Throughout DePaul's history, its students have contributed to the institution’s distinctive character. Since 1898, as the university has changed and the campus has grown, a vibrant student culture has evolved. This was hardly unique to DePaul. In many respects, the university's students have reflected national trends in their activities and interests. But as an urban institution, DePaul's location and programs have affected the character of its students and their activities.

Historically, Chicago has been a city of immigrants, and over the years DePaul has served the city's principal immigrant groups. It has ministered to Chicago's Roman Catholic population, to be sure, but it has also provided educational opportunities for others. As constituents of an urban university, DePaul's students have reflected the diversity and vitality one would expect of a major Chicago institution of higher learning. This is an important part of the university's heritage.

In coming together at DePaul, these students created a distinctive social world of their own that changed over time, often mirroring broader tendencies in student life. Still, certain features of the DePaul student experience were quite durable and helped to define an institutional identity. While in many respects its students were similar to their counterparts at other institutions, there were aspects of life at DePaul that were unique. In part this was simply structural. Campus life at DePaul has long been divided between its downtown and uptown (or Lincoln Park) locations, with each site acquiring its own atmosphere. But there were other factors operating that endowed the two campuses with a common set of traditions and social expectations. One was coeducation, which long made DePaul unique among Catholic institutions. Another was sports, particularly DePaul's identification with basketball. To the extent that it was possible, athletic events and social activities helped to bind the university's diverse student body together. (1)
As noted in other chapters, DePaul expanded rapidly in the years immediately following World War Two, and in the following decade the university became even more diverse as new ethnic and racial minority groups appeared in the student population. During the 1960s students began expressing concern over the major social and political issues of the day. Although DePaul certainly was not a hotbed of student activism, there were occasional signs of unrest as some students protested university policies or responded to such national issues as the Vietnam War. In the years that followed, growing numbers of DePaul's students came from outside of the city. In the 1970s and eighties, as the university built dormitories to accommodate them, the Lincoln Park campus expanded. DePaul diversified yet again, as students from across the country came to study in Chicago. And it became more cosmopolitan also, as the university forged a growing national and international reputation in the 1990s.

In many respects, however, DePaul's student traditions have remained constant through all of these changes. DePaul has continued to be an institution marked by openness, and even in the face of the university's growth it has managed to preserve an element of the intimacy that characterized earlier periods of student life. Much of the university's student body is still made up of adults seeking further professional training. Even these students, however, have managed to create a social life within the institution. If DePaul today is no longer the "little school under the El," and the Greek-letter organizations no longer dominate the campus social life, it is still possible to know a large number of one's classmates and to identify a distinctive DePaul culture in the late twentieth century.

Origins
DePaul's beginnings were modest, and its first students appear to have come from the neighborhoods surrounding its near north side location. From the beginning, DePaul served an urban clientele who attended college for a variety of reasons. It was from this array of constituents that the distinctive student culture of the institution was born. It is important to consider the backgrounds of these students. If DePaul offered an urban and Catholic variant of mainstream American college culture, it was rooted in the lives of the individuals who first came to this particular institution to study.

When Saint Vincent's College was established, the student body was predominantly Catholic, and like the faculty, entirely male. It served students preparing for collegiate studies, most of these in what was called the Academy, and a smaller number of bona fide undergraduates. The largest group, however, was enrolled in the "commercial" course to obtain certification of competence in accounting, record keeping or other business fields. Much of the student population was quite young, at least by today's standards, and probably attended Saint Vincent's for a variety of reasons. Even in the beginning, DePaul students represented a diverse range of interests. (2)
If there was one characteristic that these early DePaul students shared, it was their immigrant backgrounds. The first generation of students at the university consisted largely of the sons and grandsons of Chicago's Irish and German immigrants. An analysis of the backgrounds of students enrolled during the first ten years of the institution's existence reveals that nearly half were from Irish households, while roughly another third were German. The others included representatives of an array of other immigrant groups, including British, Canadians and Italians. Fewer than 8 percent had grandfathers born in the United States. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the statistical profile of the institution's earliest students and show that there can be little doubt that DePaul started as a school for the city's principal Catholic immigrant groups. (3)

The Irish made up the largest group of Catholic immigrants in the city at the turn of the century, and they had long dominated the local Catholic community. The Irish also were native speakers of English, and generally enrolled in college at higher rates than other Catholic

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>St. Ignatius</th>
<th>St. Vincent's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures for St. Ignatius are based on the years 1897 to 1909, while those for St. Vincent's are for the years 1898 to 1903 and 1905 to 1908. The latter should be interpreted as general estimates rather than precise indicators for the period in question. Source: L. Goodchild, "The Mission of the Catholic University in the Midwest, 1842-1980: A Comparative Case Study of the Effects of Strategic Policy Decisions Upon the Mission of the University of Notre Dame, Loyola University of Chicago, and DePaul University" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1986) Volume 1, pp. 191 and 229.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Course</th>
<th>Commercial Course</th>
<th>Academy</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

immigrant groups. It is little wonder, given this, that the Irish were the largest segment of St Vincent's students in the decade following 1898. Though the Germans were also an important immigrant group at this time, even more numerous than the Irish, only a minority of the Germans in Chicago were Catholic. Even so, they represented a considerable presence in the institution. Like the local Church itself, tiny Saint Vincent's was a cross-section of much of the city's immigrant population. (4)

In other respects, however, the backgrounds of this first generation of DePaul students were quite different from the backgrounds of the city's other immigrants. Chicago was an industrial city at this time. The bulk of its immigrant labor force worked in shops and factories, many of them as unskilled or semiskilled laborers. Others were skilled workers or small-scale proprietors, often struggling to make ends meet. Surveys conducted at the start of the twentieth century found that many immigrant families sent their children into the labor force to contribute to household income, or adopted such alternative ways of making money as taking in boarders or performing home-work of various sorts. While the families of DePaul students appear to have utilized some of these strategies, particularly those with no father present, the others represented something of an elite among the city's ethnic population. Two-thirds of these students' fathers held white-collar or proprietary jobs. They included lawyers, merchants, wholesalers, and a wide variety of clerks, contractors, city employees and managers. The rest worked in blue-collar jobs, but only 12 percent were unskilled or semiskilled laborers. This occupational profile was dramatically different from that of the city's larger immigrant community. Furthermore, about two-thirds of the families that sent their sons to Saint Vincent's owned their homes; and this rate was about double that of the city as a whole (this was true of blue-collar student families as well as others). Even if Saint Vincent's students offered a picture of ethnic diversity, as a group they also represented a rather select social stratum of Chicago's Catholics. (5)

Saint Vincent's was not a residential college, and the majority of its early students lived close by. Over half of the students from the first ten classes lived in the three wards adjacent to the school in 1900. Many lived in other north-side neighborhoods and a significant minority came from the wards around the city's center. For the most part, Saint Vincent's was a neighborhood school, although it seems to have attracted some students from a considerable distance as well. Even though its student body consisted of the sons of well-to-do Catholic immigrants, at the beginning DePaul was a local institution, drawing its clientele from Chicago's largely Catholic north side. (6)

Early Student Activities
From the beginning, students at Saint Vincent's engaged in a variety of activities. Athletics were an important element of life at the institution, and the large field behind the college's principal building was emblematic of the significance sports held for the all-male student
population of the time. It was here that the various college teams competed with other institutions and where most of the student body played in intramural games. But like other colleges of the time, Saint Vincent's (and DePaul) provided students a range of options for expressing particular interests and abilities away from the classroom.

Saint Vincent's fielded teams in football and baseball, and eventually added basketball as well. While a relatively small number of students participated in these activities, they had great symbolic significance for the entire institution. As was the case at other schools, athletics was seen as an outlet for the school's all-male constituency and as an inducement to young stalwarts to enroll, attracted by the opportunity to compete on the athletic field. The space behind the College's main building and Saint Vincent's Church, a vast playing field, constituted the largest part of its campus at the time. It was here that the institution's various teams practiced and competed against opponents from a wide variety of organizations, including businesses, ethnic clubs and independent athletic groups, as well as other colleges. (7)
It is difficult to gauge the extent to which these events became centerpieces of public attention outside of the college, but they clearly were important within it. Few contemporary reports are available, but storied contests were recalled by later generations of DePaul students and became a part of the institution's lore. Such events included the 1906 and 1907 football games against Notre Dame, one of which DePaul reportedly won, though it lost the other by a narrow margin. In the second decade of the century, college athletics became a focal point of the earliest student journal or newspaper, *The Minerval*, which reported the fortunes of DePaul's teams assiduously. Eventually, the university became a member of an informal network of local and regional institutions, most of them Catholic, competing against one another in various sports. By the twenties traditional rivalries had been established with such schools as Loyola, Saint Viator's College, the University of Detroit and, of course, Notre Dame. The result was a regular schedule of athletic events that provided an altogether new dimension to student life. The various games became a point of pride and identification for the entire university, an affirmation of DePaul's status among peer institutions, and each athletic event became an opportunity for students to gather outside of their normal class routines. In time, athletics became a major feature of student life at DePaul, just as it did at other universities across the country. (8)

There was more to student life than athletics, of course. From the very start students at Saint Vincent's—and later DePaul—engaged in a variety of other activities, ranging from literary societies and science clubs to professional organizations and fraternities and sororities. In the Saint Vincent's College years, such activities appear to have been limited to participation in groups organized for the discussion of literature and other subjects, supervised by the faculty. In this respect Saint Vincent's was similar to other nineteenth-century colleges, where adult guidance of such clubs was commonplace. Given the low numbers enrolled in the college in these years, institutional sponsorship of such activities was probably essential to their vitality. (9)

In later years student activities proliferated as the institution grew and its population became more diverse. The appearance of *The Minerval* in 1912, an outlet for student compositions and short stories, was a critical step in providing students with a forum for the expression of ideas and opinions. At roughly the same time, the first independent student organizations began to appear, fraternities and professional groups for students in law and business. The opening of the College Theater in 1907 provided a stage for campus speakers and theatrical productions (it would later be called the auditorium, gym, or "the barn"). By 1917 the university had established a standing student theater company. At the same time the first general fraternities began to appear on the uptown campus. (10) Even though DePaul was a small institution, and the student body was largely male and constituted entirely of day-student commuters, a limited range of extracurricular activities was available to students. This was a feature of DePaul's social environment that became even more important as the institution expanded in the years ahead.
Years of Growth and Diversification

As noted in earlier chapters, in 1913 DePaul established a second “campus” in offices rented in the Loop for its business education program and a newly acquired law school. As was the case at other urban, denominational schools, enrollments grew quickly at this downtown site, soon surpassing those uptown. The students in these professional programs were different from their counterparts at the uptown location. They often had a more utilitarian view of university study, and many of them were older. The downtown campus developed a somewhat different ethnic profile as well, enrolling a significant population of non-Catholic (mainly Jewish) students. The addition of the downtown programs made the university significantly more diverse. In time, the “downtown campus” acquired its own distinctive identity. For the time being, however, the campus uptown on Webster Avenue remained the center of student culture at DePaul.

