

Architecture of college union buildings and the changing meaning of the campus “living room”

Clare Robinson, Ph.D.
University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ

ABSTRACT: Student unions buildings are a window into the architectural and social history of college campuses. Designed to support student government and normative leisure activities outside of college classrooms, the buildings have served as instruments of social education and student culture since the invention of the building type in the late nineteenth century. With few precedents, architects of early student union buildings in North America took cues from private social clubs to shape and arrange spaces for reading, games, club meetings, and cultural events, such as recitals and dances. As the Association of College Unions (ACU) matured into an influential national organization, it augmented the most significant architectural elements and purpose of the buildings, and guided the planning and design of buildings nationwide through publications and appointed expert consultants.

Student union proponents and architects regularly referred to the campus buildings as “living rooms” throughout the twentieth century, invoking familiarity and domesticity for an otherwise public campus building. This paper makes extensive use of primary sources to depict and interpret the relationships among architecture, culture, and meaning by wedding methods in architectural history to methods in conceptual history. Specifically, it combines the close examination of college union architecture with the social and cultural intentions of the buildings during three distinct different periods in college union history to chart the persistent use yet changing meaning of the phrase the campus “living room” and other related metaphors. By analyzing the interdependence of architectural design and meaning, this study broadens the role of architecture in humanities research while also arguing for the knowledgeable use of metaphors in contemporary architectural practice.

KEYWORDS: [student union, history, campus living room, home, art of living]

INTRODUCTION

An advertisement for the University of Arizona Student Union prints a photograph of two college-aged women sitting on a ledge near a couple of saguaros, cacti barrel, and rocks. Their arms are bare, their shoes off, and their backpacks sit to the side. The photograph captures a portion of the student union building facade and the university logos appear at the bottom of the page. It is a typical sunny day and typical university publication. A banner across the top of the photograph, however, declares the union “UA’s living room” and a note penned across the bottom of the image states “make yourself at home.” The everyday moment captured in the photograph is thus freighted with other meanings. The student union building and its immediate environment is not just a public space for leisure, but it is where you make yourself at home in the campus living room.

Using methods in conceptual history and architectural history, this paper examines the use of the term “living room” and the related metaphors of “home” and the “art of living” that proponents uttered to describe student unions in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, and compares the words and phrases to architecture during three distinct historical periods of college union design. The paper then argues that although the persistent use of these metaphors has allowed student union proponents to anchor the importance of student unions in the origins of the buildings themselves, the meaning of the metaphors changed because the spaces and programs of student union buildings have delivered different messages over time. By analyzing the interdependence of architectural design and metaphor, this study illuminates the architecture and meaning of student union buildings while broadening the role of architecture in humanities research.

College union buildings are familiar to nearly every North American college student because the buildings are now standard fixtures on most college and university campuses. The maturation and popularity of college unions as a campus building type began in the early twentieth century with professional proponents, a national organization called the Association of College Unions (ACU), and numerous architects. Although it had few direct architectural precedents, the building type emerged from a confluence of several forces and ideas in the nineteenth century and was firmly established as a building and social institution by the end of the Progressive Era. The buildings of the 1920s and 1930s varied in style – some were collegiate gothic while others were Georgian or classically inspired – but despite the variation, the buildings and their interiors tended to uplift college students with refined materials and stately spaces similar to private social clubs of the same and earlier eras. After World War II, when campuses absorbed G.I.s and expanded campus facilities, the

architecture of student union buildings changed along with student enrollment and demographics. Thus, when campuses added, replaced, or expanded unions, the new buildings and building interiors tended to adopt the latest, most durable architectural materials and add recreational amenities appropriate to the middle class. By the turn of the last century, campuses had replaced or completely renovated older student unions to not only remedy normal wear and tear, but to also address the economic necessities of operating union facilities, especially on large public campuses. Many recent unions look and operate much like shopping malls.

