown by University personnel. (The feeling was expressed that this relationship personalized the University, which was otherwise felt to be big and impersonal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Found opportunity for self-expression. Appreciated opportunities for laboratory testing of interests and practical application of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquired skills and attitudes directly related to vocational plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participation in activities led to academic improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developed habits and attitudes of good citizenship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquired awareness of educational implications of the Union for the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developed a feeling of belonging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learned the importance of efficient work habits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appreciated the variety of facilities in one building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Developed critical ability in understanding persons and ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Friendship and opportunity for constructive use of time had met a great need at time of personal crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Positive Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benefited from directed, purposeful effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acquired business skills (related to purchasing, publications, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appreciated place to relax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Found opportunity to learn to work with both men and women.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Negative Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Danger of spending too much time in activities. (&quot;Too much&quot; was considered to be 15-20 hours by one person. One committee chairman expressed the feeling that Board membership seemed too demanding.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Too much red tape involved in working in Union Activities. (One said he came to recognize need for rules and procedures for efficient operation as he learned of the complexity of the organization of the Union and the University.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closer relationship between Board members and committee chairmen is needed in Union Activities. (One recognised recent progress made on the problem.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disliked standing in long cafeteria lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Felt that Union Activities office should not provide so many office services (typing, duplication, etc. for other student organizations.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Failure of students, particularly freshmen, to join student organizations was due to failure of upper-classmen to interpret the value of the experiences available and to the status factors involved in the participation of leaders in these organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Negative Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-occupation with Union Activities responsibilities led to overly business-like attitude which dominated personal relations with fellow students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the respondents made clear certain of the advantages in working in Union Activities. These were generally related to their opportunity to work in an organization serving all students in the University, to the benefits derived from participation in an organization responsible for so many different programs and services, and to the chance to gain an understanding from key administrative personnel on the Ohio Union Board of Overseers of the plans and problems of the University.

A paragraph from one letter typifies the feeling expressed by several students who had been or were at the time Board members.

Union Activities seems rather unique to me as an activity because one who serves on the board is involved in a business, to a degree, as well as an "activity". For this reason, the union program stands out in my mind; it is not solely an activity in the usual collegiate connotation of the word, but, rather, it is a business, an organizational structure, a going, progressive, far reaching program, as well as an activity. It gives one the ingredients of many of the other activity groups, along with some realistic participation in the organization and management of a business. For example, our budget sessions and full board meetings and student meetings are valuable experiences in financial management and give all the student members insight into the important financial aspects of running a business. Associating with top level university administrators causes student board members to extend their thinking and offers a
challenge to them. It stimulates our interest and enthusiasm and, again, it shows us that we are a part of an important university service.

Another statement illustrative of the vocational implications of certain types of responsibilities comes from the chairman of one of the music committees.

Through the Twilight Musicales committee, the Ohio Union is giving me the opportunity of practicing the actual work which I expect to do the rest of my life. For this reason, the Union is not just a recreational center but also one of the most important educational experiences I will have at this university. My work in performing, lecturing, and writing about music, as well as in planning and organizing concerts, though this may all be limited, is for me what practice teaching is to the education student. I am planning to make my home in a university teaching the piano, and to carry on all these other activities from this position.

Representative of the comments of many students' experiences as freshmen, is that of a student who received a chairmanship appointment at the end of her first year.

Ohio State is a big place with a lot of strange people. The activities offices offer havens to lonely, befuddled, little freshmen. This is the beginning of what my participation has meant to me.

As the bigness wears off and the loneliness disappears the union becomes a "home away from home," to steal someone's line. It offers food, relaxation, friends and hard work - all in one spot. The activities there help to round out the student's life and to keep him in balance. This is a summary - total of what my participation means to me now.

Certainly characteristic of participation in all student organizations are the friendships which grow out of them. One
student, listing this among several benefits, writes:

I feel, also, that the Union is the perfect place in which to make warm and lasting friendships. I truly believe that you don't actually know a person until you have worked with them under all sorts of conditions, good and bad. If your faith in people is not shaken, even if they let you down, the experience is worth it. If under adverse conditions you can be as pleasant with someone as if you were having a cup of coffee with them in the Tavern, you have become a bigger person.

No college union would be so presumptuous as to claim sole responsibility for the values students have found in student activities. Not all student activities are sponsored by unions and the majority of students who are actually members of student organizations may benefit only through the use of certain physical facilities of the building. Each college union, however, has the responsibility, as far as its human energies, physical resources, and authority allow, to make available to all students the benefits found by these few. The continued expansion of the Ohio Union program during the five years that the Union has been open has been an attempt, however limited, to utilize the building's excellent facilities to attain broadly educational ends. Very much a five-year-old in what it has learned in this regard, it may be possible to accept the statistics of this section only as evidence of a possibility. The possibility would be that what is happening to the handful of students who have written about the Union is happening to many others.
Summary: The Ohio Union, Old and New

Between 1911 and 1956, it might be said with accuracy that the only thing in the Ohio Union which did not change was the price of a cup of coffee. In the number of services and programs provided for the campus, the old Ohio Union took on greater responsibilities, reaching its peak years immediately following World War II and prior to the opening of the new building. The greatly increased size of the new building rather than any great change in the role it was to play on campus can be credited for many of the differences between the two. In summary, several observations of comparison or contrast may be made.

1. In matters relating to the extracurricular life of students both the old and the new Ohio Union have been responsible as supplementary rather than primary and coordinating agencies of student activities. Unique facilities for the sponsorship of programs in the new building as well as the capacity to provide office space for all major organizations has meant a closer relationship to the over-all campus program.

2. In service, through provision of facilities for meetings and other events, the Union's totals have jumped from approximately one thousand events per year in its heavily used early period to nearly four thousand events per year in the sample year reviewed, 1955-56.

3. As contrasted with the function of the Ohio Union Board
of Overseers which served in the old building as a managerial, policy making, and program board, the Board in the new building has been responsible only for the Union's program. The scope of the business operations of the building, as pointed out earlier, was the basic reason for the change.

4. In financial operation, both the old and new buildings were self-supporting with the exception of the subsidies provided by free utilities and varying amounts of fee income. Comparatively speaking, both in actual dollars and in proportion to its total budget, the support for the new building has been less than that of the old. An annual decrease in assistance since the opening of the new building in 1951 has resulted in restricted development of programs and services in the building, food price increases beyond a desirable margin of profit for college unions, and other less tangible effects or pressures.

5. Both buildings have been heavily used by comparison with most other college unions. Whereas, during the years immediately following World War II, students without housing on or near the campus tended to monopolize the use of many areas of the building, the greatly increased size of the new building has allowed use by a broader cross section of the student population. There has

---

61 Five per cent is considered by the Association of College Unions as a safe operating margin. The Ohio Union has aimed at 10 per cent in its food operation.
been a consistent policy throughout the history of the Union to prevent the development of priority feelings by any group in the use of the building.

6. One policy modified in the planning of the new building resulted in the exclusion from the building of any facilities or offices not under the jurisdiction of the Union director. A firmly established practice in many college unions and a principle considered basic to successful union operation by the Association of College Unions, as applied to the Ohio Union it meant that staff offices of the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. were not moved into the new building. For the same reasons, proposals for special lounges or other areas to be controlled by other organizations or departments were excluded from the new building. In effect, in addition to eliminating many administrative problems, this has meant that all public general use areas of the building are available for the needs of all campus organizations.

Because of their bearing on the future development of the Ohio Union, some of these areas will be discussed in more detail in the final chapter.
CHAPTER IV
PART I  THE UNIVERSITY FIRST, AND THE UNION

"The business here is learning." So a college president invites and challenges each entering class to join in the enterprise of the educational community. The elaboration of this statement might take various forms in various universities. They would, however, be necessarily and primarily educational in their implications. No purpose would be served here by a detailed discussion of the interpretations given them by institutions which range greatly in size, differ greatly in history and tradition, and, whether public or independent, may have assumed somewhat differing responsibilities to the society which they serve. There is only one thesis: that any college or university which would be what it professes to be must relate all that it does to some statement of educational responsibility. While a great variety of factors must necessarily enter into the decisions which fundamentally affect the life of the educational community, the educational implication is a factor in every problem. It would appear the height of simple-mindedness to suggest that the academic dean of the college be consulted on the establishment of a college laundry. If the dean discovers, however, that in addition to his present duties the director of the college union is to be asked to supervise that laundry, the question would have to be raised
regarding the most effective use of university administrative personnel, their distraction from primary responsibilities in an educational department of the university, and numerous related factors. The example is not fiction. The situation arose in a college where evidently the questions were not raised.

While the need is constant to relate the activities of a university to its educational objectives, the recent rate of growth of universities and colleges makes it imperative that the possible changes in size, organization, facilities, and public responsibility be considered in the light of the central objective. Ideally the educational responsibility of the university would be a perennial concern of all members at the top of the administrative ladder and, of course, by the nature of their training, all of those involved in the teaching, research, and general academic areas of the university. Also, it would be a minimum requirement that prior to changes involving the expansion of the physical plant, the extension of services to the campus community, the realignment of departmental responsibilities, or the general reorganization of administrative staff the consequences in the educational life of the institution be considered. If the requirement seems obvious, it is only more obvious when not followed and when the agencies and departments of the university responsible for implementing the educational program, directly or
indirectly, or for servicing the educational community find it difficult to clarify their own responsibilities or to give optimum performance.

From general observation of university catalogs might come the following composite statement of purpose of a hypothetical university.

1. The University is responsible for the general education of its students. The student has the opportunity to study and gain competence in a wide range of subjects which may be narrowly and specifically vocational, broadly cultural in their implications, or intended to lead him to a basic understanding of the various fields of organized human knowledge. It is further the purpose of the University to encourage in the student a habit of continuing self-education.

2. The University recognizes that each of its students will seek the satisfaction of basic human needs with which he enters the University and which will persist throughout his life. These the University provides for through its established health services, dining facilities, residence halls, and counseling and service agencies.

3. The University recognizes a responsibility to educate for good citizenship and leadership in a democratic society. This the University does by providing for organized group activities,
participation in student government, and the practice of democratic procedures in the boards, councils, and departments of the University. Through its lectureships, forums, and convocations it seeks to nurture a respect for civilized controversy, and offer opportunities to the University community to develop intelligent and concerned opinion on issues vital to the state, the nation, and the world.

4. The University recognizes its responsibility for providing for the wholesome social, cultural, and recreational growth of the student. Organized social activities, facilities for the development of leisure time skills, and programs in music and the arts are open to all.

Whether the university has two objectives or ten in its statement of purpose is of little concern. The point to be made is that the generality of such statements has been essential to the flexibility with which the university needs to adapt to a growing and changing society. On the other hand, however, the breadth of these statements has at times deluded those in the university into thinking that the university was performing persistently and equally well in all areas of expressed concern, while sometimes under the guise and rationale of broad responsibility engaging in activities which seem to dilute or even negate its central purpose. It would seem helpful, in the light of this, that a university, in
addition to its statement of purpose, develop principles by which new activities might be judged worthy or unworthy of undertaking. The particular nature of the principles doubtless will depend heavily upon the history of the university and its present nature, but such principles should be determined by the leaders of the university and shared with the university community. Illustrative of the use of such principles in the study of problems facing a college would be their application to the question for which many colleges are presently seeking an answer, namely, what is the optimum enrollment? Or less sharply, how many students can the institution take? The great variety of factors involved and all of their detailed implications are matters beyond the scope of this dissertation, but it seems obvious that in order to answer any such question adequately it must first be asked precisely. The answer to either of the questions above would be different from the answer to the question, can we increase our enrollment without reducing the quality of our educational program? Immediately criteria must be established for measuring the quality of the education now provided. The college can then proceed to the answer, taking into consideration, of course, factors relating to plant expansion, acquisition of new land, availability of additional teaching and administrative personnel, financial resources from gifts and endowments, public appropriation or fees, organizational changes, administrative costs, and seemingly endless
other items.