Student activities evolved slowly at the uptown campus, and enrollments remained low, despite new programs in engineering and summer courses for teachers. The university's theater was used by the community for the first decade of its existence, although student theatrical productions also were offered on occasion. The Minerval apparently served as literary journal and campus newspaper combined until about 1922, ten years after it was founded. DePaul thus offered the essential trappings of collegiate life in these years, but enrollments rarely exceeded two hundred full-time students in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The event that appears to have changed this was the university's decision to admit women as regular students just before the start of the First World War. (11)

DePaul was among the first coeducational Catholic universities in the country. Beginning in 1911, female students attended occasional teacher training institutes, conducted primarily for teachers in the parochial schools—most of whom were members of religious teaching orders. There is also evidence that a small number of women enrolled in the College of Commerce and the law school in this period. Coeducation became a question of university policy, however, in 1916. (12)

Most Catholic educators at this time were opposed to coeducation, but DePaul's Vincentian administration was willing to try it. The first full-time female students were admitted to the College of Arts and Science (LA&S) in the 1916–17 academic year. It was in the wake of these enrollments that university President Francis McCabe, C.M. wrote to Archbishop Mundelein about the idea of establishing coeducation at DePaul. The Archbishop's reply was not favorable, but the university went forward with plans to allow more women to enroll as full-time students. The 1917 catalogue first described the new policy of coeducation. That year six women registered in the college, along with thirteen in law, sixteen in commerce, and more than 200 in the teachers' institutes. Over the next five years the number of full-time LA&S women students grew to 78, or about 40 percent of the total student body uptown. Women were also enrolled in the other colleges, but in smaller numbers. Once the decision was made to admit women as full-time day students, coeducation developed quite rapidly at DePaul. (13)
By the 1920s, DePaul was becoming a complex institution, with two separate and distinct campuses serving a diverse student population. The university began to expand rapidly, exceeding several thousand students by the end of the twenties. Student activities at this time assumed the form familiar at other institutions, with football, fraternities and sororities, dances, yearbooks and other traditional collegiate functions predominating. In many respects this was the "college spirit" era of DePaul's history, and it extended into the early 1930s.

**A Diverse Student Body**

The university's growth brought greater diversity, but it poses the question of who attended DePaul in the years following World War I. Unfortunately, there are no individual records for later generations of students. But there are sources of information on student backgrounds that suggest what types of students came to DePaul in the 1920s and thirties.

The first university yearbooks appeared in the 1920s, listing the names of seniors (and sometimes other classes) and students involved in various activities. Using a dictionary of names, it is possible to group the surnames into broad ethnic classifications, and to obtain a general picture of the institution's ethnic profile at a particular time. The university collected information on the religious backgrounds of students, beginning in the early 1930s, and it occasionally conducted surveys on the occupations of students' parents and where they lived in the city. It is possible to extrapolate from these data a fairly detailed picture of DePaul's student body in the 1920s and thirties. (14)
To begin with, surnames listed in the yearbooks offer valuable clues about the ethnic composition of the student body. In 1925, for instance, more than half of the seniors in all branches of the university had last names that could be classified as being Irish or English in origin. On the other hand, slightly over one-quarter of the seniors had surnames that could be described as German or Jewish. Roughly 10 percent had surnames that were clearly eastern European (mostly Polish) or Mediterranean (mainly Italian) in origin. Similar patterns appeared in 1930. Last names, of course, are notoriously inexact indicators of ethnic origin. Still, if the broad groupings identified from the yearbooks are generally accurate, it would suggest that the number of DePaul students with Irish backgrounds remained significant, and that the city's German neighborhoods continued to be an important source of students as well. This was a pattern at other Catholic institutions of higher education in the twentieth century, where the Irish also tended to be the dominant group. At that time, there were relatively small numbers of applicants to DePaul from Chicago's other principal Catholic ethnic communities, particularly Poles and Italians; but evidently these groups were not sending large numbers of their sons and daughters to college during that period. The Irish and the Germans continued to be the city's wealthiest and most influential Catholics, and it was their sons and daughters who appeared at DePaul in the largest numbers in these years. (15)

The presence of many surnames identifiable as "English" and "Jewish," raises the question of religious background. In its promotional literature DePaul clearly declared itself open to students of all religious backgrounds, and pointed to the presence of non-Catholic students throughout the university. Like many other institutions, the university grew rapidly in the years following 1920. And there is indeed evidence of a significant non-Catholic minority among DePaul's students at this time. The largest number of these non-Catholic students were Jewish.

DePaul was an urban institution, and like other universities in large cities at this time it attracted Jewish students interested in its professional programs. Data on the religious backgrounds of DePaul students, collected by the university in the 1930s, permit a more precise examination of this issue than the yearbooks. At the Loop campus, for instance, Catholics constituted a majority, but as much as one-quarter of the student body was Jewish. The program with the greatest concentration of non-Catholics was the law school, where Catholics numbered slightly fewer than half the students and Jewish students constituted as many as 40 percent in the mid-thirties. Other schools had fewer Jewish students, although they were still an important minority. In the College of Commerce, nearly three quarters (74 percent) of the day students were Catholic in 1936, while some 15 percent were Jewish. Commerce and law, of course, enrolled the largest numbers of full-time day students at the downtown location. In the Downtown College of Liberal Arts, which chiefly served teachers seeking extra credits and college degrees in evening classes, fully 80 percent of the lay students were Catholic, and only 4 percent were Jewish. But the vast majority of these students attended in the late afternoon
or evening and did not participate much in the social life of the school. Among full-time students at the Loop campus, Jewish students may have constituted about 30 percent altogether, the largest proportion of these being enrolled in the law school. (16)

At DePaul’s uptown campus, on the other hand, the picture was quite different. There, fully 85 percent of the students in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences reported their religious affiliation as Catholic. The remainder were about evenly divided between Protestant and Jewish. Analysis of surnames in the 1925 and 1930 yearbooks, moreover, indicates that more than two-thirds of the students uptown had Irish or English surnames. Combined with the information on religious backgrounds, this suggests a good deal of cultural homogeneity on DePaul’s Webster Avenue campus. And the vast majority of these students attended full time. Thus it is likely that the ethnic quality of the university’s two principal campuses in this period was quite different. If the uptown campus was somewhat Irish Catholic in flavor, there certainly was greater diversity in the Loop.

DePaul students and an unidentified Vincentian priest outside the Liberal Arts Building, circa the late 1940s, Lorraine Bond private collection.
By and large, in that case, it appears that DePaul remained a largely Catholic institution in the years following 1920, but it also educated a sizable group of other students. In the university as a whole, given the figures above, Catholics probably numbered about 70 percent of all full-time students. Jewish students represented a little less than 20 percent, with the largest concentration being at the Loop campus. This means that Protestant students were the smallest group at the university, at least among the full-time students—those most active in student affairs. The patterns of representation were quite different at DePaul's two campuses, as the Jewish presence was certainly most clearly evident in the Loop. But on both campuses, the majority of the university's students continued to be drawn from the city's immigrant communities. Despite the number of apparently "English" last names (or German ones, for that matter) evident in the yearbooks, there were relatively few WASP students at DePaul in these years.

In addition to data on students' religious backgrounds, the university also recorded information on where students lived and other aspects of their social status in the mid-1930s. In fall 1936, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences asked its freshmen about their fathers' occupations, a strong correlate of social standing. By and large, the results do not appear to have been much different from the occupational profile for the university's very first students. About 80 percent of the students reporting such data indicated that their fathers worked in white-collar occupations of one sort or another. Relatively few, about 7 percent, were employed in traditional professions requiring college-level education. Most of the others were small businessmen, managers, salesmen, clerks or government employees. Only one in five reported that their fathers were blue-collar workers, and a slight majority of these were skilled. As in the labor force at large, the number of blue-collar households represented among DePaul students dropped in the decades following 1900. This trend may have been exacerbated by the Depression, of course. But it also reflected the largely middle-class constituency for institutions such as DePaul. Judging from the data provided by this particular survey, DePaul's uptown campus continued to serve the city's Catholic middle class throughout this period. (17)

If the occupational profile of many DePaul students did not change, however, other things did. Chicago had grown considerably since the turn of the century, and it also possessed a well-developed and complex transportation system. As commuters, DePaul's students were undoubtedly sensitive to questions of the college's location. And there is evidence of this in the geographic distribution of students' homes. Among students at the uptown campus, fully 45 percent came from the north and northwest sides of the city in 1936, the area of closest proximity and the location of Chicago's largest German communities and many Irish neighborhoods as well. For these students, the college's location may well have been an attraction. But this was also a much lower proportion of the university's student body than formerly, when the vast majority of students came from these neighborhoods. By
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the mid-1930s, another 45 percent of the students uptown came to school from other Chicago neighborhoods, including large contingents from the southeast and southwest sides (over 25 percent combined). These areas represented important and growing Irish Catholic neighborhoods in these years. Another 10 percent came from nearby suburban communities. The majority of DePaul's full-time liberal arts students commuted a considerable distance to attend college. While the university's Webster Avenue location continued to be important for some of DePaul's students, it probably was not an inducement for most of them, apart from its accessibility to public transportation. (18)

In the Loop, proximity was less an issue for most students, since all of the major public transportation lines fed into the downtown area. A student survey there indicates that they came from all parts of the city. In early 1936 some 637 commerce students were more or less evenly divided between five major regions of the city (north, northwest, west, southwest and south). Indeed, the area with the largest absolute number was the city's south side, home to 149 students. This was hardly a traditional source of students for DePaul, and the numbers certainly cannot be attributed to the consequences of proximity to the university. Rather, the geographic distribution of students in the College of Commerce appears to reflect the central location of DePaul's Loop campus, and the well-developed system of public transportation, particularly elevated trains and busses, in Chicago at the time. By the mid 1930s DePaul drew students from all over the city. (19)

Important changes occurred at DePaul between 1900 and 1940. Clearly, it was no longer a neighborhood institution but now served all of Chicago. At the same time the student body became more diverse, although it continued to consist largely of the descendants of recent immigrants. Judging from the data on the occupations of LA&S freshmen's parents, the university also continued to serve a largely middle-class constituency. But the new ethno-religious diversity was significant indeed. While Catholics remained the largest group of students, and the Irish apparently the largest body of Catholics, a sizable number of Jewish students also commuted to the university's downtown campus. Others attended DePaul, but it was undoubtedly these larger groups that dominated the social and cultural life of the university. On the eve of the Second World War DePaul remained an urban institution representing several of the major ethnic groups of its city. Examination of the social and extracurricular activities of its student body is revealing, therefore.