The architectural changes to college union buildings generally reflected the development of campus planning and architecture because their spatial paradigms and materials adapted to the tastes and styles of architects and campus administrations. However, while architectural strategies developed, the metaphors underpinning the building type remained the same. Student union proponents and architects regularly referred to the campus buildings as “home” or a “living room” throughout the twentieth century, invoking familiarity and domesticity for an otherwise public campus building. The invocation was and remains metaphorical but it has helped college presidents in the early twentieth century argue for a well-rounded college student long before campus dormitories were commonplace; allowed administrators to envision the university community as a “family;” and enabled architects to link the civic functions of student government to familial socialization through design. By the postwar period, student union buildings were boldly modern; they prepared students for adult life by mimicking shopping malls and civic centers, even though they were still the campus “living room.” Thus, the shift from student-union-as-private-club to student union-as-civic-center relied upon the convergence of domestic and institutional ideas in non-residential campus buildings, as well as the potential of architectural modernism to reshape student culture on college campuses. As campuses revived unions with more food courts, stronger wi-fi, and a variety of spaces to hang out, the domestic metaphors were reshaped again as students were deemed users and consumers of college unions amenities.

1.0 SOCIAL CENTERS ESTABLISH IDEAS OF HOME AND BELONGING

The social center movement of the Progressive Era fueled the North American student union movement. From it, student union proponents borrowed the idea of a physical space to gather, but also key social ideas embedded in social centers themselves. By the 1920s, when college unions were established as distinct and desirable buildings on campus, social centers bolstered citizen participation in political processes. Social centers, however, had additional ideological attributes: buildings became “home like” because social activities gave every member a community a chance to belong.¹ For Edward Ward, author of the 1913 book *The Social Center*, “home” stood as a critique of individualism and an antidote to modernization. “Home,” he argued, countered the loss of unity, of neighborship, and of the centrifugal forces distancing people from one another. Drawing upon familiar collective memory, “home” was not literal but a metaphor for the feeling of being part of a community. It borrowed from the mutual consideration, care for others, and cooperation taught by parents to chart the widening circles of family and community that led to patriarchal forms of government. Moreover, it acknowledged the evacuation of family functions – from food preparation, to the weaving and sewing of clothing, and the making and using tools – into the broader, specialized economy of modern civilization.

Few student unions existed in 1913, but Ward anticipated the utility of social centers for college graduates as well as the importance of campus social centers for students in college.² Social centers offered college graduates a place to participate meaningfully in the life of a community, and it was through social centers that community center proponents envisioned college graduates transforming society. Most importantly, similar to community centers around the country, social centers on campus united students from diverse socio-economic backgrounds and economized the discovery and formation of common values, especially at public universities before dormitories were commonplace. Unions, like social centers, were a place students could feel they belonged while being away from their families and hometowns.

University presidents and later presidents of the ACU would embrace social center ideas. Glenn Frank, President of the University of Wisconsin at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth century was a proponent of student socialization, and the first person to bundle “home,” “living room,” and student unions together. He uttered the words in 1904 when he advanced the idea of a student union on the Wisconsin campus. In particular, Frank believed that if a student union were a campus “living room,” then the building would readily transform the university from a “house” into a “home of learning.”³ In a similar vein, ACU President J. E. Walters would later describe the union as the “home” for the “university family” in 1925.⁴ Thus, leadership in higher education used the metaphor of “home” and “living room” to cast student unions as familiar and establish them as social institutions with egalitarian community membership.⁵ Thus, it was simultaneously a social metaphor for belonging, a material goal for culture, and a reason for campuses to build a union.

2.0 ARCHITECTS AND THE “ART OF LIVING,” FROM PRE TO POST-WWII BUILDINGS

The “living room” supported variant ideas, especially the “art of living” popularized by student union architects. As a concept, the “art of living” gained popularity in the United States during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁶ Early iterations of the idea had a reformist imperative that pointed out the moral and physical ills of the individual, society or cities.⁷ Early student unions fit into this scheme as institutions through which socialization of college students occurred. Later, ideas about the “art of living” targeted personal improvement and professional success.⁸ Taken together, the popular advice addressed the daily aspects of life (from marriage and family to personal direction, work and leadership) and advanced various ideas about happiness, contentment, and success. Those in academia took the art of living to mean an antidote to systems and science, an infusion of the humanities in daily life, and a path to living well. Particularly, administrators and educators argued that leisure activities and humanities courses in college taught graduates life-long cultural interests, and how to measure the quality of life not by professional success but by intellectual interests and day-to-day relationships.⁹ By the postwar period, the “art of living” happened when professionals, such as lawyers and businessmen, enjoyed hand-crafts and the arts, and when craftsmen, such as carpenters, plumbers and painters, cultivated interest in fine art and humanities, thus making the “art of living” a synthetic and democratic notion attainable by all.¹⁰

