Negative microfilm received from university 65–5357

NOFFSINGER, Mark George, 1924–
THE EVOLUTION OF STUDENT RIGHTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1964
Education, general

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE EVOLUTION OF STUDENT RIGHTS

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

by

Mark George Noffsinger

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Education in
The University of Michigan
1964

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Lester W. Anderson, Chairman
Professor Howard S. Bretsch
Professor James A. Lewis
Professor Clyde Vroman

PREFACE

This research is undertaken with the hope that a contribution may be made toward assisting people interested in the administration of universities to understand students and their unending search for privileges and rights. Further, it is intended that by understanding how a university may and does respond constructively to student requests, such administrators will be able to meet their responsibilities more effectively.

I am indebted to my colleagues in the Office of Student Affairs for their assistance in making materials available for my use. Two other men gave considerable help: Dr. Lionel H. Laing, who devoted years to working with students in addition to his teaching responsibilities, and Dr. Fred Wahr, who previously served as the first Assistant to the Dean of Students at the University.

My special thanks to the members of my committee, all of whom are busy working with students. Dr. Lester W. Anderson, chairman of the committee, has given much thoughtful, patient assistance, and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE		ii
CHAPTER		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background for the Study	1
	Specific Statement of the Problem	5
	Hypotheses	5
	Definitions	6
	Procedure	7
II.	HUMAN RIGHTS FOR STUDENTS TAKE ROOT	9
	The Educational Revival of the Early 1800's	9
	The Formation of a State University	11
	Early Concern for Human Rights	12
	The Government of the Students	12
	Early Student Organizations	15
	The Fraternity Controversy	16
	A New Constitution for the State	17
	The University's Concern for Student Morals	18
	The Students' Christian Association	19
	Elective System Introduced	20
	Dormitories Abolished	20
	Student Morality Examined and Defended	21
	Appeal to Student Help	24

Page

Post-Civil War Effects 24

The Admission of Women 25

A Common Code of Morals 28

Expansion of Elective System and the Students' Reaction 29

Admission by Diploma 30

A More Liberal Government for Students 32

A School for the Rich? 34

Looking to the Students 36

Evaluating the Progress 37

III. COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS

Establishment of the "Anti-Graft" Committee . . . 43

Financial Questions 44

The President Explains 45

The Right to Review 47

The Committee's Composition and Duties 48

Response of a Shocked Committee 49

The Students React 51

Committee Interference 53

A Student Council Proposal 54

Faculty Response 56

Senior Council: a Reality 57

A Bid for Power 59

Power to Recommend 60

Council Constitution Ratified 61

Campus Interest in Reform 62

The Committee Tightens its Grip 64

A Need for Unity of Policy 65

Page

Policy Explained to Students 67

Executive Committee Appointed 70

"Recognition" for Organizations 72

Positive Student Response 73

A Student Judiciary 75

The Committee and World War I 76

IV. OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS 79

Students' Status: 1920-1921 81

Student Organizations and Interests 83

Dean of Students 84

The Office and Policy 88

The Student Advisory Committee 89

University Committee on Discipline 93

Dean of Women 98

Women's Self-Government 99

Separate Offices 101

V. STUDENT GOVERNMENT DURING PROHIBITION, DEPRESSION, AND WAR

The Dean's Dilemma 105

Committee on Freshman Conduct 107

Freshmen Warned 109

As the Facts Were Told 110

It Happens Again 113

A Paradox 115

Another Episode 116

Hazing 119

Committee of Inquiry 121

Conditions and Attitudes 122

Page

A Reorganized Student Council 128

New Rules 130

Student Use of Automobiles 130

Early Automobile Ban 133

Reaction to Auto Ban 136

Changes in the Auto Ban 139

The Larger Michigan 140

Reorganization of the Committee on Student Affairs 142

The Question of Control 145

Concern for the Future of Student Council . . 146

Undergraduate Council 148

Another Change 152

World War II 155

Another Facet of Student Welfare 157

VI. IN THE HANDS OF THE STUDENTS

Origin of the First Post-War Student Government: Student Legislature 168

Student Legislature 169

Some Provisions of the Legislature's Constitution . 172

Committee Appointed 177

The Committee Works 181

To Include Other Ideas 183

Proposals Studied 186

A Proposal is Made 188

System of Election of Representatives 189

The Work of the S.E.C. 190

Areas of Jurisdiction 192

Page

Other Considerations 193

A Draft is Presented 194

A Board of Review 196

Tentative Draft 197

In the Hands of the President and the Regents 201

A Student Referendum 202

Student Poll Favors Student Government Council 206

In Retrospect 209

VII. ANALYSIS OF DATA 212

Introduction 212

Major Hypothesis 212

First Sub-Hypothesis 221

Second Sub-Hypothesis 224

Third Sub-Hypothesis 230

VIII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 232

Summary 232

Conclusions and Recommendations 238

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY 242

Public Documents 242

Books 242

Catalogues 242

Pamphlets 243

Yearbook 243

Reports 243

Newspapers 243

Proceedings 246

Page

Unpublished Materials 247

Other Sources 249

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Background for the Study

Throughout the nation and world there are significant segments of the population concerned with the rights of the individual. One of the more vocal of these segments is found among the students on the college and university campuses of America. Although there may be some confusion within the thinking of university students as to rights, privileges, and civil liberties, both law and morals are progressive, and no educational institution should ignore this concern.

> The college which wishes to set an example of openminded inquiry in its classrooms will defeat its purpose if it denies the same right of inquiry to its students outside the classroom - or if it imposes rules which deny them the freedom to make their own choices, wise or unwise.[1]

Despite the current emphasis which the subject, i.e., rights of individuals, seems to be receiving, attention to so-called "student rights" is not new. It is an assumption in this proposal that concern for rights of individuals must be accepted as a responsibility of colleges and universities. This is particularly true of state institutions which are

---

[1]American Civil Liberties Union, Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities (New York, 1961), p. 4.

expected to provide for the needs of all citizens.

This particular study does not deal with all institutions of higher education. It is confined to The University of Michigan; it is a study of the evolutionary aspects of the development of student rights within this institution. "There is so much that is unique in any one community of scholars that we are not well experienced in transposing experience from one community to another."[2]

The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate and analyze the development of student rights by tracing its history and identifying the administrative structure through which student rights have been exercised.

The assumption is made that rights of students can more clearly be identified and traced in the non-academic aspects of student life than in its academic aspects.

> Likewise much, but sometimes not all, of the learning about concepts of authority, freedom, rights, and responsibilities of students, especially in respect to the complex problem of their separate membership and dual role in the institution contrasted with their retained community citizenship - all these learnings are acquired, if at all, in those controversies which continuously rage in the extracurriculum over the issue of control and rights.[3]

As early as 1821, prior to the University of Michigan's having been granted constitutional protection, the

---

[2]E. G. Williamson, Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities (New York; McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc. 1961), p. viii.

[3]Ibid., pp. ix-x.

Territorial Legislature made provision that "no person should be excluded as president, professor, instructor or pupil for his conscientious persuasion in matters of religion."[4] This was one of the early recorded concerns for individual rights. Concern for social rights has constantly been apparent from within the University, its alumni, and the people of the State. The stimulus has not always been the student; the response has not always come from within the University structure.

For many years the President was personally charged with the responsibility for the welfare of the students. With increasing enrollment, this was no longer possible, and the concept of the student also changed along with obligations toward him. The authoritarian attitude gradually evolved toward a consideration of the student as a responsible adult. The faculty became increasingly concerned with their students as individuals. As a consequence, students were given more authority for establishing policies with respect to their own affairs.

With the admission of women, it was deemed necessary to appoint a person charged with the responsibility for the welfare of the women students. As the demands on the faculty and administrators increased because of increased enrollments, it was no longer possible for the faculty to be so heavily involved in the out-of-class activities of the students.

---

[4]Wilfred B. Shaw, The University of Michigan: An Encyclopedic Survey (Ann Arbor, Ann Arbor Press, 1942), I, p. 17.

Consequently, a Dean of Students was appointed to administer this part of the University's activities. Thus, the Office of Student Affairs and its forerunners at Michigan came to exist as a student-centered complex of services, personnel, and policies.

From 1921 to the present, the Office of Student Affairs has been the official agency of the University concerned with student rights and other student personnel policies. The Office of Student Affairs acts as the interpreter of University policy from the Board of Regents and administration to the students; acts as the agency by which concerns originating from student groups and individuals may influence policies affecting students. This relationship expresses the importance of the Office of Student Affairs as the functional link between the University and its students.

No longer are student rights a matter of discussion only among governing boards, faculty, and administrators. Students are now included in such discussions and policy formulation. "It is clear from the record that, like some presidents and academic deans, some deans of students have suppressed some students' freedoms. The record is replete with instances of the opposite."[5]

There exist among faculty, administrators, and students apprehensions about freedoms, rights, and responsibilities. It is for this reason that a study to evaluate our own traditions is appropriate.

---

[5]Williamson, op. cit., p. 286.

Specific Statement of the Problem

Specifically, the purpose of this study is to trace the historical development of student rights at The University of Michigan in order to show how new rights were established, and established ones were extended. Further, accepting the assumption that student rights cannot exist in an uncontrolled or irresponsibly controlled student body, it is necessary to identify the administrative structures through which student rights have been exercised. Evidence is to be located that there exists an interrelationship between administrative structure and the formulation of student rights as a necessary step to the exercise and enjoyment of student rights.

Hypotheses

The major hypothesis of this study is:

Rights for students at The University of Michigan have increasingly evolved.

In addition to the major hypothesis, three sub-hypotheses are tested; these include:

1. Student rights have increased as student action and behavior have become more responsible.
2. As student behavior has become more responsible, administrative structure has changed in keeping with this behavior.
3. As student rights have increased, more legal responsibility has been

delegated to the students.

Definitions

In testing these hypotheses, the following definitions of terms are used.

Student rights refers to the degree to which students are given the privilege to determine and control the behavior of the student body in non-academic affairs of the University.

Student behavior refers to the manner in which students demonstrate a sense of responsibility in relationship to their activities in non-academic affairs. In this study the primary emphasis is not given to the more informal aspects of student behavior, such as dating habits, spending habits, etc.

Legal responsibility refers to any authority delegated to students by the Board of Regents.

Administrative structure identifies lines of authority within the University, and defines working relationships within the organization. Both formal and informal structures are considered; formal structure identifies the lines of authority within the University; informal structure identifies the working relationship within the organization. Administrative structure considered refers only to that part which deals with non-academic affairs.

Procedure

In order to test the hypotheses of this study, the following procedure will be followed.

1. Review original and official documents relating to student rights and administrative structure; i.e., Minutes of the Student Affairs Committee, correspondence received by the Office of Student Affairs, legal briefs, etc.
2. Review related literature, such as Regents' Proceedings, Presidents' Reports, The Legal Basis for College Student Personnel Work (Clarence J. Bakken, Washington: American College Personnel Association, 1961), The Structure of Freedom (Christian Bay, Stanford University Press, 1958), etc.
3. Secure personal interviews with living persons once active or presently active and particularly knowledgeable in the area of student affairs, such as Dr. Fred B. Wahr, Professor Emeritus of German, and the first assistant to the Dean of Students; Mr. Walter B. Rea, currently Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs and Director of Financial Aids, formerly Dean of Men, and who for over twenty-five years, held major offices in the Office of Student Affairs; Dr. Lionel H. Laing, Professor of Political Science, who served on the Student Affairs Committee, was Chairman of the Special Study Committee whose work lead to formulation of the Student Government Council plan

of student government at The University of Michigan; Dr. John Bingley, Director of Student Activities and Organizations, Office of Student Affairs, and who is currently active and knowledgeable in the growth of the student judicial system at the University.

4. Analyze the development of student rights as they evolved within time periods unique to the University's history; i.e., during the Nineteenth Century, from its establishment until the turn of the Century; from 1902, when the University first created a structure (Committee on Student Organizations Other than Athletic) specifically designed to work with student affairs, to the formulation of an Office of the Dean of Students in 1921; from the establishment of the Dean's Office after World War I, until after World War II, when a Vice President for Student Affairs was appointed, and the first so-called "student self-government" was approved; as well as a brief examination of the period since 1955, when that student government, still current, went into effect.

5. Those policies, practices, and procedures which document the increasing evolvement of student rights at The University of Michigan will constitute significant evidence in support of the hypotheses of this study.

CHAPTER II

HUMAN RIGHTS FOR STUDENTS TAKE ROOT

Even before the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor opened its doors to students in 1841, provision had been made to protect human rights for students. It is the purpose of this chapter to survey the noteworthy events in the University's history from 1821 to 1900, which served as a foundation for the gradual evolvement of human rights for students. Although in the Nineteenth Century they were to remain relatively few, the discerptibility of their presence in the University's history points to an early recognition on the part of the Legislature, Regents, Faculty, and students that in any educational institution concern for human rights for students is essential.

The Educational Revival of the Early 1800's

Clairvoyance is a gift to no generation, yet in retrospect the French editorial which appeared in the Detroit Gazette[1] on August 8, 1817, made it quite clear that shortly after the turn of the Nineteenth Century signs of an educational revival were appearing. The

---

[1]A weekly newspaper, it first appeared in the summer of 1817, printed partly in French, and partly in English. (Elizabeth M. Farrand, History of the University of Michigan /Ann Arbor: Register Publishing House, 1885/, p.8).

editorial read:

> Frenchmen of the Territory of Michigan! You ought to begin immediately to give an education to your children. In a little time there will be in this Territory as many Yankees as French, and if you do not have your children educated the situations will be given to the Yankees.[2]

On August 26, 1817, the Governor and Judges of the Territory of Michigan took one of those opportunities and enacted there should be established a Catholepistemiad, or University of Michigania.[3]

The educational revival,

> . . . .while purely American in its origin, . . . was stimulated and to a degree shaped by foreign influences . . . from the establishment of direct contact between the minds of our scholars and teachers, educators and statemen, and the schools and education, the science and learning, of the Old World. It was a determined demand that the American State should assume its rightful and necessary duty of providing instruction for its people.
>
> If we seek its ultimate causes we shall have to inventory modern democracy, free inquiry, the national spirit, modern industry and commerce, the ethical spirit, and modern science; in a word, the numerous factors that, acting and reacting upon one another, go to make up what we sometimes call, in loose phrase, modern progress.[4]

---

[2]Andrew Ten Brook, American State Universities: Their Origin and Progress (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke and Company, 1875), p. 94.

[3]Burke A. Hinsdale, History of the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1906), p. 8.

[4]Ibid., p. 8.

The Formation of a State University

The idea of a state university is no longer novel; the nadir of its existence in American educational history has passed. "The great educational centers of California, Michigan, and Minnesota stand as the citadels of independence for state universities throughout the United States."[5]

The University of Michigan is established by constitutional authority.[6] The management and control of University funds is vested in its Board of Regents. With the governing board having control over internal affairs, the University is considered by some to be a fourth branch of government. Independent and autonomous within its sphere of jurisdiction,[7] The University of Michigan is generally recognized as among the more distinguished state institutions. Therefore, rooted in the fundamental law of the State, the University has been able to regard human rights for the students from within the institution. It must, of course, operate within the framework of United States Constitutional guarantees to the individual citizen.

---

[5]Fred W. Hicks, "Constitutional Independence and the State University" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Higher Education, 1963, University of Michigan), p. 292.

[6]Michigan Constitution (1850), Art. 13, Sec. 2, 6-8 (amended 1862). Michigan Constitution (1808), Art. 11, Sec. 3-5.

[7]Clarence J. Bakken, The Legal Basis for College Student Personnel Work (Washington: American College Personnel Association, 1961), p. 5.

Early Concern for Human Rights

As early as 1821, prior to the University of Michigan's having been granted constitutional protection, the Territorial Legislature made provision that "no person should be excluded as president, professor, instructor or pupil for his consciencious persuasion in matters of religion"[8]. This was one of the early recorded concerns for human rights of students; but there were others, and "in every good college the free voluntary life and activities of students is an important feature of the institution."[9]

The terms of admission for the first freshman class at the University were:

> Candidates for admission to the Freshman class are examined in Arithmetic, the elements of Algebra, Geography, Cicero's Orations, Sallust, Virgil, Jacob's Greek Reader, the Four Gospels, and Latin and Greek prosody, and are required to furnish satisfactory testimonials of good moral character.[10]

The Government of the Students

The Regents assigned to an Executive Committee on Branches of 1841, the responsibility for preparation of a code of laws for the government of the University, in concert with the Faculty. This group judged it best to define only the general features of the government to serve as a

---

[8]Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 13.

[9]Ibid., p. 123.

[10]University of Michigan, Regents' Proceedings (1837-1864), (Ann Arbor: University, 1915), p. 194.

guide until they could find out what rules and regulations were found to be useful in other institutions.[11] As a result the government of the students was only vaguely defined for the first class, but by the time the first class had been graduated in 1845, the government was spelled out explicitly in the University's Catalogue, and the faculty was expected to administer it.

> In the government of the Institution, the Faculty ever keep it in mind that most of the students are of an age which renders absolutely necessary some substitute for parental superintendence. It is believed that no College in our country can secure public confidence without watching over the morals of its students, and making strict propriety of conduct, as well as diligent application to study, a condition of membership.
>
> Considering, therefore, the government of the students as a substitute for the regulations of home, the faculty endeavor to bring it as near to the character of parental control as the nature of the case will admit; and to attain the end, not wholly nor chiefly by constraint and the dread of penalty, but by the influence of persuasion and kindness.
>
> But there may be in the College, as well as in the family, or community, perverse individuals, whom nothing but the fear of penalty will influence. In respect to such, the Faculty consider themselves bound, as standing in the place of parents or guardian, first, to see that the student be kindly and faithfully advised and admonished, and, also, that the parent be fully informed of any improper conduct in his son. If such corrections prove insufficient, a

---

[11] Ibid.

> regard for the best interests of such a young man, and certainly a proper care for the other members of the Institution, requires that he should be removed. He has forfeited all claims on the Institution, by violating the indispensable conditions on which its advantages are to be enjoyed, and is, therefore, forthwith to be returned to the charge of his parents or guardian.[12]

Such were the regulations of 1845; however, it must be remembered that in the pre-Civil War period unity existed between curriculum and extracurriculum, and the government of the students in and out of class was the clear responsibility of the faculty. Any significant self-government of their out-of-class affairs by the students would have to wait until after the turn of the century. As late as 1892 the Regents, by unanimous vote, passed the following resolution:

> That this Board desires to be explicitly understood as recognizing the authority of the Faculty of any Department in the University to expel and exclude students of that Department from the University Buildings and Grounds.[13]

How much clearer could it be stated that the Faculty was still charged with the responsibility for governing the students?

---

[12]Catalogue of the Officers and Students in the Department of the Arts and Sciences, in the University of Michigan, (Detroit: Harsha and Willcox, 1845), p. 9.

[13]Regents' Proceedings (1891-1896), p. 16.

Early Student Organizations

Student organizations began to appear shortly after the first students enrolled, and through these organizations, increased freedom from supervision for the students was to evolve.

There were twenty-five students on the campus in 1842, when the first student organization appeared. Although that society, the Phi Phi Alpha, existed only until 1860,[14] the Alpha Nu Society established in 1843, was destined to enjoy a long history. Official recognition[15] (italics mine) for the literary societies had to wait until the Catalogue for 1848-1849 appeared. It contained a statement to the effect the College had two literary societies. This was the earliest recognition of student organizations at the University.[16]

There is reason to suppose the literary societies enjoyed the approbation of the Faculty and Regents, as evidenced by the fact the Board of Regents repeatedly approved furnishing University rooms so these societies

---

[14]Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 123.

[15]The word recognition used in relation to student organizations would have had no meaning for the student of the Nineteenth Century. The word was adopted for use by the University's "Committee on Student Affairs" in 1909, and at that time referred to the Senate Council's approval for the organization to exist. It was not, however, Council's endorsement for the views or purposes of the club. It assumed that students as well as others who belonged to the University should have a reasonable freedom of life and thought. (Michigan Daily, December 14, 1909, No. 58.)

[16]Hinsdale, op. cit.

would have appropriate places to meet.[17]

The Fraternity Controversy

In contrast to the literary societies, the Greek Letter fraternities, initially, did not do as well. After a long and bitter controversy among the Faculty, Regents, and students,[18] over the existence of secret societies on campus, the following public notice appeared in the Catalogue of 1850-1951.

> There are two other societies besides the regular literary associations, which, having exhibited their constitutions and adopted regulations approved by the Faculty, may, in accordance with the laws of the institution, admit students to membership. By these regulations minors, in order to become members, must exhibit to the President of the Faculty, the written consent of parent or guardian; and the admission of students to these societies, their time and place of meeting, which must, unless otherwise permitted, always be within the University buildings, and their corporate good order are under the proper supervision of the College government.[19]

The above notice represented only a modus vivendi, for it was becoming very apparent that a step toward student rights was being established. This viewpoint was clearly evident, for as was pointed out by Professor Ten Brook, who at that time

---

[17]Regents' Proceedings (1837-1864), p. 639.

[18]Ibid., pp. 445-454, "Special Report of Faculty on College Difficulties Referred to in Foregoing Proceedings." The report clearly states the Faculty's disapproval, the history of their supposed authority to disapprove, and in eight enumerated and delineated points, their positive objections to these secret societies, i.e., fraternities.

[19]Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 124.

was a member of the faculty, both the students and the faculty were the victims of an impracticable and mistaken theory of university government.

> The self-reliance and maturity of the students caused them to resent the implied faculty paternalism and minute regulation of student life. The faculty, moreover, held the narrow-minded clerical point of view of that period and supposed that they had the support of the other leading American colleges. Nevertheless, the students knew that in no other institution had faculty regulation of the fraternities been effective, and they resolutely maintained their position. Under these circumstances the final victory of the students was perhaps inevitable.[20]

The faculty never acquiesced to the presence of secret societies on campus, but fraternities were on the campus to stay, as evidenced by their continued presence to this day.

A New Constitution for the State

The Constitution of 1850 helped bring to a close the struggle for a satisfactory government for the University. New sections[21] were provided

> which gave the University of Michigan a unique standing among state universities. They emancipated the institution from legislative control so far as that object can be affected. The Regents are not merely a body corporate, the creature of municipal law, but a constituent part of the state

---

[20]Joseph Bursley, "Fraternities" The University of Michigan: An Encyclopedic Survey, ed., Walter A. Donnelly, IV (1958), p. 1801.

[21]Michigan Constitution (1850), Art. 13, Sec. 2, 6-8.

> government, co-ordinate within its sphere with the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary of the state. It cannot be doubted that the independent position of the institution has had much to do with its growth and prosperity. In fact, its larger growth may be dated from the time when the new sections began to take effect.[22]

Free of legislative control, the University began to grow not only in student attendance, but in complexity of structure. The yearly rotation among faculty of the office of president had been reasonably satisfactory during the infancy of the University; however, increased growth rendered the method impractical. Whereas the president had once been able to take care of the administrative demands, teach, and look after the students' welfare, it was no longer possible if the institution was to progress. As responsibilities were delegated, the faculty became increasingly responsible for student welfare. This is significant, for it meant that students were to look to the faculty for any increase in their freedom or responsibilities.

The University's Concern for Student Morals

From the beginning the University was never intended to be sectarian,[23] but the morals of the students were of great concern. In the earliest Catalogue, it was announced:

> Every student is required to attend public worship on the Sabbath, at such one of the Churches in the village of Ann Arbor, as

---

[22]Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 40.

[23]Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 13.

his parent or guardian may direct.[24]
(italics mine)

Students were also required to attend prayers daily in the College Chapel. It was not only for the religious facets of the student's life the faculty showed concern. The faculty felt the student needed constant supervision. "....Some person is needed for keeping order (among students) during the day and especially during the night. At present improprieties of the grossest kind may take place with little means of prevention or detection."[25]

The Students' Christian Association

It is not surprising that from the fertility of the times the "Students' Christian Association" took its roots. This organization was ultimately to span eighty years in the life of the University. Under its auspices were begun many projects now recognized as essential services of the University,"[26] i.e., publishing of a Student Directory, maintaining rooming lists, operating a student employment bureau, etc.. The history of the organization is adequately recorded[27], but reference is made to it because no student organization at the University reflected more initiative and enterprise than this one.

---

[24]Catalogue (1843-1844).

[25]Regents' Proceedings (1837-1864), p. 381.

[26]C. Grey Austin, "Students' Christian Association" An Encylopedic Survey, IV, p. 1895.

[27]Ibid., pp. 1885-1896.

In the founding of this organization, students were quick to seek the counsel of the faculty.[28] Perhaps earlier history had already taught the student the value of the facultys' approval, or perhaps the student was emerging as a more responsible citizen of the community.

Elective System Introduced

The time had come in 1855-1856 when in the University the elective system of studies would permit the senior student to select his more advanced subjects, and thereby, his professor. Both, no doubt, enhanced the student's view of his freedom and made it easier for him to seek counsel from a faculty member whose teaching and opinions he felt he could respect.

Dormitories Abolished

In 1855-1856, the Literary College had 231 students enrolled. The College had been unable to house all of its students since 1853-1854. There was urgent need for more museum and library space. At its June meeting, the Board of Regents appointed a committee to ascertain if the dormitories, which had existed from the beginning of the University, could be altered, and if board and rooming accommodations could be obtained at reasonable rates in town for the students.[29] "From 1857 to the coming of the Society House, the students

---

[28] See Professor Ten Brook's recollections of the founding of the "Society for Missionary Inquiry", (Ibid., p. 1886).

[29] Regents' Proceedings (1837-1864), p. 646.

lived in boarding houses and in the homes of citizens of Ann Arbor."[30] Regardless of the reasons for abolishing dormitories, this was another step forward toward freedom for the students.

The elective system and the elimination of dormitories were to be considered as among Dr. Tappan's "Prussian" innovations. But as Williamson cautions, there is need for

> ... a correction of an early interpretation of the German influence on American higher education. Often that influence has been characterized as seeming to establish impersonality as to the prevailing relationship of professors with students. Moreover, this has been appraised as the origin of American abandonment of colonial concern for students, pietistic and individualistic as it was in a large measure, and the shifting to students of responsibility for their out-of-class affairs.[31]

Although the University, by this action, moved forward in granting student freedom, the door was only slightly ajar. At the time these innovations were not viewed as gestures to increase student rights but as a practical necessity in an expanding university.

Student Morality Examined and Defended

The students had just been freed from the supervised life in the dormitories when the Methodist Conferences for

---

[30]Hinsdale, op. cit., pp. 46-47.

[31]E. G. Williamson, Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1961), p. 289.

the State of Michigan met in September, 1857,[32] suggesting the need for "a decided improvement"[33] in the morals of the students on the campus. The Regents immediately requested the President and faculty to report on "as far as practicable, the moral conduct of the students attending said University and the means employed to impress upon them sound moral and religious principles."[34] The faculty answered:

> . . . .There exists in general among the students of the University of Michigan a more virtuous sentiment and a higher tone of moral feeling than we have ever witnessed elsewhere; that the proportion of youth whose impulses are wayward and vicious is unusually limited; and that, in addition to those youth of irreproachable character and sterling integrity who have not become members of any Christian Church, there has ever been among us a very considerable number, we may with devout thankfulness add, an increasing number, who furnish the most conclusive and gratifying evidence of active, Christian piety. To this expression of our opinion, we may add, that, as in other public institutions of the State, the Sacred Scriptures are regularly read and prayers offered in the morning in the Chapel of the University by the President, and, in his absence, by the Senior Professor; also, that several series of lectures, one of which is now in progress, have been publicly delivered

---

[32]See paragraphs from published "Proceedings of the Methodist Conference" as they appear in Regents' Proceedings (1837-1864). pp. 701-702. No mention is made of compulsory Chapel attendance, for from the first, professional students were not required to attend.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Regents' Proceedings (1837-1864), p. 702. Some note this as the beginning of the Faculty Senate although its exact date of origin is not known.

> Sabbath afternoons by the President on the "Evidences of the Christian Religion." In addition to these more public services, weekly prayer-meetings are held among the students, and a Society for Missionary Inquiry furnishes occasional addresses which are delivered in the different churches in Ann Arbor. In connection with this Society, an effort, first suggested by a Professor in the Medical College, is now making (italics mine; words in italics as in copy) to establish a select Library of Religious Literature, which shall not only be auxiliary to the researches of the Missionary Society, but which shall also furnish and encourage appropriate Sabbath reading among the students generally.[35]

The report of the faculty was positive.[36] Not only were students considered to be responsible for their own behavior, they also were considered capable of managing their moral behavior. This was equally true for those students who were not members of Christian churches. Student societies made significant contributions to the morality of the student body. This view of the student body was a step forward for both students and faculty toward increasing student rights.

---

[35] Ibid. See Regents' Proceedings (1837-1864), pp. 802, 806, regarding Regents' actions re drinking, card playing, and gambling. Apparently the admonishment of the Methodist Church was still being keenly felt by the Regents.

[36] In March 1858, the Committee of Regents who asked the faculty to prepare the report above referred to, asked to be discharged, stating: "We are satisfied that the Faculty have used all reasonable exertions to secure good conduct on the part of the students without seeming to be too rigid." (Regents' Proceedings [1837-1864], p. 740).

Appeal to Student Help

The Civil War caused a marked decrease in the attendance of the University, but ever more upsetting to the students, the alumni, the people of Ann Arbor and the state, was Dr. Tappan's dismissal.[37] So bitter were the feelings of the students, the new President, Dr. Erastus O. Haven, "appealed to them to share with him the responsibility of saving the University from disaster."[38] This was the first evidence in the University's history of a direct appeal to students for help. Hinsdale says the new President knew how to win ground, and then adds that "Time innovateth greatly. Old students went and new ones came; old regents died out and new interests sprang into life."[39] Ita semper est!

Post-Civil War Effects

"By 1863 the University had acquired a momentum of its own, and its success was largely independent of any individual man, no matter who he might be."[40] After the close of the Civil War the student population grew rapidly.

---

[37]Charles M. Perry, Henry Phillip Tappan: Philosopher and University President (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1933), Chapter XII, "Swarming of the Gnats," pp. 274-300; also, Tappan's "Historical Statement on my Connection with the University", Regents' Proceedings (1837-1864), pp. 1120-1166.

[38]Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 53.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 54.

"The Civil War was attended and followed by a great increase of prices throughout the Country, . . . and, by a considerable elevation of the standards of living. ..."[41] Until 1865 every student had paid a matriculation fee of $10 and an annual fee of $5, regardless of his residence. Because of the increased prices, the annual fee for all students was doubled, and the matriculation fee for non-residents became $20. Until this time, "the University lived on its endowments and the fees that were paid by students."[42]

Although expanding human rights for anyone are hardly a product of war years; such rights appear to receive greater attention in post-war periods. The post-Civil War period, in retrospect was no exception.

The Admission of Women

The admission of women at Michigan in 1870 received considerable attention at intermittent periods since 1858.[43] The subject is adequately recorded in the history of the University,[44] but the causes at work which appear to have brought it to fruition were similar to those found in society at that time: "the democratic spirit working in society, the incipient 'Woman's Rights' movement, and the great

---

[41] Ibid., p. 57.

[42] Ibid., p. 56.

[43] Regents' Proceedings (1837-1864), p. 793.

[44] Hinsdale, loc. cit., ("Thirty Years of Coeducation", Chapter 15, pp. 130-138); Encyclopedic Survey, IV, pp. 1783-1785).

educational revival."[45] There were the to-be-expected claims: women's attendance would corrupt morals, cause a decline in scholarship, and lessen the reputation of the University; however,

> . . . the real cause of anxiety (within the University) lay in quite another direction: the coming of the women, increasing as it did the total numbers of students, increased the perplexity of the authorities, already great, in regard to building, recitation rooms and officers of instruction.[46]

Student Interference with the University's Government

When President Angell came to the University in 1871, his problems were legion,[47] but among them, ever-present on the President's agenda for years past and years to come, was the problem of student discipline. And while it may be true that "questions of discipline were annoying but much more easily handled than some other,"[48] the subject of "hazing" enjoyed neither the approval of the faculty nor the community.

> There were warnings, and when in the early spring of 1874 three freshmen and three sophomores were caught wet-handed in holding members of the rival class under a pump spout, they were promptly suspended. This action was speedily countered by

---

[45]Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 130.

[46]Ibid., p. 132.

[47]A self-appraisal of his problems is contained in a letter to his brother-in-law, dated September 28, 1871. See: (Shirley W. Smith, James Burrill Angell: An American Influence /Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1954/, pp. 1-4).

[48]Smith, Ibid., p. 105.

> communications signed by 106 sophomores and freshmen protesting the disciplining of the six when "we were equally guilty." The boys must have felt there was an irresistible power in numbers. But the faculty after waiting five days, took action resulting in the dispatch by the President of ... (a letter) to the parents of 39 sophomores and 45 freshmen . . .who were suspended.[49]

In a letter to his father-in-law, President Angell said of the conflict:

> There are two chief troubles in the matter. 1. Hazing is regarded as innocent by nine tenths of the students. 2. For years the students here have regarded it as their privilege and duty to criticize & condemn the disciplinary action of the Faculty. They have never been confronted on that point. It is not impossible that we may yet have a war of extermination on that question. For the great body of students are very ill-natured on this action of ours. . . . But in our minds the question of interfering with the government is a much graver one (graver than the question on hazing). I am determined that I will not administer an Institution in which that is to be allowed.[50]

Smith notes: "The spread of hazing upon the Campus was checked that day."[51] It is questionable as to whether it was actually curtailed as noted by Smith; more important, a position in regard to the practice of hazing had been established.

Expulsions and suspensions were not new at the

---

[49]Ibid., p. 106. For copy of letter, see: (Smith, op. cit., p. 106-107).

[50]Smith, op. cit., p. 108.

[51]Ibid.

University.[52] In his two-year term as Acting President, Dr. Frieze felt it necessary to suspend fifty-two students for skipping out of recitation rooms, much to the chagrin of their faculty, when a circus parade passed near the campus.[53]

A Common Code of Morals

Early in the University's history, the student had been confronted with a strict Code of Laws. By the 1870's that Code had changed to what Professor Hinsdale, a faculty member at the time, called "A Common Code of Morals." Again the students had proved they were capable of accepting responsibility, and as a result were given more freedom.

> . . .The student was thrown upon the common code of morals and manners, with an appeal to his good sense, self-respect and sense of honor, with an assurance that he was deemed worthy of regard and confidence until he proved to the contrary. The free spirit prevailing in later years has no doubt been an element in that improvement of manners and morals which has already been remarked upon. The advent of women and the constant increase of their number, has also tended to the extirpation of the grosser forms of disorder. The abolition of the dormitory and the housing of students in the homes of citizens have perhaps worked toward the diminution of the college spirit, but they have certainly worked towards the

---

[52]A considerable proportion of the student body of that period left the University and never returned. The expulsions, on December 18, 1849, were for being members of a secret organization. (An Encyclopedic Survey, IV, p. 1800).