Without belaboring the point, it seems essential that the leaders of any university seriously concern themselves with specific principles which could be utilized in the judgments they make which in significant though often subtle ways affect the lives of their students. As a human institution dedicated to human development in an educational environment, the inquiry must continually be made as to how changing conditions affect the human being. As an institution with many and varied responsibilities to many people, with some of the culturally nurtured temptation to be big and noticeable, it must differentiate between size and quality and willingly forego the former for the latter if the problem at issue requires the choice. It must realize that when it tries to do everything, it is in danger of becoming less than the thing it should be. As an institution concerned with its responsibilities to free men in a free society it must necessarily, while conserving what has rationally proved to be good, be acceptable to and give positive leadership to the change which is the need and expectation of a free culture. If the university becomes first concerned with the perpetuation of itself as an institution comprised of certain physical and financial assets, it becomes as sounding brass and a clanging cymbal.

College unions as they have been conceived in their recent period of rapid expansion have, with their versatile facilities,
demonstrated their capacity to serve a wide variety of functions on the university campus. As these university community centers increase in responsibility and number, it will be necessary for them to determine in cooperation with leaders of their respective universities what their primary educational functions are, what responsibilities they should have which are essential to the maintenance of any human community, and what services they could provide which are non-essential conveniences on the fringe or beyond the realm of the responsibility of the university to the members of its community. It has been customary in the planning of college unions to make a survey of the social, cultural, recreational, and informal educational needs of the campus community and the kind of an organization and building needed. It is the thesis of this writer that the responsibility of the union should be directly derived from the responsibilities of the university and should supplement these. The assumption of all the following discussion is that the college union is primarily an educational institution. Wherein it is responsible for various services to the campus, it is assumed that these services and associated facilities cannot be elsewhere provided in ways as conducive to the fulfillment of related objectives or needs of the university community. Having stated, all too briefly, that the college union must be an integral part of the purpose, organization, and educational program of the university, problems related to the union's purpose will be discussed.
PART II  THE NEED FOR A STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Ideally, the union staff on any campus ought to be able to define precisely the function of the union. Even though the design and facilities of a particular building may commit the college union's staff to the fulfillment of certain college campus services, presumably the building has a specific educational function of its own. The director, his staff, and the governing board of the union, hopefully in cooperation with other leaders in the university, should have this purpose worked out and in print. While a statement of purpose is necessarily general in order to be inclusive, it should provide a base from which new policies, programs, and services may evolve. Such a statement is needed in order that the union may justify certain basic responsibilities, established or proposed. It is necessary in order for the union to be able to reject the request or suggestion that it assume other responsibilities which do not relate to its basic functions. This applies of course to the use of the building or its personnel in providing for miscellaneous auxiliary enterprises which deprive priority responsibilities of their needed attention. A statement of purpose is needed in order to guide the union in its cooperation with other agencies, departments, or organizations on still other types of responsibilities which it should not or
could not assume alone, and, as implied above, to help decide in which types of responsibilities or functions it is wisest not to participate even though it could. The union needs to be able to define its function in order to justify the provision of facilities and the financial support needed to open up opportunities for their use. Understanding the non-academic yet nonetheless educational responsibilities of the union, there is justification for providing the facilities and opportunities found elsewhere on a campus but not found under conditions similar to those which prevail in unscheduled, informal, and completely voluntary student and campus-wide participation.

It is not surprising that the statements of purpose of college unions are general when the many and varied responsibilities of these organizations are considered. It is even less surprising when we note how little has been done to consult with those having academic responsibilities in the university regarding the means by which the union, within the bounds of its purpose, can supplement what takes place in the classroom. In addition to having deprived itself of sound method and theory which might enable it to do more effectively what it is doing so much of—namely advising and counseling and directing the students in a wide range of skills, nurturing all kinds of attitudes, and offering conditions which presumably develop self-understanding—it has left many faculty members on our campuses with an inadequate
conception of what it is doing. Or it has left them with a conception identified with their own student experience. This may be quite adequate or grossly inadequate, but in any case needs reinterpretation in the light of the contemporary responsibilities of the university and the union.

With whatever diligence those most bound up in the life of the union seek to declare its purpose, they must at least recognize the facts of its origin. They must also be aware of the bounds of its jurisdiction as these bounds are imposed by the organizational structure of the university and maintained by the officers of the university to whom the union is directly responsible. Ideally it will have been conceived as a unique educational institution capable of performing functions essential to the life of the educational community. In reality, however, it may approach the day of its birth with mid-wives of myopic perspective who commonly agree only in the hope that the union should be self-supporting or, still worse, make money. Unions, like most other institutions, are usually encouraged to do things which are reportable in black and white. While it may be fair to assume that tangible accomplishments may have their intangible complementary results, it would be unwise to think that this is inevitably so or that such results were necessarily contributive even in a general way to the education of the student or to the
enhancement of the lives of other members of the university community.

In reality, therefore, the stated purpose of the union may evolve and be expressed to the campus in precise and even eloquent terms but be found incapable of implementation due to certain facts of its organizational life. While the greatest proportion of unions are officially responsible, as departments of their universities, to the president or his representative, a union may find its educational prospects and policies governed by the conceptions of its task which emanate from the office of the business manager or the director of auxiliary enterprises. While the many commercial and financial aspects of the operation of a college union necessitate a close relationship between the business office of the university, direct relationship to this office makes it imperative that the person to whom the union is responsible be well informed and sympathetic to its educational purpose and philosophy. He must be convinced that it has responsibilities which arise from educational foundations and understand that many of the finest results of the effective operation of the building are not of the material sort which he is most interested in and, necessarily, most capable of encouraging, organizing for, interpreting or measuring. It is alone dangerous enough that union staff members become prone to consider as primary the concrete
results. As children of a material culture it has become natural for them to place great value on these. It is oftentimes unfortunate that their own preoccupations may reveal a disdain for the essential function of the teacher unless he is teaching something which has so-called practical and materially productive consequences. Thus, not realizing that the practical man and the theoretician are mutually dependent partners, they are caught on a road which, although often leading to more efficient and effective operation on matters of daily perfunctory routine, too seldom leads to asking the question, why? as it pertains to the reasons for and the implications of initially doing anything. Concentrating on the educational task of the union helps to avoid placing in first order of attention the institution rather than the human beings whom it was built to serve.

Continuing study by union staffs would doubtless lead frequently to new orientations on many matters which they assume to be going along well. The individual staff member may have closely identified himself with the specific functions and goals related to his own area of responsibility, meanwhile ignoring those of others. Likewise a director may have found in the building, its design, its historic obligations, or in the residue of his previous teaching or business experience the elements of a security-giving conception of what the union ought to do and be. Sabbatical leave
offers the university professor an occasion for study, re-examination, or reflection. The union staff member needs something comparable.

The inadequacy of the response received from union directors when asked by Humphreys to state the purpose of their unions is evidence of the problem.¹ She strongly suggests that even though the college union on a particular campus may be providing well for all the needs which the ideal union might hope to serve, the director and his staff have an obligation to make public the union's purpose. This may obviously be done in many ways: through the addresses of college union staff members; articles in campus publications; and formal printed statements made available to all who may be interested. Frequent restatement of such a purpose by all these means enables members of the campus community to identify themselves with the institution, its program and its personnel in a way which is not possible if they are familiar only with the union's rooms, its bowling lanes, or its public telephones.

Having insisted that the union, actually a group of people with certain educational convictions and hopes, make its purpose clear, there is a need to comment at least briefly on the ground from which this purpose evolves. As the university must

¹ Humphreys, College Unions, p. 55.
understand the culture of the state, the nation, and the world it professes to serve, the union must seek to understand the campus culture which it serves. If the phenomenon of the college union has arisen from a desire to provide a uniting place, a focal point for varied activities of common concern, or an agency for provision of specific educational needs, it serves a culture which is made up of diverse sub-cultures and individuals who are seeking to harmonize in their own lives the influences of such sub-cultures. As the union seeks to be responsive to the dynamic cultural patterns which affect campus needs and behavior, it must recognize itself as an institution which affects and is affected by certain campus cultural patterns; many of these are traditional and difficult to change and others have a propensity to change.

The organizational patterns of the union in relation to the university may have once been looked upon as progressive, efficient, and productive of the best educational results. What was once a helpful form of organization may have become over the years so closely identified with the persons holding positions within the organizational structure that out of a perhaps misconceived respect for those who perpetuate the pattern, others who perceive the need for change are reluctant to initiate it.

Without making a defense for rut-bound patterns of what might be called an administrative sub-culture, recognition must be given to the fact that the administrator, in some respects like the
faculty member, is the guardian of a culture which has dimensions in years far exceeding that of the culture in which the student may see himself.

In addition to the various campus cultures in which a student and staff member is operating, there are the diverse cultures from which they have come. They may have grown up either hundreds of miles or hundreds of yards from the university. They come from large cities, small towns, and rural areas with or without access to all types of civic and social institutions, with or without opportunities for social, economic, religious and political intercourse with other social groups, and in or out of families or groups which place a high value on education itself.

It would be fruitless for those concerned with the purpose of the college union to give detailed attention to the many and changing influences which affect the cultural complexion of the campus. It is doubtful that the faculty members of a number of social science departments could come up with conclusive findings after a year on the problem, despite the writer’s belief that any university would find it worth the undertaking. The purpose of the college union, however, must reflect a conception of the campus community which involves both its stabilizing characteristics and its continually fluctuating needs.

Ideally the members of a university community would always be
aware of the distinctions between those who comprise a cross-
section of the life of the university on a given day, each with
his individual interests and aspirations, and the university as
continuing representation of rationally agreed upon, or stumbled
upon, underlying principles, practices, and high hopes which have
been found enduring in the community in the past, adaptable to
the basic needs of the present, and which give promising assurance
of the perpetuation and continued progress and general welfare of
the community of the future. Simply stated, some things are of
relatively permanent importance and other things are important in
only a transient sense. The difference between these should be
known.

The faculties of most universities recognize the concept by
prescribing in their curricula at least a minimum of material which
would convey to the student what the "public philosophy" of the
university, to use Lippmann's phrase, has been and might be.
While there is, of course, no guarantee that verbal acquaintance
with the great precepts of our nation, of western civilization,
or the world may lead to living expression of their validity in
the activities of men, they help us to understand what the
imperatives and continuing objectives of the university community
should be. The faculty presumes or, indeed, is charged with an

2 Walter Lippmann, The Public Philosophy, (New York: Little,
obligation of preserving certain standards of competence and understanding in various fields of knowledge. It makes distinctions between courses in American history and government which it requires and courses in first aid or fly casting which it does not. The distinction is based on the existence of the subject areas in completely different dimensions of importance and is related to the historic responsibility of the university to provide, in a context difficult to duplicate elsewhere, an education of essential or basic value to the larger community in which it exists. In short, the university and all of its departments must continually insist that some things are more important than others.

While the many student personnel services on a university campus reflect both the individual needs of students and a continuing need of the civilized community, the distinction between these is often difficult to make. For instance, the medical service made available to the sick student satisfies both an immediate need and interest of the individual and the need of the community for healthy and productive members essential to its life. In the realm of student activities frequent distinctions must be made between the private interest of an individual group which, if sanctioned, might unfairly restrict the freedom or the interests of other members of the community, and those which, however unusual they appear or however threatening they seem to the status quo of established routine or relationships of authority and
responsibility in the university, may indeed be necessary to continuing re-examination, sans disagreement, and experimentation.