**The Collegiate Era at DePaul**

The period following 1920 was a time of heady optimism at DePaul, as it was at most other colleges and universities. Enrollments approached six hundred at the uptown campus by mid-decade, and more than a thousand downtown. Despite the fact that all of these students were commuters, telltale signs of collegiate culture began appearing at this time. An array of student organizations emerged at both campuses, along with activities ranging from
forums on various topics to homecoming celebrations and a busy annual schedule of dances and other social events. The 1924 yearbook, the first such publication in the university's history, listed more than a dozen student groups. Most of them were fraternities or sororities of one sort or another, but there was also a French Club, a Biology Club, a group called “The Scribes” for future writers, and “the Merrie Club,” which aimed to foster “happy relations among women.” The number of groups increased in the years that followed, as DePaul's students—like their counterparts elsewhere—became absorbed in the increasingly complex collegiate culture of the day. By the end of the decade, students at DePaul could boast the same assortment of campus activities as college students at larger residential institutions elsewhere in the country. (20)

Then, as now, some college students were more active than others, of course. At DePaul, membership in most organizations appears to have ranged from twenty to forty, with some numbering as few as fifteen and others as many as fifty. In the twenties the most active groups were located on the uptown campus. Judging from activities reported by graduating seniors and recorded in the yearbooks, there was a high level of participation in such organizations. In 1924 and 1925 more than half the graduating seniors reported belonging to at least one organization or participating in a college-sponsored extracurricular activity during their collegiate career. A smaller number, about 15–20 percent, reported taking part in two or more. The latter group no doubt represented the most animated cadre of students in campus activities, and its size corresponds to the most active group of students at other colleges at this time. But DePaul boasted an unusually large number of students involved in at least one activity, especially among urban, nonresidential campuses. In this respect DePaul provided a well-integrated campus experience for its relatively small enrollment of full-time students, or at least for those at the uptown campus. (21)

There were several reasons for this. The uptown students were overwhelmingly Catholic and they all attended the same college, liberal arts and sciences. The Webster Avenue campus was also the location of the university’s principal athletic field and its auditorium/gym (in the old theater building), places where many important athletic and social events occurred each year. Significantly, most of the organized student groups were housed on this campus as well. The main office of the DePaulia, the student newspaper, was there, as was the editorial office of the yearbook, the DePaulian. Given this concentration of resources and enterprises, it is not surprising to discover a high degree of participation in student activities there. One coed wrote in the student newspaper in 1932 that there was greater “zest” at the uptown campus, and more involvement in a variety of extracurricular activities. Remarks such as this were commonplace in these years. (22)

The Webster Avenue campus was also the site of one of the university’s most enduring student traditions, an annual competition between freshmen and sophomore males over small green hats the freshmen were expected to wear. This also was a common practice at other
institutions. It appears that the institution of a “green beanie” rule at DePaul occurred in the twenties, and when aggressive upperclassmen started to enforce it by “ducking” violators in the nearby Lincoln Park lagoon, a veritable war broke out. To avoid spontaneous fights between members of these classes, university administrators arranged a “rush” to decide whether the freshmen should be required to wear the beanies until homecoming. The first of these occurred in 1928, and for a number of years they were little more than organized brawls, as the sophomores attempted to stop the freshmen from placing a flag atop a pole placed in the athletic field. In the thirties, however, this practice was replaced by a “pushball” contest, in which the two groups vied to propel a giant inflated rubber ball to one side of the field or another. This struggle, usually conducted in mud, continued annually in the early fall for more than forty years at DePaul, long after the beanies and the hazing of freshmen had disappeared.

Although the number of students directly involved was usually fairly small, the pushball contest became an event which reinforced class loyalties and helped stimulate camaraderie. The hazing of first-year students was a long-standing practice at American colleges, dating from the nineteenth century, when most students were men. For DePaul’s freshmen, it often served as a way of forging new friendships and relating to upperclassmen in a spirit of good-natured rivalry. And for upper-class students, particularly sophomores, it affirmed a role of helping to introduce first-year students to the norms and social expectations of university life. For many students, particularly the men, it was a potent rite of socialization. And it primarily involved students from the uptown campus. (23)

For students in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences in the late 1920s, DePaul offered a campus culture that closely resembled that of other American colleges in this period. This collegiate atmosphere was cultivated in spite of the institution’s wholly commuter student body. But there was a good deal of cultural homogeneity on the uptown campus. The vast majority of the students were Catholic, most, apparently, of Irish descent. Because non-Catholics were a small minority, the social composition of the student body posed few obstacles to the development of extracurricular student activities.

The social scene at the Loop campus was quite different. There were several colleges downtown, large numbers of part-time students, and a significant group of Jewish students attending the colleges of law and commerce. It was often suggested that downtown students exhibited less “college spirit” than their counterparts uptown. Loop campus students sometimes complained that they were too often left out of extracurricular activities, or that uptown students thought themselves the natural leaders of student activities. Former students remember this clearly. Rita Barr, a commerce student in the thirties and the downtown editor of the student paper, noted that the uptown students “felt they were the university, and we were something put together.” (24) Tensions between the two campuses were a constant theme in student commentaries. Yet it is hard to gauge whether important differences distinguished student life at either location.
It is difficult to determine, for instance, the extent to which students from a particular campus were involved in a given activity, even for those housed on one campus or the other. But by using college yearbooks, it is possible to link students enrolled in particular DePaul colleges to various student organizations. Altogether, some 272 students were identified by the yearbook as participating in student activities in 1930 (aside from membership in fraternities or sororities). It is possible to link 217 of these names to students listed under class photos, which indicated the college and class. Interestingly, a clear majority of these students attended colleges on the Loop campus, some 117, or 54 percent. This dispels to some extent the notion that the students who attended the various schools of DePaul in downtown Chicago were not involved in extracurricular activities. Indeed, a higher proportion of Loop students than uptown students participated in more than one activity. But the majority of all DePaul students attended the Loop campus in this period, and the students listed in the various group and activity photos included those attending part time. At the uptown campus, on the other hand, the 100 students identified as participating in such activities represented about one-fifth of the entire student body, a very high level of participation for a single year. Thus, while it is true that many downtown students did engage in various student activities, the degree of such participation was considerably higher at DePaul's Webster Avenue campus. It was there that the collegiate model was most firmly established, and where students had the time and inclination, after all, to pursue the collegiate lifestyle. (25)

The fraternities and sororities, the "Greek" world that flourished at American colleges and universities in this period, constituted yet another important area of student activity. Although there was much variation across the country, historians suggest that as many as half the students at some schools joined such organizations, with participation highest in the east. (26) Judging from the evidence in the 1930 yearbook, the appeal of Greek societies seems to have been just as strong at DePaul as elsewhere. The 1930 yearbook listed more than 450 members of fraternities and sororities on both campuses, in seventeen different organizations (ten fraternities and seven sororities). This was less than one-fifth of all the students at DePaul but it was a much larger fraction of the day or full-time student population. While many fraternities and sororities included evening and part-time students as members, the clear majority were full-time day students. If this were the case, these organizations probably involved about one-third of DePaul's full-time students. This level of participation was comparable to many of the residential campuses other historians have described, and as such it is striking in light of DePaul's wholly commuter student body. For students at this Catholic, urban institution, the period's traditional forms of campus life as embodied in student organizations appear to have been quite alluring.

Some of DePaul's fraternities and sororities were affiliated with national groups and others were exclusive to the institution. Whatever their origin, however, the organization of DePaul Greek societies reflected the peculiar structure of the university. Having developed in an ur-
ban setting, these groups did not have houses or property of their own. Some of them rented office space or even apartments, and others used university space for meetings and social events. (27) The Greek organizations were very active in the social life of the university, but most of the social activities they sponsored occurred away from the campus. DePaul was neither large nor generously endowed and space in an urban environment was always at a premium. Student groups made do with whatever resources were available to them.

The fraternity population on the Loop campus was the larger one, undoubtedly because of the predominantly male student body in the colleges of law and commerce. Indeed, it was these colleges that supplied the vast majority of part-time and evening students to the fraternities, along with large numbers of day students. Further, the principal professional fraternities and sororities appeared in the Loop colleges, especially at the law school. Conversely, at the Webster Avenue campus, which had the larger number of full-time women students, there were more sorority members. There was at least one "fraternity" which included both men and women in 1930, and which appears to have spanned the two campuses. But for the most part the organization of Greek life at DePaul was divided quite clearly along gender lines and differentiated by colleges and campuses.

There were yet other ways that the organization of the Greek system may have reflected social distinctions in the university. Historians have noted that fraternities and sororities in this period often engaged in exclusionary behavior along ethnic and religious lines. Jewish students especially were subject to such practices when they began to appear in relatively large numbers on college campuses. At many schools Jewish students were excluded from the Greek world altogether, or they were obliged to form their own organizations. And there is clear evidence of the latter at DePaul in these years. (28)

Many DePaul fraternities and sororities included a mixture of students from a variety of backgrounds, although others seem to have been dominated by students from particular groups. Using the 1925 and 1930 yearbooks in which fraternity and sorority photos list the names of students, it is possible to identify ethnic categories tentatively, based on analysis of surnames, and to draw conjectural conclusions about the ethnic backgrounds of the fraternity and sorority members. It is not surprising that most of the Greek society groups, particularly at DePaul's uptown campus, were headed by students with English or Irish names. Members appear to have been mainly Irish, although there were German, Scotch and Welsh names also. Occasionally there were Polish, Norwegian or Czech names, but these were relatively rare. If there was a dominant group of students in Greek society at this time, its members were the children of English-speaking immigrant groups.

But what about "other" students? The greatest concentration of these students was at the Loop campus, and it is there that they were most evident in DePaul's Greek system. Jewish students made up the largest group of non-Catholics, and they were especially active in the law school. DePaul had a number of law fraternities and at least two legal sororities between
1925 and 1930. Among the three major law fraternities in 1925, there was considerable variation in membership. One was composed almost entirely of students with Irish and English names. A second fraternity was populated largely by students with names which were Jewish in origin. The third law fraternity in 1925 had a mixture of Jewish, English and German names, but included no Irish names. In the law school, with its large Jewish enrollment, there was a clear pattern of ethnic affiliation with particular Greek organizations, especially for Irish and Jewish students. These patterns continued to be evident in the 1930 yearbook. Although the names of the fraternities had changed, there were still organizations dominated by Irish and Jewish students. In some respects the severity of the ethnic segregation had diminished, as each fraternity included at least several members of the formerly excluded group. And the third fraternity counted almost equal numbers of Irish/English and German/Jewish students in its membership.

It is difficult to say just why this manner of fraternity organization existed. There is no mention of these issues in student publications or university documents. Interviews with former students reveal little conflict between students from different ethnic backgrounds. Bud Kevin, an Irish student who attended the law school briefly in the late 1930s, recalled that he and others were aware of the different ethnic profiles of the two campuses. “There used to be a joke,” he said, “that when came the (Jewish) holidays, the law school would be half empty.” Kevin did remember “teasing” the Jewish students but said it was done in good fun and without animosity. Other students who attended the Loop campus during these years were also aware of diversity in the student body, but it was not an issue they remember as being important at the time. (29)

Separate fraternities might have been formed to compensate for hidden discrimination against Jewish students, but they might also have reflected a desire on the part of those students to belong to an organization that was sympathetic to their religious and cultural heritage. The fact that so few Jewish students were members of fraternities with predominantly Irish memberships may indicate the existence of subtle tensions between these groups. There can be little doubt that DePaul students were aware of their differing ethnic identities. Thomas Joyce, a student born in Ireland who first enrolled in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences in 1928, became a member of an all-Irish social club and recalled similar Jewish organizations in the law school when he was a student there in the early thirties. But he did not remember conflict between these groups, either. (30)

If ethnic competition existed at DePaul, it did not surface in other observable ways. Jewish students were involved in a variety of student activities and organizations, albeit in somewhat smaller numbers than others, particularly the Irish. In 1925 a student with a Jewish name was one of four leaders elected to the university's Student Council, and in 1930 a Jewish student, the head of a law fraternity, served as president of the Student Activity Council. (31) Clearly, some Jewish students were prominent participants in student activities. But there also
may have been a subtle practice of exclusion, which kept Jewish students out of certain organizations and activities (very few Jewish women were involved in sororities or other student groups). If this were the case, DePaul was similar to most other colleges in this period. This may have been simply one more way in which the student experiences at this Catholic, urban institution mirrored those of students elsewhere.

By the 1920s, the elements of a fully developed campus culture were beginning to appear at DePaul, particularly at the Webster Avenue campus. DePaul was still a small institution: its two campuses together had fewer than fifteen hundred full-time students; somewhat more than two thousand were enrolled part time in one program or another. Still, large segments of the student body were quite absorbed in various aspects of college life, exhibiting a degree of involvement in campus activities comparable to many residential schools in this period. This may be explained partly by the emergence of collegiate athletics as a point of interest and identification for students across the institution, as well as by the development of fraternities, sororities, professional groups and other organizations. Traditions such as freshman hazing and the rush and pushball contests helped as well. But there may have been other factors besides. One of these was the unusual policy of coeducation instituted at DePaul during these years. In mixing young Catholic men and women together, the university may have unwittingly created the conditions for an unusually high level of campus social activity.