[53]Smith, op. cit., pp. 105-106.

better order.[54]

Expansion of Elective System and the Students' Reaction

Although elective studies had been introduced in 1855-56, in the Department of the Arts, the student had an option of only one-third of his courses for his senior year. In 1871, "all the studies of the Senior year except Philosophy were thrown open to election."[55] By 1877-1878, a great number of studies had been thrown open to election; in fact, "a little more than one-half of all the studies required for a Bachelor's degree were prescribed, and a little less than one-half were made elective."[56]

Interestingly enough, the wide introduction of electives broke down the class spirit,[57] Hinsdale records, thereby spelling the death-knell for some of the bitterest rivalry between classes leading to the need for disciplinary attention by the faculty and President. Although electives are taken for granted at present, this liberalization in University policy, along with other liberalizing policies made in 1877-1878,[58] made it the most important year in respect to internal changes in the University that had been

---

[54]Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 152.

[55]Ibid., p. 79.

[56]Ibid., p. 81.

[57]Ibid., p. 82.

[58]Ibid., pp. 80-82. Other changes in policy made during 1877-1878 are also discussed on these pages.

seen since President Tappan's arrival in 1852.[59]

> When announced, the changes in curricula made in 1877-1878 were received with great enthusiasm by the students, and called out many expressions of approval, both within and without the state. The number of students in the Literary Department increased twenty per cent the next year. The President stated in his next report that the "new departure", as it was called, had been begun under serious disadvantages; that one year's experience was too brief to justify him in the use of unqualified statements of opinion on the subject, but that no reason appeared to weaken the expectations of the authors of the plan. "We have seen no disposition in our students, under an elective system to choose studies because they are easy, or to avoid those which are usually thought difficult . ...."[60]

Admission by Diploma

Years had passed since classical and non-classical studies had been given equality,[61] thus freeing the student to pursue the course of his choice. Far more significant to the students and the schools of the State, however, was the admission by diploma. Acting President Frieze, under whose administration this policy was adopted said of it:

> The principle of this movement is obvious: we go back to the schools, and aid their instructors in devising

---

[59] Ibid., p. 155.

[60] Ibid., pp. 81-82.

[61] "For twenty-eight years the University has placed classical and non-classical studies on a footing of absolute equality, both in opportunities for acquirement and in rewards for successful attainment." (Regents' Proceedings [1876-1881], p. 572).

> correct plans and laying solid foundations of scholarship; instead of waiting until pupils present themselves at the University, prepared under dissimilar, and perhaps, erroneous systems . . . which could be obviated by the previous interchange of views between the Faculty and the preparatory teachers.[62]

It had been a bold change, and in his first President's report to the Board of Regents, President Angell felt it necessary to report:

> It is with great pleasure that I refer to the first year's experience in forming a quasi organic connection between the University and the High Schools. It will be remembered that if the Faculty on the report of a Committee of Inspection, approve the work of a school, then the University receives without examination the graduates of that school, provided their certificates from their school board or superintendent declare that they have successfully pursued all the studies required for admission to our Freshman class.[63]

The President then informed the Regents that the inspection performed by the Committee of Inspection, if approved by the Faculty, bound the University for only one year. In his report of 1873, President Angell was to report with obvious pride the admission by diploma had ". . . awakened through State and the country, and even in foreign lands, a new interest in the University."[64]

The diploma system of admission was in keeping with the new spirit of the University - to maintain vital contact

---

[62] Regents' Proceedings (1870-1876), p. 129.

[63] Ibid., p. 306.

[64] Ibid.

with its constituency.[65] With enlarged opportunity for advanced education came a more liberal government for the students. Students could now enter with a high school diploma, and no additional entrance examinations were required. The effect was a kind of popularization of college attendance. Again enrollment increased, at an unprecedented rate. The constituency of the University had always responded to new steps in the direction of enlarged opportunity.[66]

A More Liberal Government for Students

While even the most minute detail within the University's structure was brought to the attention of the Regents, it is noteworthy that in the Proceedings of the Board of Regents, students are but seldom spoken of except by the President. Clearly the students were the charge of the faculty, but President Angell was to eulogize the students' acceptance of responsibility repeatedly in his Annual Reports to the Regents. This merited praise resulted in more liberal government for the students.

> No equal number of young men, I think, could anywhere be found, more pervaded with the feeling of individual responsibility and the desire to discharge faithfully every obligation. . ...The students have been encouraged to the cultivation of manhood ... results of this liberal tone of government, which has been gaining ground with us from year to year, have been highly

---

[65] Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 152.

[66] Ibid.

satisfactory.[67] (italics mine)

The ground gained by the students was never to be lost, for as they proved themselves capable of handling responsibilities, they were given greater freedom to pursue their areas of interest. This freedom to pursue areas of interest had been one of President Tappan's great dreams for the University, and on the occasion of the Semi-Centennial in 1887, the President observed: "Not even yet have we filled in the sketch which he (Tappan) drew of the ideal University of Michigan."[68]

The Semi-Centennial celebration of 1887 is noteworthy because it brought to the campus many alumni and friends. This wider patronage helped the student, for it manifested itself in a kind of nationalistic pride, and friends and alumni began to contribute funds, presented gifts, and otherwise took an interest in what was happening at the University. Student performances were given and well received by those in attendance. Ultimately these same alumni and friends would be asking student organizations and societies to bring their productions into outlying areas of the state and out-of-state. In their Proceedings, the Regents report the following:

> The attendance of the alumni and friends of the institution equalled our highest anticipations. A considerable number of the most important colleges and universities were represented by delegates.

---

[67] Regents' Proceedings (1870-1876), pp. 69-70.

[68] Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 47.

> Most cordial greetings were sent to us from the great universities beyond the sea. The devotion and enthusiasm of the many friends of the University were so pleasantly manifested that we cannot see her enter upon her second half century without new hope and cheer. The progress of the arts and the sciences, the improvements in the methods of education, and the increasing number of students, are making larger and larger demands on the strength. But the generosity of the State has enabled us thus far to meet those demands in at least a fairly satisfactory manner. We have the fullest confidence that we shall be properly sustained in all well considered efforts to make her future career worthy of her splendid history, and worthy of the fame and intelligence of this prosperous commonwealth.[69]

A School for the Rich?

The inevitable pleas to the Legislature for financial support had for years become part of the President's Report, and in 1887-1888 more pertinent, perhaps, than before, for it had been claimed that the University was becoming known as a school for the rich; it had, in fact, repeatedly been claimed that the University was becoming "aristocratic."[70] The concern by those not familiar with the inner workings of the University had become so pronounced that President Angell made a study to ascertain whether it were true, the conclusions of which, he thought, disproved the accusations, inasmuch as forty-five per cent of the fathers of students earned their livelihood by physical labor.[71]

---

[69] Regents' Proceedings (1886-1891), pp. 164-165.

[70] Ibid., p. 162.

[71] Ibid., pp. 162-163.

> . . .A very large proportion of our undergraduates have by hard toil and self-denial earned the means to support themselves in whole or in large part while here. Not a few continue to remain here only by the practice of an economy which too often endangers their health.[72]

The Student Lecture Association's programs year by year reflected the intellectual fashions and preoccupations of the nation at large,[73] and in the 1890's, the word aristocratic was not popular. As students discussed the need for social reforms, the accusation that the University of Michigan was thought to be aristocratic was damning, when in the final analysis education for all was seen as the answer to the ills of an industrial civilization.

> In the cities of the 1890's a new generation of Americans was coming into contact with the ills of industrial civilization. They swarmed in droves into New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Detroit, seeking jobs, wealth, excitement, a better life. What they found too often was the hard grinding misery of the tenement in which hopes corroded and dreams turned rapidly to nightmares. Poverty, squalor, and disease were hardly new in the nineties. . . .To look back on the nineties is to sense an awakening of social conscience, a growing belief that this incredible suffering was neither the fault nor the inevitable lot of the sufferers, that it could certainly be alleviated, and that the road to alleviation was neither charity nor revolution, but in the last analysis, education.[74]

---

[72] Ibid., p. 163.

[73] Theodore Hornberger, "The Student Lecture Association", Encyclopedic Survey, IV, p. 1880.

[74] Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), pp. 58-59.

Student organizations were maturing and after the Civil War discarded much of the provincialism which had once characterized their programs. In keeping with the times, even the students rebelled at the idea theirs might be a school for the rich. It is significant that the students were sharing the concern for the image of the University.

Despite these claims, the University's graduating class of 1890-1891 was

> . . .not only larger than that of any previous year, but much larger than that of any American University at that time. This result has been accomplished not by lowering the conditions of graduation, but in the face of a somewhat rapid advancement in the requirements for graduation in all Departments.[75]

Looking to the Students

The development of a more varied extra-curricular life had become quite apparent by 1895.[76] Interest in literary and oratorical societies was beginning to fade,[77] and physical culture was to receive great attention from the faculty and the students. It is of interest to note that concurrent with the zenith reached in attendance and requirements for graduation there was also "the passion for athletic sports," [78] and a very real fear that athletic sports might

---

[75] Regents' Proceedings (1891-1896), p. 555.

[76] Encyclopedic Survey IV, op. cit., p. 1879.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Regents' Proceedings, op. cit., p. 340.

interfere with the academic pursuits of the student and ". . . .lead to certain moral perils."[79]

Much attention was given to making gymnastic accommodations conducive to the "normal physical development and sound health of the many",[80] for the experience of other institutions had already pointed out some of the evils of over-emphasis on athletics. When possible over-emphasis on athletics was discussed, President Angell said to the Board of Regents: ". . .we confidently look to our students to cherish and maintain a spirit which will enable us to secure . . ."[81] satisfactory results in athletic endeavors.

"We confidently look to our students . . . ." - How times had changed from 1841, when it was the parent's responsibility to write for information about the possible matriculation of his son,[82] to 1891, when a student was looked to as a responsible agent in helping to establish satisfactory results in something so peril-laden as the athletic program!

Evaluating the Progress

If the evolution of the consideration for the student and his rights had been slow, at least the progress had been steady. In the middle of the year of 1871-1872, voluntary attendance at prayer in the Chapel had been substituted for

---

[79] Ibid., p. 561.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Ibid.

[82] Farrand, op. cit., p. 14.

compulsory attendance;[83] not without some opposition, it might be added. Now the elective system had been fully approved ". . .to the interest, heartiness, and success of the work of students, and so to their manliness and industry, and to the good order of the University. It has also strengthened the intimate friendly relations between students and professors."[84]

Not only had the rules changed, but so had the students. Because of directed high school preparation for admission to the University, and despite increased requirements for admission, students in the 1890's were, on the average, a full year or more younger than they had been in 1870.[85] There were those who were willing to give testimony to the fact the morals and manners, as well as the spirit of good order, had improved - that there was less vice, and a better sense of decorum. "Even the relations of students and the Faculties had improved, where there had once existed not a little unpleasant friction."[86]

But caution must temper judgment, and the President wrote:

> Not that our University community has reached sainthood or perfect wisdom or absolute self-control under all circumstances. It is made up of persons

---

[83] Regents' Proceedings (1891-1896). p. 576.

[84] Ibid., p. 575.

[85] Ibid., p. 576.

[86] Ibid., p. 577.

> of an age at which the blood is hot, the sympathies are quick, and lungs are strong. Waves of excitement sometimes suddenly drown their reason for the moment, and their feelings find vent in demonstrations more expressive than wise. But they have a keen sense of justice and at heart a love for what is right. Under tactful leading they soon return to their normal state, regret their mistakes and can be thoroughly trusted in their assurances of the future. The great mass of them have the spirit of earnest work. Nothing is more erroneous than the opinion sometimes expressed that the moral sentiments of great bodies of students are below those of society about them. On the contrary, from no single class of young men ... could hundreds be assembled and left so largely to themselves, as students are, who would work so zealously and maintain so high a moral standard of life and action. Never was the moral and intellectual elevation of students in American colleges and universities higher than it is today.[87]

As the Century came to a close some of the early rules for students already appeared incredible and archaic to the student body. Even by the 1890's it was no longer considered unusual for women to attend college. In 1896 the first Dean of Women was appointed to look after the welfare of women students within the Literary College,[88] student loan funds were made available,[89] and it was even reported there was pressure being applied on the Board of Regents for students to join in sharing a privilege previously extended only to

---

[87] Regents' Proceedings (1896-1901), p. 493.

[88] Ibid., p. 423.

[89] Ibid., p. 90.

professors - that of taking books from (italics mine) the library.[90] Student clubs and organizations were maturing; so were the students. The appeal was now to the student's "... good sense, self-respect and sense of honor, with an assurance that he was deemed worthy of regard and confidence until he proved to the contrary."[91] The students were becoming used to more refined surroundings, and they were beginning to benefit from the wider patronage of the Alumni.[92]

The free spirit near the turn of the Century served as an element in the improvement of student manner and morals.[93]

> It was natural enough that the modern and liberal educational ideas should take deep root in Western soil. Society was new, and institutions had to be built from the bottom up. . . .[94]

The same was true for human rights for students; the evolvement of rights had been natural and increasingly apparent from the time the University of Michigan first opened its doors to students. A greater acceleration had to wait for student self-government after the turn of the Century.

---

[90]Hinsdale, op. cit., p. 152.

[91]Regents' Proceedings, op. cit., p. 577.

[92]Hinsdale, loc. cit.

[93]Ibid., p. 151.

[94]Ibid.

Chronology

1841	Establishment of Code of Laws for the government of the University.
	Church attendance required; to be selected by student's parents.
1842	First student organization established, the Phi Phi Alpha Society.
1850	New Constitution of the State of Michigan emancipated the University from legislative control.
1855-56	Elective system introduced.
1856	Dormitories abolished.
1857	Faculty declared students considered responsible for their own behavior and capable of managing their own moral behavior.
1863	First direct appeal to students asking them to share responsibility with him (President Haven) for saving the University from disaster.
1865	First revenue, other than endowments and student fees, received by the University.
1870	Admission of women.
1871	All studies of the senior year open to election except philosophy.
1871-72	Voluntary chapel attendance.
1872	Admission by high school diploma.
1890-91	Largest student enrollment of any American university.
1896	First Dean of Women appointed.

CHAPTER III

COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS

If education is a continuous process for the individual, it is no less so for an educational institution. Ten Brook's concern for the future of the University in 1875 was as pertinent in 1900 as it had been earlier: "May those who have its management never allow it to lose its prestige by standing still to contemplate and proclaim the wonderful successes which it has already achieved."[1] Whistles may have blown to mark the precise beginning of the Twentieth Century, but there was no such line of demarcation for those charged with the responsibility for administering the University.

In the earliest history of the University the Regents and faculty in concert had developed the government for students. This charge was later delegated to the entire faculty meeting as a group under the chairmanship of the President. As the University grew, this arrangement was no longer practical, and so the Faculty Senate created a "Committee on Student Affairs" for the express purpose of working closely with the students and their organizations, with particular emphasis on student control. It is the

---

[1]Ten Brook, op. cit., p. 313.

purpose of this chapter to present an historical review of the Committee's foundation, procedures, and powers from its origin in 1898, until 1921, when the Office of Student Affairs was created. It was to this Committee students would look for authority, counsel, their responsibilities in relation to out-of-class activities, and help in their apparent quest for ever-enlarging student rights.

After 1921 significant segments of the Committee's responsibilities were transferred to the Office of Student Affairs. The Committee existed for over fifty years; however, for the purposes of this study the history of the Committee's actions for its last thirty years is more appropriately a part of the next chapter.

Establishment of the "Anti-Graft" Committee

On April 22, 1898, a communication from the University Senate was read to the Board of Regents by the President. Specific in purpose,[2] the recommendations contained within it were adopted by the Board. Pandora's box had been opened, and on May 26, 1902, the University Senate created a committee penultimately known as the "Committee on Student Organizations Other than Athletic," and ultimately as the "Committee on Student Affairs".[3]

---

[2]Regents' Proceedings (1896-1901), pp. 209-210.

[3]John Bingley, "Men's Student Government," The University of Michigan: An Encyclopedic Survey, ed. Walter A. Donnelly, IV (1958), p. 1828.

A committee was appointed on March 7, 1898,[4] within the Senate, to consider the financial questions involved in all student organizations. The "consideration" lead to the dismissal of two students,[5] but for more than fifty years, the Faculty Senate Committee's actions were to play a prominent role in the students' life on the Michigan campus.

Financial Questions

At its meeting of March 7, 1898, it had been the Senate's initial Committee's intent " . . . to consider the financial questions involved in all student organizations, and such other allied questions as might seem to them worthy of consideration"[6]; after its April 11 meeting, the Committee reported to the Faculty Senate it seemed wise for them to consider only the case involving the Students' Lecture Association.[7] With the Senate's approval, the Senate's Secretary sent the communication on to the Board of Regents April 22, 1898.[8] Because portions of the proposed duties of the Committee imposed responsibility upon the Treasurer of the University, it was mandatory the Board of Regents approve and ratify the Senate's action; this they did.[9]

---

[4]Regents' Proceedings, op. cit., p. 209.

[5]John Bingley, op. cit., p. 1828.

[6]Regents' Proceedings (1896-1901), p. 210.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid.

The Committee was composed of the President and the Deans of the several departments. Although some of the details of the Committee's approved recommendations were peculiar to the immediately-detailed situation of the Students' Lecture Committee's affairs, other recommendations were to have long-term effects, such as, the establishment of an Auditing Board to grant approval for all expenditures and contracts, that a financial statement in writing go to the Treasurer of the University at the end of each season, and all tickets had to be prepared by the Treasurer, and paid for by the Association.[10]

With such control it is noteworthy that a previous financial liability became a profitable enterprise so that on April 25 of the following year the Students' Lecture Association resolved to give the Board of Regents "the sum of seven hundred and forty dollars, which sum is the net balance remaining after paying all the expenses of the Lecture Course for the season of 1898-99, and dedicating the sum of twenty-five dollars to the incoming board . . . ."[11] It was evident to faculty and students that financial controls had been effective.

The President Explains

Further financial irregularities were discovered by the Committee. The presence of the practice of "graft" on the

---

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid., pp. 422-423.

campus was now so apparent, President Angell acknowledged it and reported to the Regents the action taken by the Senate to work toward eradication of the practice. He regretted

> " . . . to say that a vicious custom, not unknown in the business world, has been edging its way into this University and into other colleges and universities. It is what is popularly known as "graft." Officers of various kinds of student organizations which expend money for some object, have been tempted to take contracts on terms, which allow them secretly to pocket a commission. It is just, but lamentable to say, that some business houses and lecture committees have in certain cases approached these officers with corrupt propositions, which have been accepted. The sentiment of the great body of students strongly condemns this vicious practice of soliciting or accepting the opportunities for "graft". But the University Senate has deemed it wise to subject the financial action of certain student organizations for a time to supervision of a committee. It is believed that when the methods that a committee has introduced into the management of the finances of student bodies are once established supervision can be restored to the students themselves. The Senate will be glad to restore it at the earliest moment practicable. But it was felt that nothing could be more demoralizing than to allow students to live in an atmosphere of indifference to such unworthy practices as have been growing up in the management of the finances of student organizations here and elsewhere. To permit it would be to encourage the very spirit which has been poisoning municipal and corporate administration in so many ways. We wish every graduate, whatever else he may lack, to go forth with the spirit of absolute integrity in things small as well as in affairs of importance."[12]

---

[12] Regents' Proceedings (1901-1906), pp. 593-594.

The Right to Review

In June 1902 two students were expelled for mishandling funds of the Students' Lecture Association, and although they appealed to the Board of Regents,[13] their appeal was denied, with the provision that if they presented to the Board testimony by affidavit in support of their claims that false testimony had been given to the Faculty, and this had been used to reach the conclusion that they were guilty, the information would be considered by the Board and given to the Faculty for the purpose of a review of the previous action of the Faculty.[14]

Affidavits were forthcoming and at the September meeting of the Board of Regents, recommendations were made by the Regents' Committee (a committee appointed to review the facts) to have the Literary Faculty and Law Department review the cases, as one student had been registered in each school. This was done on the grounds that the students claimed not to have been given full opportunity to defend themselves before the Faculty.[15] At the October 13 meeting of the Board of Regents, the Dean of the Law Faculty reported that after a review by the Faculty, the former law student was "guilty as charged";[16] the action of the Literary College, "taken on the

---

[13] Ibid., pp. 380-381.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Regents' Proceedings (1901-1906), pp. 422-423.

[16] Ibid., p. 426.

former hearing should be sustained."[17] The action of both Faculties was approved by the Board of Regents. Regardless of the final decision, and any intervening judicial body's decision, the precedent of appeal to the Board of Regents as the final authority within the University had been established.

The Committee's Composition and Duties

At a meeting of the University Senate, after the expulsion of the two students, the following action was taken.

> Resolved: That a committee of five members of the University faculties be established, whose duty it shall be to have general supervision of the affairs of the Students' Lecture Association, the Good Government Club, and other organizations and boards of students, excepting athletic organizations.
>
> The members of this committee shall be appointed by the President, and the names announced at the spring meeting of the Senate, at the time when the faculty members of the Board for the Regulations of Athletic Sports are elected.
>
> This committee shall make a report to the Senate at the spring meeting.
>
> The chairman of this committee shall be the chairman of the auditing board provided for by action of the Senate at the meeting of April 11, 1898.[18]

At a meeting of the University Senate on June 2, 1902, the President named a committee as provided for one week earlier.[19] Ten days later the committee met for its first

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] "Minutes of the University Senate, May 26, 1902."

[19] "Minutes of the Committee on Student Organizations Other than Athletics," I, p. 2.

meeting and held a discussion about a possible program for action, completed the organization of the committee by electing a secretary, and recommended the postponement of a degree to a student charged guilty of irregularities with the Students' Lecture Association.[20]

No matter how minute the area of jurisdiction, it was a beginning.

Response of a Shocked Committee

In the cases brought before it, the Committee had no powers of final adjudication, but it could make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.[21] At a subsequent meeting it decided to draw up a constitution and by-laws for the guidance of the Committee to be put before the Senate for its approval.[22]

The Committee had been shocked by its earliest discoveries into the financial affairs of student activities. A pall of collective guilt appeared to shroud the faculty for their previous lack of concern. The discovery of the abuses now added a sense of urgency to the Committee's assignment. Throughout the rest of the year, and into 1903, the Committee called before it students from well-known organizations on the campus: the Michigan Daily News, privately owned at the time, the Michiganensian, the Student Lecture Association, and the Wolverine, a publica-

---

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid. p. 5.

[22] Ibid., pp. 5-6. This decision was made October 7, 1902.

tion which the Committee felt was not on an acceptable basis at the time.[23] The Chairman told the two Editors-in-chief of the Michigan Daily News things would have to change before the paper "could be regarded as subservient to the best interests of the University."[24] The editors of the Michiganensian were told the Committee hoped for their cooperation. The editors of the Michiganensian were elected from the senior class and were responsible to no one, they reported; and because they took financial risks, felt they had a right to make whatever profit they could.[25]

The Committee was moving at a whirlwind pace; from September until Christmas, it had held six meetings,[26] meted out instructions, and liberally "moved." At its meeting on February 2, 1903, it was resolved and carried

> (1) That hereafter no student organization, committee or board shall be permitted to undertake or enter upon any enterprise assuming to represent the University or any Department or class therein and appealing either to the student-body or the general public for support, until such organization, committee, or board shall have submitted the matter to this committee and secured its approval of the purpose and methods of procedure.
>
> (2) That all acts and proceedings of such organizations, committee, or boards as above named shall at all

---

[23] Ibid., pp. 7-15.

[24] Ibid., p. 8.

[25] Ibid., p. 9.

[26] Ibid., pp. 4-11.

> times be subject to the direction, revision, and review of this committee.
>
> (3) That this motion in both the foregoing clauses apply to the future action of all existing organizations, committees, and boards of the kind above described.[27]

The first campus-wide policy concerning student organizations awaited only the Senate's approval. Government of the student was as old as the University. Now another significant step was to be taken - the governing of student activities by a faculty committee.

The Students React

It was a bold but perceptive statement that appeared in the Daily: "Prior to the early "90's student affairs were entirely in the hands of students. . . . There being no focus of sentiment among the students, there was no way of exercising control over student management. . . ."[28] How easily the writer had dismissed the rules binding the students, individually and as a group, now that the noose appeared to be tightening on organizations per se! The student revolt had begun, though hardly perceptible, in the fall of 1904, with a short sentence in a column in the Daily entitled "Gossip of Other Colleges": "A student council is being agitated at Minnesota."[29]

---

[27] Ibid., p. 14.

[28] U. of M. Daily, June 2, 1905, No. 175.

[29] Daily, October 28, 1904, No. 28.

The Regents had voted to notify the editors of the Daily and Inlander that if they didn't clean up the rooms they occupied in University Hall, they would be forbidden to use them.[30] President Angell had predicted that by 1937, there would be twelve thousand students at the University,[31] and announcement had been made that no freshman would be eligible to play varsity athletics for the first half of his freshman year.[32] Apparent paternalism and predicted growth were seen as incorrigable bed-fellows by the student leaders.

For the student the period might be characterized as a blend of "rah, rah" and introspection. The prowess of the athletic teams was emblazoned on the front page of nearly every issue of the Daily, yet the subjects for lectures presented by the new Amalgamated Christian Society included such topics as "Cleanliness in College Politics."[33] Off-campus, as on, the subject of hazing received attention. A Goshen, Indiana, paper had erroneously reported[34] a student had been "sent home a nervous wreck from the effects"[35] of hazing at the

---

[30] Regents' Proceedings (1901-1906), p. 445. The specific date was October 13, 1904.

[31] Daily, November 20, 1904, No. 48.

[32] Daily, November 30, 1904, No. 51.

[33] Daily, December 7, 1904, No. 57.

[34] Ibid., December 11, 1904, No. 61

[35] Ibid., December 8, 1904, No. 58.

University; and as incongruous as it may sound, another Good Government Club made its debut on the campus. The announcement of the existence of this club appears to have been the torch for the tinder.

Committee Interference

The Daily duly reported a new literary society had been formed on campus, to be known as the "Good Government Club."[36] Such clubs had been popular in the East as early as 1895, and were organized to discuss questions of political economy and politics.[37] A month later the Daily reported the faculty Committee on Non-Athletic Organizations requested the management of the Good Government Club to change the name of its organization.[38] A former club by the same name had been abolished in 1904 by the Senate: That club had requested permission to present a series of lectures, and when permission was withheld, its membership waned to the point where no member would run for office.

The Daily reporting had been clear and accurate, but the interpretation was clearly that again, the Committee was interfering.

Among the students, opinion was divided between the fraternity men and the independents. Independents thought "much would be gained if the University authorities would

---

[36] Ibid., December 11, 1904, No. 61

[37] For a discussion of various national organizations of the times and questions discussed, see Cremin's excellent chapter, "Culture and Community" (Cremin, op.cit., Chapter III.)

[38] Daily, January 14, 1905, No. 74.

interfere once in a while in fraternity manipulation of student affairs."[39] At the time, on other college campuses, such charges as "manipulation" and "radical rules" levied against the faculties were not uncommon.[40]

A Student Council Proposal

As usual, following a crackdown, there was a re-grouping of the forces; this time it was spearheaded by the Daily.

The Board in Control of non-athletic organizations laid down a new plan for the business conduct of the Michiganensian in March of 1905.[41]

In response a vitriolic editorial epitomized the reactionary students' point of view. It read:

> . . . As in the case of changes in the affairs of the Students' Lecture Association, little or no suggestion

---

[39] Ibid., January 24, 1905, No. 82.

[40] Ibid., February 14, 1905. See "Gossip of Other Colleges".

[41] This is a reasonable assumption. There are no minutes in existence for the Committee on Student Organizations other than Athletic, from February 9, 1903, to February 17, 1908. See ("Minutes of Committee on Student Affairs," Vol. I, June 1902 - May 1913, Student Activities Building, The University of Michigan.) This volume contains the cryptic note: "Five years missing. Pages 17-49 left blank." The assumption is made from a Daily editorial of March 18, 1905, No. 119.

From the "Minutes of Committee on Student Affairs," Vol. I, and from reference to the "Committee on Student Organizations Other than Athletic" in the Daily, not until March 15, 1909, was the committee's title formally "Committee on Student Organizations Other Than Athletic". Until that time, the to-be-acquired title was only descriptive of the Committee for purposes of distinguishing it from other committees. References to it in the Daily before this time were in lowercase letters, and should not be interpreted as editorial disrespect.

was received in either matter from students.

This fact is to be regretted for unfortunately the interference of the committee in several student enterprises has caused in no small degree the estrangement of many representative college men from the faculty as a whole.

In all sincerity the Daily believes there should be student representation on the non-academic Board in Control. If this representation cannot be direct, there should be a "Senior Council" or some similar organization to act jointly with the faculty committee.

As the situation stands at present, it is evident that the students consider the "anti-graft committee" a sort of "government without representation."

With all that has been said about democracy at Michigan, we find springing up in our midst a conduct of affairs that tend toward different sentiment.

If the Board in Control takes away the freedom of management from the heads of any of the college organizations, they take a sure step backward into the mire of paternalism.

Freedom from graft must come as a result of an awakening of the student conscience. This may be guided by the faculty, but can never be driven.

The Daily believes a "Senior Council should be established to help settle these student problems. . . . Much of the power of the committee is lost without the active support of student sentiment.

We believe the student body is just as anxious to put down graft as the faculty, and if given a chance to help the committee, will lend valuable assistance as well as inspire a better feeling toward the non-athletic Board of Control.[42]

---

[42]Daily, March 18, 1905, No. 119.

Into the heart of the editorial had been written a proposal, no matter how nebulous, for a Senior Council, but the larva had yet to pass through a metamorphosis before assuming definite characteristics. It was not felt necessary to agitate, to sound out the faculty, and the Board of Control (the Committee).

Faculty Response

The students found the faculty not unwilling to discuss the proposition, and reported:

> The formation of such a body has the entire sympathy of the faculty, although the body does not intend to push the plan, feeling that it will be more effective if planned and brought to a working basis by the students.[43]

How sensible of the faculty! the Daily reacted, stating that it had advocated such a plan for two years.

It is important to note the pursual of the suggestion by the Daily that some organization be established "to act jointly with the faculty committee." For the present the alternative suggestion, to have representation on the Committee, was dropped. It has been said that organizations always need a cause. This cause (representation) would lie dormant only for an abbreviated period of time.

An interview by the Daily with Professor George W. Patterson, further helped the student cause. He was quoted as having said:

---

[43]Daily, April 5, 1905, No. 134.

> I am sure that no obstacle will be put in the way of the student control of student affairs. On the contrary, the faculty would be relieved. . . .
>
> I would feel perfectly safe in placing control of "graft", regulation of hazing and like affairs in the hands of a responsible representative student body, elected by students and having student confidence. The faculty would support their decisions if necessary, but will attempt no interference unless extreme mistakes are made. This I regard as unlikely.
>
> From the beginning I have urged the two upper classes in the engineering department to appoint student committees for the purpose in the hope they will act upon suggestion and that the move will spread to the other departments on campus."[44]

Senior Council: a Reality

A Senior Council was established within the Engineering Department.[45] The Daily was apparently taken by surprise, and not wanting to be left out of the act, moralized: "At last they (Faculty) appear to have taken the right fork in the road, as recently suggested by the Daily."[46] The Daily was to do still further speculating and rationalizing. While the movement had received its start in the Engineering Department, couldn't it be expected that other departments would fall in line? True, they rationalized: until the present move for councils, the faculty had taken no steps toward gaining the good will of the students, so how could the

---

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Ibid.

students have thought anything else than that the action of the Committee was unwarranted: The students, the Daily reported, had not understood.[47] But now

> with the students as judges of students this "don't care" feeling is sure to disappear. The students will have to believe when some of their own number give the verdict.
>
> The faculty have been a long time in the gloaming,[48] but the time has not been wasted as the results show. Now that they have reached solid ground at last and wish to turn over to students the control of student affairs, it is the duty of every loyal Michigan man to work for formulation of a senior council . . .[49]

composed of representatives of all departments, or the formation of some other organization "to cleanse and sweeten the moral atmosphere of the campus."[50]

The urgency was over that had called the Board of Directors of the Union together a year before,[51] to hear a report on the advisability of establishing a student council to consider graft, elections, and campus customs as a court of last appeal in these matters, subject to faculty intervention if necessary.

It was the fall of 1905 before the headlines of the

---

[47] Ibid.

[48] The songs of Sir Harry Lauder, Scotch singer, were popular at the time. i.e., "Roamin' in the Gloamin".

[49] Daily, April 5, 1905, No. 134.

[50] Ibid.

[51] April 28, 1904.

Daily read: "Senior Council is Now a Reality."[52] The headline of the first edition of the fall Daily announced that the Rocky Mountain Club and the Pennsy Club were to have club houses. Mass meetings were the vogue, and as mentioned above, new customs in housing were being inaugurated. The University of Michigan was now the largest American University.[53] The students had not forgotten, nor had the Daily, when it printed:

> Considerable interest has been taken in the organization of some sort of a student body to assume control of strictly student affairs, since the house-cleaning of political and social functions was indulged in by the Senate Committee of non-Athletic control last spring. This board, popularly known as the "anti-graft committee," investigated the business methods of all college functions and imposed a rigid supervision on their actions. As a result of these investigations, several students were forced to leave college, and the student body felt that they should have a voice in the disposition.
>
> . . . The need of some sort of student organization to act between students and a faculty board was evident at the time of electing a Michiganensian board last spring. . . . The whole plan was changed on short notice and readjusted to the dissatisfaction of a large majority of students.[54]

A Bid for Power

The Board of the Michigan Union now took up the plan, perfecting its organization and suggesting that the Council be given ultimate jurisdiction in all cases of graft, the

---

[52]Daily, October 31, 1905, No. 31.

[53]Daily, September - October, 1905, Nos. 1-21.

[54]Daily, October 25, 1905, No. 26.

method of elections for all student elections, and the management of all student social functions. The Board went beyond the limits of original proposal and suggested the establishment of honor systems in all departments, but members of the faculty "expressed themselves as opposed to giving such independence to the student body.[55] The approval was inevitable. Senior Council was, on October 31, a reality. In some departments there was already a strong competition for seats on the Council.[56]

The minute rules and regulations of the organizations involved in student government are not within the scope of this paper, but the areas of expanding self-government and organizations are: Both areas were growing, and Senior Council now led, in a very conservative manner, the way.

Power to Recommend

Written into the Senior Council's duties was that of investigating and reporting to the faculty cases affecting the best interests of the student body. The Council had to look to the Committee on Non-Athletic Organizations for the disciplining of any student organizations, just as the Committee had to observe faculty authority for individual discipline.[57] The Council did not hesitate, however, to make suggestions and recommendations, i.e., that all

---

[55] Ibid.

[56] Daily, October 31, 1905.

[57] Encyclopedic Survey, IV, loc. cit., p. 1829.

politics be eliminated from class elections, that the practice of ticket-scalping was unacceptable, and that it did not wish to make public any of the names of those caught, "unless absolutely necessary."[58] The Council formally and publically reprimanded a student author for his article "The Matter with Our Athletics" which was instrumental in stirring up an athletic controversy on campus,[59] but was quick to add its opinion the student should not be asked to leave school for having written it. These were among the typical items for Council's consideration for the year, along with drawing up a constitution.

Council Constitution Ratified

As the time came near to submit the constitution to the Committee, there was little doubt it would pass. The hurricane of the Daily's invectives had subsided, and the calm of what the Daily reported as a victory for students had settled.