These latter interests may be the healthiest kinds of evidence that democratic principles are at work which have led to higher orders of organization and fellowship in the life of the community. These activities are also characteristic of the process which presumably goes on in the classroom. It is conceivable that this is the area in which the union, as both a facilitating and sponsoring educational agency, may yet develop its closest kinship with the teaching faculty. Such kinship will hardly evolve, however, unless the union in declaring its responsibility for teaching good citizenship and the practice of good democratic principles is given the go-ahead signal by the university officers or boards to which it is responsible.

In concluding this section, several summary statements may be made:

1. It has been emphasised that the union must precisely relate its purpose to the educational objectives of the university and that its purpose must be reflected in its organization and specific functions.

2. It has further been suggested that although the statement of purpose may appear general in print, it must have its roots in a clear understanding of the dynamics of the university culture and be subject to continuing re-examination.
3. It has been pointed out that in the exercise of its responsibilities, the union, through its staff and those to whom it is responsible, must seek to make the distinction between those things which are essential to the life of the university, as a community and as an institution, and the individual desires and needs of its members, understanding wherein interests are in conflict, either real or apparent, and wherein they may be, most happily, in harmony.

Specific purposes of college unions have been omitted so far except as they have been noted in a review of the history of the Ohio Union or other early college unions. Consideration of the more widely published and currently used statements of the role of the college union will follow.
PART III  THE STATED OBJECTIVES OF COLLEGE UNIONS

whether the college union serves the campus of five hundred
as does the recently completed building at Reed College in Oregon,
whether it is a four million dollar structure for twenty thousand
students as at Ohio State, or whether it is one of the buildings
which combine in its facilities college clothing shops, hotel
rooms, and areas for the social, recreational, and cultural life
of the student, all share the basic objective of providing for
the social needs of the campus community. They may or may not
have as their responsibility the sponsorship of educational
programs, the provision of recreational facilities, or those which
would allow it to become a leisure time center for enjoyment of
music and the arts. It is not the purpose at this point to suggest
how these buildings should be conceived, but to review representa-
tive statements of the purposes of unions as they now exist. From
one of the publications of the Association of College Unions comes
the following list of union objectives:

1. To provide a common life and social program
   for the students, faculty, and alumni of the
   university.

2. To serve as an informal educational medium
   for supplementing the academic education of
   students and, insofar as possible, for relating
   the academic and non-academic factors of
   education— that the student’s total training and
   experience may be well-rounded and complete.
3. To carry out the meaning implied by the word "union" or "community center" by centralizing, integrating, and democratizing university community effort and activity.

4. To provide an education in human relationships.

5. To contribute to the student's education for self-government and civic responsibility.

6. To give students the opportunity, through cooperative effort and self-government (in determining union operating policies), to affect many of the costs of going to college.

7. To make the large university a more human place.

8. To maintain a physical center as an instrument for implementing the objectives stated above and for facilitating a communal life through whatever means possible.³

Statements of university presidents have also given support to the development of the educational purpose of college unions.

Virgil M. Hancher, president of the State University of Iowa, has said,

It seems to me that the union should be thought of as a part of the total educational enterprise, as an integral part of the institution, as contributing a supplementary form of education, outside the classroom in one sense but certainly not unrelated to it, as rounding out the student's life so that by the time he graduates he not only knows his Greek or mathematics or his history or his law or his medicine or whatever else he may take, but will also have

appreciation of the great music and the great painting and the great theater of the Western world. 4

An earlier statement, then a prediction and now a description, is to be found in the inaugural address of Charles R. Van Hise, president of the University of Wisconsin, 1904:

The communal life of instructors and students in work, in play, and in social relations is the very essence of the spirit of Oxford and Cambridge... If the university... is to do for the sons of the state what Oxford and Cambridge are doing for the sons of England... it must once more have halls of residence, and to these must be added a commons and a union. At the commons the men meet one another each day; at the union they adjourn for close, wholesome, social intercourse. The union should be a commodious and beautiful building, comfortably, even artistically furnished. When the students are done with their work in the evening, the attractive union is at hand, where refreshments may be had, and a pleasant hour may be had at games, with the magazines, in a novel, or in social chat. The coarse attractions of the town have little power in comparison... 5

The support of Van Hise and his successors has led to the development of a college union at Wisconsin which is pre-eminent in its efforts to be a "humanizing, unifying, and democratizing force, in the university." 6

The increase in college union buildings has led more recently to a recognition of their purpose and contribution by leaders in university student personnel work, among whom is C. Gilbert Wrenn,

5 Humphreys, p. 35.
6 Ibid.
who writes,

The college union building has become a popular means of providing experiences that result in social learnings... At its best the college union is a center of social life, of cultural experiences, and of creative arts and craft activities. It offers individuals and groups opportunities for expression that the classroom doesn't offer. It is a laboratory for the constructive use of leisure time, a social educational center, in which students may learn how to live together. The college union brings together both resident and off-campus students, faculty members, and guests from outside the college in a variety of social situations. The program of the college union should be an intrinsic part of the social program of the college or university, which is an important part of its entire educational program.7

The difficulty of defining the college union has long plagued those who are attempting to interpret its functions on a university campus. While definition has often begun with a reference to the college union "building," there have always been more "unions" of students, or of students and faculty, than there have been union buildings. Indeed, even though identification is simplified by reference to an observable university structure, this becomes confusing when we learn that one such union is a quonset hut, or, even less, the snack bar facilities in a particular building, or a building which consists predominantly of hotel or dormitory rooms, or is a building completely lacking in residential facilities but with extensive extracurricular program facilities.

supervised by more than a dozen persons with faculty rank. The need for some commonly accepted statement led, however, to the acceptance by the Association of College Unions in April, 1956, of the following definition of "The Role of the College Union":

1. The Union is the community center of the college, for all the members of the college family—students, faculty, administration, alumni, and guests. It is not just a building; it is also an organization and a program. Together they represent a well considered plan for the community life of the college.

2. As the "living room" or "hearthstone" of the college, the Union provides for services, conveniences, and amenities the members of the college family need in their daily life on the campus and for getting to know and understand one another through informal association outside the classroom.

3. The Union is part of the educational program of the college. As the center of the college community life, it serves as a laboratory of citizenship, training students in social responsibility and for leadership in our democracy.

Through its various boards, committees and staff, it provides a cultural, social, and recreational program aiming to make free time activity a cooperative factor with study in education.

In all its purposes it encourages self-directed activity, giving maximum opportunity for self-realization and for growth in individual social competency and group effectiveness. Its goal is the development of persons as well as intellects.

4. The College Union serves as a unifying force in the life of the college, cultivating enduring regard for and loyalty to the college.  

8 Proceedings, 1956, p. 113.
There is little doubt that all of the latitude provided in the statement is needed by institutions which vary so widely in their functions from campus to campus. There is mutual agreement, however, among those who have done the most extensive and recent research on particular problems of the college union that it must be primarily and specifically an educational institution. Humphreys, Tinney, Kohler, and Wolf have all, while maintaining that the college union has little justification unless it is an educational institution, begun with the premise that it should be such, a natural premise in the light of the fact that they were doing their research as educators in the quest of advanced degrees. While there are probably few who would question its educational responsibilities, local conditions, the inclusion of extensive commercial facilities, the training and experience of staff members, and lines of responsibility in the university organization may do much to hinder its fulfillment of these responsibilities.

Although the basic need and purpose which brought college unions into existence in the United States have changed little in their history of fifty years, there is a pressing need to understand its functions more clearly, determine what its potentialities are in those as yet untouched areas of service, and with the help of the social scientists describe more clearly the nature of the campus community and culture which college unions are attempting to serve.
PART IV  PRINCIPLES FOR THE DETERMINATION OF RESPONSIBILITY

Implicit in the preceding section are principles which relate to the union's task on the university campus. It may happen in only a minority of cases that the specific purpose of the college union is well clarified prior to the planning and construction of the union building. Likewise, it may be rare that any particular principles arise out of a general statement of purpose which will guide those responsible for the union in either assuming or rejecting new responsibilities as its programs and services evolve. As the purpose of the college union on a given campus evolves and is implemented, the key factors in the process will prove to be the physical design of the building and its director. The more important of the two may be the design of the building itself. If the building was constructed with the hope of providing numerous facilities for free services and low cost educational programs, with a minimum of revenue-producing area, one might expect to find as its director a person whose primary interest is in making the union truly an agency of informal education, recreation, and cultural activities. If, on the other hand, the primary need of the campus is for food service, hotel rooms, and extensive conference facilities, it certainly behooves the university to seek a man trained in institutional management and interested in running the commercial enterprise which this type of union will be. The
very complexity of conditions on an individual campus may make it extremely difficult to anticipate exactly what the financial future of a college union holds. A review of college union literature would seem to indicate over-optimism on the part of those planners who expect their college unions to be able to support themselves through their revenue-producing services. A revision of the administration's thinking on the problem may lead to more realistic expectations only after every effort has been made to trim costs, increase the use of revenue areas, and restrict the development of programs which, however educationally essential, may not be self-sustaining.

If the purpose of a college union has been carefully determined in the initial planning stages, such problems relating to the role of the union may never arise. Once in operation, however, the union must be able to adapt itself to changing conditions in the university. The suggestion here is that any union staff should work out in conjunction with administrative leaders and governing boards directly involved principles by which possible courses of development may be judged and new responsibilities evaluated. A list of such principles, in question form, is given below.

1. Is the development of a policy, a service, or a program in accord with the educational objectives of the university?
2. Is there recognition of the priority of students and other members of the university community in the development of policies, services, and programs over the non-university groups which may request use of the union? Although cogent arguments may be presented for having numerous non-university organizations use the college union building, it should be frankly admitted that the greatest advantage to the union is in most cases financial. The often nebulous value of the public relations by-product may not balance out well with the union's own relation with its university public.

3. Do the responsibilities which the union is asked to assume indicate a recognition of the nature of the staff's training and experience and its most effective use? Perhaps the danger of succumbing to odd job requests is greater in the smaller college unions where the staff is very limited in numbers, and perhaps, being less specialised in its training, more likely to assume responsibilities which they think someone must carry out. The jack-of-all trades concept of the college union director, in addition to winning for the union tasks which may not really be in accord with its purpose, deprives the director and his staff of the freedom to assume the educational responsibilities which they have in the underdeveloped areas on any campus, and limits the respect they hold in the eyes of their faculty and administrative colleagues.
1. Do the responsibilities of the union provide for optimum use of university physical resources and facilities? Is there an organizational relationship between facilities under the jurisdiction of separate agencies but serving similar or supplementary purposes?

5. Is each facility, service, or program desirable for the life of the university community? The educational contribution of a music listening room, a film program, or rooms available for group discussion may be easy to describe. The inclusion of a barber shop, clothing store or other non-educational facilities in the building may be more difficult to justify. These latter may be included in the college union building because there is no easy access to such services in the community immediately surrounding the campus. Or such services may be included in the college union building because it is believed that they will provide additional revenue necessary to its support. The argument is occasionally made that such services attract students to the building and lead to the use of other facilities and participation in the union's program.

Again we return to the suggestion that all facilities, services, and programs be necessary to the life of an educational community. Presumably all functions of the university and all of its resources would be expected to contribute directly or indirectly
to some educational purpose. Those advising on the planning of college unions have usually cautioned against the inclusion of facilities for services which could be equally well provided off the campus. On the other hand the need to provide convenient food service may justify the establishment of food service facilities as close to the student's residence as possible. Such facilities may in addition result in real savings to the student. Other facilities which provide for less basic needs if included in the plan of the union building for revenue-producing purposes may, because of labor costs beyond the control of the union or simply the need to make money on the facility, actually lead to little real savings for the student.