2.1. Irving Pond

Although the handful of student unions built before World War I influenced discussions about college union buildings, the unions built during the 1920s solidified the common characteristics of the first generation of buildings. Whether funding came as wholesale gifts, alumni subscriptions, or WPA programs, by the 1930s it was commonplace to describe the buildings as the campus “living room.” As rhetoric, the term conjured ideas about the comforts of home and domestic order, but the notion of “living” or “art of living” structured social education of student unions buildings.

Early surveys of campus architecture by Jens Fredrick Larson and Archie MacInnes Palmer, *Architectural Planning of the American College* (1933), and Charles Klauder and Herbert Wise, *College Architecture in America* (1929) devote several pages to student union buildings.¹¹ However, Irving Pond, who designed the unions at Purdue, Michigan State and the University of Michigan, penned the first professional article on planning a union in 1931.¹² As an architect, he was primarily concerned with program, how to reconcile conflicting interests concerning the allocation of rooms and spaces, and to how create spaces for “living.” In his analysis, he contended that any university serious about the success of its union should hire an architect versed in the sciences of psychology, sociology, economics, and the “art of living.”¹³ Thus, if living were an art on campus, it came from scrupulous planning and design of a standard set of union spaces. In his essay “The College Union,” Pond authoritatively discussed the use and potential of lobbies, offices, check and toilet rooms, lounges, cafeterias, dining rooms, committee rooms, assembly rooms, kitchens, libraries, game rooms, barber shops and beauty parlors, quiet rooms, storage rooms, and theater facilities. Through these environments, he painted a backdrop for the everyday and upscale celebrations that would reinforce social norms and life on campus. Upholstery and wood paneling covered the furniture and walls of the lounges and large gathering spaces. These rooms, often with double-height ceilings, hosted formal occasions. Cafeterias and game rooms were stripped of expensive materials but not their power to foster collegial socialization. Informal spaces only reinforced social expectations harbored in more opulent settings. In other words, for Pond it was the suite of spaces, not a single room, which freighted social education and “the art of living.”¹⁴

Pond’s manifesto labored over the social divisions between the staff and students, as well as the use of the union by non-members or outsiders at a time when college enrollment had grown significantly over three decades. Between 1929 and 1930 alone college enrollment rose by 84%. Although more than half of college students in the U.S. enrolled in public schools, students generally came from families with financial security and professional aspirations and more than half of the student were male.¹⁵ For these reasons, Pond separated the users of student unions carefully. Non-members, who were often women, would be suitably welcomed when they used a separate entrance to the dining room or theater. Under this arrangement, they would not intrude on “elite” members-only spaces. Similarly, support staff, such as cafeteria cashiers, line servers, and cooks, should have their own offices, storage, and amenities near the kitchen. This physical separation kept a clear division between white-collar staff who attended to the psychological and social well-being of students and blue-collar staff who cooked, cleaned, and performed maintenance. The making of these divisions – between men and visiting women, staff, and outsiders – reinforced social hierarchy found in upper-class homes and set parameters for the “living room” metaphor and meaning of the “art of living.”

At Purdue, the architectural firm Pond and Pond designed a union with few but well-planned amenities for male undergraduates.¹⁶ Completed in 1930, it had a large commercial kitchen and cafeteria, a barbershop, a billiards room, ballroom, guest rooms, and a memorial hall and men’s lounge on the first floor. The overall building layout created a three-sided exterior courtyard, but the main interior on the first floor was a layered

set of spaces that permitted the visual supervision of activities by staff. Thus, the grandeur of Purdue's double-height memorial hall adjacent to the men's lounge served a dual purpose: to elevate and to supervise men's everyday leisure activities.¹⁷ The spatial arrangement and architectural materials balanced the casual and refined, the practical and recreational in the same way that the "art of living" contained ideas of practical know-how and art or humanities.