> We are pleased with the friendly attitude of the faculty towards the student council. Judging from the expression of several leading faculty members, they are favorable to student self-government . . .
>
> And, of course, it goes without saying that this kind of fraternalism in the ideal relation which should prevail between the faculty and the students.[60]

The first paragraph quoted above presents two concepts:

(1) that the faculty was kindly disposed toward a student council.

---

[58] Daily, December 8, 17, 1905.

[59] Daily, January 25, 1906, No. 85.

[60] Daily, April 6, 1906, No. 121.

(2) that the faculty was favorable to student self-government.

It would appear the author had never discerned the dichotomy. The students had previously asked to share jointly with the Committee the responsibility for the government of student affairs. This was the notion of a student council. The students had not asked for their own self-government. Confusion regarding the same issue appears to be a legacy to students and student personnel administrators to this day.

On May 25, the University Senate ratified the Constitution of the Student Council. It was new; it was exciting, and despite Professor Wenley's comment the following fall that Scottish colleges had had student councils for years,[61] it was an innovation at the University, and great interest was shown by the students as they prepared for their first official elections.

Campus Interest in Reform

The early 1900's had been years of reform nationally, and the college campus was not excluded. The University Civics League received a letter from Jacob Riis in which he asked their help as part of his national effort toward eliminating the ills of industrial civilization.[62] Samuel Gompers was to speak on campus, and there was great concern because the program printed to announce his lecture had not

---

[61] Daily, October 9, 1906, No. 13.

[62] Daily, January 29, 1907, No. 90.

been printed by union employees. While the report was in error, it was reported doubtful as to whether he would come because of the incident.[63] He spoke on "Labor Unions in America", to be followed a few days later by Booker T. Washington, reported as "one of the best products of the era of African freedom."[64] In retrospect, it appears as a paradox that the column headline in the Daily next to the one announcing Washington's lecture announced the successful minstrel the Michigan Union had recently sponsored.[65]

It was a time for testing; a time for growth. House clubs, honor systems,[66] and resolutions concerning infringement on personal liberty,[67] were current in campus discussion. Now even the women were demanding to be heard in their request for University housing, saying: "Boarding houses and lodging houses will give way to residential halls if the influences that make most strongly for character and culture are to be developed for the benefit of students."[68] Colleges and the activities of students were currently in review by the Saturday Evening Post in a "College Series". The University of Michigan's review ended the series, and was reprinted in

---

[63] Daily, March 31, 1907, No. 134.

[64] Daily, April 7, 1907, No. 140.

[65] Daily, Ibid.

[66] Daily, November 23, 1906, No. 52.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Daily, October 18, 1907, No. 22.

the Daily. The Post reported Michigan

> . . . is among the most chaotic of our universities, as it is among those that give greatest promise for the future.
>
> The disorder is largely due to the fact that the University has no dominant progressive policy.[69]

The Committee Tightens Its Grip

Perhaps students were reacting to the times, the immediate situation, or the confusion of reform. Agitation concerning an honor system was spreading to all departments on campus,[70] and the Student Council members were beginning to rebel at the system of having to report offenses of other students.[71] There was sentiment that students should be a part of the deliberations concerning fellow students when the committee on non-athletic affairs met.[72] Student riots were of magnitude.[73] Out-of-class and out-of-town activities were demanding more and more of the student's time. The faculty felt it necessary to tighten up. "Close watch is being kept over all students in the Literary Department who are participating in college activities,"[74] the Daily reported. Eligibility was to become a meaningful

---

[69]Daily, October 16, 1907, No. 20.

[70]Daily, November 9, 1907, No. 41.

[71]Ibid.

[72]Daily, February 16, 1908. No. 99.

[73]Daily, May 8, 1908, No. 54.

[74]Daily, March 31, 1908, No. 136.

word for non-athletic affairs, too.

Eligibility Rules Introduced

In March of 1908, two students who were appearing in the Michigenda, later to be known as the Michigan Opera, came to the Committee on Non-Athletic Affairs and asked for permission to take the show out of town after spring vacation; more specifically, that two students who had "outstanding conditions"[75] against them be permitted to make the trip. The requests were granted but at the same meeting the Committee moved:

> That no exception be made to the standing rule of this committee that students with outstanding conditions shall not be allowed to participate in student activities.[76]

A Need for Unity of Policy

Growth in student enrollment brought on a growing complexity of student interests. This meant that in addition to administrative responsibility for academic affairs, greater attention by the faculty had to be given to non-academic affairs. Academic and non-academic affairs were not, to be sure, divided, but keeping unity became a more staggering proposition even as it has continued to be to the present day. The multiplicity of organizations, each with its faculty adviser, made the schisms even more noticeable.

---

[75] Outstanding conditions meant that the student was on "warning", or "probation" as far as the college was concerned, for academic reasons.

[76] "Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs", I, p. 51.

The Committee on Student Organizations Other than Athletic had a membership of five. The time had come when unity of policy in the regulation of student organizations had to be effectuated. The Committee proposed to the Senate that a new and larger Committee be formed, and that the powers of the Committee be defined.[77] At a meeting of the Senate, March 15, 1909, the proposals of the Committee on Non-Athletic Organizations were presented and referred on to the Senate Council for their report.[78] On May 3, 1909, the Committee, as originally constituted in 1902, held its last meeting.[79]

On May 31, 1909, the University Senate adopted the report transmitted by the Senate Council, as follows:

> 1. No non-athletic activity shall hereafter be organized, launched, or continued by students of the University except by permission, first obtained, from the Senate Council. In every case the application for such permission, which must be in writing and signed by at least one student from each Department from which students for the proposed activity are to be drawn, should contain a full statement of what is desired by the applicants and their associates and of the object or objects in view, and should be filed with the President of the University.
>
> 2. The eligibility of students to take part in any activity that may be authorized by the Senate Council, is to be settled hereafter by the Deans of the respective departments, each passing upon

---

[77] Ibid., I, p. 54.

[78] Ibid., p. 55.

[79] Ibid., p. 58.

> the question as connected with students under his jurisdiction.
>
> 3. General supervision of such non-athletic acitivities as shall be authorized by the Senate Council is hereby delegated to a Committee on Non-Athletic Organizations, which shall consist of nine members, to be appointed annually by the President of the University from members of the Senate, which Committee shall have power and authority to appoint such sub-committees as may be necessary for the full performance of the duties herein imposed. Student representatives, chosen by the student body, may be eligible to membership on such sub-committees.[80]

The new and larger Committee began to function.

Policy Explained to Students

It was deemed necessary to explain the report to the students. For this purpose, Professor Lloyd prepared a report for the Daily.[81] "Faculty Watches Campus Societies", it read. "A finger on the pulse of every organization in the University - that is what the faculty proposes to have this year."[82] Resolutions were passed to the effect that all non-athletic student organizations must secure recognition and permission to continue activity from the Senate Council.

> This edict extends not merely to the mushroom societies that prevade the campus each year, but to the old and regularly established organizations, regardless of their purposes, ambitions or ideals.[83]

---

[80] Ibid., p. 59.

[81] Daily, December 14, 1909, No. 58.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid.

Professor Lloyd's report followed:

> In view of the recent action of the University Senate requiring the various non-athletic organizations and activities among the students to apply for recognition to the Senate Council and appointing a new committee of general supervision, an open statement seems not out of place at this time. The original action, it is true, was taken near the close of the last academic year, but only within a few days have the various details involved been even provisionally decided upon. Moreover misunderstanding is to be avoided.
>
> In the first place it should be said emphatically that the new policy is only a development or a more systematic and comprehensive expression of what has been in practice for some time. It should be said also that the few changes contemplated do not mean lack of sympathy with student life and its many enterprises. No one wishes for a moment to rob that life of its interest and spontaneity, for to the members of the teaching staffs as truly as to the students themselves a vigorous student life is one of the best gifts of a university. On the contrary, then, the purpose is improvement and real efficiency. There certainly is need, for example, of more balance and of a better university spirit and the hope is strong that these may be secured. Not least among the improvements contemplated is some means of bringing about co-operation in the determination of dates for public entertainments.
>
> So with regard to the organization and activities of student life it is to keep themselves better informed than heretofore and the intention of the officers of the University henceforth to secure greater promptness of action whenever action on their part is required and to these ends the following arrangement has been made. A committee of nine members of the University Senate, to be known as the Committee on Non-Athletic Organizations and to take the place of the old committee of the same name, has been appointed. This general committee has the power to appoint such subcommittees or boards as may be thought necessary. For the present year it has appointed, among others, the boards in control of publications,

musical clubs, dramatic clubs, the Students' Lecture Association, the Oratorical Association and the Michigan Union. Most of these boards have student as well as faculty representatives and both as to their individual members and as to their jurisdiction they remain substantially as in 1908-9. Also there has been no change in the manner of electing any of the student representatives.

All student organizations, then, now known to the committee and conceived to come under its supervision either have been notified or soon will be notified that they must first apply to the Senate Council for recognition. Organizations not receiving such notification, if in any doubt whatever as to whether they need make application, should consult the committee without delay. Then after action by the Council, if recognition shall have been granted, the president or other chief officer of each organization must report to the committee and make record of such facts as may be desired by that body. Lists of officers, for example, with addresses and telephone numbers, statements of general purposes, information as to membership and its qualifications and copies of constitutions, where there are constitutions, will be requested. And finally, when at any time permission is desired for special activities, such as public entertainments, out-of-town trips, and the like, this must be secured very much as in the past, the application going first to the special boards in control where such exist, and being referred or not, as may be found necessary, to the general committee or in extraordinary cases to the Senate Council. Of the few rules adopted with reference to participation in these activities only one need be given here, namely, that no student who has been warned or who is on probation can take part without permission of the dean of his department.

As to the recognition by the Senate Council, of course, this must never be understood necessarily to mean agreement or endorsement for all the views or purposes that may be represented in the organization and

> activities of student life. It is only an admission to registration and an open reminder of responsibility to the University. It assumes that students as well as others who belong to the University should have a reasonable freedom of life and thought.
>
> For the rest, the committee will keep regular office hours in the president's office, University Hall.[84]

Executive Committee Appointed

Even with the Senate's action, the Committee was unable to proceed with the work assigned to it without clarification from the Senate Council as to its intent in specific areas,[85] and requested a meeting with the Council for that purpose. The Senate Council instead responded through the Committee of Deans as to its intent.[86] The Committee on Student Affairs then appointed a sub-committee to recommend procedures for the Committee's implementation.[87] The sub-committee recommended an Executive Committee of three[88] be appointed by the President of the University to have full power over all ordinary matters of business between regular meetings of the general committee, that the Committee as a whole meet bi-monthly, that special meetings of the whole Committee could

---

[84] Daily, December 14, 1909, No. 58.

[85] "Minutes of Committee on Student Affairs," I, op. cit., pp. 65-67.

[86] Ibid., p. 67.

[87] Ibid., p. 62.

[88] The Chairman of the Executive Committee was to be the chairman of the Committee on Student Affairs.

be held at the Chairman's initiative, and that the executive Committee keep regular office hours.[89] Even a request for a chair and a desk had to have the approval of the Board of Regents.[90]

Firmly Established

It is perhaps an under-statement to say that the development of the Committee on Student Affairs had been tedious; however, from the efforts of this devoted and conscientious Committee the students were ultimately to receive the direction and help they would need before they could hope to establish responsible self-government at Michigan.

In his Annual Report to the Faculty Senate for the Committee on Non-Athletic Organizations, the Chairman for 1913-14, A. H. Lloyd, reported more than usual routine business for the Committee of the year,

> . . . but rather less than usual requiring formal action of the Committee. This was to be expected with the student body becoming educated to the purposes for which the Committee was organized. Perhaps the education has been slow, but it seems to have been fairly well accomplished at last.[91]

In the same report referred to above, the Committee on Non-Athletic Organizations recommended that its name be

---

[89]"Minutes of Committee on Student Affairs," I, op. cit., pp. 65-67.

[90]Ibid., p. 69.

[91]MS Committee on Student Affairs, Annual Reports, (1913-20) compiled copy (Office of Student Affairs, Ann Arbor), p. 1.

changed to the Committee on Student Affairs;[92] the name change was authorized by the Senate.

"Recognition" for Organizations

The helter-skelter mushrooming of societies, various fraternities and house-clubs, new honor societies, musical organizations, and social clubs had created a need for order in student affairs. Therefore, the requirement by the Committee on Student Affairs that each organization apply for "recognition" caused this recognition to bring with it prestige for the organization. Recognition by the Committee on Student Affairs did not, of course, mean "agreement or endorsement" of the policies and practices of each organization, but served as " . . . an open reminder (to the organization) of responsibility to the University . . . and a reasonable freedom of life and thought"[93] for the organization.

Order in University student organizations was being achieved. For example, the University Band was wholly reorganized,[94] and the Inter-Fraternity Conference adopted a new constitution which was considered by the Committee to be considerably advanced.[95]

---

[92] Ibid., p. 9.

[93] "Minutes of Committee on Student Affairs," I, p. 60.

[94] Committee on Student Affairs, Annual Reports, op. cit., p. 2.

[95] University Bulletin, New Series, XIV, Number 17, p. 15.

The powers of the Committee on Student Affairs increased yearly. Powers were also assumed, when in the Committee's judgment the Senate Council need not be bothered. However, permission for extraordinary non-athletic student activities including activities outside of Ann Arbor still had to be obtained from the Senate Council.[96]

Evolving as they were, many of the prerogatives of the Committee would ultimately become those exercised by students through their own self-government. There were, however, intervening steps before students would realize the privilege. First, the Dean of Students became chairman of the Committee on Student Affairs with power to act in all routine matters, and second, the committee's composition changed to include greater student representation. These steps are considered in Chapters IV and V.

Positive Student Response

In most cases students and their organizations were responding to the positive influences of the faculty interest in their affairs during the decade from 1910 to 1920. The Committee noted an improvement in the quality of students chosen to lead, and attributed it to the use of better methods in college politics.[97] This is not to suppose there was a complete absence of those organizations and individuals

---

[96]"Minutes of Committee on Student Affairs," op. cit., p. 2.

[97]MS Annual Reports, op. cit., p. 11.

who felt interests and good repute of the University should be subordinated to their own.

It was perhaps natural that students gave great attention to the myriads of details involved in their own social affairs and entertainment, yet they frequently showed their concerns for health and safety standards for individuals and groups, worked toward the reduction of "rough stuff" in mock initiations, and worked toward procuring better quality housing and fire protection for the campus community.[98]

By 1915 there was sentiment among students that the campus was becoming over-organized; however, the problem as seen by the Committee on Student Affairs was not that of over-organization, but a problem of inequality in the distribution of student membership within their organizations.[99] The women on campus initiated a point-system to control participation in activities in 1914, but the men rejected the idea of control over their right to participate in such activities as freely as they wished.

Two student organizations were created during the 1910's which merit individual mention in a study of evolving self-government for students. The first of these is the Judiciary of the Women's League, which was created in 1915; the second is the Honor System created in the College of Engineering in 1916. These organizations were the first of their kind to be established at the University of Michigan.

---

[98] Ibid., pp. 16-19.

[99] Ibid., p. 22.

It is noteworthy that both kinds of organizations, i.e., judiciaries and honor systems, are in operation on the campus today.

A Student Judiciary

In American government it is to the judicial branch that we look for clarification of legislative action and ultimate decision-making processes. The Women's League, in its 1915 constitution, was the first to establish three branches of self-government within any student organization at the University, thereby providing for a judicial structure.[100] The Judiciary handled infractions of regulations in various women's organizations; however the Judiciary's structure and operation is more appropriately discussed in Chapter IV.

An Honor System

The first undergraduate Honor System was adopted by the students in the Engineering College in 1916. "It is instituted at the request of the students themselves and is operated entirely by them, according to the principle that it is dishonorable for any man to receive credit which is not the result of his own efforts."[101] This system remains in effect today. It stands as an example of students' initiative in accepting responsibility for their own behavior.

---

[100]John Bingley, "Men's Student Self-Government, "op. cit., p. 1831.

[101]Melville B. Stout and Alfred H. Lovell, "The College of Engineering," Encyclopedic Survey; ed. Walter A. Donnelly, Volume III, p. 1173.

The Committee and World War I

The Committee on Student Affairs served well. It had been the Committee's aim from 1902 to make its administration of student affairs responsive to the Senate's wishes, and to serve as an intermediary between that body and the students. It was its aim to acquaint the students with the Faculty's ideas, and yet gain sympathetic insight into the views and aims of students.[102] History, rather than their then-current appraisal was to tell of their successes and failures in this regard.

World War I had become a reality. Many of the organizations "born to the blare of trumpets"[103] expired unostentatiously. The "Deutscher Verein" suspended activities, "sensibly and patriotically," it was reported.[104] The male attendance in the University dropped to such an extent the economic stability of the fraternities was threatened, and there was little choice for the Committee except to permit fraternities to initiate incoming freshmen, a practice which for many years had been foreign to University policy.[105] Practically the only service-organization that survived the tidal-wave of militarism was the Daily, and it was continued by the granting of a dispensation to freshmen under military age from the rules of eligibility, and by

---

[102]MS Annual Reports, op. cit., p. 33.

[103]Ibid., pp. 44-45.

[104]Ibid., p. 44.

[105]Ibid., p. 45.

the willingness of the women to give time and energy to its operation.[106]

It was the aim of the University to continue its life in as nearly normal a manner as possible during the War.[107] During a period of war is it perhaps a bit more acceptable to be considered paternalistic? At least the Committee on Student Affairs must have felt so, for with emotionalized indulgence it reported:

> The Committee is pleased to acknowledge that its efforts to encourage a sound attitude among the students have been anticipated rather than seconded by the natural leaders of student opinion. The Michigan Daily, for example, and the Student Council have displayed a consistent right-mindedness in their general policies. Whatever may be said of ordinary times, in the times that try men's souls the honor of the University is safe in the hands of its students.[108]

For the time, there it was to rest, but not so "When Johnny Comes Marching Home Again."

Chronology

1902	University Senate created the "Committee on Student Organizations Other than Athletic."
	Precedent set of appeal to the Board of Regents as the final authority in cases of dismissal of students.
1903	First campus-wide policy concerning student organizations adopted.

---

[106] Ibid., p. 51

[107] Ibid., p. 58.

[108] Ibid., pp. 43-44.

1905	Student Council established, with powers to recommend to the Committee on Student Organizations Other than Athletic.
1907	Students rebel at having to report offenses of other students.
1909	Student representatives eligible to serve on sub-committees of the Committee on Student Organizations Other than Athletic.
	Eligibility rules established for participation in activities.
	Recognition required by Senate Council for all Student Organizations.
1914	Name of "Committee on Student Organizations Other than Athletic" changed to "Committee on Student Affairs."
1915	Judiciary of Women's League created.
1916	Honors System established in the College of Engineering.
1917	Sharp reduction in student organizations because of World War I.

CHAPTER IV

OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

World War I was over. Supposedly the world had just been made "safe for democracy." Increased enrollment in colleges and universities was national in scope and reflected the continued industrial prosperity. In 1919-1920, there was a twenty-five percent increase in the University's enrollment; the number of students enrolled was 9,401.[1] "America had acquired a new and almost pathetic confidence in higher education."[2]

> . . . 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 co-operative student-faculty government.[3]

The rapid growth of the University occasioned great

---

[1]Marion L. Burton, The President's Report for the Year 1920-1921 (Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1922), p. 33. President Burton was the first President of the University to issue an annual report in book form covering the outstanding features of the year under review. Although annual reports to the Board of Regents were previously prepared, they had, to this time, appeared in the printed proceedings of the Board of Regents.

[2]Ibid., p. 143.

[3]Edith O. Humphreys, College Unions: A Handbook on College Community Centers (The Association of College Unions: Ithaca, New York, 1946), p. 25.

concern.[4] No problem is more apparent than that of housing when any community is suddenly deluged by an unanticipated increase in population; Ann Arbor, "a relatively small-sized city,"[5] was no exception. The University did not own a single building of any consequence for the housing of men.[6] Fraternities and sororities helped a great deal with the housing, but they were filled to capacity.

The gap that was so apparent in the area of housing for students was beginning to close in the area of social concerns, for in 1920, the Michigan Union was opened - "the most impressive club type of building to date, complete with hotel rooms, swimming pool, billiard room and tap room."[7] Although the Michigan Union revived the union idea and kept it alive,[8] for the purposes of this study, its existence on the Michigan Campus is significant because historically "from the very beginning a concept of student government was injected"[9] into the idea of a union. Michigan was no exception.

As a result of the growth in enrollment, additions of equipment and staff had to be made. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine the organization of personnel

---

[4]The President's Report (1920-1921), p. 143.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Humphreys, op. cit., p. 25.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid., p. 20.

administratively charged with the responsibility of the students' out-of-class welfare, their policies, and practices, with particular emphasis on the further evolvement of freedom for students to concern themselves with their own government.

The students had initially looked to the Regents and faculty for their government; then to the faculty, and later to the Committee on Student Affairs. After World War I, the title of the Committee on Student Affairs remained the same; however, the Committee's composition was considerably changed. In order to understand the changes, students had to acquaint themselves with a new administrator and his role. The new administrator was to be known as the Dean of Students; his office was new on the Michigan Campus.[10]

Students' Status: 1920-1921

The appointment of a Dean of Students who was charged with general responsibility for the students' out-of-class welfare was ultimately to have a decided effect upon the students' government. It is important, therefore, to purview the state of the students' government prior to the establishment of that office in order to better understand the changes that took effect almost immediately afterwards.

Admission

Except for admission to the professional schools, it may be said that admission to the University was granted upon evidence of the satisfactory completion of a full four-year

---

[10]Regents' Proceedings (1920-1923), p. 121.

course in a standard high school amounting to at least fifteen units of work.[11] Provided communications were complete and definite, and the credentials were official, it was rarely necessary for a student to come to Ann Arbor for a personal interview.[12]

Although the State of Michigan extended to all persons of either sex who were qualified the privileges of the University, it did not receive patronage but was itself the patron of those who sought its privileges.[13] Students not in their places at the opening of a semester had to present excuses from their parents or guardians for the delay, and flagrant cases of absenteeism were reported to the faculty for adjudication.[14] Students were suspended or dismissed whenever, in the opinion of the faculty, they pursued a course of conduct seriously detrimental to themselves or the University.[15]

Students were considered amenable to the laws of the City of Ann Arbor, and if guilty of disorder or crime, were liable to arrest, fine and imprisonment. Further, the University Senate provided that if a student was arrested or convicted on any offense by civil authorities, he was

---

[11] Catalogue of the University of Michigan, 1920-1921 (Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1921), p. 97.

[12] Ibid., p. 120.

[13] Ibid., p. 100.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

required to appear before the faculty of the school in which he was enrolled, and was liable to suspension or expulsion.[16]

Student Organizations and Interests

Matters of scholarship and general conduct were looked after by the faculties and administrative officers of the various schools and colleges, but all other student enterprises and organizations were under the supervision of two general committees - the Senate Committee on Student Affairs and the Board in Control of Athletics.[17]

> The Committee on Student Affairs has jurisdiction over the establishment of student organizations and the management of their affairs and the launching of new enterprises and activities, as well as to hold offices. The authority of this committee is derived from the University Senate and extends to all non-athletic activities and to all students in every school and college of the University. Activities of various types are supervised directly by appropriate sub-committees while the question of eligibility to participate in any non-athletic activity is under the immediate charge of the Sub-Committee on Eligibility.[18]

It is essential that details of the above be properly understood because with the appointment of the Dean of Students, the chairmanship of the Committee on Student Affairs was transferred to his office. More important than the transfer of the chairmanship was the fact that the power

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid., p. 101.

[18] Ibid.

to act was repeatedly placed in the hands of the Dean of Students.[19] It is not the purpose of this paper to appraise the use of this power, but it is appropriate to note the delegation of the power from the Committee, to the Dean of Students for it would decidedly affect the students' government and welfare.

Dean of Students

On February 10, 1921, on motion by Regent Murfin, the Board of Regents took the following action:

> Resolved, That there shall be established the office of Dean of Students and that said official shall by virtue of his office also be a member of the University Senate, and Chairman of the Senate Committees on Student Activities and on Student Publications.[20]

At the same meeting, the Board further directed the President and Secretary to provide such assistance, office space, furniture, and equipment as was needed by the Dean of Students.[21]

Why a Dean of Students?

Dr. Fred B. Wahr, first assistant to be appointed to the new Dean of Students at Michigan, stated that under

---

[19]After the appointment of the Dean of Students on February 10, 1921, he chaired the next meeting of the Committee on Student Affairs. The minutes reflect a significant change. Beginning May 6, 1921, and on, the minutes are filled with myriads of examples of this - "referred to the Dean with power." The concept of the chairman's role had changed. ("Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs," II, May 1912-June 1928), pp. 41-160.

[20]Regents' Proceedings (1920-1923), p. 121.

[21]Ibid.

President Hutchins, 1910-1920, there was no talk of the appointment of a Dean of Students.[22] Technically, this appears to be correct, for there is no reference to the title per se previous to 1921, when the Dean of Students was appointed; however, the appointment of a new officer had been requested by the Senate Council in 1919.

> Accordingly, on March 18, 1919, the Senate Council was asked to recommend the appointment of a new officer to be called Dean of Men, who should take over the duties of the committee (Student Affairs), and furnish the human contact between the student body and officialdom that was so much needed. The Council reported to the Senate favorably upon this recommendation, without, however, suggesting a definite title for the new officer, and on May 26, 1919, the Senate voted to approve the general proposal of the Senate Council and the Committee on Student Affairs and to recommend to the Regents the appointment of an officer to be known as "Assistant to the President in Relation to Student Affairs." The Regents approved this recommendation June 13, 1919, with the understanding that the title might be changed. Final action was to be deferred until the appointment of a new President.[23]

The appointment of a Dean of Students only climaxed an anticipated necessity. Those who were aware of the difficulties of exercising supervision over student activities felt that as administrative officers became increasingly involved in the business of the University, they would be less able to keep close contact with the

---

[22]Interview with Dr. Fred B. Wahr, July 8, 1963, Ann Arbor.

[23]President's Report (1920-1921), p. 33.

student body and its interests.

> The supervisory function of this new official was inherited from the committee of the University Senate which was known first as the Senate Committee on Student Affairs.[24]

Something of the tone on campus at the particular time is helpful in developing an understanding as to why members of the Committee on Student Affairs were pleased to be relieved of some of their responsibilities. Dr. Fred Wahr summarized it this way:

> President Burton wanted a Dean of Students. There is no doubt President Burton brought the idea with him from the University of Minnesota where he had seen such an office in operation. It was not a question of giving power to any new office and taking it away from the faculty. Faculty members were teaching at least sixteen hours, and all extra-curricular work was done in addition to their teaching load; nor did the faculty members receive any monetary reward or release from their teaching assignments for their extra hours. Committee meetings were held after classes, in the evening, or in the early morning. The faculty members were tired. Some, such as Alfred Lloyd and Louis Strauss, had given their services for years (1913-1920). When the troops came marching back to the campus, these men wanted to be relieved of their increasingly-growing responsibilities. Further, they felt it was impossible to give the individual attention to students the student deserved.
>
> Don't get the idea the appointment of the Dean of Students was popular with all faculty or students. Some of the

---

[24] Ibid.

> more vocal faculty members made it clear they could not understand the need for another full time administrator. After all, the student body was still small as compared to its current size, and even President Angell had taught along with his duties as President. Some of those who opposed the appointment in the first place couldn't understand how an Engineering Professor (Dean Bursley) could possibly be qualified to counsel students. Well, those who were opposed were comparatively few. Dean Bursley told me he had quite a few misgivings about his job the first six months, and even after that, but he stuck to it.
>
> Dean Bursley wanted no part of discipline. He wanted to draw students into his office to help them, and he did. You know, a student really needed a friend in those days. They didn't have counselors in the colleges; you just saw your professor before or after class, or at his home. But students in trouble didn't get a break from civil authorities if they appeared in the downtown courts; particularly if there was a citizen's vote at stake. The juries were taken right in off the street, and a student needed a "friend at court" both literally and figuratively.[25]

The Committee on Student Affairs began as a committee on organizations and had, in fact, remained for eighteen years exactly that.[26] Feeling themselves incapable of dealing successfully with the individual student in an empathetic manner, they had recommended in March of 1919, that a new officer be appointed, to be called the Dean of Men.[27] It was proposed this official would be the student's "friend at court", take over the duties of the Committee, and fur-

---

[25]Interview with Dr. F. B. Wahr, July 8, 1963.

[26]President's Report, op. cit., p. 33.

[27]Ibid.

nish contact between the student body and officialdom.[28]

> Thus the feeling was well established by the spring of 1919 that another old institution (Committee on Student Affairs) was out-worn and a new one must soon take its place.[29]

The Office and Policy

It is especially noteworthy that the Dean began his office term without issuing any general notice of policy to be followed. It appeared best at the time to gradually develop an understanding on the part of the great mass of students of his policies, and thereby he hoped to avoid misunderstandings.[30] With the fundamental purpose - service to students - spelled out in the creation of the office, and no prescribed policy announced, the office was relatively free to develop its own methods of operation. As decisions were made, they became in effect the policies of the office. Thus it was that historically the antecedents of many of the services of the Office of Student Affairs currently identifiable can be traced to the early developmental policies of the Office of the Dean of Students, such as concern for off-campus housing, financial aid, and regulations in regards to the use of automobiles.

> After World War I all was changed. In 1921 the Regents established the Office of Student Affairs, which became the "catch-all" for nonacademic or extra-curricular activities. This marked, so

---

[28] Ibid., pp. 33-34.

[29] Ibid., p. 33.

[30] Ibid., p. 34.

it would seem, the dichotomy between faculty and administration.[31]

The Student Advisory Committee

A request for recognition of a Student Advisory Committee was presented March 23, 1921, from the Student Council to the Committee on Student Affairs.[32] The proposed constitution for the Advisory Committee was adopted by the Senate Council on April 18, 1921.[33] This student-organized group held its purposes to be: to voice the sentiment of the student body to the Dean of Students, to discuss with him general principles of student conduct, to submit recommendations on such matters to the Dean, and to actively (italics mine) assist the proper University authorities in the enforcement of all rules pertaining to student conduct.[34]

It is noteworthy that the Student Council with the recommendation of the Dean of Students requested the formation of such an advisory group,[35] for it showed the willingness of the students to accept the new administrator's role as well as the students' desire to accept responsibility for standards and conduct of their peers. The constitution of

---

[31] John Bingley, "Men's Student Government," Encyclopedic Survey, IV, p. 1829.

[32] "Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs," II, p. 40.

[33] President's Report (1920-1921), p. 103.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid., p. 247.

the Advisory Committee contained provisions for semi-monthly meetings with the Dean of Students, but more significant for the students, it provided for an appeal to the President and Deans of the University in case disagreement arose between the Advisory Committee and the Committee on Student Affairs.[36]

President Burton said of the Student Advisory Committee:

> The establishment of this committee promises to be justified by the results. Administrative officials, although they must retain the authority to regulate student affairs, the responsibility for which eventually must be borne by them, welcome the friendly and constructive cooperation of the student body. It is hard for any institution to do good work if mutual distrust is the rule, and those agencies which tend to produce better understanding are under all circumstances to be encouraged.[37]

Here appeared clear evidence that retrospectively the period from 1919 to 1929 might be catagorically labeled "The Campus Democracy Stage" as Humphreys chose to call it.[38] Repeatedly the Advisory Committee was used to voice the sentiment of the students, such as recommending that the Junior-Hop be reinstated, and indicating its willingness to recommend to the proper authorities penalties for either individual or group violations of rules.[39] Student govern-

---

[36] Ibid., p. 104.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Humphreys, op. cit., p. 22.

[39] "Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs," II, p. 44.

ment on most campuses was a government in cooperation with the faculty. Three months after his appointment as Dean of Students at the University, Dean Bursley said:

> The student self-government body at Michigan, the Student Council, is too large to act as a whole in many matters. Now a coexistent but independent Advisory Council has been formed, consisting of nine members, three presidents of campus organizations, ex-officio, and six elective members. The Advisory Council which, as its name indicates, has now no charter and no power vested in it, promises to be exceedingly useful.[40]

It is of note that despite testimonies to the effectiveness of student government, at the Third Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men of Mid-Western Institutions, held at the University of Iowa, in April, 1921, the conference moved and carried:

> That this conference recommend to the various institutions represented[41] that in the management of student affairs, the cooperation of students and faculty be developed, so far as local conditions may permit, in preference to either student government

---

[40]"Secretarial Notes on The Third Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men of Mid-Western Institutions, Held at the University of Iowa, April 14-16, 1921."

[41]Those institutions represented at the Conference were: University of Illinois, University of Wisconsin, University of Michigan, Ohio Wesleyan University, Toledo University, University of Nebraska, University of Iowa, Purdue University, University of Minnesota, University of Kentucky, University of Missouri, Iowa State College, Grinnell College, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Iowa State Teachers' College, and the University of Colorado.

or faculty government exclusively.[42]

The Question of Who Should Discipline

President Burton shared Dean Bursley's opinion that his office was not properly an office to handle the disciplining of students.

> He is not the judge set over the students, nor the executioner who carries out the judge's sentence, but their advocate; and his appointment is an attempt to furnish our ever-growing official organization with a heart and human feelings.[43]

At the end of his first year as Dean of Students, Dean Bursley stated:

> While this association (with students) has been intimate, it is hoped that it may be even more so in the future, as it is only by getting the confidence of the student body and bringing them to realize that this office was established to help and advise, rather than to discipline, that any really worth while results can be accomplished.[44]

Michigan was not the only University concerned with the apparent conflict in the Dean's role there was no uniform answer to the problem.[45] Dean Coulter of Purdue said, "In every case within my knowledge the Dean of Men has had to

---

[42]"Secretarial Notes on the Third Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men," op. cit.

[43]President's Report (1920-1921), p. 35.

[44]"Minutes, Committee on Student Affairs," II, p. 50.

[45]"Secretarial Notes on the Fifth Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men Held at Purdue University, May 3-4-5, 1923," p. 3.

discover the duties of his office and to determine largely the limits of his authority."[46]

Even though the Student Advisory Committee was repeatedly used at the University of Michigan to recommend disciplinary action it was not an answer for the Dean of Student's problem, i.e. who should discipline? The Advisory Committee, as its name implied, served the purpose for which it was created and was useful to the Office of the Dean of Students. From 1921 until 1934, the Committee was used to investigate student infractions and make recommendations to the Dean of Students, the Committee on Student Affairs, and to the University Committee on Discipline.[47]

University Committee on Discipline

The University Committee on Discipline was created in 1922. President Burton and Dean Bursley shared the belief the Office of the Dean of Students would be weakened in students' eyes if it became disciplinary in function. The Advisory Committee could recommend, but it had no power to act. Someone had to discipline, but who?

In his plight, the Dean of Students turned to the Conference of Deans. This Conference, created as a significant administrative change made in 1921-1922, was the appropriate place to discuss the problem.

---

[46] Ibid.

[47] John Bingley, "Men's Student Self-Government," op. cit., p. 1830.