Another problem which relates to this principle is often referred to by the rather nebulous phrase, duplication of facilities. Much has been written in college union and university business publications in regard to the waste of money and personnel in the running of similar and competitive facilities or services on a campus. An illustration would be found in the construction of extensive dining facilities for contract feeding of residents in a new dormitory when adjacent to it is a college union building with a cafeteria running far under capacity, yet expected to be the major source of the union's income. While it would certainly be desirably to develop in the food service operations of the
campus, which usually involves the union, as well as in the programs which the union provides, a cooperative relationship among university agencies or departments providing the same service or program, the mere existence of similar facilities, services, or programs hardly justifies the charge of duplication. Such duplication becomes wasteful, however, when two or more departments or agencies are equipped and manned to provide the same facilities, services, or programs when one could do the job as well, or when one, for reasons of organizational effectiveness and economy, should retain sole responsibility. In many types of university facilities and services compromises must be made. The establishment of a main library and branch libraries is based simply on the needs for accessibility of books, though it would be obviously wasteful to maintain inventories in all branch libraries which duplicated that of the main library.

The problem of centralized versus decentralized maintenance of university buildings and properties also arises. Neither an attempt to have all work done by one large and versatile maintenance staff nor an attempt to employ in each major building a staff sufficient to take care of all its maintenance problems is satisfactory. The former would lead to inefficient and delayed service, especially on larger campuses, and the latter would lead to inevitable over-staffing and over-equipment. Unions, because of their physical complexity, are usually most effectively
served by a few of their own maintenance and repair employees, semi-skilled or skilled depending upon particular needs, and having tools sufficient only for the routine jobs. Skilled employees, such as carpenters, painters, and pipe-fitters, may be called in from the university's central service department for major tasks or those which demand specialized skills.

As this problem of duplication relates to program facilities, the question is not whether there are music listening rooms in the union, the library, or the department of music, but what students are permitted to use them, under what conditions, and at what times, and whether these provide adequately for the existing need. A particular facility may be essential to the university to implement a formal classroom program which is required, in which attendance is compulsory and credit is given, and where other conditions of a formalized program are present. On the other hand, similar facilities may be provided in a music room, a browsing library, a craft shop, or photographic darkroom which satisfy interests which for the average student are chiefly avocational. The student may participate voluntarily, at his leisure and in accordance with other time demands, and may pursue the interest as far as he wishes, joining with others who are likewise amateurs except in their keen desire to gain for themselves a fuller education. The argument returns again to the principles stated above. Does the service or facility or program enhance the life
of an educational community, provide for maturing experiences for the university students, or implement the specific educational objectives of the university?

As the purpose of the union is expressed in the life of the university and as additional responsibilities are placed on the union, it would seem helpful to have such working principles in mind and on paper. It should hardly need to be said that they be generally applicable to the wide range of problems and that they be capable of understanding and application by key members of the union staff, its governing board, and by those with whom the union works directly. While interpretation of these may be necessary as new situations or problems arise, basic decisions regarding the union's purpose should not require the individual and special knowledge of the attitudes and opinions of other administrative and staff personnel who may be involved. In practice, the participation of these people in the development of both the principles and the statement of purpose should, unless conflicts of authority become the main issue, lead to quick clarification and interpretation of the problems being faced. If the issue becomes one of conflicting authority or conflicting value, the greater good of the university probably will be served by having had as clear a conception as possible of the role of the union. The union, having contributed this much, may then have to rest its case and abide by the decision of higher authority.
Summary

Several questions have been posed which relate to the determination of the responsibility of the college union. Although the final chapter will suggest certain areas wherein the Ohio Union might well develop, its present operation may be reviewed in the light of the principles suggested.

1. The development of policies, services, and programs of the Union are in accord with the educational objectives of the University in so far as these have been made clear. The lack of public or other statements regarding the general task of the University, much less its responsibility in matters of student extracurricular life, has left the Union without authority or firm support for the development of unique educational programs, some of which will be discussed in the remainder of this chapter.

2. Many of the policies of the Union reflect the basic responsibility of the Union to the University community and primarily to students. By comparison most other large unions are more open to the charge of being too public, that is, more used by the general non-university communities in which they exist. For primarily financial reasons the Ohio Union serves a public relations interest of the University by acting as host to many conferences which have quite secondary relationships to the University. This function at present commands staff time and building facilities which might otherwise be directed toward the
service of the immediate university community and particularly the students whose opportunities to benefit from the Union are of brief duration. Notwithstanding the financial contribution derived from such conferences, there is often justifiable student resentment at the pre-emption of facilities by non-University groups. The solution may come only with the construction of an adult education or conference center.

3. With the exception mentioned above regarding the pre-occupation of key staff personnel with extra-campus events held in the Union, the optimum use of personnel has been characteristic of the management of the Union. Careful definition of responsibilities, high standards of efficiency, and close inter-division communication have helped to maintain operational effectiveness at a high level. Pressures do result from these factors, however. When combined with a need for economy and the consequent shortage of personnel, the result is often the neglect of continued training for both staff and line employees, of research which is essential to self-analysis and planning, and of factors which are conducive to high morale.

4. The relationships between the Union and other departments has tended to provide for optimum use of physical facilities and resources. In most instances facilities similar to those in the Union are not found elsewhere on the campus. In certain cases, of which an all-campus dance would be an example, University
regulations require that the ballrooms of the Union be used. Exceptions provide interesting examples, however. One of these is the use of space outside of the Union for Union-sponsored dance instruction programs. The rental of Union space would necessitate prohibitive student registration fees, whereas space and janitorial service is available elsewhere on campus at no charge. This again emphasizes the practice of indirect subsidy to certain buildings providing for extracurricular use as contrasted with the Union's policy of self-support.

5. Regarding the desirability of the facilities, services, and programs for the life of the University community, the Union has filled a needed role. It was designed to provide for services and include facilities which were badly needed on the campus. The extensive use of the building has borne out the adequacy of the plan. The program while remaining exploratory has been intended to provide for group and individual interests on both a participant and spectator basis in the arts, music, recreation, and other interest areas. Deliberately planned to exclude facilities or offices which would be under the supervision of other University departments, the Union has been in all of its responsibilities under the authority of its director. Coordination of all of its functions under one staff has helped to avoid problems of wasteful duplication of effort within the building and allowed a singleness of purpose and non-partisan cooperation with other departments.
PART V  THE CURRICULUM AND THE EXTRACURRICULUM

The original unions at Oxford and Cambridge, while organized independent of their universities, might well have been considered academic in their approach to the study and disputation of all kinds of topics of timely as well as often timeless interest. Austerely by contemporary standards, they consisted first of all of a place to debate and a place to keep the books and reference materials so needed by their members. The librarian held a most honored position among the members. The distinctions between freedom of thought, sanctioned by the university, and freedom of expression encouraged by the union led to relationships between the two institutions which were hardly cooperative. As has been earlier pointed out, the development of later English unions presaged what the college union as transplanted to the United States was to become.

The evolution of the college union in the United States from the turn of the century until just prior to World War II was influenced primarily by a concern that there be social centers on university campuses which should provide a wholesome place for meetings and recreation where the student, to paraphrase statements of various universities and university presidents, could engage in harmless activity, and to put the matter simply, "let off steam." The transition of college unions from social clubs to institutions
whose task at least had an indirect bearing on the curricular life of the university grew out of two almost inseparable trends. The first of these was the development of what is now so commonly accepted as the student personnel point of view, in which the student came to be viewed as a totality in relation to his whole university environment. The second trend was the greatly increasing variety of curricular offerings of the university and the concomitant growth in the variety of possibilities provided by the versatile facilities of the college union. The gradual disappearance of the feeling that college unions were an attractive escape and student activities an instrument of some anti-academic devil led to the recognition by university administrators and some faculty members that opportunities provided through the union could supplement indirectly and, until only recently, unofficially the work of the classroom.

The studies of both Tinney\(^8\) and Wolf\(^9\) have concentrated attention on the relationship between the curriculum and the extracurriculum. The latter writes, "The college union in close cooperation with other university departments can give training on a credit basis. By the very nature of its operation, the union can

\(^8\) Tinney, "The Educational Role of the College Union," p. 20.

be a natural laboratory for certain courses taught on the campus. As Wolf suggests, students majoring in institutional management in a home economics department might find great value in working for credit in the food or hotel operations of the unions. Students majoring in recreational leadership might do likewise in related areas, either as participants or paid volunteer leaders.

Depending upon the availability of union or departmental staff personnel for cooperative supervision of students working in the union, such a relationship might be established with many departments. There are numerous obvious relationships between the resources of departments of music and the arts and the primarily avocational interests pursued by many students in these activities in the union. In general, however, the student's participation in the relationship might take two paths. In one, the student would actually be assuming employee responsibilities under supervision in work definitely related to his curriculum and vocational objective. Assuming that this work were required, he doubtless would receive laboratory credit for it and might be paid in addition.

Another approach would be that in which the student, on a purely voluntary basis and in acceptance of the open invitation of the union to students in certain curricular areas, assumed committee member or chairmanship responsibilities in activities

10 Ibid.
which would quite directly supplement his curricular interests. The latter relationship is currently the more common and is ordinarily the coincidental rather than the deliberate result of the union's attempt to point out to students the types of activities involving learning experiences related to their curricula.

The suggestion that a more formal relationship be established between the union and various academic departments, either by providing accredited work opportunities or officially encouraging their participation in particular activities may raise the question of distinctions made between those students and those who are participating on a purely voluntary and informal basis. There certainly should be no feeling on the part of students who have a purely avocational interest in a particular activity that students majoring in the field and receiving official sanction for their participation would receive priority of opportunity or guidance. It is the freedom of selection and the voluntary nature of student activities which for many students provide the greatest intellectual and emotional satisfaction. Indeed, while many students are interested in obtaining practical experience in matters related to classroom study and their vocational training, others feel the need to develop skills and have experiences in the union unrelated to their specific curriculum.

In her questionnaire study of the educational role of college
unions, Tinney reported a response from 71 colleges and universities offering 530 experiences to students in college unions which supplemented or complemented credit course work. These 530 experiences were not necessarily different experiences. Forty-four or 8.3 per cent were for credit. Sixty-nine or 13 per cent were for remuneration. There were 109, or 21 per cent, supervised by academic instructors who were not members of the union staff. By far the largest majority of these experiences, 495 or 93.4 per cent, were supervised by college union staff members. In effect, therefore, it might only be concluded that the relationship between the curriculum and the extracurricular experiences which were denoted as educational experiences was unofficial or even coincidental in over 93 per cent of the cases. Remembering that these experiences were deemed to have educational implications for the curriculum, the study reveals an area which invites experimentation.

It is the experience of the Ohio Union and doubtless many others that students may participate in various activities such as accounting, advertising, and art gallery administration, these being areas listed by Tinney, which may be closely allied to their curriculum. It seems, however, that the relationship is as often coincidental as intentional, participation usually being determined by the amount of time a student can give to the activity, when the

\[11\] Tinney, p. 29.
time is required, the persons with whom he will be working, pre-
college experience in a similar activity, or a complex of these
and other factors. A case may be made for the value of a student
with rather stable curricular interests and well fixed vocational
goals seeking practical experience in a related student activity.
It might also be argued, however, that students occasionally
change their major field of study on the basis of experience
in related activities which have proved unsatisfying. The effect
of participation in an activity which requires certain skills or
attitudes may be the same as the effect of field work experience
related to a given curriculum and vocational goal. The student's
conception of the vocation toward which the curriculum leads
simply changes as practical experience increases.