2.2. Michael Hare

After World War II, the influence of ACU had reached a national scale. Association publications, such as the *Bulletin*, and regional and national conventions circulated ideas about college union buildings. But consultants worked to champion student union ideas as well. Among them were individuals such as Porter Butts, who directed the Wisconsin Union and served as the long-time editor of ACU publications, and Michael Hare, a New York-based architect who designed the Wisconsin Union's 1930s theater addition and sought subsequent consulting opportunities and design commissions for student union buildings.

Looking beyond the campus, Hare argued in his essay "Thoughts on Union Architecture" that union buildings should relate to the future homes and neighborhoods of college alumni. To this end, he furthered the Progressive Era use of "home" by linking unions to the physical space of cities and suburbs. More specifically, he imagined the architecture of the union as the consequential preface to the built environment of graduates. He knew that drill presses were not essential to enjoy the pleasure of woodwork in the same way he knew that the activities and grandeur of student union facilities might be absent from the neighborhoods and communities of alumni. Nonetheless, the principal role of the union was to show students how to live after college. Student unions, conceived of in this way, would have "the qualities ... necessary to practice the *art of living*" on campus, at home, and around the neighborhood to secure a congenial postwar society.¹⁸ The importance of Hare's conceptual framing is that it reached into the private realm from the public realm of the student union to establish a direct and reciprocal relationship between public and private life. Moreover, Hare reinforced how the "art of living" was at once a way of life, a material reality, as well as personal and civic matter. Hare's "art of living" was thus synthetic and democratic, public and private, and reduced the socio-economic distinctions made by Pond.

Hare designed few student unions but he consulted for many institutions, including the postwar unions at William Jewell College in Missouri, DePauw University in Indiana, Case College at Cleveland, the University of Maine, the University of Arizona, Washington State College in Pullman, the University of Oregon, and the Rhode Island State College.¹⁹ For this reason, it is not Hare's architectural projects but the ideas he put forward and the work of local architects following his consultation services that mattered. Among Hare's many clients, the University of Oregon stands out as an early postwar college union building.

The 1950 Erb Memorial Union at the University of Oregon exemplified the social ethos and physical manifestation of student unions of the period. Designed by the Portland architecture firm Lawrence, Tucker, and Wallman with the guidance of the architectural consultant Michael Hare, the building included long-standing recreational and cultural spaces found in most prewar unions, such as dining facilities, a ballroom, and student offices, but it was coed and used an updated material palette and spatial order. The brick exterior walls, interior brass handrails, and polished terrazzo floors harkened back to the unions of the 1920s, and reminded users of the private club union architects once found inspiration from.²⁰ In this case, however, the architects and interior designer combined these tried and true materials with exposed concrete columns, aluminum storefront windows, and contemporary textiles. Equally important, designers brought recreational activities once tucked in basements or behind doors to the most visible parts of the building, thereby modernizing the union both materially and spatially.²¹

The ground floor of the Oregon Union had the cafeteria, snack bar, and lounge. While aluminum storefront windows, plastic plaid seating, Formica table tops, and the latest kitchen equipment of the food services served and socialized students, carpeting and upholstered furniture in the lounge provided respite from the bustle of campus. The lowest level contained bowling lanes, game tables, and a barber shop while the upper floors hosted the grand ballroom and student offices.²² The spatial proximity of the offices to other union rooms allowed students to coordinate events, collaborate, and practice democratic decision-making regularly. The spaces for recreation, including cultural areas for browsing books and music as well as popular areas for bowling and billiards, offered students contrasting, ample, and common leisure activities suitable to the postwar period. Both special events and daily breaks between classes presented students opportunities to consume culture and social activities during their leisure time. Although students attended planned events in the ballroom, the cafeteria held the most prominent position on the main floor, which put food and its consumption in the center of the union building. In Oregon and other postwar college union buildings, activities concerning student self-government and leisure coalesced under one roof, and the architecture and program of postwar unions introduced students to a new material and consumer culture.