> A second administrative innovation of large importance has been the institution of informal weekly conferences of the Deans of the various schools and colleges, attended also by the Secretary of the University, the Assistant to the President, and, from time to time, by other officials with whom it is advisable to consult. The value of assembling the officers on whom the actual administration of University affairs devolves is obvious. As Dean of his own department, an officer may think mainly in terms of that department; coming to a conference with the President and his colleagues, he must think in terms of the University and give his counsel on matters of University interest. He is informed about the doings of other departments than his own and must naturally feel the impulse to shape his own administration in such a way as to conform to the common ends. The practice must tend to a unification of aims and procedures and to the development of a more intense esprit de corps.[48]

The plan to create a method for handling cases of discipline was informally discussed by the Deans in conference. It was then written by a committee appointed by the President of the Dean's Conference, and brought back to the Conference for further discussion, before being sent on to the Senate Council. It was referred by the Council to the several Faculties who discussed it and reported back to the Council. The Senate Council, after adding recommendations of the Faculties, sent it to the University Senate on May 15, 1922. It was adoped and sent to the Regents. The Regents adopted the plan (Committee on Discipline) at their

---

[48] The President's Report (1920-1921), p. 35.

meeting June 16, 1922.[49]

Although subsequently known by other names, this committee was the first University-wide committee charged with the responsibility of handling discipline cases involving individuals and organizations.[50] Even though its composition and procedures have varied, such a committee exists and is in use today.

The provisions made for the operation of the first committee are given below. They show how the much-needed unity in policy for handling cases of discipline was to be implemented and clearly removed from the jurisdiction of the Office of the Dean of Students.

> I. Discipline of Women Students
>
> All cases of discipline in so far as women students are involved may either be handled as at present or at the discretion of the Dean of Women be referred to the University Committee on Discipline. Women in the Nurses' Training School and Dental Hygienists are subject to the same disciplinary regulations as women students in all other parts of the University.
>
> II. Discipline of Men Students
>
> Cases of discipline, in which men students are involved and which fall under the jurisdiction of the University Committee on Discipline, must, whenever practicable, first be reported to the Dean of Students, who, with or without investigation, refers them to the committee. The Dean of Students is not a member of the University Committee on Discipline, but he may attend its meetings.
>
> It is recommended that cases which fall under the jurisdiction of the Faculties be brought to the attention of the Dean of

---

[49] Regents' Proceedings (1920-1923), p. 504.

[50] It should be recalled the Committee on Student

Students, and, so far as possible, before action is taken.

III. The Disciplinary Authorities
The disciplinary authorities are as follows:-
1. The Faculties or such committees as they may authorize.
2. The University Committee on Discipline.

IV. Jurisdiction of the Faculties or their duly authorized Committees

The Faculties of the Schools and and Colleges have complete jurisdiction in all cases of discipline which involve only their own students, but even such cases, specifically or as a general policy, may be referred for action to the University Committee on Discipline. Moreover, it is suggested that any Faculty so disposed may take definite action in cases of discipline of its own students may be referred, at the discretion of the Dean, to the University Committee on Discipline.

V. Jurisdiction of the University Committee on Discipline
The University Committee on Discipline:-
1. Exercises authority over all disciplinary cases involving students from more than one school or college of the University.
2. Acts in any other cases which are referred to it by the Faculties of the various schools and colleges acting through their proper authorities.

VI. Composition of the University Committee on Discipline
1. The University Committee on Discipline consists of three members of the University Senate and representatives of the Faculties, as hereinafter

---

Affairs, except in its earliest years never handled the discipline of individual students. This was handled by the faculty of the school in which the student was enrolled.

> designated, all having voting power.
>
> 2. The Senate members of the Committee are appointed by the President of the University. On the establishment of the committee, one member is appointed for three years, one for two, and one for one year. Thereafter one member is appointed each year, for a term of three years.
>
> 3. The Faculty members of the committee are members of the Faculties of the several schools and colleges, one from each, who are designated by the Deans of the respective schools and colleges, and hold office for three years.
>
> 4. The committee for the consideration of any particular offense shall consist of the three Senate members and of the Faculty representatives from the schools or colleges having students involved.
>
> 5. The University Committee on Discipline may at its discretion call in consultation members of the Student Council, the Student Advisory Committee, and the Judicary Council of the Women's League.
>
> 6. The decisions of the University Committee on discipline are final in all cases, but the President of the University shall be consulted (whenever practicable) before any final action is taken resulting in suspension or expulsion.
>
> 7. The University Committee on Discipline elects its own chairman and keeps its own records. It files with the secretaries of all the schools and colleges reports of its action in the cases which come before it stating the offenses and the penalties.[51]

Despite the careful provisions made to keep the Office of the Dean of Students free from having to handle discipline, it eventually became central in the disciplinary function.

> Central though the Office of Student Affairs became in the disciplinary machinery of the University, it had

---

[51] Regents' Proceedings (1920-1923), pp. 504-506.

> no special authority from the University Council or the Regents. . . . That the Office of Student Affairs gained more and more the nature of a disciplinary agency came not through legislation, but by default and, of course, ever-increasing student enrollment.[52]

Dean of Women

In 1896, the Regents resolved "that Eliza M. Mosher, M.D., be elected Professor of Hygiene and Women's Dean in the Department of Literature, Science, and the Arts, . . . her duties to begin October 1, next."[53] The Castalian[54] of 1896, announced her as "Dean-Elect of the Womans' Department."[55] It further recorded that "the presence of such a woman cannot but be of great value to the women of the University, and they may well feel that by her appointment a long-felt want has been supplied."[56] She was appointed to give special attention to the needs and welfare of women students.[57] The history of this office is well recorded,[58] but for the purpose of this paper, it is important to note that from the

---

[52]John Bingley "Men's Student Self-Government", op. cit. p. 1830.

[53]Regents' Proceedings (1891-1896), p. 577.

[54]A yearbook published annually by the independents of the Senior class at the University.

[55]Castalian, Volume XI (Published annually by the Independents of the Senior Class: A.C. Swift and Company, 1896), p. 50.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Alice C. Lloyd, "The Office of the Dean of Women," Encyclopedic Survey, Volume I, p. 283.

[58]Ibid.

establishment of the office in 1896 until after the establishment of the University Committee on Discipline in 1922, only the women in the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts were, by definition of authority, under her charge.

> Women enrolled in the colleges other than Literature, Science, and the Arts remained under the jurisdiction of the academic deans until 1923, when the jurisdiction of the dean of women was broadened to include all women enrolled in the University. This ruling apparently was an attempt to catch up with fact, for Dean Jordan's achievements from 1902 until 1922 are ample evidence that she was Dean of Women and not just Dean within the Literary College.[59]

Women's Self-Government

The claim is made that the women had self-government at the University from 1890.[60] Perhaps it would be more accurate to say women had such notoriously poor housing and social conditions, the formation of the Women's League in 1890 represented a kind of self-government for women created by the default of the University up to that time to make adequate provision for their welfare.

> Based on the principle that the problems of every woman are the concern of the Women's League, the resulting governmental function was a natural outgrowth. . . . Through the cooperation of the dean of women, a system of self-government developed, with prestige and dignity for all women students.[61]

---

[59] John Bingley, "Men's Student Self-Government," op. cit., p. 1828.

[60] Marian Swanson Wissenberg, "Women's Student Self-Government," Encyclopedic Survey, IV, p. 1834.

[61] Ibid.

Even though the University defaulted, the students proceeded to work for the desired improvement in these conditions through their own efforts. This was a significant step in student self-government at Michigan.[62] Article VI of the Constitution[63] describes the Judiciary Council of that government as follows:

> Sec. 1 - There shall be a Judiciary Council which shall consist of the President and Vice-President of the League, and the class representatives from the outgoing freshman, sophomore, and junior classes.
> Sec. 2 - The Judiciary Council shall have charge of all girls' class organizations and shall provide for the nomination by the classes of class representatives to the Judiciary Council.
> Sec. 3 - The Judiciary Council shall have charge of such matters of conduct and House Regulations as shall be referred to it by the Board of Directors, the Board of Representatives, or the Dean of Women.
> Sec. 4. - The Dean of Women shall be ex-officio member of the Judiciary Council.
> Sec. 5 - The Judiciary Council shall elect a secretary from its own number at the first meeting after its election.[64]

That the Judiciary Council was effective in making all-campus rules representative of student opinion is shown by the fact that in 1916,

> . . . the women's Judiciary Council presented a petition (signed by ten of the eleven sororities, all of the

---

[62] Ibid.

[63] Constitution of the Women's League, 1915.

[64] Marian Swanson Wissenberg, op. cit., pp. 1834-1835.

> league houses, and the dormitories) to the Committee on Student Affairs requesting that mid-week dances be abolished and that the closing hour on Friday night be one o'clock.[65]

After the Committee on Student Affairs was notified that the Student Council had approved the adoption of the proposed rule to abolish mid-week dances, it approved the action of both groups and forwarded the resolution to the University Senate where they were approved. Thus, for the first time in the history of student government at Michigan, a student-initiated proposal approved by the two existing student governing bodies became a campus-wide policy.[66]

It is also noteworthy that in 1922 when the University Committee on Discipline was established, a member of the Women's Judiciary Council and a member of the Student Council were invited to attend formal meetings of the Committee without vote. However, in the case of the representative from the Women's Judiciary Council, she was to attend only when cases pertaining to women students were discussed.[67]

Separate Offices

From their origins until 1962, the Office of Student Affairs and the Office of the Dean of Women were technically separate offices. Regardless of the title of its head occupant, i.e., Dean of Students or Dean of Men, the Office

---

[65] Ibid.

[66] "Minutes of Committee on Student Affairs," II (1913-1928), pp. 19-20.

[67] Marian S. Wissenberg, op. cit., p. 1835.

of Student Affairs remained an office rendering services primarily to male students. There were a few exceptions; for example, the Office of Student Affairs administered the automobile regulations and the issuance of identification cards for men and women.

The Office of Vice President for Student Affairs was created in 1954.[68] From that time until 1962, the Vice President served as a coordinative rather than a directive officer. Although administratively the responsibility for the welfare of students was divided according to sex, it was the policy of these offices to cooperate in mutual concern for the welfare of all students. Although conflicts ultimately appeared as a result of this bifurcation and apparent duplication of services, it is not within the scope of this paper to examine the conflicts. It is essential to mention the bifurcation in order to understand that at the University there existed side-by-side a government for men and a government for women.

The offices of Dean of Women and Dean of Men were abolished in 1962 in favor of a functional organization with the Vice President for Student Affairs in charge of a composite Office of Student Affairs.

---

[68] Regents' Proceedings (1951-1954), p. 1309.

Chronology

1919	Board of Regents approved recommendation of Faculty Senate to appoint a person to furnish contact between students and officialdom.
1921	First Dean of Students appointed.
	Student Advisory Committee created.
	Cooperative government of faculty and students believed to be best.
1922	University Committee on Discipline established.
	Students invited to attend meetings of University Committee on Discipline, without vote.
1954	Vice President for Student Affairs appointed.
1962	Offices of Dean of Women and Dean of Men abolished.

CHAPTER V

STUDENT GOVERNMENT DURING PROHIBITION, DEPRESSION, AND WAR

The cry for a new order of student guidance and control had been responded to by the creation of the Office of Student Affairs. It had not come too soon, for there had been a continual increase in the mass of detailed work for the Committee on Student Affairs. The Committee sensed " . . . its own inability to grapple effectively with the many problems of policy and details of administration, (and) above all, the need for competent and sympathetic leadership for the student body . . . ."[1] The rapid growth of the University, with its natural concomitant of growing complexity of life and vagueness of standards and ideals, seemed to demand the appointment of an administrative officer and office where proper attention could be given to student welfare.

In his Annual Report[2] prepared less than six months after the creation of the Office of Student Affairs in February 1921, the Dean of Students wrote:

---

[1]MS Annual Reports (Committee on Student Affairs, 1913-20), p. 78.

[2]Beginning in 1920-1921, the Annual Report of the Dean of Students is part of the President's Report. President's Report, 1920-21, pp. 247-249.

> While it is felt that the conduct of the student body as a whole is as good at Michigan as at any other university, still there were certain moral conditions existing in Ann Arbor last winter which were not all that could be desired. In order to correct these conditions steps which seemed rather drastic were necessary. . . . There seems to be little doubt that the unwholesome situation was brought about by a combination of three things - whisky or other liquor, public dance halls and the character of the music and dancing there; and finally, the automobile. If the impossible could be accomplished and the use of automobiles by students while in college eliminated, seventy-five per cent of the difficulty would be overcome.[3]

The Dean's Dilemma

In theory the Office of the Dean of Students was not that of "judge" of student behavior;[4] however, within a month after his appointment, six sets of parents were requested by the Dean to withdraw their sons from the University "on account of immorality."[5] The Dean had not thought it wise to delineate the nature of the general charge in his letters, but did extend to the parents of the men who were asked to withdraw the privilege of discussing the action with him at their convenience at a later date in Ann Arbor. Examination

---

[3]Joseph A. Bursley, "The Dean of Students," President's Report, 1920-21, p. 247.

[4]President's Report, 1920-21, p. 35.

[5]Letters from Joseph A. Bursley dated February 18, 1921 to March 2, 1921. Copies of these letters as well as responses to them are bound in a "catch-all" volume of records and correspondence entitled "University Committee on Student Discipline, March 1921 - June 1938," housed in the Office of Student Affairs, the University of Michigan.

of the responses from the parents would seem to prove none of them challenged his authority to act as he did, although there was sentiment expressed the penalties had been harsh and in some cases given without obtaining full legal evidence of the facts.[6]

All routine work previously done by the Committee on Student Affairs was handled by the Office of the Dean, including acting on petitions for recognition of new organizations; passing on the eligibility of students desiring to take part in campus activities, and acting upon the requests of student organizations for permission to give dances and various other social affairs.[7] To gain some appreciation of the magnitude of student social events during the year 1920-1921, sixty-four dances were given after spring vacation.[8] The housing of students and the work of the Foreign Student Adviser became the responsibility of the Dean of Students the same year.[9]

The responsibilities listed above were routine, but there were greater problems. One of the more serious campus problems was the use of liquor as related to the enforcement of the Prohibition Amendment. Dean Bursley said:

> The liquor situation is serious at

---

[6]Letter from L. B. Robertson of Detroit, Michigan, to J. A. Bursley, dated February 28, 1921.

[7]Joseph A. Bursley, "The Dean of Students," op. cit. p. 248.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid., p. 249.

> Michigan because of the proximity of Ann Arbor to Detroit and Windsor. The fraternities have ruled against drinking in the houses, but it still continues to some degree. There is more of it in the lodging houses. There is also much petty gambling.[10]

Some of the student problems were foreseen; others were peculiar to the University. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine those events which appear to have had a significant effect upon the students' government at the University during the 20's, 30's, and 40's, when the returning tidal wave of Veterans after World War II made rapid changes imperative.

Committee on Freshman Conduct

At a meeting of the Committee on Student Affairs, November 13, 1919, a communication from the Student Council concerning the establishment of a sophomore committee on Freshman Conduct was considered, and the following resolution was adopted:

> Resolved: That the request of the Student Council for permission to attempt the elimination of hazing by undertaking itself to prevent the disregard of campus customs by freshmen, be approved and the Council authorized to act through deputies appointed by the Council, provided it be done privately and

---

[10]Joseph A. Bursley, "The Regulation of Social Life," a speech given at The Third Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men of Mid-Western Institutions, University of Iowa, April 15, 1921. (Secretarial Notes on the Third Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men of Mid-Western Institutions, University of Iowa, April 14-16, 1921).

without violence to the offender.[11]

Thus was created a sub-committee of the Student Council known as the Committee on Underclass Conduct.

> In 1919 a Student Committee on Underclass Conduct was established to regulate the hazing of freshmen. In 1923 this committee fell into ill repute and, although not formally abolished, it disappeared.[12]

This action was particularly significant because from 1906, when it was created, to 1922, the Student Council appears to have played only a passive role in disciplinary matters.[13] No record exists of any direct disciplinary action taken by the Student Council for violation of University regulations until 1922.[14] On February 28 of that year Dean Bursley presented to the Committee on Student Affairs the case of the action of the Committee on Underclass Conduct in regard to a freshman named Thomas Orr. After a discussion of the various phases of the situation (hazing), the Committee recommended the Student Council draw up and submit plans, definite in nature, for the Committee on Underclass Conduct.[15] There is no record this was ever done, and as stated above, the Committee on Underclass Conduct disappeared. The case of

---

[11] "Minutes of Committee on Student Affairs," II, p. 34.

[12] John Bingley, "Men's Student Self-Government," op. cit., p. 1830.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] "Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs," II, op. cit., p. 49.

Thomas Orr received national attention, and it remains one of the most curious stories in the annals of the history of students at the University of Michigan. In its complete anecdotal form, it has no place in this study except for purposes of clarification; however, the principles involved are clearly pertinent, i.e., the question of the right of a student to disregard a campus tradition, and the question of the right of students to discipline their peers.

Freshmen Warned.

An Article appeared in the Michigan Daily on February 26, 1922, stating that the co-operation of classes on the campus in stopping freshman violations of Michigan Traditions was sought by the Underclass Conduct Committee.[16] The article requested prompt action be taken in reporting every freshman found guilty of violating any of the Michigan traditions to one of four students whose names and telephone numbers were listed. The article read:

> Cases of freshmen who are not wearing their pots (caps) or toques are still far too common. Such cases will receive immediate attention, according to the committee. While second semester freshmen are being given an opportunity to become acquainted with Michigan traditions, first semester freshmen will receive no such leniency. The committee feels that all students who have been here during the last semester, have had sufficient opportunity to become versed in the traditions of the campus, and have no excuse of any kind for not complying with these regulations.

---

[16] Michigan Daily, February 26, 1922, p. 7.

> Hazing of freshmen by other students is also under the ban of the underclass conduct committee. The committee will take charge of all freshmen in need of discipline, and will not tolerate interference by others. Cases of hazing which do occur may be reported to any member of the committee.[17]

As the Facts Were Told

Thomas Orr, Jr. stated that he received a letter demanding that he appear at the Michigan Union on the night of February 23, 1922, which was signed by the Chairman of the Underclass Conduct Committee of the Student Council.[18] Later in the same day Orr received a phone call asking if he had recieved the letter, and when he replied he had but did not intend to appear, he was assured that if he went, no harm would come to him.[19] He went, thinking he was going to talk with one man, but when he was urged to step into the room he saw a long table around which were seated some twenty fellows.

> . . . I was unable to get out the door as it was closed behind me. The man who seemed to be the spokesman who sat at the head of the table then asked me if my name was "Orr, 116 North State" and whether I came from Chicago. . . . He said that I had broken the Michigan traditions and that I had been called to this meeting and action was to be taken

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] "Statement of Facts of Louis Thomas Orr, Jr., In Respect to Hazing at the University of Michigan," (Stivers & Laird, Attorneys at Law, First National Bank Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan) In bound volume entitled "University Committee on Student Discipline," housed in Student Activities Building, University of Michigan.

[19] Ibid.

against me by order of the president of the University. Then he asked me why it was that I didn't wear a freshman toque and who I thought I was and whether I thought I was any better than anybody else. I told them that I came to the University of Michigan to study and to learn something and that was my object there. Then he said "That is all right" and two fellows led me out into the corridor. I waited out in the corridor (they told me to wait) and I waited in the corridor and they closed the door and some three minutes later I was led back into the room. They told me then that I was in for a beating and again they told me that everything that they did was by order of President Burton. When they mentioned I was to be beat I doubted I was to be beat by the authority of the President of the University. Then it was that they said "Whatever treatment you receive here is by order of President Burton." I was then told to turn around, bend over and take hold of my ankles. They said "there is no use trying to fight now, Orr, because it won't do you any good." . . . A paddle was produced from somewhere, it was over three feet long and about six inches wide and an inch and a quarter thick. . . . Seeing that resistance was impossible, I bent down and grapsed my ankles. . . . They stood back and I received the hardest blow that I received ever in my life. At the first crack a splinter from the board flew past my head . . . . I fell forward, caught myself, and straightened up and started to walk around the room. From the time I bent over and saw the piece of wood fly past my face everything was in a blur. My recollection is that I walked around the room in great pain and very much grieved that I should receive such treatment. Then I recall their leading me back again, bending me down and the same thing happened again. I recall, that is I have a hazy recollection . . . I received three or four, I don't know. . . . I should say also that Ted Banks, the president of the Student Council was chairman of this meeting, and was present during the entire proceedings. . . . I was led out, . . . left alone and the door was closed behind me. I recall

> walking . . . in the cold night air. I walked and walked the Lord knows where I went and when I came home it was four o'clock in the morning . . . . Between the time I bent down for the first whack and when I reached my room at four o'clock in the morning I have only a hazy recollection. . . . I got up about, I think it was three o'clock in the afternoon, still in great pain. I dressed carefully after having tried to take the blood off my back. . . . After I had eaten I went home and realized the necessity of studying. . . . Both physically and mentally I was exhausted. . . . I sat there and tried, but it couldn't be done. . . . I did not tell anyone or communicate with anybody about what had happened to me the night before.[20]

The student's father arrived unexpectedly the day after the event, and the story was related to him.[21] The two went to see President Burton the next day.

> . . . He (President Burton) said the matter would be investigated thoroughly and nothing of that kind would be permitted again and asked us to go see Dean Bursley. . . .[22]

The case was related to Dean Bursley

> . . . and he said that things like that couldn't go on on the campus and he did not know that things of that nature had been going on and he thought if he had known they were he would have stopped them right off, . . . he would stop them immediately and see that nothing like that ever occurred again, and I asked him if this committee that beat me up had done so with any authority and he said "no". . . .

---

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

> My father asked him if he would see to it that I was thoroughly protected from any such attacks as this in the future, and he said "Yes, this matter will receive my immediate attention and I will bring those fellows in Monday morning and this will not be repeated."[23]

It Happens Again

The headline to the article in the Michigan Daily on April 21, 1922, read: "Freshmen Warned To Observe Rules."[24] It called the attention of freshmen to the necessity of observing Michigan traditions.

> Freshmen may not appear on the campus bareheaded according to members of the Underclass Conduct Committee. . . . The attention of freshmen is also called to the necessity of observing other Michigan traditions. Discourtesy to upperclassmen has resulted in the sending of reports of the offending freshmen to the committee. A very common offense which, according to committee members must be remedied, is the "door courtesy". Freshmen must allow upperclassmen to pass through a doorway in front of them. This same courtesy must be observed when freshmen meet upperclassmen at sidewalk intersections.
>
> Pipe smoking by freshmen has not been a common violation during the present year, but vigilance against such conduct has not been raised.

On April 22, the Daily reported President Burton had received a telegram from Louis T. Orr, Sr., of Chicago, protesting, as interfering with constitutional rights, an alleged attempt to force his son to submit to "arbitrary

---

[23] Ibid.

[24] Michigan Daily, April 21, 1922, p. 8.

hazing".[25] The article further stated:

> The Senate Committee on Student Affairs is said to have admonished the Underclass Conduct Committee not to mistreat Orr, when it was reported some time ago that there were plans under foot to paddle him on account of his refusal to abide by freshman traditions.[26]

In the same issue of the Daily[27] an editorial appeared to the effect some freshmen seemed inclined to disregard summons sent them by the Committee on Underclass Conduct.

> . . . As a matter of fact, it (Committee on Underclass Conduct) has more power than they think. That committee is an authorized unit of the Student Council, the under-graduate governing body of the University, and, as such, has full power to summon before it any persons who are reported to have violated freshmen rules. Its summons are not to be ignored; neither has a freshman any business to sit in judgment over the council or its sub-committee. . . . The Underclass Conduct Committee aims first of all to be just in its decisions. and does not seek in any way to work a hardship on the yearlings. It has proved to be an effective means of doing away with mob hazing in a just and dignified way. . . . But the fact that hazing is taboo does not relieve the freshman from his obligations. He will be a freshman for only five weeks more; but during that time he may be doing himself a favor if he will watch his step. The Underclass Conduct committee is not fooling.[28]

The next day a "Freshmen Notice" appeared in the Daily calling for a mass meeting of all freshmen for purposes of

---

[25] Michigan Daily, April 22, 1922, p. 1.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid., p. 2.

taking action on members of their class "who fail to observe their class traditions."[29] At that meeting "it was voted to declassify and ostracize Louis T. Orr, the yearling who has refused to wear his freshman toque. . . ."[30] Resolutions were established to meet reoccurances of such cases. They were:

> In the future all freshmen who refuse to live up to Michigan traditions as stated by the Student Council shall be declassified and ostracized by their class.
>
> Second: That the Michigan Daily be requested to publish the picture of said violator and reasons for said action taken, provided for in article one.[31]

Despite the protest of a speaker at the mass meeting who attempted to champion Orr's cause. the mass ruled. The Daily headline of a page one article read: "Freshman Class Votes To Oust Orr From Ranks."[32]

A Paradox

The same day the notice for freshmen appeared in the Daily warning freshmen to observe rules (April 21, 1922), the President of the Student Council spoke at the Fourth Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men, held at the University of Kentucky. The Secretarial Notes of that conference record the following regarding his speech.

---

[29] Michigan Daily, April 23, 1922, p. 1.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

> Mr. A. G. Goetz, president of the Michigan student council, was the next speaker. He believed that the plan of cooperative management as contemplated by the preceding speakers is fairly well worked out on the Michigan campus. The council is advisory and has only the right to make recommendations; the right of authoritative action rests with the faculty. The council works in conjunction with the Dean of Students. It does not desire sole and final authority, realizing that it can obtain better results cooperatively. At the same time, the faculty allows it a large measure of authority and responsibility, as when it took action against an offending fraternity during the current year and stood back of its action alone and unaided when attacked by influential alumni. The faculty sustained its judgment and was proud of its firmness.[33]

On the Michigan campus the confusion in the students' minds seemed to present a picture of the Student Council's role somewhat less clearly than their President had painted it at the conference.

Another Episode

On April 25, Orr was picked up at his room, his hands bound and a pillow case put over his head. He was then taken into rural area near Ann Arbor. The passing of a car not belonging to a member of the group brought a temporary termination to the antics in which "someone spoke of paddles, tar and paint."[34] Orr told it as follows:

---

[33]"Secretarial Notes on the Fourth Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men, Held at the University of Kentucky, April 20-23, 1922," p. 23.

[34]Statement of Louis Thomas Orr, Jr., op. cit.

> After the second car had passed, they stood me up again and told me that none of them were Freshmen, and that they were all upper-classmen, and members of the Student Council. They then proceeded to call me down for going to the J-Hop. Then they asked me why it was that I would not wear a Freshman cap. That question was asked again. I told them that I had never been asked to wear one and that I had merely been commanded and beaten to wear one. They then said that they had never heard of this before. They promised me then that if I would promise then that I would wear a Freshman cap and abide by all Michigan traditions that they would re-instate me in the Freshman class. I consented that I would wear a Freshman cap and would abide by the Michigan traditions, if they would re-instate me in the Freshman class in the same standing I was before. They then said it was done. They shook hands with me all around, (there were about twenty or thirty fellows,) and they untied my hands. They then said: "We, as Freshmen, promise you that we will re-instate you in the Freshman class in the same standing as before." It was then that they stated that they were all Freshmen.[35]

Orr was returned to his room. After this he was congratulated and told it would help him and them if he made a statement to the Daily.

> They then told me that it would be to my benefit and as a benefit for them, if I would make a statement and sign it, that they could put into the Michigan Daily, to the effect that after I was re-instated in the Freshman class that I would abide by all Michigan traditions. . . . They left and about ten minutes later they returned. . . . He said that if I signed this statement (one Orr had not prepared) that everything would be cleared up and the Student Council would drop all things

---

[35] Ibid.

> against me and would rescind all statements that had been made against my character or reflected on me, and that I would be reinstated in the Freshman class. After I had signed this statement, they shook hands all around with me and promised that everything would come out alright, and they left.[36]

The next morning the following article appeared on page one of the Michigan Daily.

> Louis T. Orr, who refused to wear his freshman toque, and who was ostracized from the class by 300 of his classmates at a mass meeting in Hill auditorium Monday afternoon, exhibited a change of attitude last night and issued the following signed application to the Student Council:
>
> "I wish to express my desire to the Freshman class to be reinstated in the class. I wish to state that in the future I shall conduct myself as will become a student in the University of Michigan, and I shall in the future observe all Michigan traditions. Although there have been misunderstandings I believe my statement to observe Michigan traditions will settle the trouble that has arisen. I am making this statement in the presence of members of my class and the Student Council, and make it of my own free will."
> L. T. Orr.[37]

In the same issue of the paper as noted above, another "Freshman Notice" appeared stating there would be a four o'clock meeting of all freshmen in University Hall to consider the petition of Orr to be re-instated in the Freshman class.[38] It further stated that after reinstatement in the class the

---

[36] Ibid.

[37] Michigan Daily, April 26, 1922, p. 1.

[38] Ibid.

council would consider such action as sufficient to drop all proceedings against Orr. Orr was told that it would not be right for him to be there, and accordingly stayed away.[39] The next day the Daily reported Orr was reinstated on probation until June, provided he observed traditions. The article further stated:

> Adverse opinions were offered and the discussion waxed hot and furious. One element declared that Orr should not be re-admitted to the class under any consideration - he had broken and violated traditions and for that reason should be punished. In rebuttal the other side asked if "a man who had done wrong and repented should not be given a chance to make good?"[40]

There is no evidence it might have occurred to those taking action that no so-called "other side" had been taken at all. Those presenting the rebuttal were only taking a different view as to how one who was judged to be guilty might be treated.

Hazing

It is of note the University position was very clear on the question of hazing. " . . . No true university can or will tolerate physical violence, interference with personal liberties, or lawlessness,"[41] President Burton stated. Hazing had always been a troublesome one to universities, and speaking in general, hazing in American universities in the 1920's

---

[39]Statement of Louis Thomas Orr, Jr., op. cit.

[40]Michigan Daily, April 27, 1922, p. 1.

[41]President's Report (1921-1922), p. 148.

occured far less frequently than it had formerly.[42] Even the students appear to have realized this.

> If those who sympathize with the lowly and persecuted freshman of today had only been here 10, 15, or 20 years ago, they would have a different notion of the whole thing. College life now, we are told, is a Sunday school picnic compared with college life of that day.[43]

The University authorities did not side-step the issue. After the report of the first of two serious incidents of hazing in 1921-1922, when the subject of hazing arose through the activities of the Underclass Conduct Committee of the Student Council, President Burton authorized a faculty Committee of Inquiry.[44]

On May 3, 1922, a conference was held with the Deans, the Committee on Student Affairs, two members of the Board of Regents, selected students and other interested parties.[45] At the conference "a sincere effort was made to provide a real opportunity for a full and free expression of opinion . . ." on the subject of hazing.[46]

---

[42] Ibid., p. 146.

[43] Michigan Daily, May 4, 1922, p. 2.

[44] President's Report (1921-1922), loc. cit. The two cases are those of Louis T. Orr, Jr., and Josselyn Van Tyne. Josselyn Van Tyne's father was Claude C. Van Tyne, at that time a Professor of History at the University. Although details of the two hazing incidents differ, both resulted from what the Committee on Underclass Conduct chose to call "failure to observe University tradition." Details of the Van Tyne case may be found in the Michigan Daily of April 27, 30; May 13, 1922.

[45] President's Report (1921-1922), p. 146.

[46] Ibid.

On May 10, 1922, the Deans, in conference, voted that a Committee of Inquiry[47] be appointed by the President to make its report to the Regents, May 26, 1922.[48]

The following statement over the signature of the President appeared in the Daily on Sunday,

> To the Students of the University:
>
> It seems wise to reiterate at this time that the University cannot tolerate in any way the use of violence; but with this understood, to make clear that the the University stands behind the Student Council in its efforts to develop effectively what is termed "student self-government."
>
> "Student self-government," the University believes is an effort (to) substitute reason for force; and the students by their use of force are attacking their own form of government. If force or disorder be encouraged by student opinion, as expressed in the editorial columns of The Daily this morning, it can have no other effect than that of defeating the plan of "student government."
>
> The Committee of Inquiry, recently appointed, unanimously concurs with this statement. M. L. Burton, President.[49]

Committee of Inquiry

The Committee held extensive hearings. All students known from whom there seemed reason to expect that useful information could be secured were called before the Committee. About forty witnesses were examined, and the number included at least fourteen members of the Underclass Conduct

---

[47] Ibid.

[48] Regents' Proceedings (1920-1923), pp. 472-474.

[49] Michigan Daily, May 14, 1922, p. 1.

Committee.[50]

The Committee endeavored to ascertain the names of the students who took part in the hazing of Orr on the night of April 25, and of Van Tyne on the afternoon of May 10.[51] They investigated all phases of hazing at the University, including the methods employed by the Underclass Conduct Committee to prevent hazing, and considered what should be done to improve conditions.[52] At the time the report was made to the Regents, the investigations into the cases of Orr and Van Tyne were still being made.[53] For purposes of this study, it is important to consider the conditions on the campus at the time and the attitude of the Underclass Conduct Committee toward hazing.

Conditions and Attitudes

For the year 1921-1922, more than two hundred freshmen had been reported and called before the Undergraduate Conduct Committee for failure to conform to the so-called traditions of the University.[54] The minutes of the Committee show that sixteen were punished by three hard blows of a paddle, and the rest were warned or reprimanded.[55] The punishments ranged from severe to brutal, and in all cases were intended

---

[50] Regents' Proceedings (1920-1923), op. cit., p. 472.

[51] Ibid., p. 473.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid.

to be and were humiliating.[56]

It appeared that then-current members of the Student Council and Underclass Conduct Committee had not observed, understood, or even known of the agreement made by the Student Council with the Committee on Student Affairs, the express terms of which forbid personal violence being employed in enforcing the rules of student conduct.[57]

The Committee of Inquiry found no evidence that the Student Council, the Underclass Conduct Committee, or any member of either body had any knowledge or part in the abductions and hazings of Orr and Van Tyne.[58] The Committee found the Underclass Conduct Committee and Student Council had done much to restrain disorder and hazing; however, the Committee found considerable zeal shown in dealing with violations of traditions.[59]

Throughout the year the Daily had been persistent in its propaganda campaign to educate student opinion to approval of and pleasure in the infliction of physical pain

---

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid. Reference is made to an agreement made in November, 1919, with the Committee on Student Affairs. (Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs, Volume II, p. 34.)

[58] Ibid. This opinion differs from Orr's testimony prepared by Attorneys Stivers and Laird entitled "In Respect to Hazing at the University of Michigan." (Collection of papers bound in a volume entitled "University Committee on Student Discipline", Office of Student Affairs, University of Michigan.)

[59] Ibid., p. 474.

upon fellow students.[60] The results were evident in the Underclass Conduct Committee's behavior, but they were also evident in practices of some fraternities and societies.[61]

The report of the Committee of Inquiry had made it imperative steps be taken to make perfectly clear to the student body the attitude of the University toward personal violence. In order to do this and improve existing conditions recommendations were made by the Committee; the report was accepted and placed on file by the Regents. These recommendations were as follows:

> (a) That the students generally and the members of the Student Council and Underclass Conduct Committee particularly again be notified that the University cannot authorize or in any way permit the use of physical force or violence as a means of enforcement of regulations or punishment for their infractions.
> (b) That, with this accepted and agreed upon, student control of student relations should not be discontinued but, under proper regulations, should be encouraged and enlarged; and that the Committee on Student Affairs should hold conferences with the student organizations holding such control and keep in close touch with them and their methods and proceedings.
> (c) That it should be understood that conformity to student customs cannot be made a prerequisite to the enjoyment by any student of the privileges of the University, which are open to those who pay the required fees. That outside of these privileges, the recognized student control may be enforced by some student organization hereafter to be determined by denial to non-conformists of

---

[60] Ibid.