Other changes in the field of study may result from the
satisfactions found in completely new and different responsibil-
ties of a particular activity which suggest to the student
potential interest in another curriculum. These comments, based
wholly on the writer's observations, perhaps do more to suggest
needed areas for research than to question Tinney's proposal that
a closer official relationship is needed between the curriculum
and the extracurriculum. As is indicated elsewhere in this section
there is much to be gained in certain areas where the relationship
of the extracurricular activity and the curriculum is a naturally
complementary one. In other areas the content and objective of
the activity and the expectations and motivation of the student indicate the desirability of separation of the curriculum and the extracurriculum. The great need in many areas is to make the student activity more soundly educational without making it scheduled, accredited, or required. Presumably any university wants to make optimum use of all its educational facilities and personnel, but the finest educational opportunities may be provided by recognising and valuing the distinctions between the opportunities provided by the classroom and those provided by the union. The justification for the existence of either the classroom or the union need not be sought in the capacity of one to do some of the other's job.

Another basic problem which relates to the development of closer relationships between extracurricular and curricular programs is summarized in a quotation from Tinney:

As high standards of academic training and experience should be demanded of the college union staff as any faculty member of the college or university, because whether or not it is defined as part of their responsibility, the reality of the situation is that the college union staff members are teaching and influencing the professional experience and knowledge of students.\(^\text{12}\)

Considering that the college student gives about as much time to leisure time pursuits as he does to study responsibilities, it is interesting that there has not been more insistence by those

---

\(^\text{12}\) Tinney, p. 32.
involved in the specifically academic responsibilities of the college that union staff members and others primarily responsible for student activities give evidence of specialised training and experience for this work in order not to negate in the time that they spend with a student the benefits the student presumably derives from the classroom. Granting that the union staff member must be a generalist, experienced but certainly not highly specialised in a great many areas, it could not be expected that highly technical supervision could be given to students of various activities. It should be expected, however, that he would be perceptive of the general problems and approaches in various fields of study in which the union could provide laboratory opportunities and that he could communicate with faculty members in those areas. Again, it should be remembered that such an arrangement would considerably change the nature of the satisfactions, motivation and values that many students find in their experience in student organisations. It might also be surmised that many faculty members would have no desire to become directly involved in this type of official supervisory relationship. In many instances they, like the students, feel the need for extra-curricular diversion and satisfaction not found in their professional or academic fields. In other cases they feel that students should be freed from any semblance of authority or requirement in their leisure time activities. As a matter of further research,
it would be of interest to know whether the faculty advisory relationship with student organizations would not be found to be most wholesome in organizations which had the least in common with the faculty advisor's teaching field. One might speculate that the advisory interest of a faculty member in such organizations would be as nearly avocational for the advisor as it is for the students and that therefore student members and professors would share a common interest with a minimum of distinction made among the participants brought about by virtue of official position in the university or age.

Further, in fairness to the many faculty members who devote their abilities and long hours to the assistance of extracurricular groups, it should be no more expected that the average faculty member be any better prepared to deal with the problems of such organizations than the average student activities director is to provide the specialized teaching skills which the classroom demands.

In as much as the nature of the preparation of college union staff members has a direct bearing on the future development of college unions and will determine the extent to which unions are consciously and effectively educational institutions, the matter of their educational preparation, experience, and general aptitude for union work is crucial. The union is only in a position to assume educational responsibilities and request recognition for its
staff members that academic or teaching personnel possess if they are comparable in general competence. Here again the university's conception of the student and its responsibility for the total educational environment, in and out of the classroom, is the key. The conception of extracurricular activities purely as a means of emotional catharsis is, while still current in the minds of some, too inadequate and negative a conception of a potentially fruitful area to merit comment. The concept of the place of student activities, however, affects the values students find in them, the general morale of the student body, and the caliber of the professional leadership which can be attracted to the university's program in this area. This in turn involves the university's insistence on academic preparation or comparable experience and its provision of comparable salary and rank, these and other factors being evidence of the recognition of the educational legitimacy of extracurricular activities. The union does provide educational experiences which faculty members might utilize in a supplementary way, and the college union staff members must be as well prepared in their own field as faculty members are in their to explore the relationship. There is a need, in addition, to focus the attention of both students and faculty members on the innumerable opportunities to develop problem-solving abilities, self-understanding, cooperative skills, and lasting attitudes and
values which may transcend the work of any organization or class assignment and lead simply, or profoundly, to more effective living.

The problem which the union has to solve in this respect is that of how to interpret to the university community, and particularly to the student, the benefits of participation in extracurricular activities. It seems trite to emphasize the need of reaching those with no membership in a student activity group, for these students would, of course, be members if they recognized the advantages. Such an easy answer, however, assumes that all students have equal opportunity for participation, that programs presently established appeal equally to all, and that residential groupings and geographic problems, particularly on the large campus, have no effect on the likelihood of participation by the student. There is little doubt on the part of union staff members who work with students in these experiences that participation is educative. The statements of students participating indicate that they are aware of specific benefits in their experience.

In agreement with Tinney's recommendation that a reexamination and broadening of the educational role of the union would lead to the integration of the theory of the classroom with the practical experience provided by student activities, the reexamination must obviously be a joint project in which union staff members and faculty and administrative leaders join. Major changes, it
seems, will come only with the recognition of: (1) the sheer amount of time which students spend in leisure time activities and the fact that this time may be either wastefully dissipated or productively used in ways which contribute to the student's total growth and education; (2) the time now spent in extraclass activities that could be educationally more productive if more, more available, and more competent advisory personnel were employed; and (3) the many areas in which the union laboratory-classroom program of experimentation might lead to more effective and more rapid teaching and learning.

With most universities hard pressed financially, it will doubtless depend on college union staffs to provide the evidence which justifies expenditures for additional personnel. Just as ambivalent and conflicting goals render the individual ineffective, so many college unions are caught with their own contradictory objectives. On the one hand they must support themselves financially, a necessity which leads to a priority of concern for the commercial management of the union. On the other hand, presuming to exist for a basically educational purpose, they must recognize a responsibility to provide services and educational opportunities for which there is no cash return or which are at least non-profit in nature. While similar in organization, administrative and personnel practice, and other respects to institutions of business
and industry, college unions, with one exception of which the writer knows, have not allowed time or money for research on the needs or accomplishments in the areas in which some sort of balance sheet is most needed, namely the educational areas. A good business studies the effect of the intangibles. A good college union should and with a little staff help could. In this regard, the suggestion of Porter Butts, director of the Wisconsin Memorial Union at the University of Wisconsin, is pertinent. Says Butts, "Most Unions would settle for the number of staff assistants the college employs to coach 50 men on the football squad."\textsuperscript{13}

In providing evidence of the educational value of many of the activities of a college union, particularly as these activities relate to the union's and the university's shared objective of training for citizenship, a recently completed study by Minahan\textsuperscript{14} is provocative. The research, conducted at the University of Wisconsin and in no way identified with the Wisconsin Union in its methodology, showed that participation in activities at the Wisconsin Union was in many cases almost the sole influence on the


development of particular skills found necessary to the student in his vocational and community life. Other conservative but convincing results indicated the great educational benefits derived by those participating in union activities under the guidance of trained personnel, as opposed to those participating in activities for which no staff guidance was available.

In this section it has been emphasized that one of the least explored of the union's potential responsibilities is in the area of developing closer cooperation between the curriculum and the extracurriculum. From the problems related to this development it has been suggested that, while not all students need be involved in organized student activities, the amount of time spent by the student outside of the classroom justifies giving greater attention to the provision of more productive extracurricular opportunities. Related to this is the increasing evidence that college unions can supplement the curriculum and the general objectives of the university if properly staffed. A yet to be studied area would concern the integration of teaching theory and methodology and subject matter content in specific curricular areas with opportunities in related areas in the extracurricular program. While it is the belief of this writer that such cooperation need not lead to laboratory or academic credit, such a relationship between the curriculum and the extracurriculum should prove helpful to the
student who wished to coordinate his program in the two areas
and would doubtless lead to an interchange of ideas and experience
beneficial to both the classroom instructor and the activities
counselor.
PART VI TRAINING FOR CITIZENSHIP

The working experience of a student in the college union should lead to his understanding of the concept that responsible participation in the life of the community is the obligation of those who have received the privileges of an education. While there is no doubt that many students expect a college education to give them monetary advantage as job holders and while there are those on the staff of the university who may reinforce this type of motivation, no university can profess to train for citizenship or instill ideals of democracy without challenging the adequacy of this idea.

Tinney in her study raises the question of what opportunities are available for the implementation of citizenship education in the college union. Her first question is: "Are students on your campus given an opportunity to work with community organizations? Please describe."\(^{15}\) While 75 union directors or 87 per cent of the respondents indicated that such opportunities were offered, the nature, duration, and value of such work is anyone's guess. The fact that a particular fraternity, sorority, or other student organization sponsors a Christmas party for a county children's home may only suggest the inadequacy of the conception of a social need in the community and perpetuate a fairy godmother

\(^{15}\) Tinney, p. 36.
principle of action which is often more detrimental than beneficial to the persons involved. This is one of the more unfortunate elements in the nationally proclaimed fraternity programs to have all members, or at least those under duress of their pledge-ship, help the under-privileged in the community. While some such activities are well planned and of the continuing sort that allows the growth of insight into the problems of community organizations, the primary motivation for many is the superficial self-satisfaction of the "do good" organization, and the result an undermining of the self-respect of those being helped.

Likewise, the value in citizenship education of organizing students as participants and solicitors in a community chest campaign on one hand and the listing of the dates of such a campaign or event in the union calendar on the other are not comparable. There is a difference between sponsoring an annual coffee hour for international students at which, too often, only international students appear, and a continuing effort to integrate foreign students in established union activities or carry on a regular program in which they share in social and work activities with American students. There is likewise a distinction to be made between programs on the way the United Nations Organization works and programs which tackle on a local scale the kinds of problems facing the United Nations.

While Tinney points out the many opportunities for
participation in these and related activities, qualitative
distinctions are not made nor is there evidence that many unions
approach this area of responsibility with clear objectives or
plans developed in cooperation with others in the university.

Education for citizenship in the union may mean the
encouragement of public debate and forums on problems more timely
and real than the necessity of voting in a national election,
problems which are disturbing to the local university status quo,
and problems which in the most real sense demand the gathering of
information, clarification of ideas, adoption of policy, and
formation of specific courses of action. It might be expected
that wholesome debate on an endless variety of issues would most
often take place in a building where the most diverse elements of
the university community are cordially welcome. We may look as
far back as the Cambridge (1815) or Oxford (1823) union debates
for a precedent for such an activity, or we may consider it in
its broader outlines as the expected outcome in the activity of
an organization which calls itself a union and which in a seeming
paradox can or should embolden each to present in civil ways his
views through debate, through committee planning, through student-
faculty forums, or through the policies in governing boards of
the university in a social and educational context wherein common
pride, purpose, and hope give the reassurance of personal security
and acceptance whatever the issue. Encouragement of the exchange
of ideas must be a sincerely expressed working principle or it will soon become recognized as a means of manipulation and a matter of make-believe democracy, revealing as it does most quickly the real values of the organization or the institution.