In general, postwar buildings tended to be larger and more complex, with spaces dedicated to technology-laden programs such as bowling, music listening rooms, and kitchens for quantity cooking. Equally important, architectural design and building programs equalized differences among students, gave students access to sanctioned activities, and made them social and economic participants in the life of the student union building. Generously-sized and efficient cafeterias anchored lounges, television rooms, workshops and craft rooms, and well-supplied bookstores. Arranged according to activity, the myriad of postwar unions targeted student demographics by meeting them in the cultural middle of America's broad middle class. As student enrollment rose by 49% in the 1950s and 120% in the 1960s, public colleges expanded to meet the demand and ultimately account for 74% of the total enrollment among all US colleges and universities. Although men still outnumbered women, campuses welcomed greater numbers of middle-income students.²³ For these reasons, the "art of living" served postwar union leaders because it allowed them to promote a well-rounded college student while loosely drawing upon middle class social norms, including the character of environments in which socialization occurred. Similar to suburban communities, shopping centers, and bowling alleys – all sites of normative social interaction and leisure – student union proponents provided spaces that fit within middle-class culture. In this way, by the postwar period the "living room" was not simply a container for the social education or living taking place, it was charged with socio-economic aspirations, particularly middle-class aspirations. Thus, between the 1920s and 1950s, the meaning of the "living room" shifted from being the arbiter of social organization and appropriate leisure activities to also be a concept that straddled public and private life of the postwar era. Less important was social hierarchy. More important were democratic activities and the pursuit of middle-class lifestyle and material culture.

3.0 BEING AT "HOME" IN THE CAMPUS "LIVING ROOM" CIRCA 2018

The University of Arizona's claim to "make yourself at home" in "UA's living room" represents the contemporary combination of architecture and metaphor at a point in university history when thousands of more students are enrolled in institutions of higher education and massive campus protests are largely a phenomena of the past.²⁴ In this particular case, the Student Union Memorial Center on the University of Arizona campus, rebuilt since the postwar period, is comprised of several buildings connected by exterior passageways that are either corridors or plazas and landscapes. The northwest building contains a ground and basement-level bookstore and upper-level offices for both student government and building operations. The northeast building contains a theater, game room, business center, and food services – including an underground industrial kitchen, ground floor food court and mini-mart, and upper level cafeteria – as well as meeting and ballrooms. The buildings on the south side contain ground floor restaurants, student and alumni services, as well as additional meeting rooms and restaurants.

The main exterior passageway is open to the sky and separates the east and west buildings (Fig.1). It is also where students find the entrance to the bookstore, a convenience store, and entrances to corridors that lead to the food court. The space has palm trees, a fountain, music, and lighting, and is crossed by upper-level passageways that create shade but also reveal the scale of the four-story building. The exterior circulation that cuts through the building creates several interior and exterior facades, and therefore allows for visual and spatial complexity. Most important, the ambiance and scale of the exterior spaces compare to outdoor shopping centers found throughout North America.

Student union buildings on large public campuses treat the spaces within the union as interchangeable similar to the way shopping centers treat retail spaces. The strategy allows the union staff or student organizations to replace one franchise for another or readily change the location of activities. In the case of Arizona, some of these spaces are outside, but elsewhere they would line interior corridors. The commercial character of the contemporary student union recasts the meaning of the "living room" in important ways. The concept and primary spaces no longer contain social hierarchy once pertinent to Pond, nor the connections to democracy and private life celebrated by Hare. The concept retains a vision of public life and being at home, but the public life presented by the architecture and programs of the University of Arizona centers around consumption.



Figure 1: Main exterior passageway of University of Arizona's Student Union Memorial Center looking south (Source: photograph by author).

University of Arizona's message may be unintentional but the continued use of the metaphor "living room" reflects the University's acceptance of the ACU's leadership, and the continued tenacity of the Association to disseminate information and bind student unions together in common purpose. ACU's publication *Fifty-one Facts about College Unions*, is a recent example.²⁵ Inexpensively printed at four by four inches, the booklet garners fifty-one ideas about student unions believed to be core tenants or benefits of unions. Fact number one builds on the tradition of the "living room." It states "traditionally considered the *"living room"*... today's union is the gathering place of the college." Specifically, "the union provides services and conveniences that members of the campus community need in their daily lives."²⁶ If consumerism is the spatial and programmatic backbone of the contemporary student union, then the living room is now a place of familial *exchange* or the *transaction* of conversation, goods, and services.