[61] Ibid.

> privileges, social, class, and other, as may from time to time seem necessary and proper.
> (d) That if student control can be worked out along such lines it may be of real value to the University, but if it must rely for its enforcement upon any form of physical force and violence, it must be given up.[62]

These recommendations were carried out.[63] Later reports from the same Committee of Inquiry dealing with individual offenders were approved by administrative officers and the penalties were applied by the Deans of those Colleges in which the students who were involved were registered.[64]

The University's position was clear. It would not tolerate physical violence, interference with personal liberty, or lawlessness. With these principles understood, the University was committed to student self-government.[65] President Burton described student self-government as follows:

> The whole enterprise is a study in citizenship. A University in one sense is a training school for the public-minded person. Students must learn while in the university that they have serious responsibilities to the entire group of which they are apart. Consequently, student leadership in maintaining wholesome traditions and in stamping out every form of violence, disorder, and lawlessness is necessary. No one can do this more effectively than the students themselves. They

---

[62] Ibid., pp. 474-475.

[63] President's Report (1921-1922), p. 147.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid., p. 148.

> responded always to any appeal to reason, fairness, and sportsmanship. As a group, they are among the best products of American life. They are not in any sense a group of thugs, bandits, or criminals. By their response to America's appeal in the war they have given actual evidence of their devotion to law and their concern for the best things in civilization. Students do not set out deliberately to do violent things. Some mere coincidence or some strange, fortuitous circumstance develops some unusual situation and results follow which no student really desired and for which he has genuine regret. The overwhelming proportion of the students are just as sound in their attitude to the abiding values of organized society as their elders.[66]

It was President Burton's plea that the subject of hazing be approached with an open mind.[67] In this regard, he said,

> . . . By those of us who remember that Phillips Brooks once said with great insight that "no man is a man who has lost all of the boy out of him," it (hazing) will not be taken too seriously. Sometimes a sense of humor is a saving grace. It certainly is always an asset, if not a necessity, in dealing with thousands of healthy, vigorous, throbbing youths. We cannot forget these main underlying facts. We can make no real headway by going to extremes in either direction. Certain rigid facts confront us on both sides. We have simply endeavored to say that we have unlimited confidence in college students, in spite of the fact that at times they do what they ought not to do (and who does not?), and that no true university can or will tolerate physical violence, interference with personal liberties or lawlessness. The two statements are not in any sense contradictory,

---

[66] Ibid.

[67] Ibid.

> but entirely compatible and harmonious. In fact, we shall do away with hazing just because the students are, at their best, what they are. Sporadic outbreaks of hazing, in other words, are lapses. College men are opposed to hazing.[68]

It should be pointed out the University Committee on Discipline was not created to deal with those involved in the incidents of hazing on the University campus.[69] The official records show that subject was before the Conference of Deans as early as January 18, 1922,[70] and the first hazing incident was brought to the specific attention of University authorities on February 24, 1922.[71]

One fact, however, is pertinent in regards to the University Committee on Discipline. For the first time in its history, the University was in a position officially to deal speedily with cases of discipline in which students from more than one school or college were involved.[72] The manner in which discipline is handled is a matter of concern to the University as a whole even today.[73]

---

[68] Ibid., pp. 148-149.

[69] See Chapter IV.

[70] President's Report, op. cit., p. 149.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Michigan Daily, July 27, 1963, p. 1. The Regents approved replacement of the Committee on Student Conduct with the University Committee on Standards and Conduct. Final appeal by the student, though rarely used, is to the Board of Regents.

When the students returned in the fall of 1922, talk of hazing had subsided. There were no recurrences of the hazing difficulties of the previous year. [74]

A Reorganized Student Council

Despite efforts to cooperate on occasion, the Student Council as organized at the time (1922) was not proving an effective check on student outbreaks, such as theatre rushes and drinking violations. The University Committee on Discipline recommended the Student Council be reorganized in such a way as to add to its effectiveness.[75] The President was authorized to appoint a committee of three to represent the Senate Council in reorganizing the Student Council.[76] A committee of students were called into consultation, and a plan for reorganizing the student Council was determined upon.[77]

The final form of the Student Council's Constitution appears in the President's Report (1922-1923);[78] however, for the purposes of this study only changes which appeared to make it more effective are noted.

The old Council had been composed of representatives of various classes in the several units of the University; as

---

[74] President's Report (1922-1923), p. 149.

[75] Ibid., p. 150.

[76] Ibid., p. 151.

[77] Ibid.

[78] President's Report (1922-1923), pp. 151-153.

a result it was an unwieldy body.[79] The new was made up of nine members elected at large and three ex-officio members, the President of the Michigan Union, the editor of the Michigan Daily, and a representative of the athletic interests.[80] It was clearly the hope that by the membership of recognized leaders there would be expression of student opinion and activities which would provide positive leadership for all students.[81] This time the responsibility of the Student Council to the Committee on Student Affairs was spelled out: "The Student Council shall be responsible for its actions in the future to the Senate Committee on Student Affairs."[82]

The reconstruction of the Student Council met with the approval of the student body in general,[83] and of the reconstruction, President Burton said, "We cannot but feel that something constructive has been done in this, which will be for the lasting benefit of student self-government at Michigan."[84] The first elections were held after spring vacation, 1923.[85]

---

[79] Ibid., p. 153.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Ibid.

[82] Ibid., p. 152.

[83] Ibid., p. 153.

[84] Ibid.

[85] Ibid.

NEW RULES

In May, 1923, the Regents authorized the summary dismissal of any student who was publicly intoxicated,[86] and further, that rather then have the good name of the University suffer from disgraceful conduct of certain students, the student functions might be abolished by the Committee on Student Affairs.[87]

But of all so-called new rules of the 1920's, by far the most controversial, not only at Michigan, but at other American Universities, was the control of the student use of automobiles.[88] This is a current student issue on campuses today, including the University of Michigan.[89]

Student Use of Automobiles

In the first Annual Report of the Dean of Students, the assertion was made that if it were possible to eliminate the use of the automobile by students, seventy-five percent of the problems of University administration would be overcome.[90] Although no mention is made of student use of automobiles in the second and third Annual Reports of the

---

[86] Regent's Proceedings (1920-1923), p. 800.

[87] Ibid.

[88] President's Report, op. cit., p. 155.

[89] See yearly scrapbooks of articles on Auto Regulations, Office of Student Affairs, University of Michigan. The author of this paper was charged with the administration of the Auto Regulations from 1960-1962, on the University of Michigam campus.

[90] President's Report (1920-1921), p. 247.

Dean, there is no reason to suppose the problem was less acute.[91] In his fourth Annual Report, the comments of the Dean of Students were tempered in comparison to his first report.

> If a solution could be reached so that the use of automobiles by students was the rare exception rather than the almost universal rule, some (italics mine) of the most difficult problems of University administration would be eliminated, and the best interests of the whole student body would be well served.[92]

Perhaps this tempering of opinion had come about as a result of action taken by the Regents June 14, 1923, to reinforce the recommendation from the Deans' Conference of June 6.

> Resolved, That this Conference reiterate its recommendation to the Board of Regents regarding the use of automobiles by students and their parents should be asked to cooperate with the University authorities toward lessening the use of automobiles by students.[93]

Without restatement, the Regents approved the resolution of the Deans as expressing also the views and policy of the Regents; it therefore became University policy.[94]

The matter had been discussed at the Deans' Conference on September 20, and again on October 4; on each

---

[91] President's Report (1921-1922), pp. 270-276; President's Report (1922-1923), pp. 259-263.

[92] President's Report (1923-1924), p. 253.

[93] Regents' Proceedings (1920-1923), p. 811.

[94] Ibid.

occasion the Dean of Students had given reports on action taken by other Universities.[95] On October 18, the Deans voted that the President should prepare a letter to be sent to all parents pointing out the advisability of curtailing the use of automobiles by students.[96] The letter was an appeal for cooperation, and is quoted in part because it serves as an example of the administration's policy to legislate with reserve, to appeal for cooperation, and to maintain the high aims of the University.[97]

> To the Parents and Guardians of Michigan Students:
>
> Feeling certain that the maintenance of a spirit of democracy and of a high standard of conduct at the University of Michigan is of deep interest to you, I am addressing you to ask your cooperation in a matter of vital concern to the welfare of all our students.
>
> I refer to the problems arising out of the rapidly increasing use of privately owned automobiles. Now the automobile is an obvious necessity in modern life. We are not arguing against its use in general but its presence at a University among thousands of students produces complications which cannot be ignored. While undoubtedly we have some cases where a car is almost a necessity, these cases are relatively few. In nearly all instances your son, or daughter, would be much better off without the use of an automobile while in Ann Arbor. The possession of cars by students too often leads to a serious waste of time, to the growth of many forms

---

[95] President's Report (1922-1923), p. 156.

[96] Ibid.

[97] Caution should be observed not to pass judgment upon the necessity of the use of automobiles in the 1920's as it might be viewed in the 1960's.

> of extravagance, and to an increase in practices which, besides distracting the students from the purposes for which they came to the University, involve moral risk. . . .
>
> Other universities all over the country are faced with this problem, and we are trying to solve it - some by prohibiting the possession or use of automobiles by students while in college, others by attempting to accomplish the same end through the cooperative efforts of parents, students and faculty. Speaking in general more desirable ends can be secured through intelligent interest and cooperation than by the promulgation of rigid rules and regulations. Character is made by leading, not by driving. . . .
>
> We do not prohibit the use of cars. We do point out to you a problem which may prove a menace to the best interests of your son or daughter and we ask you to assist us by limiting their use of cars while at Ann Arbor. We rely confidently upon your sympathetic understanding of the high high aims of the University and know that you approve of the purpose and spirit of this action by our Deans and Regents.[98]

The letter was signed by President Burton, and sent to the parents and guardians of all students during the summer as well as to the parents and guardians of those who were to enter in the fall, 1923.[99]

Early Automobile Ban

In a smaller degree the use of the automobile had already been prohibited by the Regents in March, 1923, by the following resolution:

---

[98] President's Report (1922-1923), op. cit., pp. 156-157.

[99] Ibid., p. 156.

> Whereas, The bringing of automobiles upon the Bogardus Tract by students enrolled at the Biological Station or Camp Davis increases the problems of discipline and tends to break down the solidarity of the camps and the morale of the students, it is hereby
>
> Resolved, That students enrolled at Camp Davis or the Biological Station be prohibited from bringing automobiles upon the Bogardus Tract during the period of the Summer Session, except that at the discretions and with the express permission of the Director of the Biological Station, any student at the Biological Station engaged in investigational work which requires transportation overland to and from an outlying area may be granted permission to bring his automobile with the understanding that said automobile is to be used for business pruposes only and under such conditions as may be imposed by the staff of the Biological Station.[100]

Although the President's letter had some effect, the actual number of cars operated the year of 1923-1924 appeared to be greater than the year before.[101] In 1925-1926, the death of four students in automobile accidents gave a more serious and sinister aspect to the matter of the use of automobiles by students. Again the President, C. C. Little, wrote an open letter to the parents and guardians of students.[102] This time the letter carried, in addition to the signature of the President, the signature of the President of the Student Council.[103] The attitude toward the use of automobiles by students, although their use was still not prohibited, was

---

[100] Regents' Proceedings (1920-1923), p. 750.

[101] President's Report (1923-1924), op. cit., p. 253.

[102] President's Report (1925-1926), p. 46.

[103] Ibid., pp. 47-48.

more restricted.[104] In addition to the letter, a copy of "Rules Governing Operation of Motor Vehicles by Students" was enclosed.[105] The rules which took effect in the year 1926-1927 are as follows:

> 1. Beginning with the Class of 1930, no student at the University shall own or operate a car, while the University is in session, until he becomes an upperclassman (Junior or Senior).
>
> 2. Beginning with the second semester of the college year 1926-1927, no student shall own or operate a car while the University is in session, unless he is scholastically eligible to take part in extra-curricular activities.
>
> 3. For purposes of administration, all student owned or operated cars shall be registered in the Office of the Dean of Students. Any student owning or operating a car, while the University is in session, without a certificate of registration issued by the Dean of Students, shall be liable to discipline. This regulation is to go into effect with the beginning of the college year 1926-1927. No certificate of registration will be issued to a minor student unless such student presents a written statement from his parent or guardian assuming the responsibility for any accident or trouble arising through the possession or use of an automobile by said minor student.
>
> 4. The administration and enforcement of these rules shall be in the hands of a committee to be appointed by the President of the Student Council. In case a student is accused of breaking any of these rules this committee shall have authority to try the case, and, if the student is found guilty, the committee may take such disciplinary

---

[104] Ibid., p. 48.

[105] Ibid., p. 47.

> action as it deems necessary, provided that a student so convicted may appeal his case to the University Committee on Discipline, if he so desires.
>
> 5. Under extraordinary circumstances, exceptions to Rule 1 and 2 may be made by the first committee referred to in Rule 4. No exception shall be made to Rule 3.

In June 1927, after a careful survey of the automobile situation by the Regents, the following resolution was passed, absolutely prohibiting the use of automobiles except in exceptional and extraordinary cases.

> Resolved, That no student in attendance at the University from and after the beginning of the first semester of the University year 1927-1928 shall operate any motor vehicle. In exceptional and extraordinary cases in the discretions of the Dean of Students this rule may be relaxed.[106]

Reaction to Auto Ban

Hundreds of letters were received by the University in response to the automobile ban.[107] It is not the purpose of this study to delineate the history of the Automobile Regulations; however, insofar as the ban appeared to some as an infringement upon student rights, it is of note. That the

---

[106] Regents' Proceedings (1926-1929), p. 244.

[107] The history of the Automobile Regulations at the University of Michigan is quite complete. Although never bound or organized, many of the original drafts of documents are to be found in the files of the Student Activities Building dating from 1922 to the present. The files include letters from parents, students, other universities, and a fairly complete record concerning the ban as published in the Michigan Daily from 1928 on.

ban was viewed as having social and humorous implications in reflected in a Daily article as follows:

> Marriage and matriculation may soon be co-ordinated as ceremonies attendant registration at the University, it is indicated by the automobile-permit applications which are being received at the office of Walter B. Rea, assistant to the dean of students and in charge of automobile administration.
>
> A record number of students have come into Mr. Rea's office this semester, demanding permits to drive automobiles on the grounds that they are married. The number of married students at the University, the applications testify, has greatly increased over last year.
>
> There must be a reason for the increased number of student marriages, and officials can think of no reason why students should want to marry unless for the sake of obtaining permission to drive automobiles.
>
> Any such permission is considered by many as a worthy incentive to marriage. "I'd marry anybody if I could get permission to drive a car," one senior told a Daily reporter yesterday.[108]

Students were suspended for violation of the ban,[109] required to take extra academic work if found to be in violation of the ban,[110] and they were particularly bitter about the request of the Dean of Students for permission to enter fraternity houses to seek out violators of the ban. The following editorial quoted in part from the Daily questions

---

[108] Michigan Daily, October 22, 1929.

[109] Michigan Daily, November 26, 1929. Fifteen students were suspended on Auto Ban charges. The Law School initiated this discipline.

[110] Michigan Daily, November 30, 1929.

The question of the auto ban is quite beside the point in regard to this editorial. The question of whether or not students should drive automobiles is quite removed from the question as to whether or not students should be secure from intrusion in their own rooms on their own property.

The federal government guarantees to every citizen the security of his own home against intrusion by any governmental officer or private citizen. Even the extremities of the prohibition amendment have not altered this right. By the time that a young man or young woman reaches college age he is generally free from intrusion into his private affairs even by his parents. There could be no more conclusive evidence that invasion of private property is incompatible with the social system under which we live.

It remained for the University officials, or rather for those of them who have in charge the enforcement of the automobile ban, to overstep this common right of citizenship and intrude upon the bounds of private property. That these officials, by their educational authority, have the power to coerce fraternity groups into any action which they see fit is undeniable; but that they should use that power to intrude on the private property of students attending this University is not only incredible but it is almost intolerable.

Yet this is exactly what the office of the dean of students is accomplishing when it requests (a request tantamount to a demand in the nature of this situation) that the fraternity presidents give them permission to enter their property and seek out violators of the automobile ban. It is a plain violation on the part of the administrative authorities of a right which has been held inviolate by the highest governments on earth.

Naturally no fraternity dares refuse this right - the good graces of the dean and the police power which the University gives to him are too important factors to be lightly reckoned with. If the office of the dean

> thinks for a moment, however that this permission is being given of free volition it is deluding itself into a miserable error, for University students are not that anxious to surrender rights which are secure to them even from their parents.
>
> The new method, in short, is a plain violation of the ethics which have successfully governed the conduct of men for generations. . . .
>
> Students cannot protest; fraternities cannot protest. Certainly both can appeal in the spirit (of) fair play that they be relieved from such an unreasonable demand. It is a request which has never been made before for any cause, even for the enforcement of prohibition. . . .[111]

Changes in the Auto Ban

It became necessary from time to time to change the rules concerning the auto ban and the way the ban was administered.[112] Changes in the Automobile Regulations have been sought and effectuated year by year until the present. The Regents' Bylaw as now in effect is as follows:

> No student while in attendance at the University shall operate an automobile except under the regulations set down by the Office of Student Affairs. Students over 21 years of age and Seniors (90 hrs.) in good standing may operate an automobile if properly registered with the Office of Student Affairs. In exceptional

---

[111] Michigan Daily, September 27, 1928.

[112] Michigan Daily, May 27, 1931; June 6, 1931; September 10, 1931; October 6, 1931; March 20, 1935; etc. In 1934, students were forbidden to operate planes or motorboats. (Detroit Free Press, November 22, 1934). It is the opinion of the author that few student rules have been so bitterly opposed as the auto ban, and from the author's experience of administering the Automobile Regulations from 1960-1962, the feeling still exists.

> and extraordinary cases the Office of Student Affairs may grant permission to operate an automobile to students under 21 years of age of less than senior standing. Any student violating these regulations shall be liable to disciplinary action by the proper University authorities.[113]

It is noteworthy that while the Administration of the Automobile Regulations is under the jurisdiction of the Office of Student Affairs, the discipline resulting from any violations of the regulations is completely handled through student judiciary channels, and that the responsibility for providing true and accurate information as required for the registration of an automobile is placed directly upon the individual student.[114]

From their origin to date, July 1963, the legality of the Automobile Regulations, nor the administration of them, has never been tested in any Michigan Court.[115]

The Larger Michigan

No phrase better describes the University of Michigan and its development during the 20's than the one coined by the Acting President, Alfred H. Lloyd, in 1925, when he

---

[113] Regents' Bylaws, Section 8.06.

[114] "The Administrative Code of the Student Automobile Regulations," Revised Sepetember 1, 1962. (University of Michigan: Office of Student Affairs).

[115] Statement of Walter B. Rea, who from 1927 to 1962 was charged with the administrative responsibility of the Automobile Regulations at The University of Michigan, even though he delegated the authority for the administration of the regulations to subordinate administrators.

referred to the University as "the larger Michigan."[116]

In the early 20's much attention was given to building needs. These needs took first place in University planning; this, President Burton said was "entirely right and natural."[117] "The provision of new buildings was a necessary antecedent condition to carrying on our educational work in a way worthy of the University."[118] During the year of 1924-1925, many new buildings were opened for use;[119] their opening brought to the fore many problems of an educational sort.[120]

> The larger Michigan, then, so long needed and at last so well planned and now so nearly accomplished, came to its visible expression under circumstances that mingled tragedy[121] with other common factors of transition and on the part of all, of Regents, administrators and executives of all sorts, of alumni, students and teachers, efforts for distinct betterment have already been made with excellent results and with promise of more to be done.[122]

---

[116] President's Report (1924-1925), p. 1.

[117] President's Report (1923-1924), p. 1.

[118] Ibid.

[119] The Lawyers' Club, Angell Hall, University High School; the new Physics Laboratory was finally equipped, and significant improvements were made in the heating, lighting and power plant. (President's Report (1923-1924) "Progress in Construction of Buildings." pp. 9-19.

[120] President's Report (1924-1925), op. cit.

[121] President Burton's death, February 18, 1925.

[122] President's Report (1924-1925), op. cit.

Problems of readjustment to a larger and better Michigan called for reorganization in many areas.

> Student life in its athletics as well as in other matters, appointments and promotions and salaries for the teaching staff, federation of the alumni associations, revision of standards and methods of admission, modification of curricula and methods of study and instruction, and change in requirements for degrees are only some signs of the transition. . . .[123]

Student life and student activities changed, too.

Reorganization of the Committee on Student Affairs

For the students a significant change in administrative methods was made in 1926; the Committee of Student Affairs was reorganized so as to provide for student representation with full voting power.[124]

By way of explanation, the newly appointed President, C. C. Little said:

> In the years just past the students of Michigan have been taking more and more interest in what is called "student self-government," have step by step made improvements in their own organizations, and have been granted by the faculty a steadily increasing share in the administration of University affairs other than academic. They are represented upon the Board in Control of Athletics and the Board in Control of Student Publications. From the first their representatives had certain privileges in connection with the University Committee on Discipline and more recently these privileges were widely extended. At the end of the year under review (1925-1926) they

---

[123] Ibid., p. 84.

[124] President's Report (1925-1926), p. 125.

> were given full representation on the remaining administrative committee of major importance, the Senate Committee on Student Affairs, which exercises general supervision over all organized student activities other than athletics and publications - notably dramatics and fraternity organizations - and which sometimes is called upon to act in a disciplinary way.[125]

For purposes of this study, this statement is significant because it testifies to the increasing evolvement of student rights, the willingness of the students to accept responsibility for their own conduct and welfare, and it delineates clearly the increasing scope of the students' involvement in the government of their out-of-class affairs.

The reconstitution of the Committee on Student Affairs was approved at a special meeting of the Senate Council, May 24, 1926, and went into effect at the beginning of the school year, 1926-1927.[126] It is important to examine the reconstituted membership, which was as follows:

> That the Senate Committee on Student Affairs be reorganized so as to consist of the Dean of Students and the Dean of Women, ex-officio, six members of the Senate, two to be appointed by the President each year for a period of three years, and five students: viz., the President of the Student Council, the President of the Michigan Union, the Managing Editor of the Michigan Daily, the President of the Women's League, and one other woman student to be elected by the Board of Directors of the Women's League, all members to have equal voting power, the Dean of

---

[125] Ibid., p. 43.

[126] Ibid.

> Students to act as Chairman of the Committee.[127]

Prior to this time students were permitted to take part in the discussions of the Committee on Student Affairs, but they had no vote.[128] Even cursory examination of the reconstituted membership of the Committee shows the students were not in a position to control the vote on any issue. However, "there was never an occasion when the faculty members were lined up on one side of a question and the students on the other."[129]

That such could be the case was undoubtedly a reflection that the University was beginning to recognize a single principle which underlaid all facets of its operation. President Little stated this principle as follows:

> In education, all modern developments that seem destined to endure recognize that greater cooperative participation by all grades of personnel involved is essential.
>
> The students, faculty, alumni are all concerned. All have their own peculiar tasks to perform, but their broad functions are interrelated and interdependent.[130]

The change in the voting membership of the Committee on Student Affairs proved to be a good one, as it gave the student members more interest in the work of the

---

[127] Ibid.

[128] President's Report (1926-1927), p. 149.

[129] Ibid.

[130] President's Report (1927-1928), p. 1.

Committee.[131]

The Question of Control

As the University grew after World War I, the questions concerning the control of students, their organizations and activities grew, too. There were boards in control, such as the Board in Control of Athletics and the Board in Control of Publications. The so-called "auto-ban" was put into effect, but even this was a misnomer, for in 1929-1930, over 800 permits were issued for the use of automobiles by students.[132] Control varied then even as it does today. For example, Dean Bursley said in 1924, "We expel a man for intoxication. We handle a great many cases without bringing them to light."[133] It is, however, a reasonable assumption the University recognized students were young and sometimes did not use the best judgment. Despite the great number of complaints in the late 20's concerning student publications, the University did not censor these publications. "Censorship is both impractical and wholly undesirable on every count," President Ruthven said.[134] General policies were often given as standards for the students to follow, rather than as

---

[131] President's Report (1926-1927), op. cit.

[132] President's Report (1929-1930), p. 235.

[133] This comment is taken from "Round Table Discussion" at the Fifth Session of the Sixth Annual Conference of Deans. ("Secretarial Notes on the Sixth Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men," University of Michigan April 24-26, 1924), p. 51.

[134] President's Report (1929-1930), op. cit. p. 101.

strict sets of rules. Who, then, can really judge whether such a plan as deferred pledging for fraternities, as put into effect in September 1931,[135] and the issuance of identification cards for students in the same year,[136] were controls placed upon students or manifestations of concern for student welfare? It is not the purpose of this study to argue the question of control, for what might appear to one as a control might appear to another as a benefit.

In 1929-1930, the Student Council requested and received permission from the Committee on Student Affairs to change its constitution regarding membership so as to make the Council more representative of the whole campus.[137] The Council, too, recognized the need for reorganization in regards to a "larger Michigan".

Concern for the Future of Student Council

The future of the Student Council was a matter of real concern to those who wanted to see it as a strong, vitally functioning force on the University campus.[138] In the spring of 1931, the Student Council recommended its own abolishment, but before the University Council could act on the request, the Student Council requested permission to withdraw its petition and continue as before.[139] In June,

---

[135] Ibid., p. 104.

[136] Ibid., p. 105.

[137] Ibid., p. 243.

[138] President's Report (1931-1932), p. 37.

[139] Ibid., p. 37.

1932, a new petition was sent to the University Council from the Student Council; this petition provided for great increases of power for the Student Council.[140] The apparent ambivalence of the Student Council led to the following vitrolic comments made by the Chairman of the Committee on Student Affairs, who was also the Dean of Students.

> Judging from the past, it would not be surprising if the Council for the year 1932-33 has another idea of the best method for student participation in the government of the University and asks to have its plan substituted for the one presented in 1932.
>
> The Dean of Students and the Committee on Student Affairs would like to see a Council developed which has the backing of the student body and which can be said to be truly representative. A change in the constitution is not necessary to accomplish this, but a change in the point of view of the student body is necessary. As long as the majority of students is not interested in a Student Council, or in student self-government, there is no use in wasting time trying to decide whether the Council shall consist of this or that number of members, or whether it shall have this particular function or that.[141]

The predictions were correct. A new plan for the reorganization of the Student Council was presented, but because of the opposition of the Daily and various honor societies, the plan was called off the night before the annual election.[142] The old council, together with the new

---

[140] Ibid.

[141] Ibid., pp. 37-38.

[142] President's Report (1932-1933), p. 22.

candidates all resigned.[143]

Undergraduate Council

The Student Council was a student government of the past; however at the request of the retiring President of the Student Council, the Dean of Students appointed a committee composed of seven seniors to consider the problems of student government.[144] This Committee was to present a new plan for a Student Council. After careful study, the Committee presented a plan of student government which was approved by the Dean of Students and the President of the University.[145] The President of the University declared it effective at once, and it became known as the Undergraduate Council.[146]

The President's action, as noted above, made it evident there was a commitment to student government. The new organization consisted of eighteen ex-officio members, most of whom were presidents of leading campus organizations. Both men and women were on the Undergraduate Council.[147] The new student government plan was put into effect, and was well received.

> It is felt by students, faculty, and administrative officers who are

---

[143] Ibid.

[144] Ibid.

[145] Ibid.

[146] Ibid.

[147] Ibid., p. 23. For the specific composition, see President's Report (1932-1933), pp. 22-23.

> familiar with campus conditions and who knew the weaknesses of the old form of student government that the Undergraduate Council based on the ex-officio plan should prove to be a strong representative body of men and women students, free from the influence of campus politics. Such a result will be particularly welcome to the Dean of Students who for years had been urging a stronger, more efficient form of student government than has existed in the past.[148]

The ex-officio plan was given a year's trial and found to be only fairly satisfactory.[149] The principal objections were two: (1) that members were not representative of the whole campus; and (2) that because the members were on the Undergraduate Council by virtue of their office, most of them were so busy with their main activity, they had little time to spend on the work of the Council.[150] To overcome the principal objections to the organization of the Undergraduate Council, the Council amended, with approval of the Committee on Student Affairs, its constitution to provide for an Executive Committee.[152] This Committee was to be responsible for all routine activities of the Council, and the total membership was to be called together only to act

---

[148] Ibid.

[149] President's Report (1933-1934), p. 53.

[150] Ibid.

[151] Ibid.

[152] "Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs," III, (1928-1935), p. 95.

on questions of general policy.[153]

The reorganization of the Undergraduate Council was becoming an annual affair. On December 17, 1934, Dean Bursley reported to the Committee on Student Affairs a plan for student government proposed by the Student Faculty Committee of the Michigan Union.[154] It was voted the plan be referred to the Undergraduate Council with the request the Council give consideration and study to the plan

> . . . and any others which may be presented, and through open hearings and other methods, obtain a widespread expression of student opinion and wishes concerning these particular plans and also concerning the whole matter of student self-government; and that on or before February 1, 1935, it submit to the Council on Student Affairs a proposed plan of government which in its opinion is best suited to the needs of our student body and which commands the most student support, accompanying this report with a written statement of the reasons for its decisions.[155]

It would appear the patience of the Committee on Student Affairs was waning, but it would be tested once again. At its meeting on January 25, 1935, six days before the report of the Undergraduate council be postponed until after examinations.[156] Approval was given to postpone the

---

[153] President's Report (1933-1934), op. cit., p. 99.

[154] "Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs," op. cit., p. 99.

[155] Ibid., pp. 99-100.

[156] Ibid., p. 102.

report until February 25, 1935.[157]

At the March 11, 1935, meeting of the Committee on Student Affairs the Undergraduate Council reported on the steps it had taken in an effort to ascertain student preference with respect to various plans for student government.[158]

> Surveys, polls, and an open forum had revealed a total lack of student interest in the problem. The Council submitted, with the report, a new plan mingling the better features of the five competing student plans and asked that the Senate Committee consider it for adoption. Communications from the Student-Faculty Relations Committee of the Michigan Union requested, in view of the inconclusive nature of the survey made, that the Senate Committee reconsider all the plans for student self-government offered. After considerable discussion it was moved and carried that the report of the Undergraduate Council and the communications of the Student-Faculty Relations Committee of the Union be accepted with thanks and placed on file.[159]

On March 22, 1935, the Undergraduate Council presented a specific plan for student self-government to the Committee on Student Affairs.[160] The Committee decided to take time to consider the new plan. On March 27, 1935, the Committee on Student Affairs approved the plan article by article, and

---

[157] Ibid.

[158] Ibid., p. 104

[159] Ibid., pp. 104-105.

[160] Ibid., p. 106.

then as a whole.[161] They then sent it back to the Undergraduate Council with their suggested changes for the Council's consideration.[162] Men's Council became effective in the fall of 1935.[163] It differed from its predecessor in that it included no women in its membership,[164] and excluded from its jurisdiction the School of Dentistry, Medical School, and the Law School.[165] With the many changes in student self-government that had occured in the few preceding years, it is reasonable to assume there was considerable question as to whether Men's Council would maintain its stability.

It is noteworthy, however, that once the University was committed to the principle of student government, in 1906, regardless of its particular form or effectiveness, it has not been without it to this day.

Another Change

The reorganized Men's Council functioned satisfactorily during 1935-1936;[166] however, the ever-present question as to whether it should be called by one name or another, organized this way or that way, came again to the fore in the spring of

---

[161] Ibid., p. 107.

[162] Ibid.

[163] President's Report (1934-1935), p. 60.

[164] John Bingley "Men's Student Self-Government," Volume IV, Encyclopedic Survey, p. 1831.

[165] President's Report (1934-1935), op. cit.

[166] President's Report (1935-1936), p. 52.

1939.[167]

At the May 16, 1939, meeting of the Committee on Student Affairs, Men's Council presented a plan for the dissolution of that body and for the establishment of a Men's Judiciary Council.[168] The plan, as approved, follows:

> 1. That the present organization known as the Men's Council be dissolved.
>
> 2. That in its place a Men's Judiciary Council be set up, the members of which shall be appointed annually in the Spring of the year from petitioning undergraduates of second semester Junior academic standing, which men shall serve on the Council for a term of one year.
>
> 3. That the members of the Judiciary Council be appointed by a Committee to be composed of: (1) the outgoing President of the Michigan Union, (2) the outgoing Managing Editor of the Michigan Daily, (3) the outgoing President of Men's Congress, (4) the outgoing President of the Interfraternity Council, (5) the Dean of Students.
>
> 4. That the membership of the Judiciary Council be set within the limits of five to seven members of which the maximum number from the Literary College shall be three men, from the Engineering College shall be two men; the remaining posts shall be filled from the undergraduate body with the qualifications set down in paragraph 2.
>
> 5. That in case there is a vacancy in the personnel of the Men's Judiciary Council, it shall be filled by choos-

---

[167] President's Report (1938-1939), p. 52.

[168] "Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs" (1935-1943), IV, May 16, 1939, meeting.

ing the top man on the list of alternates who shall be chosen by the members of the selection committee at the time it makes its selection of the active members of the Men's Judiciary Council; this list shall be filed in the Dean of Students Office.

6. That the duties formerly performed by the Men's Council be allocated in the following manner:

a) Conduction of mass meetings during football season to be given to Union Student Staff.
b) Direction of Freshman-Sophomore Class Games be given to Union Student Staff.
c) Handling of elections (as provided for in Men's Council constitution) be divided as follows:
    1) The actual conducting of elections, furnishing manpower to check identification, supervise voting, etc. be delegated to Union Student Staff.
    2) The consideration of petitions of candidates seeking political posts be delegated to the Men's Judiciary Council.
d) That any Judiciary function formerly possessed by the Men's Council be delegated to the Men's Judiciary Council.

7. That the functions, duties, and ex officio positions now performed and held by the President of the Men's Council be performed and held by the President of the Men's Judiciary Council; that this Judiciary Council President be elected each year by a majority vote of the members of the Judiciary Council from among its own membership.

8. That this dissolution shall not void the recently made election plans of the Men's Council but that these plans shall be carried out in their full content as provided for in paragraph 6.

9. That, if in the future a plan is advanced for Student Government on the

> University campus which is considered by the Judiciary Council to be of such worth as to seem better than the plan here set forth, that plan will be voted on by the Judiciary Council and if passed by a majority of the whole Council, will be submitted to the Committee on Student Affairs with the Council's recommendation for its approval.[169]

The Constitution of the Men's Judiciary Council was approved by the Committee on Student Affairs May 24, 1940.[170]

Change is the word which best epitomizes student government at the University of Michigan during the 30's. It is significant, therefore, in the proposal for the establishment of the Men's Judiciary Council delineated above, provision for any future plan of student government had to have the approval of the existing governing body. This represented a change, for in the past, any proposal for a change in student government went directly to the Committee on Student Affairs. Thus one more step was taken by student government toward handling its own responsibilities for its government. However, after a proposed change was accepted by the Men's Judiciary Council, it still had to be approved by the Committee on Student Affairs. The effect was to stablize student government; the changes in the 30's had appeared to be almost whimsical.