While it is possible that a very legitimate required classroom course might be established to encourage the thinking and action relative to the responsibilities of citizenship, efforts to do this have often been suspect, and proponents of such a course accused of attempts to indoctrinate. This may suggest a possibility of an interdepartmental program sponsored in the union which would consist of: (1) a study or discussion of the nature of the community and its citizens; and (2) a critique of the current practice of citizenship as it applies to the university community. This might include an analysis of responsibilities, privileges, and requirements of individual members, a review of the organization and authority of the university and its departmental elements, and the nature of government as it relates to the various types of committees, boards, agencies, and other groups within the university community. The net result would certainly be a clearer understanding of the citizenship responsibilities within one type of society, doubtless an increased loyalty to the university community, and a more positive and personal relationship to its problems wherever they touched the life of the student.
Again, Timney, in addition to emphasizing that the high
interest in citizenship education is a comparatively new thing,
states that if the unions are

to assume an educational role in relation to
citizenship education, concept and theory should
be re-examined and effort put forth to use the
available assets for implementation of a deliber-
ate program in citizenship education. This could
mean enlarging the staff of the union, but if the
union has a responsibility in this area, then its
standard of performance should equal that of any
other college department or activity.10

Whether or not the unions become more seriously interested
in citizenship education depends both on the strength of the
statesmanship offered by unions in providing both a rational and
an acceptable program in this area, and secondly, and paradoxi-
cally, whether or not the scope of what might be generally consid-
ered citizenship education is too broad and has too many contro-
versial implications to jibe with the traditional behavior of the
particular university. It is taken for granted that the values
inherent in democratic participation and action relating to
university policies which directly affect the lives of the students
become most easily apparent to the average student. As a matter
of pedagogy the learning experience in this area would be most
immediately productive. It would follow, however, that issues
which affect the life of the nation would also provide focal
points for debate, even though the possibility of action or the
effect on the life of the student citizen might be more remote.
An example of a program of citizenship education might involve a television program concerning an issue of major import such as the Army-McCarthy hearings, the Kefauver crime hearings, the announcement of a national policy by the Secretary of State, political conventions, or a debate in the United Nations Assembly. To provide this much, the union and university make no educational commitment and assume no basic educational responsibility, with the possible exception of allowing the program to be turned on. The only material and direct effect on the union and the university is the expense for electricity and the wear and tear on the furniture used by those in attendance. However, a brief introductory forum prior to the program, an analysis or critique of the background of the issue involved, and an estimate by experts on the potential effects of the event on the national or local community, if interspersed with coffee and doughnuts, on-the-spot Gallup polls, and questions and discussion should provide a learning experience of the first order. Unlike the classroom, those in attendance would be more diverse in their own experience and interest and less inhibited in their participation. Such an event is impossible, however, if the university frowns on the participation by professors in activities of a controversial nature outside their classrooms or if the union's policies relating to the use of its facilities are too restrictive to allow for
arrangements conducive to the desired effect. At such a point both the university and the union must determine their priorities on both principles and precedents. If the university is the educational institution it purports to be and if the union is an integral part of it with basic educational responsibilities, such programs will be a possible implementation of the role the union plays in its citizenship education.

An area so full of implications for the college union deserves fuller treatment than it is given here. The university's and the union's responsibility to train for citizenship is so frequently given lip service and so infrequently given serious attention that anything less than extensive treatment might have the effect of lessening the importance of the matter. There is little doubt that many students acquire both knowledge and attitudes conducive to good citizenship while in college. Participation in student activities provides many benefits which would not be difficult to define. Student governments may be the most obvious examples of organizations through which the student may assume responsibility, exercise duties and enjoy the privileges of assisting through legislative and other means to improve the life of the student community. However, as an agency for citizenship training student government, while often enjoying authority commensurate with proven responsibility, is often wrapped in a
dilemma which is of as much concern to the administration and faculty as it is to the student body. The effectiveness of the role which student government plays is usually measured by the student in terms of an impressive and recent achievement, rather than the continuing, time-consuming, and major responsibilities which the student government exercises through student courts, councils, and joint faculty or administrative committees. The university administration, on the other hand, while professing an interest in student government, recognises that it is ultimately and publicly responsible for the actions of the student body and that authority once given to a student government is difficult to withdraw. Further, the administration recognises that the student, as one whose whole life reflects change and an appreciation for it, may often be excited about things which are assumed to be peacefully under control.

With no further attempt to describe here a hypothetical program of citizenship training, it seems obvious that the hope of any program of citizenship training, formal or informal, having much chance of success is based on student citizens in the educational community having opportunities wherein they may demonstrate responsibility in participating in the affairs of the educational community. While size, selectivity of the student body, and numerous factors will dictate the nature of any program, the
university, if it is convinced that it should be a training ground for citizens, can invite the participation of students in the numerous committees, councils, and boards which are continually doing things which affect the lives of the students.
PART VII THE UNION'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE STUDENT

Almost all that has been written so far has been related, at least indirectly, to the union's relationship to the student. The purpose of this section will be to point out in brief areas of concern which involve, although perhaps in less noticeable ways, the type of relationship the student may have with his union and the kind of benefits it may attempt to provide.

Of the many educational responsibilities ascribed to the college union, the area in which success has been taken most for granted has been that of encouraging personal development of students. However difficult it may be to measure the benefits of the many social and recreational opportunities which the union provides, few college union staff members would deny the contribution these have made to the student's personal development, his acquisition of social and vocational skills, and his increased capacity to understand others. It is difficult to measure this type of growth, much less determine the degree to which the college union has been a factor in it. Furthermore, some may be reluctant to write about the union's working philosophy or its conception of the student, believing it better to be satisfied with day to day evidence of results than to be caught attempting to implement high-minded theory or isolate variables in an experimental study. In fact, 187
however, the orientation of staff members, the training of student leaders for union committees, the policies which are made public, the private relations of individual staff members, and the public relations of the whole union express either in a clear or confused way the union's attempt to contribute to the individual development of the student. It is distressing to note that Timney received little response from the directors of unions throughout the country when she asked how they felt their unions were contributing to the personal growth and development of students. Assuming that any director who has normal pride in the operation of his building would inevitably bias his answer to the question, the more striking fact is that apparently no attempt had been made by the directors to ask students how they felt the college union had contributed to their development. Although this matter is at the heart of the union program, Timney reports that "the thinking in the area is either meager or there is poor articulation as to how the contributions are actually implemented by means of the program." The intangible nature of the elements of the problem are too often of little concern to those more experienced in and interested in working with the tangible elements of the physical and financial operation of the union building. It can certainly be assumed that many staffs hold to unwritten, yet pervasive points of view regarding their basic relationships with

17 Timney, pp. 69-70.
students. It is obvious, however, that within other union staffs, student-staff relationships on identical problems vary in ways which can only lead to conflict in the mind of the student and disagreement among staff members. Attempts to resolve the problem are often fruitless because the attention is usually focused on details of the particular situation or issue and not on the basic difference of perspective or approach.

Whether and how a college union staff attempts to study its contribution to the personal growth of students will depend upon the size and training of the staff and, of course, the conviction of the director as to the value of spending time or money on such a matter. It is conceivable that a series of meetings or a half-day conference with faculty members from sociology, psychology, social administration, or personnel departments might provide a clearer understanding of the nature of the college age individual, group work principles, and human relations in an institutional setting which would be helpful to all. In addition to providing a theoretical basis for much of the work done by the staff, the critical view of an outsider might lead to the revision of policies or practices which, however well intended, frustrate the achievement of desired goals.

Numerous basic questions might be raised periodically by any union staff member in his own staff meetings. What is the
difference between the needs and the wants of the students? What is the nature of the relationship of the student to an institution, such as the union, which must necessarily consider the welfare of all students as well as the individual's desires? When one thinks of students, does he refer to the comparatively small minority of students who participate as leaders or members of the major student organizations with which he comes in contact? Or is he thinking of the mythical average student who, however mythical, nonetheless requires us to think of someone quite unlike those we may know best? Are his expectations of students-in-general determined by standards or capabilities of the leader or the average student?

What is the nature of his relationship with the individual student? Did he advise him, almost a total stranger, on a personal problem or on where he could get help on the campus? Perhaps he saw him only to ask that he remove his hat in the union grill room. How did he approach the matter and what was the student's reaction? Did he discuss with him a new and perhaps to the staff member implausible idea, and how did he help the student to examine the idea? If he said "no" to some request as a matter of policy, did he effectively explain the context for the policy? Was the student convinced of its fairness? Was the staff member?

Keeping in mind the ideal notions of the union being the hearthstone of the university and the home away from home, one must
ask himself what kind of effective compromise can be made between
the kind of relationship which the student has developed in what
one would hope was a happy and wholesome home and the kind of
relationship the student should have with a large organization
which, despite the friendliness of many of its staff members,
may be impersonal and complex, and necessarily require of him
behavior more adapted to a much used semi-public building than the
living room of a home. Almost any day in a busy union will yield
illustrations of the manner in which these informal yet important
relationships are established. Discussions of the college union's
responsibility for the teaching of social graces likewise include
references to these. The helplessness of the union staff member
who has naively suggested, "You don't do that at home, do you?"
and received a "yes" answer is familiar to many.

The warmth and congeniality of the union is often hard to
maintain, particularly in the large union and particularly as it
affects the casual user of the building. The relationship must be
recognized as something quite different from the relationship
established even in what would be assumed were better homes. While
some occasions demand friendly firmness, the importance of estab-
lishing non-authoritative relationships cannot be over emphasized.
Assuming that all college union staff members or employees are
normally adjusted people, even an occasion to converse on the
weather or give information may result in a personal and emotional involvement which does much to strip the institutional veneer from the student's frequent conception of the union. An extension of this type of experience may be found in the numerous relationships of individual members of the campus community to the union, or in an experience of the whole student body celebrating in a single event something of significance to the whole university. The results are the unity of the campus and the fulfillment of the hopes and goals which gave the college union its name.

Beyond the casual and completely unstructured relationships which the union staff may have with individual students are the basic and continuing relationships which may lead to the development of lasting skills and attitudes. These may derive from regular participation in union programs, use of certain facilities such as a music listening room, membership responsibilities in a student organisation which is housed in the union, or responsibilities on the union's own governing board or committees.

If the maturing student later recognizes the value of one kind of direction in the classroom or laboratory, he may also recognize that the free time activities to which the university gives sanction or support yield values gained through self-direction. These latter benefits arise through a combination of factors. For example, areas in which the student works in an activity are ones in which
results are not as specifically required at certain intervals, and are not evaluated so definitively or with consequences which determine his continued enrollment. The nature of most of these activities is such that self-government on an individual as well as group level is encouraged. The group, or the individual, either within or apart from any group, may determine the task to be undertaken, when it is to be completed, and by what means.

Self-government thus becomes a process not by which student legislative groups within the jurisdictional bounds determined by the university administration act on matters of student interest, but by which students are free to: identify in various situations their personal assets and liabilities; determine their own needs, both immediate and remote; and, utilizing fact and experience, select and pursue courses of action. Self-governing activities might better describe the process. Evidence of the educational benefits which accrue may be either obvious or, with the exception of the student and possibly an advisor, almost impossible to detect.

An example of the former might involve a student taking an occupational therapy curriculum. Knowing the therapeutic value of hand-craft arts he recognizes the limited opportunity or facilities for the development of his own skills in this area within the required curriculum. He anticipates and identifies the need of his future patient and seeks to meet the inadequacy in his own
vocational preparation by leisure time use of a college union craft shop. In addition to the motivation arising from this vocational objective he finds that motivation also arises out of satisfactions from tangible and immediate results. He acquires familiarity with previously unfamiliar tools. He learns to appreciate distinctions between the completion of an object in which the conception, design, and manipulation of tools and materials have been completely his own and the objects of mass production which he might find in a store. Likewise, other by-products derive from experience.

An example of the second type of educational benefit may seem less exciting to someone who mistakenly expects to find observable results in every phase of student activities. It simply involves the student who for reasons not fully known to himself assumes a responsibility, begins to inquire into his ability to fulfill it, questions his motivation for having assumed it, and ends the experience with a more conscious and mature picture of himself and what life means to him. There is little doubt that good counseling may precipitate the occasions on which the student becomes consciously aware of what is troubling him. Other factors which may initiate the experience or temporarily frustrate it may relate to the insight and maturity of individuals with whom the student is associated in a group, the roles he unconsciously plays as a student, a fraternity man, a campus leader, or an
activity man. The whole area suggests research on the nature and frequency of such experiences.