**Coeducation and the Social Scene**

While the "spirit" phase of student life at DePaul faded with the demise of football (in the late 1930s) and the activities that went with it, a host of other functions sustained a vital campus culture. At the center of student life was a well-attended series of dances and other social events that took place throughout the school year, providing opportunities for dating and other forms of collegiate conviviality. Fraternities and sororities flourished in this atmosphere, and students from both campuses participated in similar activities. All of this helped to define a distinctive and closely knit student culture for several decades after the mid-thirties.

The key to the social life of most DePaul students was the university's policy of coeducation. This, of course, was quite unusual for Catholic universities at the time. DePaul was the only large commuter school on Chicago's north side with a coeducational student population. By the late 1920s and into the thirties, between 30 and 40 percent of the students on the Webster Avenue campus were women. On the Loop campus there were some women in commerce and a small but consistent presence in the law school as well. The establishment in 1922 of a "Shorthand School" within the College of Commerce boosted the number of women on the Loop campus considerably, even though they generally did not take classes with students in other departments. When programs in music and theater were added in the twenties, they also attracted a significant number of female students. Almost 70 percent of the students in the Downtown College of Liberal Arts, which served mainly teachers in evening classes,
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were women. By the 1930s, in that case, DePaul may very well have been the most thoroughly coeducational Catholic university in the country. (32)

For many students, enrollment at DePaul represented more than simply an opportunity for collegiate instruction; it also afforded the unique prospect of a social life in a coeducational environment. Like coeducation itself, the new milieu took time to develop. But the eventual result was a busy calendar of social events that involved a significant portion of the student body. Dances, the most important of these events, were held with great regularity and became very significant in the social scene. With attendance at athletic events also involving large numbers of students, DePaul offered its largely Catholic, second- or third-generation immigrant students a vibrant collegiate social life.

In this respect DePaul was also similar to many other colleges and universities around the country. Historians have noted that a new atmosphere of playful sexuality and potential romance began to permeate college life in the 1920s. (33) This was no less true at DePaul's Webster Avenue campus than in such college towns as Bloomington and Ann Arbor. Although DePaul's campuses were not large and offered few places for undergraduates to congregate, certain scenes became invested with meaning for young men and women. Referring to the sidewalk on the east side of Kenmore Avenue, along "the wall" surrounding the university athletic field, the 1932 yearbook noted that it was "a contrast to the formal promenade" but nevertheless a "practice course where the eds and coeds stroll to luncheon." In the context of the new coeducational college, even the most mundane daily routines assumed amorous overtones. (34)

Central to most of these concerns was a social custom just beginning to emerge as a significant institution among American youth: the date. At coeducational DePaul, dating became a nearly ubiquitous form of interaction between students. This was not unusual, of course, at least at larger nondenominational residential institutions; historians have noted that dating became a widespread practice in these years. But it might have been particularly important at DePaul. Social functions there gave young, middle-class Catholic men and women the opportunity to explore a selective marketplace for potential future partners. The social events also offered a place at which to entertain prospects from outside the university, no doubt contributing to the vitality of the school's social life. (35)

The custom of arranging dates between young men and women at DePaul seems to have evolved gradually, and certainly was not a corollary to coeducation in the eyes of the university's administration. In the twenties most student social activities revolved around the intercollegiate athletic schedule, and events such as the homecoming football game and various booster affairs were high points on the social calendar. There were also May "Carnivals" in the spring and other university-wide events scheduled throughout the year. Yet there can be little doubt that there was a high level of student interest in campus activities staged in conjunction with athletic events, particularly football.
At first there was little sign that student social life would revolve around events designed specifically to bring young men and women together. (36) While there were other alternatives to the athletic schedule, the most popular were dancing and related activities, which induced young men and women to assemble in an implicitly sexual context. Dating was still a controversial topic in the twenties, and DePaul, of course, was a Catholic institution under the supervision of Vincentian fathers. In 1928 the *DePaulia* ran an editorial titled “Should Coeds Date,” which argued that it was “the question that today faces every college student in the United States.” Noting the potential loss of study time and the distractions dating might present, the editorial also declared that “not to date means a loss of friends and recreation.” Given these dire possibilities, the paper advised that coeds should indeed date, “wisely and in moderation,” to round out their education. The appearance of this editorial undoubtedly signaled the openness of university administrators to the idea of dating, which, after all, was a growing practice on campuses across the country. Even at Catholic universities, it appears, the new collegiate interest in romance and sexuality could not be denied altogether. In fact, it was a notion that the men and women at DePaul were quite ready to receive. (37)

In DePaul’s coeducational setting there were ample opportunities for young men and women to develop interests in one another. The classes were not large, so students quickly came to know each other, and romantic liaisons often resulted. There was evidence of this shortly after coeducation was instituted. In 1921 the student paper noted the work of “Daniel Cupid” at the Lincoln Park campus, and suggested that “he is shooting sure and straight,” with several “bulls eyes to his credit . . . and the most appreciative audience you ever heard of.” With time the interest in romantic affairs grew more widespread. In 1924 a *DePaulia* editorial lamented the growing interest in social events, worrying that it would prove a distraction from studies and a drain on “school spirit.” This was a theme often revisited, and there was little doubt about the nature of these distractions. But eventually student journalists accepted this facet of college life, and even celebrated it. In 1928 another editorial made joking reference to the “universal art of whispering ‘sweet little nothings into shell pink ears’” that preoccupied college men as Valentine’s Day approached. (38) In time the culture of dating, organized around most student activities but particularly the dances, became a cardinal feature of the collegiate lifestyle at DePaul.

Coeducation made this dimension of college life easier to achieve at DePaul than at all-male Catholic universities (such as local rival Loyola). The advantages of coeducation for the university’s social life were routinely acknowledged in student publications. Indeed, while there was a growing debate about coeducation elsewhere in Catholic educational circles at this time, it was barely evident at DePaul. And when the question did arise, support for coeducation was downright enthusiastic. *DePaulia* editorials occasionally deplored the backward thinking on other Catholic campuses, and the paper disapprovingly reprinted articles from Catholic college newspapers in which coeducation was ridiculed. For students and the administration alike,
the policy of coeducation at DePaul was worn as a badge of honor, a sign of the university's forward thinking and its enlightened campus atmosphere. (39)

This celebration of coeducation does not mean that tensions did not exist, however, and they were most evident with respect to the question of dating. In 1928 a coed complained in the DePaulia that DePaul men too often preferred to bring other women to dances and other social events, leaving the college women without dates. In the same issue another declared that “even if the boys do not care to ask the DePaul girls to a dance they might at least notice them at dances.” Other women complained about the “cliquishness” and “coldness” of other students, problems that may have been aggravated by the growth of Greek societies at this time. For their part, the men countered that college women were too demanding when asked for dates, and that entertaining them was expensive. “Too many fellows have to work for all the money they have,” one wrote in response, “why go into debt just to please some coed who will probably tell her friends that the fellow is afraid to go places and do things?”

But the women, it appears, had the last word. In 1930 another coed noted the complaints that the men did not ask college women on dates but suggested that their motives were not pecuniary. “We can see, where, in some instances,” she declared, “college men flatter themselves by displaying the little education they have for the benefit of the less educated shop girl, ribbon counter clerk, or what have you.” College women, she felt, need not worry about men who were challenged by female intellectual abilities. To such men she wrote: “you are merely incidentals in the coed’s day, a diversion in an otherwise tedious world of books.” (40)

Such banter revealed some of the underlying potential for misunderstanding and conflict that accompanied coeducation and the rise of the dating system. But it also pointed to the importance these questions held for most undergraduates. Dating was becoming more widespread at the same time as the expansion of the Greek system, and it inevitably became tied to questions of social standing in particular college circles. As other historians have noted, membership in certain groups, the friends one associated with, and the choice of dates one made all became measures of social status in the relatively cloistered world of undergraduates.

This was no less true at DePaul than elsewhere. One female correspondent to the DePaulia complained about male “big shots” who were appealing and “nice,” but who devoted attention to “only the most popular coeds.” “You can just imagine,” she wrote, “their embarrassment if they were seen at any (social) affairs with one of the hoi polloi.” The problem, she believed, was that becoming popular meant having money and “being cut from the same exact pattern as Miss Everybody.” Even at an urban, Catholic university, it appears, undergraduates established a system of social status that defined success in terms quite similar to those at larger nonsectarian residential campuses across the country. At a smaller institution there also were considerable pressures to conform to the norms established by one's peers. The emergence of a distinctive adolescent society—which other scholars have suggested accompanied the rise of the dating system—was very much in evidence at DePaul. (41)
The Dance Era
At the center of this new collegiate world were the dances, and they eventually became the most popular feature of student life at DePaul. Dancing had become a favored activity for urban youth some years earlier and quickly caught on at other campuses in this period. In the late twenties an annual schedule of university-wide dance events developed and provided a structure around which other such social events were organized by particular groups. Highlights of the fall schedule were the DePaulia Dance, a fund-raiser for the student newspaper, and Homecoming. Winter brought the Frosh-Soph Cotillion, and Spring the Junior Prom and the Senior Ball. In between these events were other dances, such as the annual Halloween Dance, the Saint Valentine's Day Dance and the All-DePaul Dance, each traditionally held at the university's auditorium. These were major events on the university's social calendar and drew participants from both campuses.

In addition to these university-wide dances, specific Greek organizations and other groups held social events, sometimes to raise money, other times just to provide an opportunity to dance and mingle. Most of these dances appealed to groups on one campus or the other, although some of them attracted a broader constituency. It is not surprising that scheduling conflicts often arose. Indeed, many of the rules the university promulgated to govern the Greek societies (through the Inter-Fraternity and Inter-Sorority Councils) were intended to regulate the scheduling of dances and other social events to prevent such conflicts. As if this were not enough, the student government (or “Activities Council”) occasionally sponsored afternoon dances, just to provide a time for students to relax. All told, this made for a robust social scene at an institution as small as DePaul.