CONCLUSION

The dissemination and widespread acceptance of the idea of the union as "home" was crucial to union builders and practitioners. Professionals in the union business, old and new, would have read about the importance of the campus "living room" in the Association's quarterly *Bulletin* and hear the idea uttered by consultants and organization members national conventions. In no place – *Bulletins* or convention proceedings – did professionals debate the merit of "home" or "living room" as a guide for planning, building, and running student unions. No one has in the union business has openly challenged the viability of the "living room" as a metaphor. Instead, campus visionaries updated the idea of the "living room" as they updated student union architecture. The introduction of "home" and "living room" into the discourse of student union buildings is therefore worth exploring.

When university president Frank, and past ACU president Walters, made the fine-grained distinction between house and home, they called out the difference between a practical structure that shelters a family and the emotional feelings that bind a family together. If the university is conceived as a house, it is measured by the suitability of its physical plant for scholarly endeavors. If, however, the university is conceived as a home, it is measured by the quality of human relationships and emotional bonds that members of the academic community have with each other and to the campus. The original use of "home" and "living room" plainly, and astutely, gave credence to the social life and experience of college as a place to *belong*. Joining middle-class Americans, union proponents of the postwar era took the idea of a "living room," understood as a respectable multipurpose space, and linked it more deeply to both the public and private realms of society, including democracy. Activities in the union prepared students for activities done in their future homes and neighborhoods. In this way, the "living room" was both civic and personal. By the twenty-first century, the "living room" changed again. With student unions as commercial enterprises akin to shopping centers, the

metaphor of “home” and “living room” anchor college unions in the past but their message is different. To belong and live is to now gather and consume. Looking to the future, proponents and architects of unions must ask if the continued use of these metaphors serves the college community, society, and humanity, or ask if it is time to again change the architectural form and function of student unions.

REFERENCES

- Fifty-one Facts about College Unions*. Indiana: Association of College Unions International.
- Hare, M. 1945. “Thoughts on Union Architecture” *Bulletin of the Association of College Unions* (February), 1, 8.
- Klauder, C. and Wise, H. 1929. *College Architecture in America*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons.
- Larson, J.F. and Palmer, A.M. 1933. *Architectural Planning of the American College*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Pond, I. 1931. “The College Union” *Architectural Forum* (June), 771-778.
- Ward, E. 1913. *The Social Center*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