While students participating in organized student activities testify to these growth experiences being of primary value in their participation, the question may be raised as to whether the participant would be able to identify the resulting insights or their significance any better than the non-participant. On the basis of observation, the writer would say that the participant could, and for his own benefit, does. His total development, however, may have prepared him for this with the complex of conditions surrounding his participation in activities being merely catalytic in their effect.

The contribution the union is able to make to the personal development of the student is essentially two-fold. It provides certain facilities or services which meet student needs or allow the development or expression of interests on a self-service basis. It also often provides through its staff highly personalized assistance to both individuals and groups on matters which range from the planning of a banquet or art exhibit to counseling on personal problems. The extent of this contribution in any form is directly related to the university's total effort in providing for the extracurricular life of its students. The unique position of the college union as the center for all types of activities
makes it a natural laboratory for the study of conditions which stimulate personal growth. While many intangible factors involved in the problem have been obvious deterrents to its study, results from even exploratory research would probably suggest new approaches for union programs and point out the significant aspects in all types of informal relationships between students and the union.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND POSSIBILITIES FOR THE FUTURE

While the brief review of the history of college unions has been one phase of this study, two other objectives have been dominant. One of these, the history of the Ohio Union, has been primarily factual. The other, the analysis and discussion of various trends and problems of the contemporary college union, has been primarily speculative. In addition to a summary of these phases of the study, an attempt will be made in this chapter to outline for the future of the Ohio Union certain possibilities which seem to be implicit in Chapter IV on the relation of the union to the university.

Besides providing a starting place for the history of college unions, the Oxford and Cambridge Unions reveal the nature of the university's relationship to the student throughout much of the 19th Century. While the chronological distance between the English unions and those founded at Harvard and the University of Pennsylvania at the turn of this century is great, the initiative of the students in developing clubs to meet their needs is apparent in the history of each of these unions. The founding of Houston Hall at Pennsylvania, however, brought out the concern of the American university for such organizations and their possibilities. It brought the union into the university.

The evolution of college unions in the United States has been
divided into the club stage, the campus democracy stage, and the community recreation stage, and this writer shares with others the belief that Humphrey's classifications have proven helpful. All unions founded in any of these periods have tended to reflect contemporary needs of students, current educational concepts of the universities, and the social movements affecting the nation. The increasingly diverse educational and social backgrounds of students, the growth of enrollment in college and universities following World War I, the gradual development of student personnel services and philosophy, and specialization in the curriculum and in vocations for which students sought preparation posed the challenge to provide a means by which some sense of community of purpose and understanding could be provided on the campus. The rationale for establishment of many unions was derived from the recognition that the total environment of the university had effects on the student, for good or ill, and that every effort should be made to capitalize on extra-class experience. Positively stated, some found in student activities and self-government a training ground for citizenship. Others, struggling to interpret the meaning of their growing concern for the student, could at least say that a good union and the activities the students engaged in there was a wholesome outlet for energies which might otherwise go astray.
From a club era the union rapidly grew up in an era in which universities were encouraging students to provide for themselves the things which the universities could not effectively provide. Hence, the early concern of college union conferences for the encouragement of student self-government organizations. Gradually the union became what it is today, a sponsoring agency providing programs and facilities for all types of leisure time activity, a department of the university which may supplement officially or unofficially the work of the classroom, and the center for major social and recreational functions of an all-university nature.

The first Ohio Union, born in the club stage, remained for forty years a social center for men, typical of and a leader among others established during the period. Constructed solely by funds from the State Legislature, it represented a gift of the people of Ohio to their students. Serving at first a student body of only three thousand, proposals for a larger building were made periodically from 1921 until students successfully petitioned for a new building in 1946.

During the period of transition from 1946 until the new building opened in 1951, there was a development of student program committees which were responsible for programs officially sponsored by the new union. Unfortunately, no over-all plan for the co-ordination of the related programs of student organizations was worked out, with the result that the new union was left with the
responsibility, expressed in its purpose, of sponsoring only those programs which were not provided by other agencies or organizations.

Planned with the suggestions of many and providing excellent and versatile facilities, the use of the new building has been intensive, in certain areas reaching capacity. Any less use, at least of its revenue producing areas, would have prevented it from being a self-sustaining operation.

In addition to the opportunities for the development of self-confidence, responsibility, and the friendships which increase the student's capacity for human understanding, those actively engaged in the Union's program have found in the Union an organization through which they identify themselves with the University. As an outlet for service to the University they have also developed increased understanding of its problems and a greater pride in their relationship to it.

The discussion of various problems relating to the philosophy and administration of unions in Chapter IV, speculative and interpretive of trends in the development of college unions generally, provides the basis for the suggestion of future courses of development of the Ohio Union later in this chapter.

Obviously basic to the writer's convictions as well as to the study is the premise that the college union is an educational institution. It should not be called a college union otherwise. Its responsibility should be derived from the university's purpose
and its task should be directed primarily toward serving the students and other members of the immediate family of the university. As a building and organization receiving support predominantly from students, top priority of concern should go to the provision of opportunities and services for students which are, respectively, contributive to their development and education and essential to their basic living needs in the community. The student will probably have no comparable opportunity for the varied experiences a good college union can provide once he has left the campus. A corollary of this is that the union should not be expected, in order to completely support itself, to become a conference center for the general public, a hotel operation, or a building whose design, program, and policies are dominated or determined by commercial considerations.

If the union is initially established or can be reorganized to become an institution whose purposes are carefully related to those of the university, it will be able to contribute as a laboratory to various curricula and give practical expression to all kinds of ideas and interests. It may provide guidance for student organizations which should increase the benefits to students who are members and increase the number of students receiving benefits. It may offer to the campus a physical focal point for the experiences which bind together the many and diverse
human elements of the educational community. It can, thereby, make real the literal meaning of the word university.

Problem Areas and Future Possibilities

A. Financial Support

Basic to the solution of the problems or the achievement of objectives outlined below is the need to free the Union of the pressures resulting from its need to support itself. As stated in the manual on college union operation of the Association of College Unions:

To accomplish its over-all objectives it is important that the college so arrange the fundamental financing of the union - through an adequate student fee and other underwriting of non-revenue facilities - that the revenue department will not be under constant pressure to make a high marginal profit to pay for other building operating costs.¹

Considering the problem only from the Union's point of view, it is apparent that lesson number one in the operation of a union has been to date ignored. Efficient operation possible in a new building has minimized the extent of the problem. Alternatives for the future may be suggested, however.

1. Utilize cash reserves to relieve the current pressures to stay in the black. This would give immediate assistance in areas involving adequate maintenance, adequate staff, and adequate program, already affected by budgetary limitations.

There should be little expectation of receiving aid at a
time when the Union has reserves, however justified the basic
need for additional support may be.

2. Request diversion of sufficient funds from the present
Ohio Union fee to avoid further restrictions on the develop-
ment of the Union's services and programs. The amount of
the original loan for the construction of the building will be
paid off in about three years at the present rate of enroll-
ment. The question then to be considered will be whether the
University should continue to collect a fee, originally
requested by students for the construction of the Union, for
deposit to a rotary fund for general construction, or whether
this fee should be used for needed expansion and renovation,
for operation and programs, and for a branch union which may
eventually be required to serve a larger student body.

3. Related to the above, and assuming that the present Ohio
Union fee, recently incorporated in the general student fees,
loses its identity, would be the less desirable alternative
that the University make up the deficit annually incurred
through the operation of the building. The problems posed
by such an alternative for effective administration and
planning should be obvious.

4. A further alternative which could be put into effect at
any time would be an operational fee subsidy of a certain
amount per student per quarter. This is commonly practiced but of course does not alone suffice when major expenditures for expansion are necessary.

The writer believes that a combination of the first two alternatives is desirable. There probably would be no need for diversion of the full fee to an operational subsidy when the construction of the building is paid for unless major expansion were under way. It seems desirable that the use of the balance of the fee be fully understood by all, however.

B. Study of Student Activity Programs and Student Participation

The topsy-turvy development of student organizations and programs of the University might easily be contrasted with the apparently well-coordinated activity programs on certain other campuses. Two prominent examples are the University of Illinois and the University of Wisconsin at which the unions are the primary coordinating agencies for extracurricular activities. Such plans are looked on by some administrative officials at the Ohio State University with suspicion, but the plans suggest at least a careful study of existing conditions at the University. The Union, while in many respects caught in a gap-filling role, would hesitate to assume greater responsibilities unless such a study indicated that reorganization would make more available to more students the values of participation now available to a comparative few. The questions to be asked would relate to the possible areas of
cooperation in similar programs, the more effective advising of all groups, the evaluation of different types of programs for the types of skills and attitudes they foster, the effect of participation on the student, and the relationship between the curriculum and the extracurriculum.

At present several organizations are concerned with the extracurricular lives of students. The Council on Student Affairs, which gives official sanction to all student organizations, has numerous legislative, administrative and disciplinary duties which have prevented comprehensive study of the problem. Social Board as a subsidiary group which actually is authorized to review the total campus program has been concerned primarily with social regulations, their interpretation, and the scheduling of campus social functions. The University Student Personnel Council, although composed of the directors of student personnel agencies, the Vice-presidents of the University, the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women, and advisory to the President on extracurricular affairs, has in the last few years advised on nothing, received no requests to do anything, had no budget and no definite responsibility, and in consequence achieved little more than maintenance of the lines of communication among the offices represented.

Any of these groups could initiate such a study. Its success would depend upon the active cooperation of all of them and the full-time research leadership of a person familiar with the
organizational structure of the University and the jurisdictional problems which would bear directly on any realignment of authority and responsibility recommended as a result of the study.

The task of the director of the study and an executive planning committee would be:

1. To determine specific objectives of the study.
2. To develop methods to be followed by participating committees or organizations. This would involve criteria for evaluation of activities and procedure for surveys conducted.
3. To establish groups of representatives of organizations on the basis of the nature of the activities sponsored, and direct the committees thus formed in the evaluation of activities in their area, the analysis of the participation in them, and the formulation of recommendations for further action. The coordinating committee would also appoint consultants or special resource persons to assist in these area studies.
4. To relate the recommendations of the above study groups to:
   a. information regarding physical and financial resources available for development of certain types of programs
   b. the unmet needs and interests as determined by
a survey of the student body

5. To make recommendations to the Vice-president of Student Affairs and to the University bodies with authority to act regarding any areas in the extracurricular life of the campus in which realignment of responsibilities, the establishment of new organizations, the burial by common consent or withdrawal of the support of defunct ones, or the coordination or stimulation of existing organizations which might provide more effectively for more students.

6. To determine the need for a permanent office of a director of student activities, the responsibility of which would be to assist in the coordination and continued study of all student activity programs and the relation of these to the broader objectives of the University.

Areas which might be of particular interest to those responsible for the Union are listed below.

1. A basic problem related to topics mentioned below would be the development of a closer, if not official, relationship to the Union of certain organizations which depend heavily on the Union's facilities for their programs or sponsor programs similar to those it sponsors. Through such a relationship the Union might provide program consulting assistance which it does not now effectively provide or which it is not within its authority to provide. Mutual understanding of
the Union's and the other organization's needs should result in more effective programs.

2. Assistance could be given to those offices and agencies working with foreign students in encouraging the participation with American students in existing student organizations. Development of activities which will integrate rather than isolate the foreign student would contribute to the mutual education of all.

3. There should be co-operative planning of group leadership training programs. Such programs might involve an extension of the present Student Life Conference to include a series of seminars on leadership, on University problems and objectives, and the development of group work procedures peculiar to various types of organizations. If there is genuine concern on the part of University leaders for training for good citizenship, the result should be the participation of students on numerous faculty and administrative committees which deal primarily with matters affecting the life of the student.

