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Black/African American alumni from Ohio State University in Columbus, OH are collective subjects in this research. The study has sought to discern and explicate the behaviors, experiences and attitudes of former Black students, now alumni, to effectively privilege their voices and viewpoints, which were previously not included in the scholarship and literature of African American Studies or Higher Education about the historic 1960s and 1970s. Determining how alumni experienced the Black Student Movement at Ohio State during the 1960s and 1970s has been the principal objective.

Black students’ experiences and motivations were very different than popular Black Student Movement discourse suggests. Findings indicate Black students’ organized social activist behavior persisted effectively and sufficiently to be considered an example of modern social movements, worthy of respect like other social movements which have helped improve human conditions not only for themselves, but also for others including non-Black students at traditionally white institutions.
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### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAAS</td>
<td>African American Alumni Society (Ohio State University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>African American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALSA</td>
<td>Black American Law Students Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEOG</td>
<td>Basic Educational Opportunity Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPM</td>
<td>Black Power Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSM</td>
<td>Black Student Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>Black Student Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COINTELPRO</td>
<td>Acronym for a series of FBI counterintelligence programs designed to neutralize political dissidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>Congress on Racial Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Civil Rights Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Central State University (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO</td>
<td>Greek-letter organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Historically Black Colleges and Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAACP</td>
<td>National Association for the Advancement of Colored People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDSL</td>
<td>National Direct Student Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMA</td>
<td>Office of Minority Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCLC</td>
<td>Southern Christian Leadership Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>Students for a Democratic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEOG</td>
<td>Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNCC</td>
<td>Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWI/PWI</td>
<td>Traditionally White Institution/Predominantly White Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUO</td>
<td>Weather Underground Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
public “Ivy”  A publicly funded university, which seeks the same consideration and status, academically and socially, as the eight northeastern United States universities called “Ivy League” institutions. The eight institutions are Brown University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Princeton University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Yale University.

social activism  The inclination and impetus to consciously engage intellectually, socially, ideologically, and collectively with other persons to achieve commonly held values and objectives seen collectively as being for the greater good of the collective organization, and/or organizing and working collectively for the greater good of society at large. Social activism is often narrowly measured as outwardly visible “tactics” such as rallies, public pickets, sit-ins, letter-writing campaigns, speech-making, and organizational meetings. However, social activist behaviors include countless subtle demonstrations of social behaviors such as less visible support of organizational objectives through administrative functions and financially through both resource donations and monetary donations, along with facilitating organizational goals through the personal networks and other organizational networks which an individual social activists can make available.

social movements  Despite the differences between them, social movements share some common characteristics that set them apart from other forms of collective behavior. Their definitive features include organization, consciousness, non-institutionalized strategies, and prolonged duration. In contrast to riots, fads, and crowd behavior, social movements commonly exhibit some degree of structure and organization; a consciousness that links social discontent and grievances with a rationale or logic; non-institutional action strategies; and a relatively long duration.¹

¹ M. Bahati Kuumba. Gender and Social Movements. (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2001), 4.
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CHAPTER 1

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and Statement of the Problem


The literature suggests that researchers from universities across the nation have looked at the phenomenon known as the “student movement” since its historic notoriety in the 1960s at their own institutions; however, the roles and reactions of Black students in the student movement on traditionally white university campuses has generally not been addressed. On the other hand, during the first decade of the 21st century several research projects have been published about Black student experiences, their organizations and contributions to the student movement at traditionally white institutions. The above publications have augmented our perspectives about Black students and their organizations, which defined the Black Student Movement separate from the [white] “student movement” particularly at traditionally white universities. Bradley’s 2009 publication about Columbia University, and Glasker’s
2002 publication about University of Pennsylvania, chronicle Black students activities and contributions during the 1960s-1970s at Ivy League institutions.