Though the dance era in DePaul's campus culture developed gradually, it was already evident in the early twenties. At the outset, some students apparently worried that the popular preoccupation with dances was hurting other student activities or proving a drain on “school spirit.” In a 1924 editorial that may have reflected concerns of the Vincentian fathers, the DePaulia called for greater involvement in such traditional student activities as literary societies, drama clubs and athletic events. “While we have been planning dances, we have neglected these organizations,” the editorial declared. Wondering whether the university was appealing to students' “baser natures,” it asked, “is a college considered seriously by those who really want an education because of its social calendar alone?” In time the question was moot, however, and even the Vincentians appear to have accepted the importance of the dances, along with dating, as vital elements of the new collegiate culture that emerged in the 1920s. Despite its student body of commuters divided between two campuses, dances at DePaul were for everyone and provided a social event to look forward to in the immediate future. They became a highlight of social life for DePaul's Chicago college students. (42)

Dancing necessarily involved both young men and women, and thus was well suited to the rise of dating as an accepted form of behavior. Indeed, the regularity of scheduled dances
at many colleges in these years undoubtedly contributed to what historian John Modell has described as the development of the date as a distinctive adolescent institution. Some of the dances were formal and required elaborate preparation. Marie Cogan referred to these as "date dances." Fran Armstrong, a student at the uptown campus in the late thirties, recalled "going to a lot of trouble, getting a formal for this dance and that dance." Even though there were fewer women at the Loop campus, much of the social life revolved around the dances there also. Rita Barr, attending school in the Loop, remembered that "all the dances seemed to be formal, and there was always a rack of formals in the house." Most of the these affairs were held in hotels around the city, usually downtown or on the north side, but sometimes elsewhere as well. Bud Kevin recalled the glass floor at the grand ballroom of the Knickerbocker Hotel, one of the more popular venues. Rita Barr echoed the sentiments of other former students when she declared the formal dance a "big deal," and "held at a big hotel." These were occasions that loomed large in the lives of many DePaul students. (44)

Many of the dances were informal too, and these often drew the largest crowds. It was not unusual in the late twenties for the Halloween or Valentines "gym" dances to draw as many as a thousand students and visitors, a very large proportion of the full-time student body at the time, perhaps 70 percent. These dances were often viewed as informal get-togethers rather than dating affairs, a venue for meeting other students and enjoying the company of friends. Thomas Joyce remembered the gym dances, and the "very beautiful girls" in attendance. These gatherings were also places to meet potential dating partners and initiate fresh romantic liaisons. It is little wonder, therefore, that these informal university-wide dances drew the biggest attendance. Though other dances, especially formals, also attracted large crowds, they rarely drew more than four or five hundred. More typically, the Frosh-Soph Cotillion or the Senior Ball numbered 200-300 participants, also a very large proportion of the class groups. Even a dance with four hundred represented a significant portion of DePaul's total student body. (45)

It is impossible to tell where the participants in these various functions came from. If DePaul men dated mainly DePaul women, students from the uptown campus—where more coeds were available—may have outnumbered those from the Loop. Ethnic, religious and other cultural factors may have played a role as well. It is a question whether many of the university's Jewish students participated in the various social functions. While it is clear that some did, it seems unlikely that their rate of participation was as high as it was for other groups, particularly the Irish. Concentrated in the university's principal professional schools, with largely male student bodies, and often isolated in separate Greek organizations, the Jewish students may not have experienced the emerging collegiate dating culture quite as intensively as DePaul's Irish Catholic students.

DePaul's whirlwind social calendar apparently slowed but certainly did not stop in the 1930s as the Depression reduced enrollments and left students with less money to spend on
their social lives. Enrollments at the Lincoln Park campus fell by nearly 50 percent between 1928 and 1936. Judging by attendance, interest in athletic events had also dropped conspicuously by the mid-thirties. Like many other urban Catholic institutions, the university discontinued its football program in 1938. At the same time, participation in dances of all sorts fell only slightly, though the number of dances diminished a little too. In 1935, after attendance at football games had started to fall, a crowd of more than five hundred attended the Junior Prom, the largest to date. Other university-wide formal events continued to draw big throngs and informal dances were still held in the gym and at the downtown campus, but attendance of more than a thousand was a thing of the past. The dances continued to be held regularly, however, and former students remember one “almost every weekend.” Although the numbers reported attending dances continued to fluctuate from one event to another, there continued to be a very high level of student participation in such activities. (46)

Dating, which was essential for dances to succeed, particularly the important formal ones, was a nearly universal activity by the end of the thirties. In a survey of uptown students in 1939 the DePaulia reported that most dated on a regular basis. The fact that men outnumbered women may have accounted for differences in dating patterns. Men averaged one date per week, with some (“a few”) having as many as three. Women, on the other hand, averaged...
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two dates per week, "with many of them having as many as four." Women on the Loop campus, where there was a greater disparity in male-female enrollments, had an even greater advantage. Marie Cogan, an accounting major in the mid-thirties, noted that there were many potential dates to choose from. Significantly, Saturday was reportedly the favorite date night for both groups in the DePaulia survey. This meant that many—perhaps most—of the dates probably occurred away from the campus. In this respect the university functioned as something of a dating exchange for young men and women, offering opportunities to find a partner for a longer-term relationship. DePaul was not unusual in this regard, and most coed residential schools probably served a similar function at this time. It was uncommon, however, for an urban Catholic institution to fill this role, as most Catholic high schools and colleges were not coeducational. (47)

The date, of course, also presented an opportunity to test the degree to which a couple were compatible and enjoyed one another's company. A large number of DePaul students married fellow students. Fran Armstrong noted that her own children "thought you always married who you went to school with, because so many of our friends from DePaul married other students from DePaul." Thomas Joyce made a similar observation, and Bernard Carey, a student at the Loop campus in the late thirties, noted the same phenomenon downtown. In this respect, the university also served as something of an informal marriage market for children of the city's Catholic middle class. (48)

The fact that young men and women attended classes together, participated in the various student activities and had a busy schedule of dances made dating quite commonplace at DePaul. And this helped to put questions of romance and implied sexuality at the very center of students' lives. Even though DePaul was a commuter school, its students experienced a very rich social life. Like students at other institutions, many of their activities revolved around meeting and spending time with members of the opposite sex. The campus was small—indeed, downtown it was just one building—but for the young men and women attending DePaul, the city was the setting in which they pursued their social lives. And this tradition changed little in the decades that followed.

The Second World War and Beyond

The social system that had evolved at DePaul by the 1930s remained largely intact for the next several decades. Some changes occurred, but fraternities and sororities continued to constitute the center of much campus life, and dating and dancing remained very popular. After the university discontinued its football program, the arrival of Ray Meyer as the men's basketball coach in the early forties marked the start of big-time collegiate basketball at DePaul. Meyer's teams experienced almost immediate success, and basketball games soon became important social events for students at both campuses. (49) Following a brief hiatus during the war, the annual cycle of dances, parties and other social occasions resumed in the late 1940s and changed
little in the years that followed. For many DePaul students, the forties and fifties were a time characterized by well-established campus traditions that continued to provide DePaul with its own special brand of collegiate culture.

As noted in other chapters, the university grew substantially in the years following the war, and its student body became even more diverse. Returning war veterans made up the biggest immediate source of new students. With tuition benefits provided by the government under the G.I. Bill, adult veteran students swelled the enrollments of colleges and universities across the country. At DePaul, however, the influx was unusually large, and within a few years the university's enrollment more than doubled, to nearly ten thousand students. The largest number of these students enrolled in the College of Commerce at the Loop campus, but enrollments increased significantly uptown also.

The veterans at DePaul, as at other institutions, were unusually serious students. Nationally, adult student veterans received higher grades than traditional college students and were less interested in extracurricular activities. At DePaul the veterans were especially concerned with getting a practical education that could be helpful in securing a job or a higher salary. Nick DeLeonardis, who attended the College of Commerce in the late forties, remembered the veterans adding a degree of seriousness to his classes. “I think the professors had to change,” he recalled, to a “less theoretical, perhaps more practical process in their approaches.” Historians have made the same observation about veterans at other campuses.

Because space was at a premium on DePaul's campuses, particularly downtown, veterans crowded into small classrooms; some reportedly even attended classes held in hallways. But these older students did not mind. Jerry Radice, a veteran who enrolled DePaul during those years, recalled that “all we were concerned about was learning and putting our energies, thoughts and minds to do what we had to do, to get a degree, to learn.” By and large, these students did not partake of the rich campus culture that had evolved at DePaul over the preceding decades. They added a practical, mature note to life at the university, and left the extracurricular activities to the new generation of college-age students then beginning to appear on campus.

Even though the number of students at DePaul fell gradually over the following decade as the veterans left, the postwar period marked a new era of prosperity for the university. It was a time when more young people wanted to attend college, and a wider cross-section of families could aspire to send their sons and daughters to DePaul. The university became even more culturally diverse as a consequence, and new wrinkles began to appear in its rather secure and well defined campus culture.

With expansion, the composition of the student body began to change in subtle ways. The largest single group of students continued to be those from Irish backgrounds, but growing numbers of students from Chicago's other large Catholic immigrant groups began to appear as well. An analysis of graduates in the mid-1950s reveals that more than 20 percent
of students at the uptown campus had names that were identifiably Italian or Polish, groups that had not been well represented at DePaul in the prewar years. Ten years later, the number of Poles and Italians combined had increased and constituted nearly one-third of the graduates in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Jewish students continued to be a significant group also, particularly on the Loop campus, where they made up as much as one-third of the student population in commerce and in law. Ethnic differences in the backgrounds of students at DePaul’s two campuses continued to be a facet of university life. But new groups of students began appearing at both campuses in the postwar years, suggesting that greater access to higher education was leading to a more representative student body for institutions such as DePaul. (52)

African American students, who also began to attend DePaul in sizable numbers in the forties and fifties, represented one such group. As Albert Erlebacher has pointed out in Chapter 6, DePaul did not always welcome Black students, but university policies to discourage Black enrollment were dropped in the postwar period, and as the university expanded, it grew more racially diverse.

DePaul was one of many colleges and universities that experienced an increase in African American enrollments following World War Two, as veterans came to campus. In fall 1949, the university conducted a survey of its various schools and colleges to determine the number of Black students. Well over 100, the largest number, were enrolled in the evening graduate students. Relaxing by the lake, early 1950s.
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school (serving mainly teachers) and the College of Commerce. These schools were located in the Loop and served many of the university's student veterans. In the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences uptown, which enrolled primarily younger students, there were just 28 African Americans out of a total enrollment that approached one thousand. Black students were a small minority at DePaul, and many were adult veterans enrolled at the university's Lake Street campus. Still, their numbers were increasing. Three years later, in 1952, the university reported nearly three hundred African American students, all but 34 of whom attended school in the Loop. Again, the bulk of these students were adult veterans, most of them men, attending class in the evening. (53)

Although they were not prominent participants in campus social life, there is evidence that African American students were welcomed by many staff members and students in these years. This was the beginning of the civil rights era, and some Black students were self-conscious about being among the first generation of African Americans to attend predominantly white colleges. In 1948 Bernice DePass, a recent graduate of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, wrote to President O'Malley to thank DePaul for helping her finish college. Hinting that not all white students were supportive, she described some Catholic students as being "more conscious of their race than their religion." But the campus mood regarding race and civil rights was decidedly liberal, at least uptown. Support for the sentiment, if not necessarily the substance of civil rights reform, was evident in the DePaulia, as it ran articles highlighting Black athletes in the mid-1950s. The DePaulia also condemned racist attacks on a Black family in Cicero, and editorialized about the need for greater support for racial integration, suggesting that integrated athletics was an important step in the struggle against segregation and discrimination. As hopeful as these signs were, however, they did not address the possibility that African American students might confront discrimination at DePaul itself. This issue emerged forcefully in the following decade. (54)

In spite of this new level of diversity, many features of student life at DePaul remained unchanged during the postwar years. Established campus rituals, such as freshman beanies and the annual pushball contest, remained as vital as ever. Fraternity and sorority membership remained substantial, even though it had declined in proportion to the entire student body. In 1955 there were some 363 members of Greek organizations and honor societies pictured in the yearbook, slightly fewer than in the 1930s. This may have been due in part to the influx of veterans, many of whom cared little for campus activities and student organizations. But the fraternities and sororities provided an ongoing stream of campus-related activities that formed the core of college social life for a significant segment of the student body, and membership in Greek organizations grew in the years that followed. Fraternities and sororities were the largest organizers of dances and other social events that brought young men and women together in potentially romantic circumstances. They also provided a point of day-to-day contact and camaraderie that helped to personalize and enliven the collegiate experiences of
DePaul's commuter student body. For many students during these years, the Greek societies remained at the very center of DePaul’s culture at both campuses. (55)