World War II

In the President's Report (1942-1943), Dr. Ruthven

---

[169] Ibid.

[170] "Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs" (1935-1943), IV, May 24, 1940 meeting.

wrote:

> The universities should recognize that in wartime they are presented with the problem of "re-tooling" and that when hostilities cease they will have similar but even more difficult problems of adjustment. Both sets of problems should be solved as promptly as possible.[171]

In order to work out effective methods of placing the University to best advantage in the war, the University War Board, as an enlargement of the University Committee on National Defense, was organized in January, 1942; in keeping with the University aims, a Student War Committee was established to correlate student war activities.[172] The University accepted its new responsibilities with a determination to make all of its facilities operate to maximum effeciency for the war effort.[173] "The past year (1942-1943) has brought the war to the University; perhaps at no time in our history have more changes taken place."[174]

Michigan's residence halls system, at that time the most extensive of any university in the country, was used primarily by military units; and nearly all of the fraternity houses were made available for the housing of military units and for civilian groups.[175]

Although attempts were made to carry the educational

---

[171] President's Report (1942-1943), p. 2.

[172] Ibid., p. 3.

[173] Ibid., p. 36.

[174] Ibid.

[175] Ibid., p. 37. All the men's halls were being used.

and extra-curricular programs of the halls to the civilian groups in fraternity houses, primary attention had to be focused on alleviating a shortage of proper eating and housing facilities for civilian students.[176] All social events were conducted on a much simpler scale than formerly. The departure of many men for entrance into the armed services and the coming to the campus of hundreds of military personnel materially changed the picture of student life.[177]

Another Facet of Student Welfare

No study of student rights can properly exclude the students' and university's concern for discipline. Although the word may suggest a negative concept to some, it should be recalled that one of the reasons for establishing the University Committee On Discipline was to establish uniform penalties and methods for handling the discipline cases involving students from more than one school or college in the University.[178]

The University Committee on Discipline was established in 1922, but its initial report to the University Council was

---

[176] Ibid.

[177] Ibid., p. 44.

[178] See Chapter IV, "University Committee on Discipline."

not made until February 8, 1932.[179] The report describes the composition, jurisdiction, and procedure of the Committee, as well as a numerical listing of the numbers of students involved in each disciplinary case, the charges against them, and the action taken.[180] The report indicates the Committee concluded it was desirable for the University to have such a committee and recommended the Committee be continued.[181]

Another recommendation from the report is of note and follows:

> That the Registrar be asked to proceed with the publication in one pamphlet of the disciplinary rules of the University and that he be authorized to request the cooperation of the various officers of the University who are in position to help him ascertain what the rules are. After the rules have been found, it will be advisable to redraft and re-enact many of them in order to secure a consistent code applicable to present conditions.[182]

An investigation of the Committee on Discipline had disclosed the rules of the University had not been published in any one place or accessible form; they had been adopted by the Regents, the Senate, the Conference on Deans, by other bodies, and many seemed to have been published only in the minutes of

---

[179]"Report of University Committee on Discipline," February 8, 1932; a mimeographed copy included in a bound volume of collected correspondence and papers entitled, University Committee on Student Conduct, (1914-1948), Office of Student Affairs.

[180]Ibid.

[181]Ibid.

[182]Ibid.

meetings.[183]

The Committee on Discipline was never a policy-making body; however, the name (as well as the functions) was changed to the University Committee on Student Conduct by authority of the University Council, and the new Committee held its initial meeting June 8, 1934.[184]

This Committee, the Committee on Student Conduct, was a policy-making body, charged with the task of formulating and interpreting principles of conduct, enforced by the Committee in order to protect the University from unwarranted criticism and to promote the welfare of the student body.[185]

The Committee on Student Conduct set up a Sub-Committee on Discipline to handle all cases of discipline within its jurisdiction.[186] This Sub-Committee was charged "to continue the work previously carried on by the University Committee on Discipline. . . ."[187]

Students were invited to attend the meetings of the Committee on Student Conduct, but it was not until 1947, they

---

[183] Ibid.

[184] "Minutes of the Meeting of the University Committee on Student Conduct," June 8, 1934.

[185] "Minutes of . . . (Committee unidentified), May 14, 1934. These minutes contain the proposals ultimately made to and accepted by the University Council on May 14, 1934; University Committee on Student Conduct (1914-1948).

[186] Ibid. These minutes detail the authority and areas of jurisdiction for the Sub-Committee on Discipline.

[187] "Report of the University Committee on Student Conduct" to the University Council for 1934-1935, prepared by J. E. Bursley.

were permitted to vote.

> In 1947 three representatives, one from the Student Legislature, one from the Men's Judiciary, and the third from the Women's Judiciary were made voting members of the Committee on Student Conduct.[188]

of the Committee on Student Conduct.

John Bingley states the "major work and its great contribution was made in 1937, when it compiled the rules and regulations applicable to students outside the classroom."[189] This publication is significant because it was the first of its kind in the University's history, and although revised and changed, exists today.[190]

This chapter has included a time span of nearly twenty-five years, or from World War I to World War II. For the purposes of this study, it is the events that transpired during that period which are important rather than the time period itself. In some cases it has been necessary to segment the events affecting students and their welfare during the total period for the sake of clarification; however, an overview of the period is necessary in order to prevent distortions. For example, upon examination of rules made during the 20's, such as the automobile ban or those concerning hazing, it might appear the University had suddenly become

---

[188]John Bingley, "Men's Student Self-Government" Encyclopedic Survey, IV p. 1833.

[189]Ibid., p. 1832.

[190]University Regulations Concerning Student Affairs, Conduct, and Discipline (University: Ann Arbor, 1938).

strict or severe in its dealings with students. But such an interpretation must also take into account that until the 20's no single administrative office existed charged, as the Office of Student Affairs then became, with the welfare of students. If because of the many changes in student government during the 30's, one were to conclude students were unable to make up their minds, this, too, would represent a distortion. The facts clearly indicate that not until 1926, were students given full voting power on the Committee on Student Affairs.[191] Until that time their role had been only advisory, and even as the Committee on Student Affairs underwent numerous changes from its beginning in 1902, so, too, did the students' self-government movement need time and experience to mature. Every President's Report from 1920-1921 on to the present includes recognition of change or the need for change.[192] Whereas in 1921 the Dean of Students was administratively charged with the responsibility to "protect the student body and to promote their welfare," and was assigned to the task almost single-handedly. By 1945-1946, his office was in a whirlwind of activities including primary responsibility in the following areas: the housing of students, student employment, administering the automobile regulations, the auditing of student accounts, the supervision of all student social events, fraternities, student

---

[191] President's Report (1945-1946). p. 45.

[192] Many of the Reports have a specific section entitled "Administrative Changes." In others the nature of the content implies change.

government, the activities of the University Bands and Glee Clubs, the Orientation programs for incoming students, counseling new students, maintaining personnel records, counseling foreign students, and providing other general services.[193] As responsibilities grew, to be sure, so did the Dean's staff.

As the student population increased, so did the problems related to student government on the campus. Many living units established their own form of self-government, i.e., the fraternities and individual houses in the Residence Halls. It is noteworthy, however, that regardless of the growth of the University and the increasing complexities of its administrative functions, the continuing concern for the welfare of its students and their evolving forms of government has never subsided. The commitment to student self-government remained constant. After World War II, however, student government for the first time in the University's history could, because of the power given to it by the Regents of the University, properly be called "student self-government for out-of-class activities".

Chronology

1919	Student Committee on Undergraduate Conduct created.
1923	Student Committee on Undergraduate Conduct fell into disrepute.

---

[193] President's Report (1945-1946), op. cit.

	Regents authorized the summary dismissal of any student who was publicly intoxicated.
1926	Committee on Student Affairs reorganized. Provision was made for student representation to have full voting powers.
1927	Automobile ban first put into effect.
1932-33	Undergraduate Council created to replace the Student Council.
1934	The Committee on Student Conduct replaced the Committee on Discipline.
1935	Men's Council created.
1937	The Committee on Student Conduct published, for the first time in the University's history, the compiled rules and regulations applicable to students outside the classroom.
1939	Men's Judiciary Council created.
1942	Student War Committee created.
1946	Student Legislature created.

CHAPTER VI

IN THE HANDS OF THE STUDENTS

World War II was over. The student enrollment at the University in the spring of 1946 exceeded 14,000, an increase of more than 2,000 over the previous peak registration in 1939-1940.[1] The question of the optimum size of the University came again to the fore. The President wrote:

> Not the size of the University in number of students, physical facilities, and personnel should concern us most directly, but the responsibilities and the nature of the institution. . . . Faculty, students, alumni, and the people of the state of Michigan alike are proud that Michigan has been to this time a national and international institution, and they realize that, if it is to retain this character and add to its prestige, it must continue to grow.[2]

Careful examination of the minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs from 1941 to 1946 shows impressively students' willingness to submit to the then-thought-necessary restrictions placed on their out-of-class activities because of the War. Student rules and regulations often carried the commonly-known national phrase "for the duration of the War"

---

[1] President's Report (1945-1946), p. 33.

[2] Ibid., p. 5.

in their title, i.e. "Rushing Rules for the Duration of the War,"[3] and ". . . participation in the Band for the duration of the war. . . ."[4] However, students also were quick in their desire to discard certain restrictions after the War was over. For example, in 1945-1946, thirty-two dances were sponsored as compared to exactly half that number during 1944-1945.[5]

Once again dissatisfaction with the composition of the Committee on Student Affairs became apparent. The Student Religious Association requested student representation on the Committee; therefore, it is significant the Committee itself was first to secure the dissatisfaction and propose a study be made as to its own composition.

> It was moved and seconded that a study be made of the composition of the Committee on Student Affairs with special reference to student representation on it, and that this subject be given special consideration at a meeting to be called for that purpose at an early date. . . . It was voted that before the meeting is called, students and student organizations be invited to present in writing their ideas concerning possible reorganization of the Committee on Student Affairs. . . .[6]

Five open letters to the Committee on Student Affairs

---

[3]"Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs" (1943-1948), V, pp. 3-5.

[4]Ibid., p. 6.

[5]President's Report (1945-1946), pp. 37-38.

[6]"Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs" (1943-1948), op. cit., p. 63.

were received.[7] The suggestions were presented by the Chairman of the Committee, Dean Bursley, and after consideration of these proposals the following action was taken.

> It was moved and seconded that a Sub-Committee be appointed by the Chairman, consisting of a student and a faculty member, to work with him in formulating a suggested plan for Committee action.[8]

The Sub-Committee was ultimately enlarged to include two students. This Sub-Committee suggested the Committee on Student Affairs recommend to the Board of Regents that the membership be revised as follows:

> Six members of the Faculty, the Dean of Women, ex-officio, seven students and the Dean of Students as Chairman. It was suggested further that the seven students be President of the Union, President of the League, Managing Editor of the Daily, Chairman of the Women's Judiciary Council, President of the newly elected student governing body and two other members of this group, at least one of whom shall be a woman.[9]

In May, 1946, the Board of Regents adopted the recommendations revising the membership of the Committee on Student Affairs.[10] Numerically the composition of the Committee on Student Affairs was not changed from 1946 until its

---

[7] Ibid., pp. 64-72.

[8] Ibid., p. 74.

[9] Ibid., p. 76.

[10] Regents' Proceedings (1945-1948), pp. 389-390.

dissolution in 1955.[11]

However, in 1953, the question of representation on the Committee came to the fore again. The student body called to President Hatcher's attention the general question of representation on the Committee on Student Affairs. President Hatcher appointed a Special Committee to study the Committee on Student Affairs. In President Hatcher's preliminary remarks to the Special Committee at its first meeting, November 11, 1953, he said:

> The Student Affairs Committee is perhaps like so many instruments at a University that are started in one environment, and during the course of time the whole setting changes, but we don't often stop to take a look at it, and suddenly we find we have grown up. It is this kind of thought, and not because we face any crisis that it would seem helpful if we had a look at the Student Affairs Committee.[12]

On March 8, 1955, the Committee on Student Affairs held its last meeting and was discontinued as a campus committee.[13] This Committee had existed on the University of Michigan

---

[11]In October, 1947, the Student Legislature recommended one of its three seats be relinguished to the President of Men's Judiciary Committee. The Board of Regents authorized this release at their meeting on December 19, 1947. Again in September, 1953, the Board of Regents amended By-law 8.13, to provide for the seating of a representative from Joint Judiciary in place of the President of Men's Judiciary. ("Minutes of Committee on Student Affairs," IX, July 1, 1954 - March 8, 1955, Appendix A).

[12]"Minutes of Laing Study Committee," November, 1953 - May, 1954, (Student Government Council) Student Activities Building (bound volume), p. 1.

[13]"Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs," IX, p. 62.

campus for fifty-three years. Throughout the history of the Committee on Student Affairs its composition was examined and changed several times. It is of note that the University was willing to cooperate with students in their desire to study their government and to effectuate changes in its structure and composition.

The Committee on Student Affairs was replaced by the Student Government Council and a Board of Review. It is the purpose of this chapter to trace the development of Student Government Council, and to examine its principles of operation, for it became the first student government at The University of Michigan charged with the responsibility and given the authority to act independently of a Committee on Student Affairs for the welfare of the student in his out-of-class activities.

Origin of the First Post-War Student Government: Student Legislature

In January, 1946, a new constitution for a student governing body was proposed to the Committee on Student Affairs by a group of student leaders.[14] At the suggestion of student members on the Committee on Student Affairs, consideration of the newly-proposed constitution was tabled at the January 16, 1946, meeting.[15] At the next meeting of the Committee, January 24, 1946, it was voted to take from the table the proposed new constitution; after discussion of the

---

[14] President's Report (1945-1946), p. 38.

[15] "Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs", V, p.51.

plan as submitted, it was voted to approve it, with minor changes, for presentation on an all-campus ballot.[16] However, before the election took place, a second constitution was submitted by a second group of students, and the Committee authorized the inclusion of this on the ballot, too.[17] Those voting could choose between the two or reject both.

> Upon motion of the student members of the committee (Committee on Student Affairs), it was voted that unless at least three thousand votes were cast at the election, the election be declared null and void and the then existing form of student government be continued.[18]

A student rally was held in Hill Auditorium on April 8, 1946, in order to present a debate on the two proposed student government constitutions.[19] The election was held; the required number of votes were cast, and the second proposed constitution was adopted.[20] Following is a resume of the structure and aims of the student government under that constitution. The body was known as the Student Legislature.

Student Legislature

The preamble to the new Student Legislature Constitution read as follows:

---

[16] Ibid., p. 53.

[17] President's Report (1945-1946), op. cit.

[18] Ibid. The existing student government at this time was the Men's Judiciary Council.

[19] "Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs (1943-1948), p. 59.

[20] President's Report (1945-1946), op. cit.

> We believe that the student government should reflect an educational philosophy which recognizes that students must participate in shaping their own education. We have established this Constitution in order to create the beginnings of democratic self-rule at the University of Michigan.[21]

The first meeting of the Student Congress[22] was held May 9, 1946. The new constitution provided for a governing body made up of men and women representatives, one legislator for every eight hundred students, calculated to the nearest multiple of eight hundred.[23] The membership was larger than that of any former student government.[24]

The basic functions of the Student Legislature were to express student opinion, coordinate student activities, and to delegate representatives to all joint-faculty-student committees.[25]

The government had been in existence for only an abbreviated period when the Dean of Students wrote:

> It is hoped that this Council will be

---

[21] Student Legislature Constitution, 1946, (Student Activities Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan).

[22] At a meeting of the Student Congress on May 23, 1946, a motion was made and passed that the name of Student Congress be dropped in favor of calling the governing body the Student Legislature. Another group on campus was using the name, Student Congress. ("Minutes of the Student Legislature," May 23, 1946).

[23] Student Legislature Constitution, 1946, Article 1, Section 2.

[24] President's Report (1945-1946), pp. 38-39. The membership was forty.

[25] Student Legislature Constitution, 1946, Article 1, Section 4.

> as representative, efficient, and responsible as its proponents anticipate. So far, at any rate, it has taken its job seriously and judiciously, and its officers have realized their responsibility not only to the students but to the University as a whole.[26]

As noted above in the preamble to the Constitution of the Student Legislature, the students had hoped to create the beginning of self-rule at the University. It is therefore noteworthy the Dean of Students could praise the Legislature for its acceptance of responsibility. Certainly the acceptance of responsibility had been one of the forward-steps taken by students in the evolution of their governing themselves at Michigan.

Basically, however, the students' government was not yet "self-government," for even when the Student Legislature wishes to change its constitution, approval was needed by the Committee on Student Affairs - as well as by the students.[27] The Committee on Student Affairs had to approve or disapprove all recommendations of the Student Legislature, although it likewise became a common practice for the Committee on Student Affairs to seek recommendations from the Student Legislature.[28] Further, the Student Legislature had

---

[26]<u>President's Report</u> (1945-1946), p. 39.

[27]"It was moved and seconded that the Committee on Student Affairs approve the presentation of the proposed amendments to the Constitution (Student Legislature) to the student body on the ballot for October 29." (Minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs," October 29, 1946).

[28]"Minutes of Committee on Student Affairs," V, pp. 104-112, campus drives and tag days.

only two votes on the Student Affairs Committee, but the working relationship of the two groups appeared to be good. This student government, as all those before it, was another student government in cooperation with the faculty and administrators. The errors in understanding terminology, i.e., calling student-faculty-administration cooperative government, student self-government, persisted, however.

The work of the Student Legislature is fully recorded,[29] and is a conscientious testimony to the work done by many students in order to effectuate an active program of concern for the out-of-class activities of students at The University of Michigan. That another change in structure of student government at Michigan ultimately came is not to judge Student Legislature as a failure in and of itself, but rather to suppose some of those involved in the change may have felt a new form of government would be an improvement. As a new form of government was being considered, some of the leaders of Student Legislature were most cooperative, but others received the deliberations with suspicion which hardened into opposition as it became apparent a change might occur.[30]

Some Provisions of the Legislature's Constitution

Examination of the Constitution of the Student Legislature gives one an appreciation for the efforts of

---

[29]"Minutes of the Student Legislature," Volumes 1 and 2, 1946-1953.

[30]"Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," op. cit., unnumbered preface.

students to attempt "to create the beginnings of democratic self-rule," as its preamble states.[31] For example, provision was made for any eligible student's name to appear on the ballot,[32] and any student could present proposals or complaints to the Legislature. Provided they were in written form, they then appeared on the agenda. The Constitution also provided for drawing upon the general student body to serve on committees and projects.[34]

Under the Student Legislature By-Laws, provision was made for the forty members of the Student Legislature to serve on one of six standing committees.[35] Only the seven members of the Cabinet of the Student Legislature were excluded from serving on at least one of the standing committees. The general function of the committees was to coordinate all campus activities and to initiate necessary programs.[36] The attempt to bring into harmony the many and diverse activities on campus represented an important expansion in the acceptance of governmental responsibilities by the Student Legislature; no previous student government had been committed to doing so.

---

[31] Student Legislature Constitution, loc. cit.

[32] Ibid., Section 3.

[33] Ibid., Section 7.

[34] Ibid., Section 5.

[35] Student Legislature By-Laws, Article II, Section 1.

[36] Ibid., Article II, Section 2.

The Committees and their functions were as follows:

Culture and Education - this committee works on all problems concerning the academic life of the student, such as projects to improve student-faculty relations, to honor faculty men, student advisors, coordinating school councils, etc. U calendar.

Human Relations - discrimination on the basis of race, place of birth has consumed the major work of this committee. Such other projects as affiliate-non-affiliate dinners, and dinners for foreign students in American housing units are also within its jurisdiction.

Intercollegiate Relations - As the name implies, all problems of information and participation between colleges come up here. The committee prepared the delegation for the NSA congress in the summer, and relates the work of this group and of the Big Ten Student Government Organization to the committees of the S. L.

International Relations - The University of Free Berlin, legal aid to foreign students, contact with the International Student Association, are some of the projects this committee has handled in an attempt to integrate the foreign student to the campus, and the campus to the rest of the students of the world. They also appoint students to: the World University Service Committee, the ISA, the Displaced Persons Committee, and the committee for the University of Berlin.

Campus Action - The problems which remain unclassified in the above groups, which are of vital interest to the campus, and those problems concerning the economic life of the student are taken up here. The driving ban problem,

---

37"Minutes of the Laing Committee." op. cit., p. 61a.

> the representation of students on University Committees, student book store plans have occupied this committee.
>
> Public Relations - This committee handles the publicity for S. L., booklets, newsletters, open houses, etc., as well as the projects to instruct the campus in the aims and the projects of the Legislature.[37]

In addition to the several committees there were various administrative groups appointed by Student Legislature, i.e., the Book Exchange Board and the Cinema Guild Board.[38] Further, representatives from the Student Legislature served on all joint-faculty-student Committees, i.e., Student Affairs Committee and its calendaring and Constitution committees; the Lecture Committee, and the Committee on Student Loans.[39] Even cursory examination of any particular year's projects is impressive; for example, in 1950, the Student Legislature initiated a plan for a Faculty Grading System, giving students an opportunity to grade instructors, and also began a Student Experts Program that provided new students with upperclassman advice in making course choices. Whatever the merit of the individual project, the magnitude of the total is impressive.[40]

---

[37] "Minutes of the Laing Committee." op. cit., p. 61a.

[38] Ibid. Both were begun and operated by Student Legislature.

[39] Ibid.

[40] "Minutes of the Student Legislature," I, Appendix, "Projects of the Student Legislature . . .," 1950.

Toward More Effective Student Government

On November 11, 1953, an editorial by the Senior Editors of the Michigan Daily appeared criticizing the Student Legislature.

> Lack of student and administration faith in the Student Legislature has not been unusual in the Legislature's seven year career on campus.
>
> Yet seldom has that criticism been as valid as it is today, for the Legislature record of late has been one of timidity, vacillation, lethargy, and incompetence.
>
> . . . We are not asking the campus to cast a vote of confidence in the Legislature, but rather a vote of support for Student Government. . . .[41]

The election referred to in the above (for Student Legislature members) was the last election to be held for Student Legislature. This is noteworthy because never before in the history of student government at Michigan had a change in the student government structure come about without a specific decision to abandon the old form in favor of a new form in a direct manner. The initial intent had been to study the composition of the Student Affairs Committee; not to create a new form of student government. This is not to suggest a devious route to a new form of government for students had been calculated. Rather, in the fall of 1953, President Harlan H. Hatcher announced the appointment of a special committee to study the membership composition of the

---

[41] Michigan Daily, November 11, 1953, "An Editorial."

Student Affairs Committee.[42] From the work of this Study Committee evolved a new, and now existing, form of student government. Whether Student Legislature as such failed as a form of student government is a matter of interpretation; the framework for the government appeared to have been adequate, even if the personnel were not. In his "Preface", written for the later-to-be-known-as "Laing Study Committee," Professor Laing sums up past failures of student governments as follows:

> In analyzing past failures of student government it was felt that the governing body composed of all elected members chosen from the campus at large was too often unwieldy in size and not distinguished enough in personnel to command the respect of either student body or administration and faculty. Deterioration in prestige and effectiveness in functioning thus resulted and though the existing body was attempting to be the mouthpiece for student opinion it was hampered by a want of confidence in its motives and accomplishments.[43]

Committee Appointed

At a meeting of the Committee on Student Affairs, October 13, 1953, the Chairman, Mr. Walter B. Rea, read a letter received from President Hatcher announcing the President's intention to create a committee consisting of

---

[42] Michigan Daily, October 15, 1953, "Editor's Note." Professor Lionel Laing states, "At that time it was felt that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Student Affairs might profitably be reviewed." ("Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," loc. cit.)

[43] "Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," op. cit.

Senate members of the faculty who had served on the Committee on Student Affairs to review the composition of that Committee. "He (Mr. Rea) emphasized that the letter definitely implied the inclusion of students in the deliberations of this Committee."[44] The body of the letter read as follows:

> I should like you to know that I am appointing a committee composed of Senate members of the faculty who have had the experience of serving on the Student Affairs Committee to study its composition. The committee will give special consideration to the question of adequately representing in its discussions all pertinent points of view within the University family. It will invite to its meetings representatives from all parts of the University and will welcome anyone to its meetings who may have a serious interest in its assignment.
>
> The committee will be appointed at an early date. At that time I shall send you the names of the faculty members who will serve on it.[45]

When the initial committee was announced there was no provision for student membership on it. Mr. Harry Lunn, Editor of the Michigan Daily, stated he would like to see one or two students working with the Committee as well as having students consulted on an advisory capacity.[46] At its meeting on October 27, 1953, the Committee on Student

---

[44]"Minutes of Committee on Student Affairs," VIII, p. 98.

[45]Ibid., p. 99.

[46]Ibid., p. 98.

Affairs again discussed the advisability of recommending the inclusion of students on the Committee being appointed by the President to review the composition of the Committee on Student Affairs.[47]

> The chairman (Dean Walter B. Rea) indicated that while he had not had an opportunity to talk with the President relative to this matter, he had talked with Mr. Walter (Assistant to the President). He stated that while it was clearly the intention to include widespread participation of students in the discussions, it was not planned to include students as continuing members on the committee.
>
> The advisability of a formal recommendation was discussed and rejected in favor of informal consultation of student members, together with the chairman, with Dr. Hatcher. It was planned to see Mr. Walter as a preliminary step since Dr. Hatcher was out of town for the week.[48]

On November 5, 1953, the Daily announced in bold headlines: "Three Students Named To Serve on Special S.A.C. Study Committee."[49]

> Present SAC student members had pressed for the proposal believing that a body studying a student-faculty committee should logically include students as well as faculty members.[50]

The issue may seem overly dramatic; however, "friction and

---

[47] Ibid., p. 104.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Michigan Daily, November 5, 1953, p. 1.

[50] Ibid.

misunderstanding between the administration and student leaders"[51] had been significant the year before (1952). Now there appeared to the students to be a turnabout. This the students viewed as a step forward in the evolution of their rights.

> . . . In a rather unprecedented turnabout, President Hatcher appointed three student members to the important committee on the informal recommendation of SAC which recognized the logical proposition that students should be included in a group studying a student-faculty committee. The move was unprecedented, and in a way difficult for the President to make, because it tacitly acknowledged that a mistake had been made in excluding students in the first place. In this respect the decision differed from the final exam controversy where the impression was created originally that a drastic change in scheduling was of no concern to students. (Inclusion of student representatives on the new final exam study group this fall was hardly a great study victory - the furor and protest caused by last spring's action left no alternative.)
>
> At the risk of assuming too much from one administrative decision, we believe the President's action represents an important change in administrative attitude. Together with grants of student representation through SL on various faculty liaison groups, the recent inclusion of two students on the Development Council Board and the expected addition of students to the International Center Board of Governors, the Presidential decision recognizes the concept of responsible student participation in affairs of the University affecting student life an extremely important gain.[52]

---

[51] Michigan Daily, November 8, 1953, "Editor's Note," p.4

[52] Ibid.

The Committee Works

The Committee began its first of a series of meetings in November, 1953, and presented its final work to President Hatcher in May, 1954. At its first meeting on November 11, 1953, preliminary remarks were made by President Hatcher. His charge to the Committee was to take a fresh look at the S.A.C. and see how it was meeting the needs and problems that needed to be met.

> . . . Then the assignment of this committee will be to take a fresh look at this very important area, the S.A.C., and learn how it is constituted, what its membership is, and how it is meeting the needs and problems that must be met. From that I hope the committee will bring forth any recommendations that it feels it ought to make. We are trying to make our instruments respond as adequately as they can. . . .[53]

It was decided to invite interested individuals or groups to present their ideas, to gather background information on the development of the Student Affairs Committee,[54] to open all meetings to the students as well as to representatives of the Michigan Daily, and make any printed information on the meetings available in the Office of Student Affairs.[55]

An abbreviated history of the Committee on Student Affairs from 1902-1953 was compiled for the Committee from

---

[53]"Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," p. 1a.

[54]See Chapter III of this work.

[55]"Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," op. cit.

materials housed at the Office of Student Affairs.[56] The Committee reviewed the general history of activities, noting particularly that financial problems were a characteristic of early organizations, and also that until 1916 there were no students represented on the Committee on Student Affairs.[57] The Committee decided to secure statements from student groups who had representation on the Committee on Student Affairs to set forth the reasons why they could justify their inclusion.[58] When no statements had been received, even though notice had been published in the Michigan Daily, letters were written to the Interfraternity Council, Panhellenic Association, Graduate Student Council, International Students Association, Inter-House Council (governing body of Men's Residence Halls), Assembly Association, and the Student Bar Association, asking them to submit their views concerning student representation on the Student Affairs Committee.[59]

One of the first questions raised by the Committee was whether or not student representatives on the S.A.C. were instructed in their voting by the groups from which they were drawn, or whether they were free agents and voted according

---

[56] Ibid., p. 2.

[57] Ibid., p. 1b.

[58] Ibid., p. 14.

[59] Ibid., These letters were to reach the Committee by January 5, 1954.

to their own opinions.[60] Past Student Legislature votes had not always represented the expressed view of the legislature.[61]

> It was agreed that a very basic question is: "Is it more desirable to have representatives on the S.A.C. voicing the strict opinions of the group they represent, or to appoint people who are well qualified and well versed in all campus activities and allow them to vote according to their own opinions as well as those of the groups they represent?"[62]

To Include Other Ideas

One of the student members of the Committee[63] was asked to sit in on a meeting of the Panhellenic Association to advise them as to what the Committee wanted from them in regards to the brief it had previously requested. At this meeting the question also arose as to whether their (Panhellenic Association) brief might include other ideas. The Committee agreed all material from such groups would be helpful.[64] Although the initial charge to the Committee was to consider the composition and representation on the Committee on Student Affairs, the "other ideas" concept held most appeal. The Committee had held only three meetings

---

[60] Ibid.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Ibid., p. 15.

[63] Miss Sue Popkin.

[64] "Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," p. 16.

before it was discussing other ideas and the ever-present question of power in a governing body.

> Mr. Britton[65] pointed out that it has been said at times that student government cannot survive unless it is given a more authoritative position then it now has. For instance, "Can the Student Legislature survive and grow in its functions as it should unless it is given powers and responsibilities comparable to those of the S.A.C.?"
>
> Dean Rea replied that it would seem that the Student Legislature serving as a vehicle of student opinion without having true authority, would not be able to extend its functions and accomplishments, but could survive in the area of its current functions.
>
> Mr. Laing observed that there have also been suggestions to the effect that either the S.A.C. should be a body composed entirely of students or that there should be an all-student body at some intermediary level, and raised the question, "over what areas could such an all-student body probably take jurisdiction?"
>
> Mr. Rea recalled that the old "Student Council" was a good example of such a body --- that it functioned back in the "Twenties" and handled a great many things including some discipline and affairs such as the Spring and Fall games. The S.A.C. then was strictly a faculty committee, and the student body numbered only approximately 8,000.
>
> The question was raised as to how efficiently sub-committees of S.A.C. have handled the responsibilities given them, and it was pointed out that they do relieve the S.A.C. of a lot of time consuming detail work and preparation in various areas such as constitution revision, calendaring, study of

---

[65] A faculty member of the Committee from the College of Engineering.

> housing, etc. and then are prepared to make recommendations to the S.A.C. for action. Some of the sub-committees which are composed entirely of students are: The Constitution Committee (work delegated to the S.L.), The Cinema Guild,[66] The Calendar Committee (work delegated to the S.L.), Committee on Housing.[67]
>
> Mr. Laing pointed out that actually the term "Student Legislature" is a misnomer; for the group has no legislative powers, but is merely an assembly or a student congress with certain executive functions but no legislative authority except in terms of their own organization, although they are provided with funds from the University budget.[68]

The wisdom of having selected a study committee composed of faculty members who had at some time in the past served on the Committee on Student Affairs was apparent. Further, even as the Committee was considering how student representatives should be selected for serving on a student government, the Committee was benefiting from the presence of knowledgeable student members on its Committee. Because of their past experience in the area of student activities the Committee realized their original charge to consider only the Committee on Student Affairs was too restrictive. It was decided to ask the President about broadening the scope

---

[66]Cinema Guild was not a sub-committee of the Committee on Student Affairs. It functioned under Student Legislature, with a Board appointed by Student Legislature.

[67]The Committee on Housing was not composed of all students. It also included the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women, or their representatives.

[68]"Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," pp. 17-18.

of the Committee's study.

> Inevitably, it must embrace the whole area of student governmental problems. Encouraged by President Hatcher to broaden its scope, and assured by him of a sympathetic reception to an overall scheme, the Committee began the formulation of its proposal that eventually lead to the plan for the Student Government Coumcil, as the body eventually became designated.[69]

Proposals Studied

With President Hatcher's authorization to continue their study of a thorough reorganization of student government, various proposals were carefully studied. Proposals had been presented by Dean Bacon (Dean of Women), the Student Legislature, the Inter Fraternity Council, and by an anonymous student who claimed to be an "outside observer of student government activity on campus."[70]

Communication to the Committee came from organizations, students, and alumni. The communications often represented organizational points of view; for example, Women's Judiciary endorsed the campus "Expert" qualification as the determining factor for student membership on S.A.C., as did the Inter-Fraternity Council,[71] and each stated why his/her President

---

[69] Ibid., umnumbered preface.

[70] Michigan Daily, February 12, 1954. This student, Malin Van Antwerp, was at the time a law student; he had written the anonymous proposal.

[71] "Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," p. 102.

could be considered an "Expert".[72]

It is of special interest to note communications were even received from eight alumni, all of whom had been graduated within the five years previous to the Study Committee's appointment.[73]

After careful study of the proposals and criticisms, recommendations began to take shape.

The Committee was in agreement ". . . that an effective scheme of student government might involve quite a fresh approach . . ."[74] in which they would attempt to set up a structure which would bring real student government to the campus. It was becoming clear that if an all-student governing body were created, it would probably take over most of the duties of the Student Affairs Committee and the Student Legislature.[75] Further the Committee recognized that financial support for student governments and organizations had always been a problem at the University. Organizations found it necessary to raise funds in order to support their own activities and governmental structures, thereby being forced to expend energy on projects which might have been

---

[72]The Inter-Fraternity Council defined a "representative expert" as one who ". . . is the result of experience and knowledge with student affairs, leadership ability, and direct contact with student opinion." (Ibid., p. 100)

[73]"Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," op. cit.

[74]Ibid., p. 49. The quoted phrase is taken from Dr. Laing's conference with President Hatcher.

[75]Ibid.

expended in policy formation. As pointed out in Chapter III of this work, financial irregularities of certain student organizations brought about the need to establish the Committee on Student Affairs in the first place. The problem of finances was discussed.

> There would have to be some financial support for such a group, and this would probably be taken care of through a small charge to all students, thereby taking the group out of the realm of service activities, which might be allocated to designated groups.[76]

A Proposal is Made

A proposal was made by the Chairman of the Committee that a Student Executive Council be formed of from ten to twenty students who would govern, and who would be known as an Executive Committee. This Executive Committee's decisions would be subject to review by a small faculty-student committee, ". . . having somewhat the same relationship which now exists between the Joint Judiciary and the Sub-Committee on Discipline."[77] The proposal for the S.E.C. called for some of the students to be elected from the campus at large and some to be appointed from the leading campus activity groups.