Although public universities in Midwestern states, such as Ohio and Illinois, were equally if not more active in the student movement as the Ivy League institutions, the roles and organizations of Black students at “public ivy” universities such as University of Illinois have only been chronicled in Williamson’s 2003 published study. In Ohio, the events of May 4, 1970 at Kent State University in Kent OH, where four white students were shot dead by the Ohio National Guard, arguably upstaged the simultaneously performed public protests and concerns of Black students at Kent State and Black students in simultaneous protest at The Ohio State University in Columbus, OH. As a result, the Kent State University tragedy has been the subject of innumerable studies, dissertations, reports, documentaries, and memorials. Conversely, nothing in the literature shows that the Black Student Movement at OSU ever got more than scant national publicity; however the institutional perspective of Black student organizational leaders and the Black Student Union were highly propagated in the local and statewide media. Ohio media portrayed key Black student leaders and participants in BSU organized public protest events as rogue students whose principal intention was alleged to be disrupting university operations. The Ohio Revised Code, ORC: Section 3345, which has been continually augmented ever since the 1970s, and countless media reports from that era are public chronicles of an “institutional” perspective of Ohio State’s Black Student Movement castigated as a criminal enterprise, worthy only of recrimination.

Thesis and Argument

Having experienced historically negative student-life experiences at OSU, African-American students perceived university policies and practices as barriers and impediments to college graduation, their principal route as African Americans to the “American dream.” Their sense of “community,” developed principally through campus memberships in Greek-letter organizations, was nurtured and became manifest through organizations such as the Black Student Union which consciously organized
African American students around issues such as racially charged police confrontations, grossly inadequate academic counseling, and racial discrimination in campus housing accommodations.

Black Students in Historical OSU Perspective

In fewer than two decades from its 1870 founding, Ohio State’s first African American\(^2\) student, Fred D. Patterson, enrolled at OSU from 1889-1892. Jessie Frances Stephens was the first female African American graduate from OSU in 1905. The first African American student activists confronting the color barrier at Ohio State were Fred Patterson in the late 1800s and William Bell in the 1930s.\(^3\) Ohio State’s roots originate in 1870, when the Ohio General Assembly established the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College in Columbus, OH, which is also the Capital of Ohio. Columbus’ stature among northern cities between 1860 and 1910 is quite noteworthy since Columbus was the locus of a significant African American population.

Outside of Philadelphia and New York [City], Columbus had the largest percentage of Blacks in the urban North. During this period, Blacks in Ohio, and in Columbus in particular, increased their access to educational, political, and social avenues. In Ohio, Blacks succeeded in acquiring equal access to public facilities and repealing the last vestiges of the Black Codes when *de jure* segregated schools were outlawed and the ban against interracial marriages was lifted in 1887.\(^4\)

The new college was made possible through the provisions of the Land-Grant Act also known as the Morrill Act, which was signed by President Lincoln on July 2, 1862. This legislation revolutionized the nation’s approach to higher education, bringing a college degree within reach of all high school

---

\(^2\) African American, African-descended, and Black are used interchangeably throughout the study. Neither includes students born in Africa, if they identify as “international” students, and unless they self-identify as African American, which is the case with at least one study participant.

\(^3\) [http://library.osu.edu/sites/blackstudies/OSUFirsts.php](http://library.osu.edu/sites/blackstudies/OSUFirsts.php) (accessed March 12, 2010)

graduates. Morrill Act tenets signaled much greener educational pastures for Ohio’s African Americans who had already overcome de jure segregation. Initial classes began at the new college on September 17, 1873, with twenty-four (24) students. In 1878 the institution’s name was changed to The Ohio State University; also during 1878, the first class of six men was graduated. In 1879, the university graduated its first woman.

O.S.U. has progressively developed from its narrower 19th century agricultural roots to its auspicious 21st century reputation as a major research institution, a “public Ivy,” with expansive undergraduate degree programs, a graduate school, and several prestigious professional schools: Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Law, Dentistry, Nursing, and Social Work. The Ohio State University is widely regarded as the “jewel in the crown” of the Ohio University System. Ohio State is among the top 10 research universities in America according to the National Science Foundation; and OSU is rated as one of the nation’s top 20 public universities, according to U. S. News & World Report. Ohio State has a competitive admissions policy; three factors are considered: (1) college preparatory curriculum in high school, (2) High school class rank or grade point average, and (3) ACT or SAT scores with writing. The freshman class admitted fall 2009 boasts more than 100 National Merit Scholars in the class, with 87 percent admitted from the top quarter of their graduating class, and another 54 percent of 2009 freshmen ranking in the top 10 percent of their high school graduating class. The Ohio State University’s main campus in Columbus, the Capital of Ohio, is now augmented by five satellite campuses in other parts of the state.