Like DePaul itself, student organizations—Greek and otherwise—continued to be distinguishable by campus and clientele. As in earlier years, the law and business societies were on the Loop campus and most of the purely social organizations were uptown, although there also were groups with members on both campuses. There continued to be evidence of some ethnic differences in the composition of student groups. In the 1950s Alpha Phi Delta, a national Italian fraternity, appeared at DePaul. And as in earlier years, there were a number of organizations with few or no Jewish members, and at least one with a predominantly Jewish membership. Relatively few African American students were pictured in yearbook photos of student groups, although there were a number of organizations with one or two Black members. Even though there was a substantial number of Black students at DePaul in the 1950s, there is relatively little evidence of African American participation in many student activities at the time. As was the case at many other predominantly White institutions in this period, African American students generally were not included in the mainstream campus culture. (56)

As in earlier years, the principal activity of fraternities and sororities at DePaul involved arranging dances and other social events. Jack Dickman, the social director of a fraternity in the late fifties, noted that dance admission fees were the Greek organizations’ principal source of income at this time. These events were staged at hotels downtown or elsewhere in the city, just as they were in the 1930s. Each organization had a preferred location for much of the period. For Dickman’s fraternity it was the Belden Stratford Hotel. Carol Nolan, who graduated in 1954, recalls that her sorority always held its dances, teas and receptions at the Edgewater Beach Hotel. The business of arranging these events was complicated, yet for the cadre of dedicated organizers it was valuable experience for the real world of commerce. It was also a source of great enjoyment, and for many DePaul students in the 1950s these dances and other organized affairs were among the principal features of collegiate culture. (57)

Dating continued to be a focal point of student life in the postwar era, and at DePaul there were numerous occasions for young men and women to get together. Formal dances required dates, of course, but students also made dating opportunities out of a number of other social events. One was DePaul’s continuing tradition of Friday night dances in the university auditorium, popularly known as “the barn” by this time. When Alumni Hall was built in the mid-fifties, the old auditorium became the site of a variety of activities, but to most students it was known primarily as a setting for informal dances and other social get-togethers. Going to DePaul basketball games, either at Alumni Hall or the Chicago Stadium, was another popular social event for students from both campuses. Games held at the Stadium were considered especially important, as DePaul was often paired with a nationally recognized opponent in a double header featuring either Loyola or Northwestern. Attending such a game was
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an exciting way to share in school spirit and go “out” with other students at the same time. Public events such as these provided ideal vehicles for young men and women to enjoy one another's company, whether watching a sports event together or informally dancing and having fun with friends. And because these occasions happened so frequently, dating was often a weekly event. (58)

For some students, of course, dating led directly to romance and eventually to marriage. This tradition began in the 1920s and 30s, but there were new wrinkles to dating in the 1950s. One was the heightened possibility of forming long-term dating partnerships. “Steady” dating partners formed relationships that were recognized and upheld in student circles, often wearing pins or rings to signify commitment to one another. Such bonds became quite commonplace in the fifties, and represented a new step in the dating culture of American youth. At DePaul as elsewhere, the collegiate social scene was particularly important to the development of such relationships. Mutual commitments required some measure of public recognition, after all, and Greek societies often provided pins, rings and other symbols of membership used to signify these bonds. “Pinned” partners were expected to attend social events together and provided a measure of stability or predictability to the collegiate social world. As a preparation for marriage, these relationships often helped to cultivate greater maturity in college students. And their ubiquity helped to sustain DePaul's reputation as a school where young Catholic men and women (and non-Catholics too) could find a mate for life. (59)
Despite its growth, DePaul continued to be a small school serving a wholly commuter student body. With roughly one thousand students on the uptown campus through the 1950s, it continued to be a place where friendships were made easily and students could become as involved in social activities as they wanted. The vast majority of uptown students were from the city, although a growing minority came from neighboring suburbs, and more than 80 percent were Catholic. The annual cycle of social events instituted in the twenties and thirties continued, including the fervent pushball competition between freshmen and upperclassmen. At the downtown campus the atmosphere was a bit more cosmopolitan, and there were large numbers of adult students seeking professional certification of one sort or another. Located in the newly acquired Kimball Building by the late 1950s, the Loop campus was also divided between four separate colleges which shared few faculty members or facilities. But even there it was possible to make acquaintances and become involved in the school's social life. On both campuses DePaul remained an institution characterized by a high degree of familiarity among students and staff, and for the most part this extended to the peculiar student culture that had evolved over the preceding three decades. It was an urban variant of the collegiate culture existing on other American campuses at this time. But it also was distinctively Chicago's and DePaul's.

DePaul Students in the Sixties
Like their counterparts at other institutions, DePaul's students changed in the 1960s. Some of these changes were subtle and others were dramatic, but altogether the decade was a watershed in the history of the peculiar campus culture that had been developing at DePaul since the 1920s. Participation in dances and other traditional student activities dropped later in the decade, and new interests found expression in issues ranging from civil rights and the emerging youth culture to political activism. Student strikes and demonstrations in the late 1960s and early seventies marked a new era in student life at DePaul, one that, in some respects, has continued into the present.

The decade of the sixties brought a new generation of students to DePaul and other colleges and universities. These were young men and women born in the postwar era, for whom attendance at college or university was less a privilege than a certainty. Theirs was a generation that confronted racial injustice and protested American military involvement abroad. Even if only a vocal minority expressed these sentiments forcefully in public, the majority of American students shared their views. (60) This was also true at DePaul, although the university's peculiar dual campus structure highlighted deep divisions in the student body. As DePaul's students became more politically liberal and were increasingly concerned with events and issues off the campus, the traditional elements of student culture began to fade in significance, especially in the uptown colleges. By the mid-1970s the transition was complete, and a new campus ethos of liberal individualism had supplanted the older collegiate culture of fraternity-
ties and sororities, dancing and dating. Gone too was the old system of ethnic differentiation, and in its place there emerged a heightened awareness of racial identity and socioeconomic status.

The issue of racial equality had a more powerful effect on DePaul in the 1960s than other questions of the day. This was partly a matter of context. On the national scene, the decade of the sixties was characterized by growing tensions over racial issues as the Civil Rights Movement gained momentum. Chicago was an important center of protest activity connected to a variety of issues. This was a period marked by increased Black concern over educational equality in particular, with large-scale protests over school segregation and access to higher education. In Chicago there were massive demonstrations in the early 1960s over the segregationist policies of public school superintendent Benjamin Willis. Active chapters of the NAACP, CORE, the Urban League and other civil rights organizations were working in the city, and more militant organizations such as the Black Panther Party were also active in Chicago. The generation of students that came to DePaul in the 1960s was acutely aware of the major issues of the day. Many of them were prepared to examine these questions intensively at the university. (61)

This was also a time of continuing change in the composition of DePaul's student body. In 1960 the university counted about one hundred and fifty Black students at both campuses. In fall 1969, when the administration conducted a census of black students, it counted nearly five hundred, more than a 300 percent increase. Although the report did not provide a breakdown by college, much of this growth probably occurred on the uptown campus, where most of the university's full-time students took classes. If the number of Black students in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences increased at about the same rate as the rest of the Black stu-
dent population, African American students at the uptown campus probably numbered about 150 at the end of the decade. Because overall enrollments in the college remained relatively constant over this period, an increase of this magnitude pushed the proportion of Black students on the uptown campus to roughly one in ten. This alone was a big change in the composition of the traditional student body of the university. (62)

The rest of DePaul's student body was changing as well. The number of Jewish students declined somewhat in these years, and more students from historically underserved Catholic groups, particularly Poles and Italians, appeared on campus. Even more significant, however, was the growth in the number of students commuting from the suburbs, for whom ethnicity may have been less important than other forms of identification, particularly race and economic status. In 1960 more than 80 percent of the undergraduate population at the uptown campus was from the city of Chicago. By the mid 1970s the figure had fallen to less than 70 percent. A new type of student was appearing in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences: the children of Chicago Catholics who had moved to the suburbs, especially to communities northwest of the city. This group grew in significance and in numbers in the years ahead. (63)

The attitude of American college students changed in the sixties as these young men and women displayed greater willingness to challenge traditional practices and to question familiar maxims. But change did not occur overnight, and it took a while to reach DePaul. In the mid-1960s Greek membership at DePaul was still above 450, and dancing and dating continued to be popular among students at both campuses. Beanies and the pushball contest remained important campus traditions. Participation in these activities may have involved a smaller percentage of the student body, however, as the university's various colleges expanded in this period. With more than two thousand undergraduates on both campuses, only about one-quarter of the university's full-time students participated in the Greek system at any given time. This was the core of students who continued to value the traditional forms of collegiate social life throughout the decade, at DePaul and elsewhere. But change was evident, especially later in the decade. (64)

Even with substantial student involvement in traditional campus activities, there was a new atmosphere uptown (now called the Lincoln Park campus) by the late sixties. Students were interested in a variety of issues, and the campus newspaper, the DePaulia, urged greater activism and debate in the student body. Eloy Burciaga, a freshman in 1968, recalls that DePaul students were aware of protests on other campuses, and that a few began to develop interests in the key political issues of the day. Nineteen sixty-eight was a critical year around the world as students in Europe and North America mobilized against war in Southeast Asia, and especially against inequality and discrimination in the United States. There were signs of this new level of activity at DePaul. Forums on race relations and the Vietnam War in the opening months of 1968 were well attended and sparked discussion of national affairs. DePaul's first antiwar demonstrations were inspired by the presidential "peace" candidacy
of Eugene McCarthy in March, and in April McCarthy won a campus poll of student preferences among leading candidates, defeating Robert Kennedy and Richard Nixon. Support for McCarthy was strongest at the uptown campus (Nixon won the general election vote the following fall, with heavy support at the Loop campus). A growing number of DePaul's students were closely attuned to events on the national stage, and some of them sought ways to bring these debates to the campus. (65)

For African American students, however, the issues of equity and fairness were immediate concerns. Late in the decade, a survey of DePaul's African American students revealed a good deal of dissatisfaction with their experiences at DePaul. Respondents complained about feeling isolated from other Black and minority students, about the lack of attention to Black history in the curriculum, and about the way certain faculty members treated them. "There are constant reminders of minorities not being on the same level as whites," wrote one African American student, "so they must put forth extra effort." Isolation was another factor. A number complained that there was too little for Black and other minority students to do outside of classes, and the vast majority said they would welcome the opportunity to meet more minority students. (66)

It is difficult to say exactly when DePaul's Black students began to organize, but in the years following 1965 there was a new level of concern about questions of social justice on the campus. In 1967 DePaul's African American students established the university's first student organization that represented Black concerns on campus: the Black Student Union (BSU). This was a critical step, and it mirrored similar groups on other campuses across the country. Chief among the issues they were interested in was the university itself, and the way it treated students from minority group backgrounds—particularly African Americans, but other groups as well.

In spring 1968, a series of events began to unfold which eventually pulled DePaul into the growing national controversy over equal rights and racial discrimination. The university's Black student activists, dissatisfied with many aspects of the university, organized diligently to draw attention to their cause. And this marked a new era in the history of student life at DePaul.