It is of interest that the name "Student Legislature"

---

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ibid., The Sub-Committee on Discipline was superior to Joint Judiciary Council in its authority; the Board of Review would be superior in authority to the proposed Student Executive Committee.

was proposed as a possible name for the new body,[78] however, it was cogently pointed out by the chairman that . . ..

> There is only one true law making body as far as the University is concerned, and that is the Regents.[79]

Almost immediately following the introduction of the proposal the Committee gained a consensus in some areas. For example,

> The Committee agreed to include 7 ex-officio members on the Executive Committee as follows: I.F.C., I.H.C., Panhellenic, Assembly Assoc., Women's League, Michigan Union and the Michigan Daily.[80]

Various numbers of elected members had been proposed by interested groups, but the proposal of a Committee member was readily approved.

> Motion was made, seconded and carried to adopt the number of 18 as the total membership on the proposed S.E.C., with 11 members to be elected and 7 to be ex-officio.[81]

System of Election of Representatives

Once the number to be elected was determined to be eleven, possible systems for their election were discussed.

---

[78]This proposal may have come about because as a new form of government appeared as the inevitable, members of the then-existing Student Legislature began to split over the question as to whether a new government was needed at all. Some preferred to revamp what already existed.

[79]"Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," p. 50.

[80]Ibid., p. 55.

[81]Ibid., p. 57.

The possibilities themselves are suggestive of the magnitude of the volume of details to be handled by whatever government was established, for only on a campus with a large student population could they suggest themselves as possibilities. They were: election from the campus at large, election by schools and colleges, election by districts or housing units, election by class year, and election from interest groups.[82] The Committee unanimously agreed to a plan whereby the eleven elected members would be chosen from the campus at large; the transferable note or Hare system was to be used.

The Work of the S.E.C.

After the number of students to be on the Student Executive Committee was tentatively established, attention was given to determining whether the work of the S.E.C. would be done in Council as a whole, or whether it would have to be done by delegating many of the "project"-type functions, as well as research and investigation leading to policy decisions, to sub-committees and student organizations.[83] It would make considerable difference, for if delegation occurred, it would free time for the members of the S.E.C. to make the more important policy decisions. The question of how many people would be necessary to satisfactorily perform the natural functions of the S.E.C., if it absorbed the jurisdiction of the Student Affairs Committee and the Student

---

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid., p. 58.

Legislature, raised further questions for the Study Committee. The following questions and expressions of opinion appeared significant. They were ten in number.

1. Provision must be made for soliciting and considering student opinion. If a small S.E.C. is set up, then some body must be created for this purpose.

2. Would students or student groups to whom responsibilities might be delegated by the S.E.C. assume these responsibilities and carry them through? Would they be interested in doing the work?

3. They could be given great authority as far as "project" work is concerned, but policy making decisions would have to remain with the S.E.C.. The delegated work should be made attractive to interested students.

4. It had been declared by some student leaders that there should be a Council large enough to carry the weight of all its responsibilities without outside help. Others felt that delegation by a smaller body is the answer.

5. Many of the projects now carried by the S.L. need not be done by the S.E.C. Curtailment of functions, or placing some of the present operations into other hands than the S.E.C. would lighten the burden of the new organization.

6. Having important functions delegated to them would in all probability spur the interest of many campus organizations and "tone up" student affairs in general.

7. Would it not be true that even as small a committee as 18 could adequately present student opinion?

8. It is important not to overload a few students. Some now contribute

as much as 40 or more hours a week to student activities. Delegating and spreading out the responsibilities to individuals and groups who are devoted and interested might be the answer.

9. Students, on the whole, have proven their reliability and stability in these matters. There is every reason to believe they would continue to perform them judiciously and well, thus enhancing the probability that they would be given real powers. This would most likely be true if the group were a relatively small one.

10. In order to avoid constant or poorly timed turnover of personnel on the S.E.C., a specific time for all ex-officio members to take their seats could be arranged as well as specified times for the elected members to commence their service on the Council, with overlapping terms of office.[84]

After a discussion of great length on the ten points listed above, the Study Committee reaffirmed their earlier decision to include seven ex-officio members and eleven elected ones, for a total of eighteen.[85]

Areas of Jurisdiction

Mr. Britton and Mr. Laing were asked by the Study Committee to state, at a subsequent meeting, the areas to be covered in the realm of student government, and they presented for consideration the following areas of jurisdiction which could possibly be taken over by the S.E.C..

1. To make rules governing recog-

---

[84] Ibid., pp. 59-60.

[85] Ibid., p. 60.

nition of new and reactivated organizations, and the maintenance or withdrawal of that recognition.

2. Approval or denial of approval for student sponsored activities.

3. Coordination and delegation of student activities carried on by recognized student groups.

4. Origination of student projects.

5. To express and to provide orderly means for expression of student opinion.

6. To serve as an appointing body for selection of student representatives to joint faculty-administration-student committees such as those groups with representatives now appointed by S.L. and other groups which might be designated in the future.

7. To make rules governing eligibility of students participating in extra-curricular activities above and beyond a grade point average established by colleges.[86]

Other Considerations

Student visitors to the meeting were quick to point out the need for financial support for student activities.[87] It was decided that S.E.C. might regard rules governing student conduct as outside its direct concern, as it was felt this area was already covered by a University body.[88]

---

[86] Ibid., p. 62.

[87] Ibid.

[88] Ibid., p. 63. The reference here is to the existing Joint Judiciary Council and the Sub-Committee on Discipline.

Many questions remained to be answered. Would the proposal be brought before the students in a referendum, inasmuch as the students would not be likely to favor a form of government on which they did not have an opportunity to vote? Although the Chairman's answer was that such a decision would be the prerogative of President Hatcher inasmuch as "this is a study committee only,"[89] the point had been made and ultimately found its way into the total recommendations of the Study Committee to the President. Would S.E.C. have adequate financial support? The Committee agreed the S.E.C. should operate without the financial strain and uncertainty that the Student Legislature knew.[90] What about the matter of publicizing actions of the S.E.C.?

> It was pointed out that the Committee could cooperate with the Daily in setting up a column reporting Official Proceedings which would be an official release for publication. This could be supplemented by regular news stories. It was felt that meetings should be open to allow interested parties an opportunity to speak, and also to provide means for the expression of student opinion.[91]

A Draft is Presented

It was now April 15; the date tenatively set by the Study Committee to present its recommendations to President Hatcher had been April 1, 1954. "Considerable emphasis was

---

[89] Ibid., p. 67

[90] Ibid., p. 66.

[91] Ibid., p. 64.

placed at this point on beginning the formulation of the plan for presentation to the President."[92]

On April 22, after five months of conducting public hearings on suggestions for forming a newly constituted student government, public meetings were closed. The Study Committee requested Mr. Laing formulate a draft of the Committee's plan; this draft would be submitted to the Committee at its next meeting, May 6.[93] It was further agreed that another open meeting would be arranged for discussion of the plan, following the meeting of the Committee on May 6.[94]

Discussion at the last public meeting had covered a variety of subjects, such as: an examination of the way campus groups supported their activities, consideration of the Regents' By-Laws which might be outmoded if the plan went into effect,[95] the creation of a forum regulated by the S.E.C. for purposes of airing student opinion regularly and making the group more responsible to its constituents; and a student referendum, if President Hatcher should approve the plan.[96]

---

[92] Ibid.

[93] Ibid., p. 67. Actually a meeting, not open to the public, was held April 25.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Reference is made to the Regents' By-Laws, Sec. 8.13, regulating the powers of the Student Affairs Committee.

[96] "Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," pp. 66-67.

A Board of Review

At a closed meeting on April 25, the Study Committee agreed to recommend a Board of Review[97] for all actions taken by the S.E.C.. After agreement was reached as to its size and constitution it was further agreed that meetings of the Board might be at the call of the Chairman, and/or upon the request of anyone of the members of the Board when there was a point at issue.[98] The point at issue was to be stated in the call to the meeting.

> The Committee then proposed that actions taken by the S.E.C. might be regarded as in effect unless notification is made within 2 weeks that the subject has been called for review. Further, it was the consensus of opinion of the Committee that normally the actions of the S.E.C. will be sustained, and meetings of the Board will occur infrequently. Possible areas of disagreement with the S.E.C. action might occur in cases of apparent lack of jurisdiction by the S.E.C. and in actions that might need reconsideration, but the Committee was not yet ready to spell out the details of this.[99]

It is of note that the Study Committee's attention had been brought to inherent dangers of such a Review Board on March 26, 1954, by the Dean of Women.

> In the planning currently envisaged, there appear to be no channels of preliminary referral or discussion. The Review Board . . . does not

---

[97] Ibid., p. 68.

[98] Ibid.

[99] Ibid.

> begin to function until after the proposed SEC will have completed its discussions and have formally presented its resolutions. In other words, this Review Board is so set up that, should there, on occasion, be something wrong with the barn door it is guaranteed that no step shall be taken until the horse is well and truly stolen.[100]

Nevertheless, the Board of Review was incorporated in the proposed plan.

Tentative Draft

On May 6, 1954, the first draft of the final report to the President was reviewed by members of the Committee. The President of the University had already agreed the final draft could be released to the Daily at the same time it was sent to him.[101] As a closing gesture, the Committee agreed it was prepared to stand ready to serve as a consulting body if the new student government were established.[102] Mr. Laing and Mr. Britton were appointed as a Sub-Committee to draw up the final draft for presentation.[103]

To the President and the Daily

On May 13, 1954, the final draft of the report was presented to the Committee. At the conclusion of the review of

---

[100]A letter from Deborah Bacon, Dean of Women, addressed to Dr. Lionel Laing, Chairman of the Student Affairs Reorganizational Study Group, March 26, 1954.

[101]"Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," p. 69.

[102]Ibid.

[103]Ibid.

the draft the following motion was made:

> I move the adoption of this report, subject to editorial revisions as are necessary, and the presentation of the report to the President of the University.[104]

The motion was accepted and the Chairman was to arrange for final revisions and the presentation of the report to the President.

The full text of the proposal recommending that the Committee on Student Affairs be replaced by a Student Government Council and a Board of Review was reported in the Michigan Daily the day after it reached the President's Office.[105] Part of the content of the letter of transmittal from the Committee to the President is of interest because it states the philosophy of a cooperative student-administrative-faculty endeavor upon which the proposal was constructed.

> We have developed our plan in the conviction that effective student government should be responsible self-government but should not infringe upon those administrative responsibilities of the University which must be carried out by its officials. At the same time, the University must seek to promote educational objectives which are properly furthered by the free and independent initiative of the students. We believe that our proposal both preserves the obligations and promotes the

---

[104] Ibid., p. 79.

[105] Michigan Daily, May 27, 1954, p. 3.

objectives.[106]

The Committee made the following recommendations to the President:

I. that the present Student Affairs Committee be replaced by a Student Government Council and a Board of Review.

II. that the Council be composed of 11 elected and 7 ex-officio campus leaders.

III. that it assume substantially all the functions now performed by the Student Affairs Committee and the Student Legislature.

IV. that the decisions of the Council be final unless reversed by the Board of Review.

V. that the Board of Review be composed of the Dean of Men, the Dean of Women, 3 faculty members and 2 students.

VI. that a full time administrative secretary be appointed.

VII. that the student government be financed by an assessment of 25¢ per semester per student.

VIII. that quarters be provided adequate for the operations of student government.

IX. that the proposed plan not disturb the status of other forms of student government on campus such as that of the Michigan League, etc.[107]

---

[106] A letter of transmittal of a Proposed Plan, to President Hatcher signed by the complete membership of the "Laing Study Committee," dated May 20, 1954.

[107] "Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," p. 81.

Along with the recommendations, a proposed plan for Student Government Coumcil was submitted, complete with details of organization and operation, as well as a proposal for implementation of the report which called for a two-year trial of the proposed plan of student government.[108]

> It would seem that a two-year trial of the proposed plan of student government could be instituted through a simple resolution by the Board of Regents temporarily suspending Sec. 8.13 of the By-Laws, with the request that appropriate administrative offices give effect to the proposals contained in this report. Subsequently, if the plan were successful the relevant sections of the Regent's By-Laws could be amended.[109]

The Committee recognized that more than legal authorization of student government was necessary if the proposed plan was to work.

> To be effective, it must be endorsed wholeheartedly by the student body, and there must be an enthusiastic willingness to participate in its institutions. To test the opinion of students and give them an opportunity to express themselves, it would seem desirable that, after the campus has been fully acquainted with the plan, the Student Legislature be requested to conduct a campus wide referendum upon the question: "Would you support the form of student government proposed by the Study Committee?"[110]

---

[108] A Complete copy of this material can be found in the "Minutes of the Laing Study Committee" pp. 82-89 (Office of Student Affairs, Ann Arbor, Michigan).

[109] "Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," p. 89.

[110] Ibid.

In the Hands of the President and the Regents

On May 27, 1954, after nearly six months of investigation the Committee presented its recommendations to the President. The school year was nearing an end, and consideration of the report by the Regents was postponed until August. Consideration of the plan was then made subject to review by a committee of three Regents.[111] Although it was generally felt by students the Board of Regents would act on the proposal at their September meeting, they did not. Despite what appeared to be great disappointment on the part of students at the Regents' reluctance to act on the plan at the September meeting, four reasons for doing so were given by the newly-appointed Vice President for Student Affairs.

> Vice-President Lewis reported the committee questioned whether the SGC's constitution - submitted to the Regents' May meeting by the Student Affairs Study Committee . . . was sufficient to determine the proposed scope and power of SGC.
>
> Also questioned was whether four days was enough time for the Board of Review, which would have veto power over any jurisdictional questions involving SGC, to announce their decision to review an SGC-passed measure.
>
> That new suggestions passed by SL[112]

---

[111] Regents' Proceedings (1954-1957), p. 11.

[112] Student Legislature asked the Regents to consider changes in the SGC financial controls. The recommendation as submitted read: "In accordance with the theory of one central student government, the SGC eventually be given financial control over student organizations." (Michigan Daily, September 22, 1954).

> arrived before the Regents' committee . . . too late for the Regents to consider completely before their full meeting. . . .
>
> A fourth reason for further consideration . . . was Regential desire to reconvene the SASC (Student Affairs Study Committee) which prepared the original SGC proposal last spring after several months of study. SASC will be reconvened to consider some further questions raised by the Regents on the SGC plan.[113]

Subsequently a thirteen-man[114] committee was appointed to review suggested changes in the SGC plan as had been edited and sifted by the three-man committee of Regents. This larger committee met on October 20, 1954, to discuss changes, and one week later agreement was reached on SGC's plans; however, a final meeting was held November 4, to consider the final draft to be presented to the Regents at their November meeting.[115] At their November meeting the Board of Regents

> The Regents referred again to the report of the Committee on Student Government originally discussed at the meeting of the Regents on August 6, and authorized the students, under the supervision of the Vice-President for Student Affairs, to obtain a general campus opinion on this subject.[116]

A Student Referendum

With the SGC referendum approved by the Regents, a

---

[113] Michigan Daily, September 22, 1954.

[114] The Chairman of the Special Study Committee was on sabbatical leave at the time; therefore, this Committee became a twelve-man committee.

[115] Michigan Daily, October 27, 1954.

[116] Regents' Proceedings (1954-1957), p. 244.

meeting was called by the Vice President for Student Affairs to work out the most feasible plan for the poll."[117] With the need to transmit the results of the student opinion poll to the Regents at their December 17 meeting, it was decided to hold the poll on December 8, 9. The Student Government Council proposal read as follows:

> WHEREAS there has been a growing need for a well established and official form of student government on the campus of the University of Michigan, and
>
> WHEREAS there has been an awareness that such student government should adequately reflect student opinion and be properly integrated with other agencies on the campus, and
>
> WHEREAS there has been a careful study of student government and a plan proposed by a committee known as the Laing Committee, such plan to be known as the Student Government Council, and
>
> WHEREAS this plan has been discussed and approved in principle by representative student groups and leaders, and has been referred to the Officers and Regents of the University, and
>
> WHEREAS the Regents, by State constitutional mandate, are charged with responsibilities of management of all affairs of the University, and cannot delegate those responsibilities without holding the right to appraise, modify, or suspend said delegations and acts of their agents, and
>
> WHEREAS the Regents have authorized the students of the University to ascertain campus opinion on the proposed Student Government Council by some adequate ballot or poll and report such results to the Regents,

---

[117] Michigan Daily, November 16, 1954, p. 1.

> THEREFORE, the plan described in the attached document is being presented to the students of the University of Michigan on December 8 and 9 at the time of the all campus elections, and the results of the voting will be reported to the Regents at their meeting on December 17, 1954, with the request that if a majority of those voting favor the adoption of the Student Government Council, the students respectfully request the Regents to authorize adoption of the plan and that it be put into effect as soon thereafter as feasible.[118]

Examination of articles appearing in the Michigan Daily during November and December vividly shows expression of student opinion for and against the SGC plan;[119] however, when the Student Affairs Committee unanimously accepted a five-point resolution endorsing the basic idea of student participation in affairs of the University, a significant forward-looking step was taken for student government at the University of Michigan. The SAC recommendations were as follows:

> 1) SAC endorses the basic idea of student participation in affairs of the University. It conceives of opportunities for student participation as a part of the total educational experience of the student. The University has a responsibility for creating opportunities for participation which are beneficial to the student and the total University community.
>
> 2) The SGC plan is one effort to define such profitable areas and modes of student participation. While

---

[118] "Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," p. 90.

[119] Michigan Daily, November 16, 21, 24, 30; December 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8; 1954.

> SAC takes no stand for or against SGC, it does heartily endorse the effort to arrive at a plan for student participation.
>
> 3) SAC does not feel that the validity of the conception of student government rests with the fate of SGC at the polls. If this plan is not approved by the students and the Regents, the University has a continuing responsibility to develop another which will meet with approval from these bodies.
>
> 4) SAC will join with other campus units in their efforts to inform students about the plan currently under discussion. It shares in the general responsibility for achieving an informed and representative student opinion in the referendum.[120]

On December 8, 1954, the student poll was begun, and a front-page editorial by the Senior Editors of the Michigan Daily appeared on that day which epitomized the essence of the need for the poll. In part, it read as follows:

> The most crucial student government election in eight years faces the campus today and tomorrow.
>
> Students are being asked to decide which of two forms of student government they prefer - the present Student Legislature or the proposed Student Government Council.
>
> Every student must realize that the Student Government Council plan is no gilt-edged guarantee of more effective student government.
>
> At the same time he must be aware that Student Legislature has been greatly limited in its effectiveness during the past eight years.

---

[120] Michigan Daily, November 24, 1954, p. 1.

> . . . A small vote will be interpreted as lack of interest; the greater the number of ballots cast the more emphatic it will be to the Regents that students feel the need for strong student government. . . .
>
> In recent years, the largest election turnout has been less than 40 per cent of the campus.
>
> Belief in the very concept of student government will be expressed in a vote that pushes well above that mark. . . .[121]

Student Poll Favors Student Government Council

A total of 6,741 votes were cast in the two-day referendum (5,102 votes for SGC), and although this vote represented approximately ten percent more votes than had been cast in the last election, it fell short of the campus-record vote for Student Legislature in 1948.[122]

Professor J. Willcox Brown, a member of the Student Affairs Committee commented on the significance of the increased vote.

> The more than 10 per cent increase in the vote is the most significant aspect of the elections. That the vote increased proportionally more than enrollment since last year indicated a turn upward in student belief in the validity of student government.[123]

With the referendum completed, the SGC plan awaited the decision of the Regents at their December meeting. There was

---

[121] Michigan Daily, December 8, 1954, p. 1.

[122] Michigan Daily, December 10, 1954, p. 1.

[123] Ibid.

an impatience for approval of the plan, and Regent Bonisteel said:

> I understand the impatience of students over the student government plan, but the Regents can't ignore the University governmental responsibilities invested in them by the people of Michigan.[124]

At their meeting on December 17, 1954, the Regents adopted the proposal for student government as approved by the student body in its poll.

> On December 8 and 9, 1954, the student body expressed its opinion on the subject of the Student Government Council by a vote of 5,102 favoring it and 1,451 favoring the present structure of student government. The Regents adopted the proposal for student government as approved by the student body in this poll, and suspended for a two-year trial period Section 8.13, Committee on Student Affairs of the Bylaws, and any other provisions of the Bylaws inconsistent with the Student Government Council plan. In adopting the proposal and suspending the Bylaws for the two-year trial period, the Regents are acting in harmony with their constitutional responsibilities for the management of all affairs of the University and with their inability to delegate these responsibilities without also holding the right to appraise, modify, or suspend said delegations and acts of their agents. The Vice-President for Student Affairs was instructed to implement the new plan as soon as feasible and, during the trial period, to make such progress reports to the Regents as seem necessary and proper.[125]

When the students returned from their December-January vacation period, the first issue of the Daily carried these

---

[124] Michigan Daily, December 17, 1954, p. 1.

[125] Regents' Proceedings (1954-1957), p. 249.

headlines: "SGC Passed by Regents; All-Campus Poll Heeded."[126] Thus, the news article read: "The Board of Regents for the first time in University history has sanctioned a student government. . . ."[127]

The Student Government Council's steering committee guided transition from Student Legislature to the new form of student government. The first election for Student Government Council was held on March 15 and 16; the first meeting of the Student Government Council, on March 18, 1955.[128]

Dr. Lionel Laing, Chairman of the Special Committee, summarized the Committee's work as follows:

> Thus was devloped and accepted a form of student government which sought to promote the educational advantages of genuine student self-government and at the same time recognize the very real interests of the University and the obligations of its responsible administration. It was predicated upon the faith that, as we enjoin responsibility, our students rise to their obligations. It sought to recognize that in team work, valuable lessons are learned, and as confidence is inspired, understanding will grow so that those entrusted with the responsibility of student affairs may indeed feel that it is intelligently shared.[129]

---

[126] Michigan Daily, January 4, 1955, p. 1.

[127] Ibid.

[128] "MS Student Government Council, summary of action taken March 18 - May 25, 1955," prepared by Henry A. Berliner, first President of Student Government Council.

[129] "Minutes of the Laing Study Committee," unnumbered preface.

In Retrospect

As this study is being completed, Student Government Council is still the student governing body at The University of Michigan. When the two-year trial period expired in 1957, the Board of Regents approved the continuation of Student Government Council.[130] In 1958, the Board in Review reversed a Student Government Council decision; in 1959, both the Student Government Council and the Faculty Senate petitioned the Board of Regents to overrule the Board in Review.[131] The Board of Regents did not, but requested the Vice President for Student Affairs to establish a Clarification Committee to work out the ambiguities in the Student Government Council plan.[132] In the revised plan, the Board in Review was eliminated. Subsequently, all actions of the Student Government Council were made subject to the veto of the Vice President for Student Affairs.

In May 1963, the Board of Regents adopted the following resolution:

> WHEREAS, in November, 1959 (R.P. 1959, page 1099) the Regents approved the revised plan of the Student Government Council and specifically approved the rules and regulations setting forth the functions of the Student Government Council, and by such resolution delegated to the said Student Government Council authority in accordance with Regents' policy for enforcement of rules and regulations concerning student organizations and the conduct of recognized student organizations with particular

---

[130] Regents' Proceedings (1954-1957), p. 1534.

[131] Regents' Proceedings (1957-1960) p. 859.

[132] Ibid., p. 945.

emphasis on enforcement of the policy of the Regents on non-discrimination as set out in Section 2.14 of the Bylaws, and WHEREAS, questions have been raised as to whether or not the Regents have in fact delegated authority to the Student Government Council and if so, whether or not fraternities and sororities are included in the above regulation concerning student organizations.[133]

Now, therefore be it resolved that the Board of Regents hereby

1. Declares that all actions taken by the Student Government Council in establishing rules, withdrawing recognition or imposing other sanctions shall be subject to the veto of the Vice-President for Student Affairs.

2. Confirm the delegation of authority to the Student Government Council to recognize student organizations and to withdraw recognition in implementing the policy of Bylaw 2.14.

3. Specifically includes fraternities and sororities within the term 'student organizations.'

4. Grants to Student Government Council, subject to the veto of the Vice-President for Student Affairs, the power to establish rules requiring the furnishing of relevant information, and rules relating to procedures for settling any controversies which may arise.

5. Declares that implementation of the policy of nondiscrimination set forth in Bylaw 2.14 shall be carried out to preserve, so far as possible, the confidentiality of secrets of recognized student organizations, the freedom of association, and to guarantee fair notice and hearing to affected organizations.[134]

The Student Government Council plan as a form of student

---

[133] Ibid. p. 1099.

[134] Regents' Proceedings, May, 1963.

government is perhaps too current to evaluate objectively. In an interview with its principal author, Dr. Lionel H. Laing, he stated that the plan as initially conceived has been distorted, and that in his opinion, the Board in Review was misused.[135]

Thus it is reasonable to assume that as opinions differ, Student Government Council as a form of student government at The University of Michigan will be challenged and modified time and again. Informed questioning of a particular plan of student government, or even a change, is not alarming; rather, historically, it would appear to have been of merit. However, it is through the persistent dedication to the concept of student government by the students, faculty, and administration at The University of Michigan that rights for students have increasingly evolved.

---

[135]Interview with Professor Lionel H. Laing, October 22, 1963.

Chapter VII

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the data which appear in Chapters II through VI of this study. In those chapters the data were presented with considerable detail in a time-sequence delineation. In this chapter, selected items are drawn from the time-sequence data for purposes of analyzing them in relation to the hypotheses to be tested as presented in Chapter I of this study.

Major Hypothesis

The major hypothesis is: rights for students at The University of Michigan have increasingly evolved.

It is an assumption of this study that any measurement of change in student rights must be made on a time-sequence continuum. State institutions are expected to provide for the needs of all citizens; therefore, when the first students arrived at The University of Michigan in 1841, their rights were already protected by the benefits of the Constitution.

However, in the early years of the institution's history it was the parents' responsibility to request admission for their sons, and the faculty was charged with the responsibility of substituting for parental superintendence. For example, students were expected to attend church, and parents were to select the church. The University required all students to attend chapel. The faculty was expected to enforce both regulations.

In the early history of the University, there is evidence to support the conclusion that those in charge of the students felt that if students were kept busy enough with their classroom discipline and the related requirements of the University, there would be little need to provide direction for their out-of-class activities. Nevertheless, the students had been together only a year when the first of many student organizations was begun. Most of these organizations gained the approval of the faculty. Many service projects developed by these organizations met with campus-wide approval. The notable exception to this was the fraternities.

With the introduction of electives in 1855-1856, the senior student found himself with increased free time in which he could pursue his interests in non-academic affairs. In 1856, dormitories were abolished, thus reducing the supervision of the faculty for the out-of-class affairs of students; and in 1857, the faculty declared that students were considered responsible for their own behavior and capable of managing their own moral behavior.

Despite alleged fears about the admission of women to the University, by the 1870's, the students were governed by a common code of morals, and the stern Code of Laws of the 1840's now seemed archaic to the faculty and students. The students began to develop a feeling of individual responsibility for their conduct. Almost half of their studies were now self-selected, attendance at chapel became voluntary, and admission to the University was by high school diploma. The admission by high school diploma tended to popularize University attendance, and by 1890, the University had the largest enrollment of any American University.

In 1902 the University placed its first specific controls on

student organizations. The students claimed the faculty was interfering with their affairs. The students accused the faculty of trying to manipulate student organizations by laying down what appeared to the students to be radical rules; in fact, the students charged the faculty with estrangement from students. It is of note that until there was a focus of sentiment among students, there was no way for the University to exercise control over its students, except as it exercised control over individual students.

This gave students a cause which actually lead to a request on the part of students for a voice in their own government. With the waking of sentiment toward the desire to govern themselves, and a realization that if peers governed peers, students "would have to believe when their own gave a verdict," the students requested permission to form a student council. It had happened again: each time there was a tightening of the grip on the conduct of students, there was a re-grouping of their forces. This now led to the request by students for their own government and the exercise of their rights.

The Council's actions were well-accepted by the faculty as a step forward toward bringing about more responsible student conduct. The Committee on Student Affairs noted a considerable improvement in the concern of the students to choose better-quality leaders.

By the time World War I began, there was a feeling within the Committee of Student Affairs that the student body had adopted a sound attitude toward the acceptance of responsibility, and that the Student Council displayed a "consistent right-mindedness" in its general policies. Thus, student government at Michigan began as an opportunity offered to substitute reason for force, and to provide

an official channel for sounding out the opinions of students.

It was generally felt by the faculty that those agencies which worked toward producing better understanding between the faculty and students were to be encouraged. The Student Advisory Committee, developed in 1922, with the help of the first Dean of Students, was one of these student agencies. There emerged a feeling among the faculty that only by gaining the confidence of the student body as a whole could anything effective happen toward developing a more responsible student body. Certainly this was the beginning of what was to become known as the era of cooperative faculty-student government at Michigan.

Students invariably seemed surprised at the faculty's willingness to allow them increasing freedom to determine policies for their out-of-class affairs. Although initially students questioned the need for a Committee on Student Affairs, whose purpose it was to supervise their affairs, they ultimately became educated to its purposes, and responded positively to its influence. For example, in 1903-1904 the Committee on Non-Athletic Organizations required the Students' Lecture Association to form a new constitution in order to correct certain acknowledged financial abuses of the organization. Receiving no cooperation from the students, the Committee deemed it wise to formulate and promulgate one on its own authority. Although at first the students objected to this action, when the new constitution was presented, it was cordially received, and its use resulted in attracting and electing a superior class of men to various offices. Soon there was evidence of pronounced and growing revulsion of student sentiment against all semblances of irregularities in the performance of trust. The student staff of the Michiganensian even

sought supervision from the faculty.

The spirit of graft which had permeated student circles in the early 1900's disappeared from the University campus, and the faculty returned to the students the detailed management of their own organizations. In response, students willingly accepted responsibility for conducting their affairs in a business-like manner.

However, the acceptance of responsibility by the students for their behavior and government was not consistently maintained; there were also periods of regression. For example, during the student outbreaks of the 1920's, such as the theater rushes, hazing incidents, etc., Student Council did not prove an effective check on student behavior. It is particularly noteworthy, however, that those charged with the responsibility for the administration of the University did not abolish the Council. Rather, they encouraged the Council to reorganize itself. This step was significant, for it helped establish a precedent which in effect tended to commit the University to the concept of student government. The University appears to have recognized merit in having students control the out-of-class activities of their peers through an orderly structure. This, in effect, committed the University to support a student government movement within which the students could pursue their rights. Further evidence of the above-mentioned commitment appeared in the 1930's, when because of what might today be called "student apathy," the students abolished their own government. Upon receiving word of what the students had done, the President of the University immediately established one, thereby acknowledging the University's concern that a student government exist.

World War II nearly brought a halt to extra-curricular

activities on the campus. Primary attention had to be focused on maintaining proper eating and housing facilities. As was the case during World War I, the status of student rights appears not to have been an issue.

After World War II, weary of the necessary restraints "for the duration of the War," the wave of older students returning to the campus brought with it the serious-minded purpose of men wanting formal educational opportunities. The level of maturity of the student population increased; student behavior reflected this maturity with increased pressure for greater freedom.

The proceedings of the first post-war student government at Michigan, Student Legislature, reflect considerable concern for student rights. Careful examination of the Student Legislature's minutes indicates that never before in the University's history had students acted so responsible in their behavior. The work of the Committees appointed under Student Legislature stands as a tribute to their concerns. Much of their work was broader in scope than local campus activity. For example, in the late 1940's special committees of the Student Legislature were actively working for a less-restricted speaker policy, the establishment of an international scholarship program, and the resolution of segregation problems. Even so, students at Michigan still did not have the self-government so often spoken of in the earlier history of the University. The name, Student Legislature, was a misnomer; the body had no authority to act without the approval of the Committee on Student Affairs.

Whatever its merits, Student Legislature was to be replaced by

the Student Government Council in the 1950's. The Student Government Council plan was approved by the Board of Regents in 1954; however, it is particularly noteworthy that the members of the fifty-three year old Committee on Student Affairs did not endorse the plan per se. Far more important from the standpoint of the development of student rights, the Committee did endorse the following: the basic idea of student participation in affairs of the University and the effort of students to arrive at a plan for that participation, and the ever-continuing responsibility of the University to work with the students to develop a plan for student government. Then, as a further gesture showing good faith, the Committee accepted as its responsibility the need to assist Student Legislature in its desire to achieve an informed and representative student opinion concerning a new form of student government through a referendum of the student body. This the Committee did with the knowledge that if Student Government Council became a reality, the authority and responsibility to guide and control student organizations and out-of-class activities at The University of Michigan would be completely in the hands of the new student government.

As previously noted, the evolution of student rights had not always been a forward-moving process; there had been periods of regression, too. However, when the broad period from 1841 to 1955 is considered, it is significant that parental attitudes, University administrative procedures and structures, and student attitudes had changed toward whose responsibility it was to guide and be responsible for the out-of-class welfare of the students at The University of Michigan. There is ample evidence to assume the evolution will continue, i.e., as the heretofore-supposed sovereignty of university

governing boards is tested, and civil right movements continue to germinate and gain support on university campuses.

Student Government Council became a reality in 1955. Its authors refer to it as "genuine student self-government" (italics mine); however, the philosophy on which it is predicated clearly indicates it is a cooperative student-faculty-administrative form of government. Its principal author wrote:

> It was predicated upon the faith that, as we enjoin responsibility, our students rise to their obligations. It sought to recognize that in team work, valuable lessons are learned, and as confidence is inspired, understanding will grow so that those entrusted with the responsibility of student affairs may indeed feel that it is intelligently shared.

Nevertheless, the evolution of student rights was significantly increased, for with the dissolution of the Committee on Student Affairs, the Committee's powers were transferred directly to the students through their newly-accepted form of student government, Student Government Council. This was the first Regent-recognized student government. No previous student government had held these powers, i.e., to grant recognition, to continue recognition, and to withdraw recognition for student organizations, as well as the responsibility for the superivision of all student activities at The University of Michigan.

The following summary of events appear most pertinent in the support of the major hypothesis:

> When the University first opened its doors to students, it was considered to be the responsibility of the parents to request admission for their sons.
>
> Students were required to attend church and chapel; parents were to select the church to be attended.
>
> The faculty was charged with the responsibility of substituting for parental superintendence.

Student organizations were begun in the first years of the University's history; most of these organizations met with faculty approval.

With the introduction of electives, the students had increased free time in order to pursue out-of-class interests.

When dormitories were abolished in 1856, the supervision of the faculty was reduced. Previously students were supervised twenty-four hours per day.

In 1857, the faculty declared students to be responsible for their own behavior and capable of managing their own moral behavior.

By the 1870's a common code of morals had replaced the stern Code of Laws of 1841. Chapel attendance became voluntary.

In 1902 the faculty placed its first controls on students. This, in effect, gave students a cause which led to their first request for a government of their own.

With a government of their own, there was increased concern on the part of the students to select better quality student leaders. The government also provided an official channel for sounding out student opinion.

The faculty encouraged those student agencies which worked for better understanding between faculty and students, i.e., the Student Advisory Committee. The students were surprised at the willingness of faculty to allow them increased freedom to run their own affairs.