Arguably, O.S.U.’s inclusion of African American students into its “university family” has not appreciated as much or as rapidly as its academic acclaim and its total student body. A little known context for the experiences of African-descended at OSU is that one of the university’s most auspiciously known Presidents, William Oxley Thompson, set the stage at the turn of the 20th century for a problematic culture of racialized treatment of African American students. President Thompson’s auspicious and simultaneous roles as university president and president of the Columbus Board of Education (BOE)
afforded him the capacity to dictate prejudicial policies and procedures for both the university and the public school system of Columbus, Ohio. Randolph’s study of the racial issues in Columbus at the turn of the twentieth century revealed the leadership Dr. Thompson assumed in segregating Black teachers and students from White teachers and students. As the president of the Columbus Board of Education, Dr. Thompson countermanded Ohio legislation forbidding the physical segregation of Blacks and Whites in two distinct ways: neighborhood gerrymandering which created “legal” political boundaries between Blacks and Whites, and by ordering the erection of the Champion Street School, built specifically to house Black teachers and Black students. William Oxley Thompson’s directives to erect Champion Street School, even after civil litigation won by the Black community in Columbus, suggests a bold and public determination to systemize racial discrimination in the Columbus educational arena where he had become the preeminent administrator as president of both the Columbus Board of Education and The Ohio State University.5

An African American OSU alumna who graduated in 1949, Barbara Thornton Harris’ lucid recollections have been documented recently by the OSU Alumni Association; her freshman enrollment at OSU was nearly de-railed because the university had a longtime practice of denying on-campus housing to African American students at that time.6 Barbara T. Harris’ student life experiences were a reflection of the Bevis administration, 1945-56, at OSU. Barbara Harris’ eventual residence hall assignment at Baker Hall was one of several changes in student life brought on by an increase in enrollment after World War II and her persistence. Issues concerning African American students at that time “ranged all the way from a resurgence of fraternity life… and from student involvement in the speaker’s rule controversies to a growing awareness of an effort to begin to do something about racial discrimination on the campus. Th[is] period turned out to be a decade of evolution in respect to Negroes

5 Randolph, *Sisters of the Academy*, 19-22. Dr. Randolph’s archival research (BOE Minutes, Record 17) revealed that the Columbus BOE led by Dr. William Oxley Thompson had installed a “segregated” school in a supposedly “integrated” system through gerrymandered districts in contradiction to Ohio State laws.

6 [http://www.ohiostatealumni.org/media/pages/PilgrimageOfProgress.aspx](http://www.ohiostatealumni.org/media/pages/PilgrimageOfProgress.aspx)
on the campus…for example, Negro fraternities were admitted to the Council of Fraternity Presidents.”

By 1945-46 three African American fraternities, but no African American sororities, had been “officially recognized” by OSU; on the other hand, a 1930s photographic documentation of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity with Jesse Owens on the front row appears in Sauer and Koblentz’ text, The Ohio State University Neighborhoods. Theta [undergraduate] Chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority at Ohio State, chartered nearly 90 years ago in 1922, was apparently not recognized by OSU’s Panhellenic Council for Women for many years. Thomas Mendenhall, an official historian of The Ohio State University published by the Ohio State University Press, further documents that “individual Negro students began to appear in dormitories, and there was a growing awareness of discrimination on campus…[and] that although the University had officially ceased to keep statistics on the number of Negro students, it was said that they constituted 10 percent of the enrollment.” The university’s “speaker’s rule,” no doubt imbrued by McCarthyism, was a policy which prevented Paul Robeson from addressing the student body at OSU in 1948. “As a solution Robeson spoke at a rally at Hunter and Eleventh Avenues, addressing a crowd estimated at 2000 from a truck equipped with a loud speaker; [h]is topic was ‘Civil Rights and Peace.’”

Merely three years after Congressional enactments of the Federal Voting Rights Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965, which opened avenues of previously ignored financial hardships for Black students to attend OSU and other institutions, Black students’ seething issues erupted at OSU’s

7 Thomas Mendenhall, History of The Ohio State University (Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press, 1972), 108.