ENDNOTES

-
- ¹ See “Like Home” in Edward J. Ward, *The Social Center* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1913), pp96-122.
- ² See “The Social Center and the University” in Edward J. Ward, *The Social Center* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1913), pp315-323.
- ³ Statement of president Glen Frank, n.d. (General Files of Porter Butts, University Archives, University of Wisconsin [series 26 11 1 box 1]).
- ⁴ Association of College Unions Convention Proceedings, 1925, p11 (National Student Affairs Archives, Bowling Green State University).
- ⁵ The earliest unions treated women as guests and it wasn’t until the 1930s when universities and colleges built coed unions with greater regularity than unions for only men. By the 1950s, with the exception of women’s colleges and a few unwavering traditional schools, unions were for the entire student body.
- ⁶ A cursory survey of texts titled *The Art of Living* illustrates the persistence of the idea. Although varied in scope and purpose, see Ellen Moore Rich, *The Art of Living* (1894); Robert Grant, *The Art of Living* (Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1985, 1899); Frank Henry Lyon, *The Art of Living* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Company, 1897); Ellen Goodell Smith, *The Art of Living* (1903); J.W. Williams, *The Art of Living* (1908); Karl Potschner, *The Art of Living* (Dover, OH: Karl Potschner, 1935); André Maurois, *The Art of Living* (New York: Harper, 1940); Margorie Barstow Greeble, *The Art of Living in Wartime* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc, 1943); and finally a collection of drawings by artist Paul Steinberg published as *The Art of Living* (New York: Harper, 1949). Shorter essays conveyed similar ideas on the art of living. See, for example, Gustav Mueller, “The Art of Living” in *Ethics*, Vol. 48 No. 3 (April 1938), 401-415.
- ⁷ See Smith and Williams above but also Frederick Hoffman, “The Art of Living a Hundred Years: morality, temperance, and industry” in *The Sanitarian* Vol. 47 No. 382 (Sept 1, 1901), 237.
- ⁸ Karl Potschner, *The Art of Living* (Dover, OH: Karl Potschner, 1935).
- ⁹ See Harold Willis Dodds Baccalaureate address delivered at Princeton University June 16, 1935 “The Art of Living” in *Vital Speeches of the Day* Vol 1 No 20 (July 1, 1953), 618-620 and Paul Mackendrick, “Education for the Art of Living” in *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol 23 No 8 (Nov 1952), 423-428, 456.
- ¹⁰ See citations above as well as John Harmon, “The Art of Living” in *Physical Educator*, Vol 10 No 4 (Dec 1953), 99-100. Unlike the “art of living” later invoked by French philosophers, the idea in the United States was apolitical (See discussion by Mary McLeod in her 2003 book *Charlotte Perriand: an Art of Living* (New York: Harry N. Abrams)).
- ¹¹ Nikolaus Pevsner, *A History of Building Types* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976); Jens Fredrick Larson and Archi MacInnes Palmer, *Architectural Planning of the American College* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1933); and Charles Klauder and Herbert Wise, *College Architecture in America* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1929).
- ¹² Irving Pond, “The College Union” in *Architectural Forum*, June 1931, 771-778.
- ¹³ Pond, 771.
- ¹⁴ Understandably, the ideal Student Union was rarely achieved because of practical constraints, but schools likened variability to a well-tailored suit designed for a specific student body.
- ¹⁵ National Center for Educational Statistics, “Higher Education,” *120 Year of American Education* (1993), 65.
- ¹⁶ The Purdue Union is one of the few buildings of its era designed for men. By the 1930s most unions were created coed or become coed as the number of women students increased. After World War II, nearly all

new unions were coed, unless they were part of a single sex campus. See Edith Outzs Humphrey's, *College Union: a handbook on college community centers* (Ithaca, NY: Association of College Unions, 1951).

¹⁷ "Purdue University Memorial Union Building" in *Architectural Forum*, June 1931, 713-16.

¹⁸ Michael Hare, "Thoughts on Union Architecture." *Bulletin of the Association of College Unions* (February 1945), 1, 8.

¹⁹ "Building Boom on the Way." *The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions* (July 1945), 5.

²⁰ Adell McMillan, in *A Common Ground: Erb Memorial Union 1950-2000* (University of Oregon, Eugene, OR: Xlibris Corporation, 2003) recounts the early history of the Oregon Union. Also see *Ellis Lawrence Building Survey*. v.2 (Eugene), compiled by the Historic Preservation Program, School of Architecture and Allied Arts, University of Oregon (Salem, OR: State Historic Preservation Office, 1989); and the *Erb Memorial Union Preliminary Historic Assessment*, compiled by the Office of Campus Planning and Real Estate at the University of Oregon (Eugene, OR, 2011).

²¹ The University of Oregon hired Dan Cooper of Dan Cooper Interiors, Textiles, and Furniture of New York City as an interior design consultant. Adell McMillan pointed out that it was he who selected modern, low maintenance furnishings for the Union's most important spaces, and he who believed respectfully furnished spaces led to respect and care of a building (Adell McMillan, *A Common Ground: Erb Memorial Union 1950-2000* (University of Oregon, Eugene, OR: Xlibris Corporation, 2003), 51).

²² Bill Frye, "Let's Look Inside the Student Union" in *Old Oregon* No.2 Vol.32 (December 1950), 19-22.

²³ National Center for Educational Statistics, "Higher Education," *120 Year of American Education* (1993), 66.

²⁴ See specifically published statistics published by the National Center for Educational Statistics, "Higher Education," *120 Year of American Education* (1993). Protests still occur on college campuses.

²⁵ ACUI, *Fifty-one Facts about College Unions* (Indiana: Association of College Unions International, n.d.), p1. Although the publication is without a date, as recently as 2015 it was printed and for sale by the Association of College Unions International.

²⁶ Original document used bold type-face instead of italics and quotation marks are original to ACUI's *Fifty-one Facts about College Unions*.