On May 1, 1968, Liberal Arts and Sciences Dean Edward Schillinger met with a delegation of "about twenty" Black students, led by James Hammonds. The group demanded that representatives from the Black Student Union be appointed to university committees that made policy recommendations regarding students and faculty. Not accustomed to being confronted by students, Schillinger was taken aback by the term "demand," but several days later he expressed interest in finding a way for the BSU to be represented on student committees. It is not clear how this response was communicated to the students, but it marked the beginning of a long dialogue between the BSU and the university administration. (67)

To respond to BSU demands and any others that might arise, the university established a Committee on Human Relations (CHR). Chaired by Dean Schillinger, it included repre-
sentatives from BSU and other minority student groups and was supposed to look into the various issues raised by the BSU and others and to make recommendations to the President. In September the CHR issued a report listing a series of courses, old and new, that had been developed to address these concerns. The report also noted efforts in the various departments to recruit Black and other minority faculty members, although it was difficult to find eligible candidates. In addition to this, the CHR investigated charges that Black and Hispanic students experienced discrimination when seeking housing in neighborhoods adjacent to the university. And it looked into ways of offering more extracurricular activities for minority students. (68)

The pace of change was uneven, and not everyone was satisfied with the university's response. Members of the BSU complained about resistance to change encountered among certain faculty members and in various departments. The BSU—along with others in the university community—also protested DePaul's lack of communication with community groups concerned about the university's expansion. This had become a heated issue with the demolition of housing to allow for construction of the Schmitt Academic Center in 1967. Even though the university had opened a dialogue with its students, the potential for misunderstanding remained significant.

In the opening months of 1969 members of the BSU were becoming frustrated. After working closely with the CHR, little seemed to be happening. The BSU also had not been assigned office space by the university, like other student groups. In the 1968 and 1969
DePaulian yearbooks, the BSU had not been listed as an official student organization. Many wondered whether most faculty, administrators and students at DePaul even cared about the issues the BSU had raised.

On Wednesday, May 7, members of the BSU staged a small rally in the SAC pit—at high noon—to read a new set of “demands” being presented to the university. This time the list went well beyond the curriculum and touched on many of the issues then becoming points of controversy among students across the country, including access to the university for the disadvantaged and the university’s relationship to its immediate neighborhood. The atmosphere on campus became highly charged in the wake of these demands, and the university administration answered the charges and demands issued by the BSU promptly. On the following day (May 8) after the BSU had received the response, it held another meeting in the SAC pit to consider it. The university agreed to discuss most of the new points but noted that a number of them would be difficult or impossible to address.

At this juncture, the crisis escalated quickly. Later that afternoon, members of the BSU went to Dean Schillinger’s office and asked to see university President John Cortelyou, C.M. At 8:30 that evening members of the BSU and students supporting them “secured” the fifth floor of the building, and after classes had ended, they took possession of the rest of the building, blocking or barricading doors so that students and university personnel could not enter. Within barely two days of seeing the new demands issued by the BSU, DePaul had joined the growing list of institutions experiencing disruptions related to student unrest.

Fortunately, the confrontation precipitated by the takeover of SAC did not last long. Although there was a tense standoff as students attempted to gain access to the building on the morning of May 9 and the university threatened to seek an injunction to open the building by force, the BSU abandoned the takeover shortly after noon that day and held another rally. There was great interest across the campus in the issues raised by the BSU, and hundreds of students came to find out what was going on. Representatives from the Black Panthers and Young Lords (a Puerto Rican group), concerned about the university’s impact on the neighborhood, also attended and spoke. If the goal of the takeover was to draw attention to the BSU’s position, it had clearly succeeded. (69)

Campus opinion was divided regarding the BSU’s demands and actions, but most students supported the call for greater curricular focus on problems of discrimination and inequality. Support was clearly strongest on the uptown campus. On the following Tuesday the Student Activity Council, the principal student governance body at the time, voted to support the BSU demands for curricular changes and for establishing special programs for minority youth. For its part, the Committee on Human Relations resumed its dialogue with the BSU and determined to look into inequities in the curriculum and school policies. Even though there had been some heated moments, it appeared that a resolution to the conflict was at hand. (70)
Just when the situation seemed to be stabilized, however, a new crisis erupted. Late on the afternoon of May 14, a week after the BSU had publicly issued its demands, arsonists struck the old Lyceum building (the former library), which contained the university bookstore and the BSU offices. Although no one was harmed and it was never determined who set the fire, the BSU declared it a racist attack, and at a rally two days later the BSU and other student groups called for a general student strike across the university.

For two days a small group of students at the Lincoln Park campus did not attend classes, and pickets circled the entrances to SAC and other university buildings. Even though most students did not observe the strike, many went to workshops on institutional racism conducted by the BSU on the following Monday and to a rally held at noon. Many students supported the quest to improve conditions for Black and other minority students at the university, and a resolution signed by several dozen faculty members also expressed support. There can be little doubt that the arson attack on university property, and the BSU office in particular, helped to build sympathy for Black students and contributed to broad endorsement of the BSU position. In the space of a little more than two weeks, DePaul’s African American students had mobilized a significant portion of the university community behind their concerns. (71)

As short as it was, the BSU building seizure and strike of 1969 had a major impact on DePaul. It opened lines of communication between the university and minority students and established the BSU as a major factor in campus life, at least for a time. Shortly after the events of May 1969, the BSU reported a membership of nearly one hundred, about one in five Black students at DePaul, making it one of the largest student organizations. Students also continued to express interest in the Vietnam war, and a chapter of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was formed at DePaul. It was a time of rising social consciousness, and at DePaul’s Lincoln Park campus students confronted the issues that defined the period. Even though DePaul was not a major center of student protest at this time, it certainly was not isolated from the activism and unrest that marked the times. The institution no longer asserted that students did not have a say in the curriculum—and other areas of university policy making—as had been the case in the past. (72)

The student protest era lasted only a short time, but its impact was significant. The Black Student Union remained active for several years, but by the early seventies it numbered only a handful of active members and was no longer a major force on the campus. The Vietnam war was an issue for some students, and there were lively demonstrations in spring 1970 (at the time of the Kent State shootings) and later (around the bombing of Cambodia). In 1970 a small band of protestors disrupted the university’s commencement exercises in an antiwar protest. The notion that the university was exempt from political activism and that the Vincentian priests who administered DePaul were above reproach was clearly out of date. (73) To many students at this time, the university was perceived as just another seat of power and
privilege; as such it was linked to a host of social problems. Even after the protest era had passed, DePaul students continued to hold two simultaneous and opposing views of the institution: it posed problems for them to solve at the same time it was offering them the skills and knowledge—and credentials—necessary for success in life.

The Seventies and Beyond
As DePaul has grown in the years following 1970, its students have continued to be diverse and politically and socially sophisticated. Conflicts continue to punctuate the regular course of university life, but the tenor was considerably less strident and confrontational than in the late sixties. While DePaul still served the children of the Chicago ethnics it educated in the past, significant new groups appeared on the Lincoln Park campus, including a growing number of students from outside of the Chicago area.

As a consequence of these changes, DePaul today has a markedly different student culture. The university’s traditionally college-age student body has become more cosmopolitan, while at the same time DePaul has been expanding its role as educator of adults in the Loop and in some suburban locations. The university has become a considerably more complex and sophisticated purveyor of educational services, addressing a broad range of constituencies. The close-knit campus life of the past, with its familiar traditions and cohesive social life has rapidly faded in the wake of these changes. In its place a new and highly differentiated campus culture has emerged, one that allows students freedom to forge their own associations amid the myriad possibilities offered by a large and complex institution. Informality has become the rule of the day, and individual friendships have replaced the old activities of the past as a new generation of students works to shape its own distinctive social world.

The traditional campus activities and organizations that had characterized student life at DePaul for several decades declined quickly in the 1970s. The previous decade had brought a new critical attitude to campuses across the country, one that questioned the value of dances,
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dating, and even such long-standing campus traditions as homecoming. In a telling commentary, the 1969 DePaulian yearbook described the spring dances as "opaque, smoke filled rooms" where a student becomes acquainted "with the people he is never in class enough to meet." In the same yearbook, homecoming is referred to as a form of "university chauvinism," comparable, at least in spirit, to other forms of status consciousness which had become anathema to many students. The rebels of the sixties had wielded enormous influence, and by the end of the decade even the college yearbook was casting aspersions on the familiar elements of the collegiate culture of past years. (74)

The shift to a new campus ethos came quickly. By the mid-seventies a veritable sea change had occurred in student life. Membership in the Greek organizations declined so precipitously that by 1974 it totaled barely 250. The annual pushball contest between the freshmen and sophomores, a campus tradition since the late twenties, was discontinued after 1975. And even though it was revived for a time in the early 1980s, it never regained its significance as an acculturating experience for successive generations of students coming to the campus each fall. Needless to say, the assignment of green beanies for freshmen, and everything it signified, ended in the early seventies as well. The traditional Friday night dances became less frequent and attendance was smaller. And eventually even the larger, formal dances drew fewer students. Although the basketball team experienced great success in the late seventies, homecoming events drew smaller crowds. Finally, in the eighties the annual homecoming dance was discontinued because of lack of interest. By that time a new student culture had established itself at DePaul's uptown campus, one that, while it eschewed the old organizations and activities, offered its own values and norms. (75)

The university's student body was changing. In 1975 almost two-thirds of DePaul's full time students came from the city of Chicago. By 1983 that number had dropped to less than half, a decline attributable to the increase in the number of students who commuted from the Chicago suburbs, principally the west and northwest regions of the metropolitan area. This trend continued as time went on, and by the mid-nineties students from the city represented barely one-third of the university's total enrollment, while those from the suburbs constituted almost half. At the same time, the number of students from outside of the Chicago area altogether rose, albeit less quickly. In 1975, fewer than 8 percent of the student body came from outside of Chicagoland; ten years later, this number had increased to nearly ten percent, with most coming from out of state. By the middle of the 1990s, however, those coming from outside the metropolitan area constituted nearly one out of five DePaul students and were almost one-third of all freshmen on the Lincoln Park campus. At that time the university's student body looked quite different than it had just two decades earlier. DePaul was no longer an institution serving primarily the city of Chicago. It had become an important regional university, drawing larger numbers of students from greater distances.

At the same time that DePaul drew more students from outside Chicago, it also contin-
used to have a racially and culturally diverse student population. While the proportion of students from the city declined, more Black, Hispanic and other minority-group students came to DePaul from Chicago, a reflection of changes in the city's schools, which graduated relatively few white students after the 1970s. This increase in minority representation at DePaul contributed to the diversity of students' backgrounds and experiences on campus. By the mid-1990s about 10 percent of the university's students were African American and another 8 percent were Hispanic. Asian students represented about 7 percent of the student body, and students from an array of other ethnic minority backgrounds constituted smaller percentages. Added to this was a growing number of foreign students, attracted by programs in computer science and related disciplines. While the Catholic student population at DePaul peaked in the sixties at nearly 80 percent, it gradually fell in the years afterward. By the late eighties only about 60 percent of the student body was Catholic, and by the late nineties it had fallen to half. Taken all together, these changes contributed to the creation of a highly diverse student body at DePaul, considerably more varied than in the past. (76)

These changes held important implications for student life, apart from the underlying modifications in American youth culture associated with the 1960s and 1970s. First, the shift to a suburban clientele meant that many commuter students traveled longer distances to attend DePaul, often driving into the city from distant suburbs. This might have made it more difficult for some students to consider such campus-based social commitments as participation in traditional collegiate activities: Greek societies and formal dances. Although most students still came from the Chicago area, enough were from beyond the city to diminish the geographic cohesion in the student body, a big change from the time when a large number of uptown students lived on the city's north side. As the student population at the Lincoln Park campus expanded, DePaul was no longer "the little school under the El," and this no doubt made it difficult for the old-time collegiate organizations to maintain their dominant roles on the campus.