9 Mendenhall, History of The Ohio State University, 111.

10 Ibid, 131-132. The original “speaker’s rule” of 1946 was bolstered by more stringent OSU Trustee action in 1951.

administration building and onto the front pages of campus and Columbus newspapers. By Spring Quarter 1968, Black student grievances with OSU included the lack of academic funding available for Blacks, insufficient student housing and discrimination in campus/off-campus housing, and the absence of coursework relevant to the Black experience in America. However, the precipitating factor that particular Spring Quarter had been the repeated reports of excessive force applied by OSU Campus police on Black female students. Initial reports of these excessive force incidents were lodged with university officials in February 1968; Black co-eds singing “Black Power” and “freedom” songs were being arbitrarily ejected from campus shuttle buses by white bus drivers. These co-eds reported being subjected to body frisks by campus police who were summoned, if the girls refused to leave the buses upon command by the bus drivers. The incidents persisted without official university responses beginning Winter quarter into Spring quarter 1968. On April 28, 1968 Black students made their grievances known en masse and publicly at the Ohio State University Administration Building. They entered the building and refused to leave the building until an official response to their issues was addressed by OSU administrators. Black Student Union leaders and members met on that date with Vice-President John Corbally and other administrators, until a mutual agreement had been achieved.

“JOYFUL EXIT of Black Student Union spokesman John S. Evans, weeping with happiness along with another Black student leader Dave Phears as they left...following the siege” was the caption of a small article in The Ohio State Lantern on April 29, 1968. In another front page article that same date, The Ohio State Lantern also reported that University Vice-President John E. Corbally “read the statement ending the five-hour siege of the Administration Building to newsmen while hundreds of demonstrators looked on;” it also discussed the fruits of the initial negotiations between the Black Student Union and the Ohio State University which withered almost immediately afterwards. OSU President Novice G. Fawcett and several other Board of Trustee Members fueled discord between the Black Student Union and the university by disputing the legality of the April 28th pact between the Black Student Union and OSU Vice President Corbally. Sprawled across the front page of the April 29th issue of The Ohio State Lantern is the
following inch-high boldface headliner, “Accord With Negroes Is Challenged: Trustee Doubts Pact’s Legality.”

Two years later during Spring Quarter 1970, OSU’s Black students again participated in a “take-over” of the Administration Building. Issues and perspectives were exacerbated by the escalating Vietnam War. Coalitions among Black OSU students with non-Black OSU student organizations such as the Ad Hoc Committee for Student Rights, Student Mobilization, and the Third World Solidarity Committee, which shared viewpoints about the Vietnam War, the Speaker’s Rule, and other issues, were formed. Both local and national news media reported that approximately 600 students were arrested on April 29, 1970 after two days of demonstrations on the Ohio State University campus. By that time, Black students at OSU had become fully engaged in the phenomenon we call the Black Student Movement. Classes were cancelled, and school for the quarter was dismissed. Multiple levels of police action and repressive force were exacted against students. Black students not only suffered arrests and detentions, but also suffered more long-range retributions such as suspensions, expulsions, and criminal prosecutions in local Columbus courts for their social activism. These alumni, now senior citizens, have perspectives and versions of student-life experiences that only Blacks in the sixties and seventies experienced at OSU; their experiences and voices have never been documented until now.

Purpose of the Study

This study has principally sought to identify the perceptions of the Black student body which chose to be educated at The Ohio State University, to interrogate how these students experienced the Black Student Movement, and to identify the objectives of OSU’s Black student organizations such as the Black Student Union (BSU), Black American Law Students Association (BALSA), and Black Graduate and Professional Student Caucus (BGPSC) acting in coalitions and alliances. Capturing Black alumni

---

perceptions of the Black Student Movement during the 1960s-1970s represents a phenomenological student perspective which is privileged over any institutional perspective. Achieving this purpose has enabled the study to anchor Black students’ perceptions of the movement in documented facts, and to establish a nexus between Black students’ activism and eventually reformed policies, practices, and programs at OSU.

Privileging the students’ perspective has been influenced by John W. Creswell, a widely published and quoted research theorist, who informs that the purpose of a phenomenological study is understanding and “… describ[ing] the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or phenomenon…” The phenomenological approach in qualitative research is an appropriate way through which publicly-staged OSU campus protests events, the phenomenon or object of this enterprise, can be recalled by 1960s-1970s former OSU African American student subjects of this enterprise. Creswell further describes the intentionality of consciousness, which informs the questions in this study and the choice for this qualitative approach, as follows: “This idea is that consciousness is always directed toward an object. Reality of an object, then, is inextricably related to one’s consciousness of it.”