4. The increasing number of dormitory programs planned in conjunction with other activities may suggest the need for the in-service training of dormitory personnel, student or staff, in the practice and philosophy of group work and recreational leadership. Provision might be made through
the Union staff for the co-ordination of such a program.

5. Development of a program of outdoor activities, bringing together those groups now sponsoring these, could receive organizational assistance through the Union. Continued efforts to establish a University camp, if successful, would offer stimulation to such activities.

6. Interdepartmental co-operation in many areas has already provided specialized help in the development of certain types of programs. Study of the activities which provide for the practical application of classroom knowledge would lead to additional ones. Departments with curricular offerings in the arts, music, journalism, photography, personnel, office management, recreation, speech and debate are obvious starting places.

The above areas are typical, not all-inclusive. The Union’s role in the development of the programs would in most cases be a co-operative one rather than one in which it had sole responsibility. Present staff limitations would preclude offering more than token assistance in any area. These suggestions are based on the availability of additional financial support for the Union and, of course, the assumption that the best utilization of the University’s physical and human resources as revealed by the suggested study would indicate that the Union should take the initiative. Should such a study not be feasible, but assuming more support for
additional Union staff members, the Union could still provide leadership in these and other areas.

Internal Union Development

More nearly within the control of the Union itself, but nonetheless also dependent upon increased financial support, are several possibilities which the writer believes deserve study and action.

1. A program of staff seminars led by faculty members representing such fields as psychology, sociology, recreation, public relations, business administration, and personnel management would broaden the viewpoint of staff members working on specialized tasks and would provide helpful outside views of the Union.

2. A graduate training program leading to a master's degree and preparatory to professional leadership in college unions should be developed in conjunction with one or more departments. This should involve work in group guidance and recreation, counseling, personnel management, business administration, and related subjects, the emphasis depending on the objectives of the student. Practical experience through graduate assistantships could be provided in all divisions of the Union.

3. More, and more adequate, consultation on the planning of all types of events in the Union should be provided. Staff
members particularly adept at working with students and their unceasing parade of new ideas should be able to reduce the rigidity of present planning restrictions, and encourage more creative and varied use of the facilities.

4. Faculty status and commensurate salaries should be sought for all staff members doing work comparable to faculty members elsewhere on the campus and having comparable training or experience. Both as a means of giving the University's recognition to the educational value of the work they are doing and of providing an attraction for the well qualified persons essential to the staff, such action seems necessary and justified.

5. Although some recent efforts have been made to develop a public relations program, this has been limited by lack of funds. The greatest proportion of expenditures made for this comes from the student program budget and this amount is hardly sufficient to advertise a million dollar a year enterprise. Money should be spent to earn money through revenue departments as well as to tell the story of the numerous facilities and free programs available to the University community. An adequate budget for all phases of a public relations program, including student-consumer research, seems essential.
In conclusion, the future development of the Union depends upon two fundamental and related factors. The first is the need for the financial support to do a more effective job in many as yet untouched areas. The second is the need to determine in cooperation with others just what those areas are and how the resources of the Union, its administrative structure and policies can be adapted to serve the needs of the campus community.
APPENDIX A.

ADDRESS OF GEORGE E. VINCENT

The earliest and most eloquent statement of the purpose of the college union known to the writer is the address of Professor George E. Vincent at the dedication and laying of the corner stone of the Reynolds Club of the University of Chicago on June 22, 1901. Following introductory remarks by President William Rainey Harper, Vincent, later to become the president of the University of Minnesota, delivered the following address.

Yonder stand laboratories devoted to the science of life; here we raise a building dedicated to the art of living. There day by day trained minds peer ever farther into the secrets of tissue and cell, but they will never lay bare the joys of comradeship which are to be housed here - the stimulus of wit, play, the fusing power of humor, the soft touch of sympathy, the thrill of common enthusiasm, the sturdy sense of loyalty to one's fellows.

The University takes pride in her laboratories, but she also covets for her students something of the charm of life in the cloisters and quadrangles of Oxford and Cambridge; she would in some sense preserve the democracy of the old-time New England campus; she would unite in a larger brotherhood all student groups, and foster among them a spirit of wider fraternity.

In the early days of our decennium there was much talk of college spirit, as of a commodity to be had somewhere, the gift perhaps of an enthusiastic donor. There were both humor and pathos in the eager effort to lay hands upon the intangible. We sang of "Old Haskell Door" before its varnish was yet dry, and of ivy-clad halls which stood in stony innocence like Eve before the fall.
ADDRESS OF GEORGE E. VINCENT, CONTINUED

Now we speak less of the spirit, for the thing itself has begun to inspire us. The social life of the University has organized itself into various groups, and these in turn are grouping toward unity. In all the circumstances this growth has been unusually rapid and stable. But the larger grouping has been hampered by lack of a rallying place. The organized clubs have had no social clearing-house, and many students living scattered through the great city area have looked to the University for a hearthstone and found only a radiator.

This ceremony is, therefore, full of meaning for the individual student, for the life of the University, and for the aims and ideals of the higher education generally. We are laying the foundations of no mere academic barracks or institution for homeless waifs. Here a friend provides a fit dwelling for the growing unity of the University. But upon you, students, rests the responsibility of building up day by day in this place a worthy standard of friendly courtesy, generous fellowship, and corporate loyalty. No outside influence can give much aid. Each one must contribute his best and feel an obligation to the whole. This building will offer opportunity and suggest possibilities, but you and your successors will give it character and determine its value. Shall it be a mere convenient resort, or shall it throb with the spirit of true democracy and reverberate with the cheers of a united and loyal student body? I have faith that your ideals and enthusiasm will make a worthy beginning.

This building will stand also as a symbol of the part which social contact plays in the higher education. So important is this deemed that as old conditions yield to new, conscious effort is made to preserve and foster the elements of comradeship. Education must cherish sentiment as well as train reason. To lose the just proportion is to fail. The unthinking enthusiast, swept away by every surge of feeling, is no more abnormal than the mechanized thinker, insulated from the currents of emotion which thrill the masses of mankind. Our times demand educated men who will think for themselves, criticize
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and at times resist, but nevertheless if they are to influence their fellows they, too, must know the deep and strong emotions which underlie the national life. College years with all their extravagances and absurdities are a school of co-operation, individual sacrifice, and loyalty to the group. The student who cynically or apathetically holds aloof loses more than passing pleasure. He loses the joy of companionship, the power to feel a common enthusiasm, to work for a common purpose. Until men make love by logic, until they rear their children from calculation, until policy spells patriotism, sentiment will fuse them together and inspire them to high endeavor.

Let us, then, on this academic soil dedicated to the social spirit, renew our vows of loyalty to our own University, to the larger commonwealth of learning, to our nation, and to mankind.¹

¹ The Reynolds Club of the University of Chicago. Published by the Executive Council of 1913-14. Oshkosh, Wisconsin: The Castle-Pierce Printing Co.
APPENDIX B.

1899 Y.M.C.A. STUDENT BUILDING PROPOSAL

The report of the Committee on Investigation of the Y.M.C.A. was the first comprehensive statement of the need for a student building and the spirit which motivated the members in their continued efforts to establish such a building. Culminating in the eventual construction of the Ohio Union, the planning done in the early campaigns of the organization revealed a more nearly co-educational conception for the building and, as this 1899 report indicates, quite accurately foretold the various types of facilities which were included in the construction of the Union one decade later. The report from the Y.M.C.A. Board minutes is here included in full.

Ohio State University

April 13th, 1899

At the last session of the Building Committee the following points were considered and determined.

1. That this is a favorable time to renew the building movement and to push it to completion.

2. That a permanent organization shall be formed at the next meeting.

3. That an outline of plans for the Student Canvass should be submitted and plans adopted.
1. That our needs, as regards size of building, rooms, arrangement, cost, etc., be stated in such form as to aid in the canvass.

The following is a suggested plan of renewing the Student Canvas for the Building Fund.

1. Presentation of the subject by one of the State or international officers.

2. A large committee of the Association will have charge of the personal canvass which will immediately follow. This committee will meet daily at 4:00 P.M. to report, make suggestions, etc., and each man will be given the opportunity to contribute.

3. The King's Daughters will have charge of the canvass among the young women and will proceed in a similar manner.

Preliminary statement for a plan for securing a building for the Young Men's Christian Association of Ohio State University.

April 13, 1899

I. The Need

In the student body of about 800 men, possibly 250 live in Columbus, 350 find their place in the city churches and 200 come under scarcely any (direct) Christian influence. The Association has an obligation to these men which cannot be met without an adequate equipment.

Social life is provided to 200 men through fraternities, probably 500 secure some social life through churches or other religious enterprises, while 200 have no provision for social liability under safe moral influences.

There is a tendency in all college life towards the social club idea. The moral and Christian forces
1899 Y.M.C.A. STUDENT BUILDING PROPOSAL, CONTINUED

of the college should provide wisely for this tendency.

Seven of the leading state universities (Iowa, Tennessee, California, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Missouri, Cornell) already have buildings in active and successful operation. In scarcely any one is there greater need than here.

A building is needed to unify the (general) student life and promote that healthful University spirit which is now interfered with by the division and geographical separation of students.

II. The Present Status

A canvass for a building fund was made in the Fall of 1892 when about $7900 was subscribed. Of this $1174 has been paid in and is on deposit at the Merchants and Manufacturers Bank. A conservative estimate would regard $3000 as collectable when the building promises to be secured. An effort is being made to locate all subscribers.

III. Suggested Plans for Renewing the Movement

(1) General Plan

The present time is considered favorable to prepare for definite action. The need is increasing and should be supplied at once. We feel that immediate action should be taken at once in securing plans enlarged from the design submitted by Mr. Burns of Dayton, providing a building to cost not less than $30,000, this building to be located on the campus through the authority of a building grant from the Trustees. The building would be administered by a Board of Trustees of the Young Men's Christian Association, through a General Secretary. This board would be elected by the Association and might be composed of nine members representing the Board of Trustees of the University, the faculty, and each collegiate class.
For the maintenance of the building there should be an endowment of at least $5000 ($10,000), college cooperation in heating and lighting, and a membership fee of perhaps $2.00 a year (not less than $3.00, in two payments $1.50 each semester).

(2) Committee

It seems desirable that a building committee be appointed by the president of the Association to lay plans at once for an active canvass to begin as early as possible, and to have direction of the building movement until the completed structure is turned over to the Board of Trustees. This committee might be composed of five students, two professors, one trustee, and one alumnus. (K. D. Hood)

(3) Canvass

1. We should desire to take up an active canvass of the student body this year if possible. Through mass meeting and personal solicitation conducted by the building committee each student should have the opportunity to contribute. We should hope to secure $5000 by this means.

2. This would be followed by a systematic effort to collect the contributions made in the canvass of 1892.

3. The committee would secure the remainder from some individual contributors through a canvass of the alumni and friends of the University.

We believe that the need is so great and the opportunity so real as to justify us in requesting authority from the Board of Trustees of the University to proceed at once; and in appealing to the president of the University for earnest cooperation.

Respectfully submitted,

V. H. Davis
W. E. Mann
H. F. Weld
Ray McCallum
Committee on Investigation
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Contents of Proposed Y.M.C.A. Building:

First Floor -

Auditorium with a seating capacity of 600
Three large parlors
General Secretary's office
Large reception hall with open stairway
Meeting room and rest room for the young women with toilet room
Cloak room

Second Floor -

Game room
Reading room
Four class rooms for Bible study classes
Parlor and individual bedrooms for secretary and president
Several small rooms for college organizations
Two or three suites of rooms as study and bedrooms

Basement -

Room for association meetings, capacity 150
Toilet room
Bicycle room
Storage room
Furnace and fuel room
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