Finally, recognition that students were coming from outside the city in increasing numbers led to the university's decision to make it possible for students to live on or near the DePaul campus. This meant acquiring dormitories and building new ones in the sixties and the years following 1970. While DePaul had a limited number of resident students in the sixties, the acquisition of the McCormick Seminary campus in 1978 enabled hundreds of students to live in the dormitories the seminary had constructed. New dorms were built in the years that followed, and by the mid-nineties the number of resident students at Lincoln Park had climbed to nearly two thousand. Larger numbers of students, particularly upperclassmen, also rented nearby apartments, adding substantially to the resident student population. This meant that suddenly there was a large group of students living on DePaul's Lincoln Park campus, an altogether new development. This too altered the shape of student culture on the uptown campus. (77)
CHAPTER FIVE

For DePaul's increasingly diverse student body, campus life has become highly differentiated and personalized in the years following 1970. Other scholars of student life have observed a similar tendency across the country. Following the tumultuous sixties, students did not return to the familiar campus activities. Instead, they were more serious about their studies and engaged in activities associated with their academic interests or other issues they personally were concerned with.

At DePaul today the old organizational forms of student life no longer command the loyalty or the attention of most students. Instead, groups of friends get together and select specific activities on which to focus. Dating, once the mainstay of DePaul collegiate culture, has fallen out of fashion with late 20th-century undergraduates. So, too, have the formal dances at downtown hotels and the elaborate preparations for a night on the town. Rather, informality is the order of the day. This is in part a legacy of the sixties and the revolt against formality in so many spheres of life in that era. And it is also the hallmark of a new period in the history of student culture, one marked by a new attention to personal tastes and interests.

The post-1960s students valued spontaneity and authenticity, and this meant doing things with friends, often without much planning or preparation. Kieran Conrad, a student in the
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late eighties, noted that she never remembered going out on an actual date, although she—like so many DePaul students before her—met her husband while they were both students at the university. Her memories of campus life feature time spent with friends in the music school (where her future husband was a student), spontaneous events like a massive snowball fight in the middle of a winter night during her freshman year, and her relationships with professors. She was active in a number of campus organizations and worked as a desk assistant in the dormitories, but these organizational forms of campus life were less important to her than the friends she associated with. Extracurricular activity meant something quite different to her: less an element of a unified student culture she experienced than just another organizational dimension of the university—like classes—in which she chose to participate. In this respect her experience was quite different from earlier generations of DePaul students, for whom the Greek societies and other organizations were central features of campus life. Kieran, like many other DePaul students in the years following 1975, had a personal DePaul experience that was shared by other students but also was uniquely her own. (78)

The new era in campus life was evident in the types of organizations that were established by students at DePaul’s two principal campuses. The directory of student organizations published in 1988 featured a dozen Greek-letter societies, but several were really professional associations restricted to students majoring in certain subjects, and only a few of the “social” groups had more than two dozen members. Five years later the number of Greek societies had fallen to nine, even though there was a national revival of these groups at that time. By the mid-1990s Greek membership at the university was less than five percent of the student body. At DePaul, it appears, a different form of student organization predominated, reflecting the diversity of student interests. The largest number of groups were those representing academic or other special interests linked to individual skills or talents (ranging from the artistic to the athletic). More than a dozen community or social service groups, and twelve different “ethnic” student groups, each representing a different cultural or racial minority were also active. In addition, there were politically oriented special interest groups with specific constituencies, such as women or gay and lesbian students. While the members of these groups engaged in an assortment of social activities, they existed so that students could pursue a wide range of individual interests. The extra curriculum was no longer dominated by the largely convivial agenda of the Greek societies and the dating culture. Rather, it had become another avenue for students to pursue personal development and potential career advancement. (79)

Like students elsewhere, DePaul students—particularly those on the uptown campus—continued to harbor a certain irreverence and exhibited a willingness to undertake protest as a strategy to advance causes they were interested in. This, too, was a legacy of the sixties, although the issues changed with time. In the early seventies, for example, DePaul students conducted small-scale protests over the university’s treatment of popular professors. In the 1980s there was a major controversy over the university’s decision to withdraw support for
NOW president Eleanor Smeal as a campus speaker, an issue about which many students felt strongly (and one that mobilized various student constituency groups). In the 1990s again there was a crisis on the campus over the treatment of African American students, and a host of related issues quite similar to those raised by the BSU some twenty years earlier. Even if the war in Vietnam had ended, and the Civil Rights Movement was a distant memory, the new tradition of students demanding changes in the way the university was run was alive and well at DePaul. This was hardly an old tradition, as earlier generations of DePaul students virtually never questioned the university administration. But students voicing their opinions about a wide range of issues was an important carryover from the student protest era. While Black student complaints and confrontations such as the one over Smeal were not everyday occurrences, they happened frequently enough to keep alive the prospect of student mobilization—a vital element of the new DePaul student culture of the late twentieth century. (80)

DePaul students in the post-1970s era resembled their counterparts on other campuses across the country. For many, especially the students on the Lincoln Park campus, college was the means to a secure middle-class career, and a lifestyle similar to that enjoyed by their parents. They were serious about school and chose not to embrace the traditional collegiate organizational forms. DePaul continued to educate many first-generation students also, and it remained a major center for adult higher education in the Chicago area. But even for these students, college was less an occasion for shared socialization than an avenue to personal and professional development. While the Greek associations and dances dominated the lives of previous students, college for the latest generations of DePaul students is a largely personal experience. These students can organize protests and express a common viewpoint when motivated by a particular interest, but they do not share the distinctive unitary student culture of their predecessors. Though today's students may be somewhat more sophisticated than those of the past, they may also have lost something. (81)

Conclusion
DePaul has served a wide array of students over the past century. The very first were the sons of Catholic Irish and German immigrant families. Starting largely as a north side institution, DePaul's students became more diverse as the university expanded, particularly in the years following World War I. For decades after that, DePaul educated the sons and daughters of Chicago's major immigrant ethnic groups. And in the 1960s and beyond it served growing numbers of Chicago's newest minority groups: Blacks, Hispanics, Asian Americans and others. In this respect the university has represented its urban setting well. Its student body has been a reflection of much of Chicago and the larger metropolitan area and the changes it has undergone since the turn of the century.

Over the course of this period DePaul's students have strived to create their own distinctive campus culture. To a very large extent this culture has mirrored national trends in student
tastes and behavior. But DePaul has always featured its own style of student life. Even though they were virtually all commuters in the twenties and thirties, for instance, DePaul students embraced the trappings of collegiate life with gusto. While football and such traditional social events as homecoming were important, DePaul's students were swept up in the dance craze then popular among urban youth. As a coed Catholic institution, a rarity for much of the twentieth century, DePaul offered its students the opportunity to place dating and the potential for romance at the very center of their activities. The result was an urban Catholic variant of the coed dating culture that was taking shape on campuses across the country at that time. At DePaul much of the social activity occurred off campus in the larger world of entertainment and conviviality presented by the city. The university offered collegiate culture, Chicago style.

Even though they were commuters, DePaul's students were active in a wide range of campus activities. For the better part of five decades membership in fraternities and sororities was high, and a vast assortment of other groups helped to focus students' energies on a variety of issues. The university's students contributed to their own education as they organized themselves to have fun and to learn more about the world outside of the classroom. Athletics were also important, as DePaul's various teams provided students with many occasions to cheer and celebrate, and a reason to take extra pride in their alma mater. Altogether, DePaul showered a rich array of activities on its students, and out of this they fashioned a unique social and cultural identity, with athletics, students' organizations, dances and other activities forming its major components. It was an identity that sustained many generations of DePaul students, and one that continues to live in the hearts of its alumni.

This distinctive student culture changed profoundly in the years following the 1960s. Once again, DePaul was following national trends. The student protest era did not last very long at DePaul, but by the mid-1970s there was clear evidence that the traditional forms of collegiate culture were in decline. At the same time, DePaul began drawing more students from the suburbs, and eventually students from across the country started coming to the Lincoln Park campus. In a sense it is ironic that the old unitary student culture disappeared just when the university acquired a sizable residential population. Yet DePaul was no different in this regard from many other institutions. Students everywhere in the eighties and nineties viewed college as a place to develop their personal interests and abilities, not as a venue for collective socialization. In this respect also, DePaul is right in step with the national mood.

Regardless of these changes, however, DePaul today retains much of the openness and intimacy it gave to earlier generations. Students in the eighties and nineties have found it easy to make friends, and the city continues to offer a wide field for diversions of all sorts. The university still sponsors activities that allow students to learn about themselves and the larger world outside of the classroom. And the various elements of the traditional collegiate lifestyle, athletics, Greek societies and the rest, are available for those who wish to pursue them. But
the unitary core of student life that existed in the past has vanished. Today, diversity is the watchword, and personal choice. At DePaul this is not as forbidding a development as it would be on a larger, more impersonal campus. DePaul has kept its atmosphere of personalism, and that is the connection to the past, the core of student life at the university that ties the present generation to those that came before.
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Adult Students in the Loop—and Elsewhere

For most of its existence DePaul has been divided between its uptown (or Lincoln Park) campus and its various downtown (or Loop) locations. As suggested in chapter 5, the student culture at each of these campuses was quite different. While both were frequented by commuter students, through most of the university's history, the downtown students were enrolled in professional schools and most of those attending in the evening were adults.

Adult students generally have not participated in the various activities that defined the culture of DePaul's traditional-age student body. By and large, they did not join the Greek societies in nearly the same numbers; nor did they participate in the dances and dating that preoccupied so many DePaul undergraduates in the years between 1920 and 1970. Most adult students worked during the day, and for them school was tied directly to career advancement. Their social lives did not revolve around the campus. Like the veterans whom Nick DeLeonardis described in the latter forties, they were serious students who wanted a practical education. And DePaul's various evening programs offered the very sort of no-nonsense education they sought, without social attachments.

This does not mean, however, that there was no social life among DePaul's adult evening students. From almost the very start of the university's various evening programs there were organizations representing student interests, many related to the professions they studied. There also were student government representatives. And at points in time social organizations and even Greek societies existed for the evening students of one college or another. But these activities did not touch the lives of most adult students. For the majority of DePaul's evening clientele, the social life associated with school occurred in the hallways and classrooms of the university's Loop facilities. There many of them met other students with similar backgrounds and interests, and made friends while completing their programs of study. In some cases lifelong relationships were started, in others the social life of the hallways and the sidewalks around the Loop campus provided a friendly environment for coping with the challenges of school. If it was not the convivial social milieu of the day students, it was one of mutual support and camaraderie regarding school questions.
As the university developed a residential campus at Lincoln Park in the seventies and eighties, differences between the experiences of day and evening students widened. While such student organs as the DePaulia and the yearbooks (DePaulian) had long focused on the undergraduate day population, the growing numbers of residential students and their activities drew even more coverage in the years following 1980. Many adult students, particularly in the large M.B.A., Computer Science and School for New Learning programs, came to believe that activities and services were concentrated disproportionately at the Lincoln Park campus. The development of satellite campuses to serve adult students from the suburbs, first near O'Hare airport and then in Westchester, Oak Forest and Naperville, sharpened such perceptions. Adult students at these locations, while feeling strong connections with their particular programs and classmates, often reported little sense of attachment to the university as a whole. Student support systems and conventional campus amenities were sparse at these sites, and the world of campus activities reported in the DePaulia and other university publications seemed quite remote. In this respect, the experiences of DePaul students continued to vary widely.

As DePaul approaches its centennial, it continues to contend with the challenges associated with its diverse student population. Maintaining a sizeable residential campus and serving a growing population of adult students across the metropolitan area, the university could never claim to have a single, unitary student culture. Instead, it has had multiple campus cultures, just as it has employed several campuses, each with a distinctive clientele. The adults who utilize DePaul's professional and continuing education programs, consequently, have defined their own degree of involvement with the institution and with each other. And in doing this, they continue to help shape the peculiar mix of student experiences that has long characterized DePaul.

John L. Rury
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