“[C]onsciousness is a unified intentional act…that does not mean it is deliberately willed, but that it is always directed to an ‘object’… in other words, to be conscious is to be conscious of something.”

Among other reasons for choosing a qualitative study approach to the Black Student Movement at The Ohio State University were the following two: achieving a deeper understanding of this phenomenon, and developing more detailed “stories” through which we can better describe the phenomenon, as

---


14 Ibid. 59.

described by methodology scholars and authors, William Trochim and James Donnelly.  

Qualitative research enables us to get at the rich complexity of the phenomenon, to deepen our understanding of how things work. Although quantitative research can describe a phenomenon generally, across a group of respondents, it is very difficult to learn from qualitative study how the phenomenon is understood and experienced by the respondents, how it interacts with other issues and factors that affect their lives…in social research, there are many complex and sensitive issues that almost defy quantitative summarizations.

Regarding the value of individual testimonials in phenomenology, Trochim and Donnelly quoted a social science research maxim, “one good personal story trumps pages of quantitative results.” They also assert that “[i]n legislative hearings and organizational boardrooms, the well-researched anecdote is often what compels decision-makers.”

For the sake of clarity, the Black Student Movement is the complex, but singular, phenomenon study respondents have been asked to experientially recall. This study has contended that OSU Black students’ organizational activities, i.e. the Black Student Union, exhibited all characteristics defined as a social movement on the part of the collective. The study has also recognized individual social activism of OSU staff and faculty, and coalitional relationships with organizations aside from the Black Student Union which helped constitute a social movement in the “indigenous” manner described by Aldon Morris, a frequently cited social movement theorist. All social movement theorists generally agree that social movements have the following characteristics: collective behavior which is conscious and intentional on the part of the collective, activities and events politically designed to influence social change, and enduring over an period of time as opposed to a singular event or occurrence. Morris contends that the modern civil rights movement broke from the protest tradition of the early 1900s in a crucial way; it was the first time that large masses of Blacks directly confronted and effectively disrupted...

---


17 Primary source data show that African-American OSU non-teaching staff, Tauhidah Ahmad-Rasul and Yolanda Robinson, and Dr. Charles O. Ross, professor of Social Work, were instrumental conduits for the BSU to the African-American community and its “indigenous” resources.
the normal functioning of groups and institutions thought to be responsible for their oppression. “The hallmark of the modern civil rights movement is that these mass confrontations were widespread and sustained over a long period of time in the face of heavy repression.”  

Aldon Morris’ *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organize for Change*,

employing his “indigenous perspective,” has been the primary framework to assess the activities of Black students at Ohio State as a social movement, and to assure that study participants were responding to the same identical phenomenon. However, M. Bahati Kuumba, a professor at the Atlanta University Center, has constructed a definition of social movement below, which is more succinct and generally encompasses all features of the phenomenon which study respondents were asked to describe from their experiences as former Ohio State University students.

Despite the differences between them, social movements share some common characteristics that set them apart from other forms of collective behavior. Their definitive features include organization, consciousness, non-institutionalized strategies, and prolonged duration. In contrast to riots, fads, and crowd behavior, social movements commonly exhibit some degree of structure and organization; a consciousness that links social discontent and grievances with a rationale or logic; non-institutional action strategies; and a relatively long duration.

This enterprise, therefore, has worked toward a student perspective based on the African-American experience and worldview, not an institutional or university, perspective of the Black Student Movement, i.e. the collective activities, the organizational behavior and the protest events in which Black students at

---


19 Aldon D. Morris, *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities for Change*. (New York City, NY: The Free Press, 1984). *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change* is considered a seminal work in social movement theories. Although Morris defines his task as exploring and analyzing the origins and development of the “modern civil rights movement,” which emerged in the South during the 1950s, his construction is nevertheless instructive for the instant study. Morris constructs an “indigenous perspective” (model) of social movements, arguing that social movements can be studied from a variety of perspectives. The Black Student Movement using Morris’ criteria can take the stance of an independent social movement.