Students began seeking faculty supervision. The faculty returned detailed management of organizations to the students. When students found their own government to be ineffective, they were encouraged by the faculty to reorganize it.

In the 1930's when students abolished their own government, the President of the University established a student government, thereby acknowledging the University's concern that a student government exist.

Post-World War II student government relfected the concern of students with larger issues than local affairs, i.e., work toward a less-restricted speaker policy, and steps toward the resolution of segregation problems.

The Committee on Student Affairs endorsed the basic idea of student participation in affairs of the University, and the Committee's responsibility to work with the students to develop a plan for their own government.

The Committee on Student Affairs was dissolved, and the control of student organizations was placed in the hands of the students through the Student Government Council.

Thus it seems clear that if by student rights one refers to the degree to which students are given the privilege to determine and control the behavior of the student body in non-academic affairs of the University, rights for students at The University of Michigan have increasingly evolved.

Therefore, the major hypothesis of this study is accepted.

First Sub-Hypothesis

The first sub-hypothesis of this study is: student rights have increased as student action and behavior have become more responsible.

When students first entered the University at Ann Arbor in 1841, the society of students was new; so was the institution. Both had to be built from the bottom up.

Although great unity existed between the academic and non-academic programs from 1841 to the time of the Civil War, glimpses of the students' resentment of faculty paternalism in out-of-class affairs had appeared even during that period. For example, when the faculty attempted to ban fraternities at Michigan in the late 1840's, the self-reliance and maturity of students caused them to resent the faculty's narrow-minded clerical point of view, so prevalent at that period. Students knew that in no other institution had faculty regulation of fraternities been effective. They resolutely maintained their position. The presence of fraternities on the campus today presents evidence of the effectiveness of early student resolution.

Other societies, such as the Students' Christian Association, did have the immediate and continued approbation of the faculty. There is evidence to support the conclusion, however, that societies were accepted in relation to the faculty's judgment of their merit because of the functions they performed. Likewise, students often sought

faculty approval of their proposed endeavors.

President Tappan saw as one of the advantages of the abolishment of dormitories that faculty would be free from the great deal of care and annoyance required in the supervision of the students in them; regardless of the reasons for this act, the abolishment did require the students to act even more responsibly for their own welfare.

In 1863, after President Tappan's dismissal, an unprecedented event took place. President Haven made a direct appeal to the students to help save the University from disaster. This gesture was ample evidence that students were thought to be responsible for something more than their out-of-class behavior. They were asked to share the concern for the image of the University.

Time and again President Angell praised the students for their responsible behavior. For example, he stated: "We confidently look to our students . . ." for help in maintaining the proper image of the University. Toward the close of the century, President Angell stated that never before in the University's history had the moral and intellectual elevation of the students been higher.

However, not all student behavior was seen as responsible. As previously stated, there were periods of regression. For example, the practice of hazing was viewed in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries as a step backwards from responsible student conduct. And again, following the First World War, student behavior at Michigan appeared to follow the lawlessness and chaos found in American society at large. Williamson states the story of this change in student behavior has not adequately been described;[1] however, it was the era of the big dances,

---

[1]Williamson, op. cit., p. 342.

theater rushes, ignominious hazing incidents, vandalism, orgies of considerable magnitude, and the auto ban.

However, periods of regression were often followed by a return to more responsible behavior, i.e., late in the Nineteenth Century, students at Michigan became concerned with such problems as health, safety, and better housing standards, and worked diligently toward the elimination of "rough stuff" in initiations within some student organizations, which they deemed inappropriate to acceptable conduct for students.

Faculty control of student organizations came into effect at the beginning of the Twentieth Century. When students questioned the need for faculty control, they were assured the faculty was ready and willing to turn control back to them when they were ready to accept responsibility for their actions. The faculty kept its word. The students took steps to eradicate the behavior which caused the faculty to restrict their rights to control their own organizations; e.g., they sought to eliminate "graft" and individual financial gains. As their actions and behavior became more responsible their rights increased. First they were permitted to sit in on the meetings of the Committee of Student Affairs; subsequently, they were made voting members. The same privileges were granted to them in re the Committee on Student Conduct. Thus there is historical evidence the University repeatedly supported students in responsible requests for increased privileges when students acted responsibly.

The following summary of events appear most pertinent in support of the first sub-hypothesis:

> When students first entered the University in 1841, both the institution and the society of students were new. Therefore, there was no established precedent for judging the behavior of the society of students at the University.

> Until the Civil War great unity existed insofar as the academic and non-academic programs of the University were concerned. Glimpses of student resentment of faculty paternalism were manifest as students resisted the faculty's attempt to ban fraternities. Students at the University had made it a point to be informed about the attempts of faculties to ban fraternities on other campuses, and knew such attempts had been ineffective.
>
> In 1863, President Haven directly appealed to the students to help save the University from disaster.
>
> President Angell, in his Annual Reports, repeatedly spoke of the increase in the moral and intellectual elevation of the students.
>
> In the 1890's, students were actively supporting the need for better health, housing, and safety standards.
>
> After any period of regression, the faculty repeatedly assured the students control of their organizations would be returned when the students proved they could accept responsibility for their actions.
>
> Students were permitted to sit on the Committee of Student Affairs; subsequently, they were given the right to vote, and even had their representation increased.

As noted, not all student actions and behavior were viewed by the faculty as responsible; however, when students did demonstrate a willingness to act in non-academic affairs, the faculty consistently supported their requests for more authority to govern themselves in their non-academic affairs.

Therefore, the first sub-hypothesis of this study is accepted.

Second Sub-Hypothesis

The second sub-hypothesis of this study is: as student behavior has become more responsible, University administrative structure has changed in keeping with this behavior.

It was a special committee of the Board of Regents who prepared the first rules for students in August, 1841, even before the first class arrived. At that time two professors had been appointed. Six freshmen students actually enrolled in the University. The government of the students was considered a substitute for the regulations of

their homes, and the faculty was to consider itself bound as standing in the place of parents and guardians.

Even though the Board of Regents had been directed to elect a chancellor of the University, no such appointment was ever made. Instead, the professors taught, governed the students, and each professor was expected to act as President for a period of one year on an established system of rotation. This distribution of extra work made even more apparent the need of a central authority, for at this time there was no permanent, central figure of authority at the University. As a result, the administrative structure was so weak the Second Constitutional Convention, unwilling to leave the matter in the hands of the Board of Regents, made imperative the appointment of a President for The University of Michigan. Even then, the first President took the Chair of Philosophy along with his administrative duties.

After the first President was appointed, it was he, who in concert with the faculty, became charged with the responsibility for student welfare. As simple and weak as the administrative structure was, it was the only structural provision until near the turn of the century to take care of the welfare and government of the students. To be sure, the student population was small, but even so the responsibility appears to have been baneful and odious at times to those charged with it in addition to their other duties.

As the student enrollment and the size of the faculty increased, each department or school was charged with the responsibility to provide for the welfare of its students. Finally in 1896, the first additional administrator was appointed whose special duty it was to give detailed attention to the needs and welfare of students. A

Women's Dean in the Department of Literature, Science, and the Arts, was appointed. She was, in fact, also Professor of Hygiene, and charged with responsibility for the welfare of women students only within the Literary College until 1923, when the scope of her office was broadened to include all women students at the University.

Administrative structure grew for reasons other than that resulting from the pressures of increased enrollment. For example, in 1898, when it came to the attention of the Regents, via the Faculty Senate, that some form of supervision was needed for student organizations, the Committee on Student Organizations Other than Athletic was created. This structure was first created to investigate the financial affairs of all student organizations. Commonly known as the "anti-graft" committee, its scope grew to include the supervision of all student organizations and their out-of-class activities. The faculty was initially embarrassed when the financial irregularities of certain student organizations was called to its attention, but assured the students its supervision would last only as long as it was needed. This assurance presupposed students would rectify their errors and accept more responsibility for control in the future. There is no evidence to cause any doubt that the Faculty Senate planned to restore the control of student organization to the students as soon as the students were deemed to be capable of handling their own affairs. The faculty felt some of the students and their organizations had become the unwitting victims of unethical practices which were applied by men who were not associated with the University.

Even though by the turn of the century the Board of Regents was removed from the direct supervision of student conduct, on occasion the Board would take some specific action to control student behavior, e.g.,

voting to have students clean up rooms used for student activities, or vacate them. These actions only served to confuse the students as to whom they were responsible.

Increasingly, students maintained that while they could be guided by the faculty, they could not be driven by them. Students maintained that the power of the Committee on Student Affairs would be lost without the support of student sentiment. This student viewpoint was often expressed, and time and again the faculty informed the students it would not put obstacles in the way of student control of their specialized form of student government. For example, the faculty was willing to discuss a proposed Student Council, but clearly stated it was not willing to push for its formation.

It should be noted the Committee on Student Affairs, as created in 1902, had no original power to act for or against student interests. It had power to investigate student affairs only, and had to refer all decision-making matters back to the Faculty Senate, via the Senate Council.

The broadening of student interests in all areas led to a mushrooming of new organizations and activity groups. By 1909, the multiplicity of student organizations was so great there was not time to consider each organization's requests in detail and then submit them to the Faculty Senate for approval. Student behavior; i.e., the greatly-increased desire to form and join new organizations, had again made a reorganization of structure mandatory. In order to facilitate the handling of routine matters, an Executive Committee of the Committee on Student Affairs was established; it was immediately given full power over all routine matters of business coming to its attention between regular meeting dates of the full Committee.

In an attempt to meet the needs of the students, regular office hours were held by the members of the Committee. However, the mushrooming of organizations and their specific activities called for more administrative help. The Board of Regents appointed a full-time administrator in 1921, the Dean of Students, to act as a "friend-at-court" to the students. Almost immediately the Dean became Chairman of the Committee on Student Affairs, and within a short period of time, the Dean was given "power to act" in all routine matters as well as in more specific cases. The Committee often approved his actions ex post facto. The composition of the Committee on Student Affairs was often changed. Students were permitted to sit in on the Committee's proceedings beginning in 1914; and from 1924 on, permitted to participate as voting members. They eventually had their representation increased. From the time of the Committee's reorganization in 1926. Until its dissolution in 1955, the Dean of Women was a member of this Committee; however, she also had power to act on behalf of all women, on and beyond the power of the Committee. Regardless of its name, composition, size, and membership, the Committee's purposes remained essentially the same throughout its history; i.e., to grant and withdraw recognition for student organizations, and to control student activities.

It is of note that a Special Committee appointed by the President in 1953, composed of faculty members, all of whom had formerly served on the Committee on Student Affairs, should have recommended the dissolution of that Committee.

In 1954, a Vice President for Student Affairs was appointed. In 1955, the power of the Committee was transferred into the hands of the students through their Student Government Council and a Board of Review. After the demise of the Board of Review, the Vice President

for Student Affairs was given veto power over the actions of the Student Government Council. The formal structure permits appeal to the Board of Regents.

There is considerable evidence to support the conclusion that as student behavior became more responsible, administrative structure changed in keeping with this behavior. For example, the faculty consistently encouraged the students to accept the responsibility for conducting their own affairs. Student efforts to accomplish these ends are reflected in the various kinds of student government organizations established and operated at different periods in the University's history. While the Committee on Student Affairs did not endorse specific governmental forms, it did endorse the concept that student government should exist on the University of Michigan campus.

However, administrative structure also changed when student behavior became less responsible. For example, the Committee on Student Affairs was created as a direct result of student behavior deemed to be unsatisfactory. The early structure change came to fruition because there were evidences of financial irregularities with student organizations. Subsequently, however, the students were assured as their behavior became more responsible, the control of their organizations would be returned to them. It did, and the administrative structure again changed, i.e., the dissolution of the Committee on Student Affairs.

The following summary of events appear most pertinent in support of the second sub-hypothesis:

> The early government of students was considered a substitute for the regulations of their homes. A special committee of the Board of Regents prepared the rules; the faculty was expected to administer them.
>
> Although the direct cause for the formation of the Committee on Student Affairs represented a regression in the acceptance of the students to manage their own affairs and conduct, the faculty

assumed the students would rectify their own errors, and assured them that as they did, control of their affairs would be returned to them.

The students maintained that while they could be guided by the faculty, they could not be driven by them, i.e., in deciding on a Senior Council, ultimately, on a Student Council.

As student organizations grew, the structure of the Committee on Student Affairs was changed to include an Executive Committee in order to expedite the handling of business brought before it by the students. The Office of the Dean of Students was established, and almost immediately a Student Advisory Committee was established. This committee was praised by the Dean for its knowledge and efforts to bring about more responsible student behavior.

The composition of the Committee on Student Affairs was changed in 1914 to give students representation on it. Students became voting members in 1924, and later had their membership increased. It is noteworthy the faculty members never lined up against students in the Committee's voting record.

With the feeling students were capable of managing their own affairs, faculty members voted for the demise of the Committee on Student Affairs.

In 1955, the powers of the Committee on Student Affairs were transferred to the students through their government, the Student Government Council.

After the demise of the Student Government Council Board of Review, veto power for Student Government Council was, at the students' request, placed with the Vice President for Student Affairs, with appeal possible to the Board of Regents.

Therefore, noting the fact that student behavior has not always increasingly reflected the acceptance of responsibility, the second sub-hypothesis of this study is accepted.

Third Sub-Hypothesis

The third sub-hypothesis of this study is; as student rights have increased, more legal responsibility has been delegated to the students.

From the time of its formation in 1837, the Board of Regents of The University of Michigan has been charged with the governmental responsibilities for the University. The Board of Regents is vested with this power by the citizens of Michigan. The authority of students to govern themselves in their out-of-class activities at The University

of Michigan may in no way infringe upon the Regents' responsibility to the citizens of the State.

In this study, legal responsibility refers to any authority delegated to students by the Board of Regents. The approval of the Student Government Council plan on December 17, 1954, marked for the first time in the University's history, the official sanction of the Board of Regents directly to the students, the responsibility and power to govern their own out-of-class activities. Until this time, the power to govern the out-of-class organizations and activities of the students had resided with the Committee on Student Affairs, the faculty, the President, or the Board of Regents.

Subsequently, in 1959, when the Student Government Council plan was revised, the Regents again resolved to delegate authority in accordance with Regents' policy for enforcement of rules and regulations concerning student organizations and the conduct of recognized student organizations, with particular emphasis on enforcement of the Regents' policy on non-discrimination.

In May of 1963, the Board of Regents further confirmed the delegation of specific powers to the Student Government Council. At this time further proposals are being prepared by the Student Government Council for presentation to the Board of Regents. Whether the proposals will be passed is problematical; however, with any testing, increased legal responsibility is added. Only the Board of Regents has the power to delegate increasing authority to the Student Government Council. The Regents have done so only as rights for students at The University of Michigan have evolved.

Therefore, the third sub-hypothesis is accepted.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize this study, and to offer conclusions and recommendations.

Summary

The detailed background for this study is given in Chapter I. Significant segments of the population of the world are concerned with the rights of the individual. Segments of the student population on our campuses appear to be among the more vocal. It is an assumption in this study that concern for rights of individuals must be accepted as a responsibility of colleges and universities, particularly of state institutions which are expected to provide for the needs of all citizens. This study does not deal with all institutions; it is a study of the evolutionary aspects of student rights within The University of Michigan.

The specific statement of the problem also appears in Chapter I; it is: to trace the historical development of student rights at The University of Michigan in order to show how new rights were established and established ones were extended.

The major hypothesis and three sub-hypotheses are stated as follows:

Rights for students at The University of Michigan have increasingly evolved.

1. Student rights have increased as student action and behavior have become more responsible.
2. As student behavior has become more responsible, administrative structure has changed in keeping with this behavior.
3. As student rights have increased, more legal responsibility has been delegated to the students.

The procedure for testing the hypotheses includes a review of original documents, such as the minutes from committee meetings, i.e., Committee on Student Affairs; correspondence, i.e., letters of the first Dean of Students; and related literature, such as the annual President's Report, Hinsdale's History of the University of Michigan, and Ten Brook's American State Universities: Their Origin and Progress, etc..

In addition, personal interviews were held with men presently or formerly interested in student affairs, i.e., Dr. Lionel H. Laing, who drafted the proposal for the Student Government Council plan, and Dr. Fred Wahr, who served as the first assistant to the first Dean of Students.

The materials were then analyzed according to time periods unique to the University's history; i.e., from the time the first class entered in 1841, to the formation of the Committee of Student Affairs in 1902; from that Committee's origin to its demise in 1955, etc..

Those policies, practices, and procedures which constituted significant evidence in support of the hypotheses were used in this study.

The limitations of this study are as follows: Some of the literature is quite subjective in nature; for example, President Haven's appeal to the students to save the University from disaster. Although this was the first-recorded direct appeal to the students in re the University's image, and followed the dismissal of President Tappan, nevertheless, President Haven is reported to have been the kind of person who knew how to appeal most effectively to others. President Angell, particularly in the later years of his administration,

made frequent references to the responsible behavior of the students, in quite general terms.

Some original materials have either been lost or destroyed, and could not be reviewed. For example, the minutes of the Committee on Student Affairs are missing from 1903 to 1908. Most of the material in this study covering that period was taken from issues of the Michigan Daily. Few histories of specific organizations exist. Only a small part of the first Dean of Students' personal papers remain. Dr. Wahr stated Dean Bursley burned most of his records when he retired. Dr. Wahr, in a personal interview, stated that he (Dr. Wahr) had kept a written record of every interview he had had with a student in his office; however, he also stated these records were subsequently burned.

Interpretations in the literature given to such terms as rights, privileges, responsibility, and behavior are often vague and misleading. For example, the first form of student government was the Student Council. It is repeatedly referred to as a "student self-government," when, in fact, it was a government having only the power to recommend.

Chapter II records the history of the formation of the University's early concern for students and their welfare. Both the society of students and the University were new and had to be built from the ground up. During the early years, the University governed the students paternalistically; later in the century, students were judged to be capable of managing their own behavior and affairs. Those events which appear to be most pertinent in bringing about changes in the government of the students are documented; such as, the introduction of the elective system, the abolishment of dormitories, the appeals to

students to help, and the establishment of a common code of morals to replace the Code of Laws of 1840. (See: Table of Contents, pp. iii-iv). Growth of student population and student organizations is also noted. In addition, changes in administrative structure as they relate to the students are considered.

Shortly before the turn of the century, the faculty became concerned with what appeared to be irregular practices within certain student organizations. A committee was formed to investigate these matters. This faculty committee became known among students as the "Anti-graft Committee," but officially as the Committee on Non-Athletic Organizations. Chapter III records the history of that committee. In addition to facts concerning the committee's formation, policies, and practices affecting students, the chapter includes information relative to the students' reaction to the policies of the Committee. As the faculty tightened its grip, the students felt they had a cause, and this ultimately lead to a student request for a government of their own. The first Student Council was created. Through the work of this Council, the students began to respond favorably to guidance of the Committee on Non-Athletic Affairs. This Committee's name was subsequently changed to the Committee on Student Affairs. The Committee made it mandatory for all new student organizations to be "recognized" by it before they could function. This was a new policy and although no longer administered by the Committee on Student Affairs, still exists today. The material in the chapter covers a span of time of more than twenty years, from 1898 to the end of World War I, when veterans returning to the campus brought about further changes in student life and student organizations.

Chapter IV records information relative to the appointment of the first Dean of Students, the policies of his office, and its effect upon the students and student life. With the increase in student population, and the conditions of the times, it was felt the students needed a "friend -at-court", or someone who would be concerned primarily with their welfare. An administrator known as the Dean of Women had been appointed in 1896; however, her responsibility was primarily restricted to the problems, care, and welfare of female students. The Dean of Students and the Dean of Women worked together for the welfare of the students. Soon after the Dean of Students took office, he encouraged the students to form a Student Advisory Committee. Chapter IV includes information about that committee and its policies. The Dean of Students was responsible for organizing the first University Committee on Discipline; initially a faculty committee, it later included a student member. The Committee held the power to discipline students. The Dean of Students felt he could not counsel effectively, be a friend to the students, and discipline, too. The content of the chapter documents the fact that, contrary to his expressed wishes that he not be required to handle disciplinary cases, he often did. Brief mention is made of the fact the offices of the Dean of Students (which later became the Dean of Men's office) and the Dean of Women were merged in 1962.

Chapter V records detailed history of student problems and activities during the Prohibition Era, the Depression, and the Second World War. Evidence is presented to support the proposition that student behavior reflected the National concerns. In this chapter the subject of hazing, its effects on students, and the University's policy concerning it are delineated. The problems accompanying the

presence of automobiles on campus are presented. For the first time in the University's history, an auto ban was put into effect. Although unpopular with the students then and now, it still exists, even though it has undergone considerable change. During the 1930's students appear to have been indifferent to their own Student Council. When they dissolved it, the President of the University established another one for them, thereby acknowledging the University's concern that a student government exist. During the period from World War I to World War II, there were frequent reorganizations of student government. These changes are documented in Chapter V. World War II nearly brought an end to the introduction of new student activities. Fewer than half of those existing before the War continued to function during the War. Brief mention is made of student activities during this period and student contributions to the War effort.

Chapter VI records in detail the students' concern following World War II for a more effective student government. The increased maturity of veterans returning to campus brought a new set of problems in regard to student welfare and activities. The work of the first post-War student government, Student Legislature, reflects these concerns. The powers of the Student Legislature were restricted; the Legislature could do little more than make recommendations to the Committee on Student Affairs. As had happened numerous times in the University's history, students again became interested in changing the structure of their government. Again, with the support of the faculty and the President, the students were encouraged to develop a form of government which they felt would serve their needs. Chapter VI includes documentation of this process, and concludes with the approval of the Board of Regents to support the Student Government

Council plan. The Student Government Council is now the recognized form of student government on the campus of the University. Since its origin in 1955, it has undergone significant modifications in structure. Although these modifications are mentioned, this study does not attempt to evaluate Student Government Council as a form of student government, nor the merits of its activities and program.

Chapter VII is devoted to an analysis of the data presented in Chapters II through VI of this study. The primary purpose of Chapter VII is to test the hypotheses presented in Chapter I of this study. It is noted in Chapter VII that there were periods of regression in the evolution of rights for students at the University of Michigan; however, the major hypothesis and three sub-hypotheses of this study are accepted.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As a result of this study, with its acknowledged limitations, the following conclusions appear to be pertinent:

1. A college or university must make provision for the interests of students in out-of-class activities beyond providing for adequate shelter, health, and recreational facilities.
2. Everytime there is a tightening of the grip on students and their behavior, there is a re-grouping of their forces; therefore, the institution should provide adequately trained staff who are willing to accept responsibility for the guidance of students in their out-of-class activities.
3. Provision should be made for the students to work with some form of student government; however, it is the author's opinion as a result of this study that the institution should endorse only the concept of a student government, and not any

specific plan for a student government. Restricting change leads to unnecessary "fly-specking" which is costly in time and effort both to students and those charged with the responsibility of providing for their welfare.

4. It would appear to be advisable to encourage a cooperative form of government wherein those interested students, faculty members, and administrators can work together initially, rather than having a separate group or individual holding veto power against which interests and actions of the student government might be tested. For example, historically, the faculty of the University has always supported responsible student requests for a change in their structure of government. The advantage of having more experienced faculty and administrative personnel working with students is that it tends to reduce the friction which becomes intensified by what appears to the students to be promoted by a person or office in opposition to them and their activities.

5. Adequate provision should be made for active advisorship for any and all student organizations. It is assumed advisorship is different from control-ship.

6. As students accept responsibility for their out-of-class behavior, more responsibility should be given to them for control of their behavior. Although those charged with the responsibility of student welfare may be inclined to take a conservative stand in relationship to student opinion, students should not be expected to have to pressure for what would appear to be reasonable changes within any mature institution.

7. Those responsible for student welfare must be willing to provide structures which will permit change, even changes within the structure itself.

Although the data analyzed in this study have supported the fact that rights for students at The University of Michigan have evolved significantly since it first opened its doors to students in 1841, other related investigations would be desirable. These might include:

1. An assessment should be made of student opinion as to the present status of their rights within the University and the larger community of the city and state. This would include an assessment of what they consider rights and responsibilities to be in relation to other students, the faculty, and the greater community. Perhaps if we knew this, some light would be shed on working with students to accomplish a greater acceptance for mature student behavior within the University community. Further information about the student's view of his role in the administration of the University would be helpful.
2. Knowledge about the evolution of student rights at other institutions could be helpful. Although a state institution is expected to provide for the rights of its citizens, what expectations might evolve concerning private schools and the rights of their students? Certainly these, too, are changing and will continue to change. Perhaps state institutions have not led in this area of concern; therefore, a comparative study would be helpful.
3. With what appears to be increased pressure for academic excellence on our campuses, what changes are occurring in

relation to student interests in non-academic affairs? Perhaps an assessment of non-academic student interests would be pertinent in order to ascertain in what direction out-of-class interests of students might be stimulated in regard to the goals of academic excellence. If these interests are changing, how are they changing, and for what reasons?

4. Do the out-of-class interests of students reflect the greater issues in our society? Perhaps a study of the issues involved in the quest for civil rights on our campuses would be productive. Certainly it would be helpful to learn the origin of this concern in regards to our student population who, it is assumed, will become the leaders in our communities.

In conclusion, it would appear that regardless of the degree of evolvement of student rights at The University of Michigan in its past history, concern for the continuing evolvement of student rights must persist. The responsiveness of a university to its students' concerns can be measured by the policies and decisions made by its leaders. Friction can often serve as a catalyst for improvement in policies and practices. Student concerns must be understood, not just tolerated. On the other hand, the increased rights of students must be responsibly enjoyed, and cooperative efforts must ultimately replace disjointed efforts by the students or the institution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Public Documents

Michigan, Constitution, 1808.

_____. Constitution, 1835. As amended, 1862.

Books

Bakken, Clarence J. The Legal Basis for College Student Personnel Work. Washington: American College Personnel Association, 1961.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Farrand, Elizabeth M. History of the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor: Register Publishing House, 1885.

Hinsdale, Burke A. History of the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1906.

Humphreys, Edith O. College Unions: A Handbook on College Community Centers. The Association of College Unions: Ithaca, New York, 1946.

Perry, Charles M. Henry Phillip Tappan: Philosopher and University President. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1933.

Smith, Shirley W. James Burrill Angell: An American Influence. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1954.

Ten Brook, Andrew. American State Universities: Their Origin and Progress. Cincinnati: Robert Clark and Company, 1875.

The University of Michigan: An Encyclopedic Survey. In Four Volumes. Volumes I and II, edited by Wilfred B. Shaw; Volumes III and IV, edited by Walter A. Donnelly, W. B. Shaw, and Ruth W. Gjelsness. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press; Vol. I, 1942; Vol. II, 1951; Vol. III, 1953; Vol. IV, 1958.

Williamson, E. G. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.

Catalogues

University of Michigan. Catalogue of the Officers and Students in the Department of the Arts and Sciences, in the University of Michigan. Detroit: Harsha and Willcox, 1845.

University of Michigan. Catalogue of the University of Michigan, 1920-1921. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1921.

University of Michigan. University Regulations Concerning Student Affairs, Conduct and Discipline. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1938.

Pamphlets

Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities. New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1961.

Yearbook

The Castalian. Published annually by the Independents of the Senior Class at the University of Michigan. Chicago: A. L. Swift and Co., 1896.

Reports

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1920-1921. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1922.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1921-1922. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1923.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1922-1923. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1924.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1923-1924. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1925.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1924-1925. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1926.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1925-1926. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1927.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1926-1927. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1928.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1927-1928. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1929.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1929-1930. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1931.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1931-1932. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1933.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1932-1933. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1934.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1933-1934. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1935.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1934-1935. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1936.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1935-1936. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1937.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1938-1939. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1940.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1942-1943. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1944.

University of Michigan. The President's Report for the Year 1945-1946. Ann Arbor: Published by the University, 1947.

Newspapers

Detroit Free Press, November 22, 1934.

Michigan Daily, October 28, 1904.

Michigan Daily, November 20, 1904.

Michigan Daily, November 30, 1904.

Michigan Daily, December 7, 1904.

Michigan Daily, December 8, 1904.

Michigan Daily, December 11, 1904.

Michigan Daily, January 14, 1905.

Michigan Daily, January 24, 1905.

Michigan Daily, February 14, 1905.

Michigan Daily, March 18, 1905.

Michigan Daily, September & October 1905. Nos. 1-21.

Michigan Daily, October 25, 1905.

Michigan Daily, December 8, 1905.

Michigan Daily, December 17, 1905.

Michigan Daily, January 25, 1906.

Michigan Daily, April 6, 1906.

Michigan Daily, October 9, 1906.

Michigan Daily, November 23, 1906.

Michigan Daily, January 29, 1906.

Michigan Daily, March 31, 1907.

Michigan Daily, April 7, 1907.

Michigan Daily, October 16, 1907.

Michigan Daily, October 18, 1907.

Michigan Daily, November 9, 1907.

Michigan Daily, February 16, 1908.

Michigan Daily, March 31, 1908.

Michigan Daily, May 8, 1908.

Michigan Daily, December 14, 1909.

Michigan Daily, February 26, 1922.

Michigan Daily, April 21, 1922.

Michigan Daily, April 22, 1922.

Michigan Daily, April 23, 1922.

Michigan Daily, April 26, 1922.

Michigan Daily, April 27, 1922.

Michigan Daily, April 30, 1922.

Michigan Daily, May 4, 1922.

Michigan Daily, May 13, 1922.

Michigan Daily, September 27, 1928.

Michigan Daily, October 22, 1929.

Michigan Daily, November 26, 1929.

Michigan Daily, November 30, 1929.

Michigan Daily, May 27, 1931.

Michigan Daily, June 6, 1931.

Michigan Daily, September 10, 1931.

Michigan Daily, October 6, 1931.

Michigan Daily, March 20, 1935.

Michigan Daily, October 15, 1953.

Michigan Daily, November 5, 1953.

Michigan Daily, November 8, 1953.

Michigan Daily, November 11, 1953.

Michigan Daily, February 12, 1954.

Michigan Daily, May 27, 1954.

Michigan Daily, September 22, 1954.

Michigan Daily, October 27, 1954.

Michigan Daily, November 16, 1954.

Michigan Daily, November 21, 1954.

Michigan Daily, November 24, 1954.

Michigan Daily, November 30, 1954.

Michigan Daily, December 1, 1954.

Michigan Daily, December 2, 1954.

Michigan Daily, December 3, 1954.

Michigan Daily, December 4, 1954.

Michigan Daily, December 5, 1954.

Michigan Daily, December 8, 1954.

Michigan Daily, December 10, 1954.

Michigan Daily, December 17, 1954.

Michigan Daily, January 4, 1955.

Michigan Daily, July 27, 1963.

Proceedings

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1837-1864. Ann Arbor: University, 1915.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1870-1876.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1876-1881.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1886-1891.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1891-1896.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1896-1901.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1901-1906.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1920-1923.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1926-1929.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1945-1948.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1951-1954.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1954-1957.

University of Michigan. Proceedings of the Board of Regents, 1957-1960.

Unpublished Materials

Annual Reports of the Committee on Student Affairs, 1913-1920 (Typewritten, bound and housed in Office of Student Affairs.)

Berliner, Henry A. "Student Government Council". May 18-25, 1955. (Mimeographed.)

Constitution of the Women's League, 1915. (Mimeographed, and in files of League.)

Hicks, Fred W. "Constitutional Independence and the State University." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Higher Education, University of Michigan, 1963.

Minutes of the Meeting of the University Committee on Student Conduct, June 8, 1934. (Typewritten). in bound

University of Michigan. Minutes of the Laing Study Committee; Student Government Council. November, 1953 to May 1954. (Typewritten, bound and housed in the Office of Student Affairs.)

Minutes of the University Senate, May 26, 1902. Ann Arbor, Michigan. (housed in files of the Senate).

Report of the University on Student Conduct to the University Council for 1934-1935 (housed in files of Office of Student Affairs.)

Report of University Committee on Discipline, February 8, 1932.

(Mineographed copy included in a bound volume of collected correspondence and papers entitled, "University Committee on Student Conduct, 1914-1948," housed in Office of Student Affairs.)

Secretarial Notes on the Third Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men of Mid-Western Institutions, Held at the University of Iowa, April 14-16, 1921. (housed in the Office of Student Affairs.)

Secretarial Notes on the Fourth Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men, Held at the University of Kentucky, April 20-23, 1922.

Secretarial Notes on the Fifth Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men, Held at Purdue University, May 3-4-5, 1923.

Secretarial Notes on the Sixth Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men, University of Michigan, April 24-26, 1924.

Student Legislature Constitution, 1946. (Mimeographed, and in Minutes of the Student Legislature, 1946-1950, Vol. I.)

University of Michigan. Minutes of Meetings of Student Legislature, 1946-1950, Vol. I. (Mimeographed, and bound into volumes which are housed in the Office of Student Affairs.)

University of Michigan. Minutes of Meetings of Student Legislature, 1952-1953, Vol. II. (Printing of bound volume cover is incorrect. The volume includes 1950-1953.)

University of Michigan. Minutes of Meetings of Committee on Student Affairs. 1902-1913, Vol. I. (Typewritten, and bound into volumes which are housed in the Office of Student Affairs.)

University of Michigan. Minutes of Meetings of Committee on Student Affairs. 1913-1928, Vol. II.

University of Michigan. Minutes of Meetings of Committee on Student Affairs. 1928-1935, Vol. III.

University of Michigan. Minutes of Meetings of Committee on Student Affairs. 1935-1943, Vol. IV.

University of Michigan. Minutes of Meetings of Committee on Student Affairs. 1943-1948, Vol. V.

University of Michigan. Minutes of Meetings of Committee on Student Affairs. 1948-1950, Vol. VI.

University of Michigan. Minutes of Meetings of Committee on Student Affairs. 1950-1952, Vol. VII.

University of Michigan. Minutes of Meetings of Committee on Student Affairs. 1952-1954, Vol. VIII.

University of Michigan. Minutes of Meetings of Committee on Student

Affairs. 1954-1955, Vol. IX.

Other Sources

Automobile Regulations, (Scrapbook of clippings and letters, from 1922 to date. Housed in Office of Student Affairs.)

Letters from Joseph A. Bursley, dated February 18-23, 1921. (bound volume of University Committee on Student Discipline, March 1921 to June 1938, Office of Student Affairs.

Letter from L. E. Robertson of Detroit, Michigan to Dean J. A. Bursley, dated February 28, 1921. (bound volume of Committee on Student Discipline, March 1921 to June 1938, Office of Student Affairs.)

Letter from Deborah Bacon, Dean of Women, to Dr. Lionel H. Laing, March 26, 1954. (in bound volume of Minutes of the Laing Study Committee, Office of Student Affairs.)

Statement of Facts of Louis Thomas Orr, Jr., In Respect to Hazing at the University of Michigan." Stivers & Laird, Attorneys at Law, First National Bank Bldg., Ann Arbor, Michigan (bound volume University Committee on Student Discipline, Office of Student Affairs.)

_____. Personal interview with Dr. Fred B. Wahr, July 8, 1963.

_____. Personal interview with Mr. Walter B. Rea, August 4, 1963.

_____. Personal interview with Dr. Lionel H. Laing, October 22, 1963.