20 M. Bahati Kuumba, *Gender and Social Movements*. (Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press, 2001), 4.
OSU who either passively observed or actively participated during the last half of the 1960s and the first half of the 1970s.\textsuperscript{21}

**Significance of the Study**

One way of viewing both the origins of and the impetus for the Black Student Movement in America is as a life and death struggle between the inertia of almost four-hundred years of systematic Black oppression and the idealism of Black youth…this perspective provides an intuitive feel for the framework out of which the Black Student Movement emerged and within which it was nurtured and continues to grow.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{21}Columbus Edition Call and Post, May 4, 1968 Volume 55, number 17; pp.1 and 2a.Three front-page headlines in boldface appear; the main headliner, a boldfaced one-inch high read, as follows: “Turmoil on College Campuses Negroes Win at Ohio State…” The others read as follows: “OSU Students Seized Bldg. Eight Hours,” and “Demands At OSU; What was Granted.” By line author, Carole Morton, is quoted verbatim:

> It has happened in institutions of higher learning throughout the country, and last week, at Ohio State University students and officials, the movement and revolt of black students against an ‘oppressive society’ finally hit home. At exactly 9 a.m. Friday April 26, some 60 Black Student Union (BSU) members entered the office of Gordon B. Carson, vice president of business and finance, armed with a list of demands and an ultimatum that they all be met by 12 p.m. May 3 or “the black people shall cease arbitration.

> When Carson was unable to produce any concrete answers to solve their problems, the students decided to stay until he could.

> The seizure came as a direct result of apathy and under-action on the part of the Ohio State administrators to resolve grievances presented them in early February.

> The grievances asked for Negro university administrators and counselors, fair housing in apartments around campus, courses in Negro History, placement of foreign exchange African students in Negro family homes.

> Almost three complete months have passed without any definite commitment from the university.


This research is important because it illustrates the substantially different relationships between Black student organizations and officials of Ohio State University before, during, and after two student occupations of the OSU Administration Building [Bricker Hall] in 1968 and 1970. Giving “voice” to marginalized African-American students who attended OSU during that time, and reviewing the unrefuted facts about movement events has the potential to shift the scholarship, the literature, and the discourses of African-American alumni, contemporary OSU personnel, contemporary OSU students, African-American Studies and Higher Education as disciplines in the academy. Official OSU publications and photographs chronicle a much different and a much prolonged history of cooperative interaction between leaders/members of OSU’s Black Student Union (BSU) and members of the university’s administration for many months prior to the 1968 occupation of Bricker Hall. This research has produced documents which attest to the institutional methods used by the BSU long before their non-institutional methods were employed. The research has also produced data which attest to the university’s conscious shift in approach to the BSU from a relationship of cooperation to one of contentiousness.  

23 The Ohio State University Monthly: The Alumni Magazine for April 1968: Relative to the issues about which the BSU complained formally in February and again in April, 1968, both newspapers and the university’s April, 1968 alumni magazine, The Ohio State University Monthly,23 provide textual data essential to validating the study’s assumptions. The alumni magazine features a two-page article entitled “Trustees Approve Housing Stand;” it also contains group photos of university officials meeting with members of the Black Student Union on campus:

A meeting between the Black Student Union and University officials last month brought a renewed pledge that Ohio State will work toward elimination of discriminatory practices in the University community.

“I know there is a problem, but I also know there is no instant answer,” Provost John E. Corbally told the gathering in Stillman Hall auditorium. “I think the future of the country depends on people slowly and unemotionally working on problems. We will be too slow for you, but too fast for others.”

Meeting with the students were: Executive Dean for Student Relations…Executive Assistant to President…Dean of Medicine…Assistant Dean of Dentistry…and Assistant Deans of Faculties. John Evans was spokesman for the Black Student Union and acted as moderator for the discussion.

(The magazine also reports the resolution which finally establishes the university’s official position against discrimination in student housing on and around the OSU campus community. The resolution text reads, as follows:

“WHEREAS: The Ohio State University has through its administrative officers repeatedly expressed its support of both the legal and moral requirements for non-discrimination because of race, color, and creed in all aspects of University and community life; and
These aspects of the study research help contextualize the attitudes and experiences expressed by study participants; these aspects lend credence to “how” the study participants experienced the Black Student Movement at Ohio State University.

Documentary reports and evidence show that Black Student Union members did occupy the OSU Administration Building in 1968 and in 1970. However, that same documentary evidence also shows that both occupations included White and other “minority” students, not only African-American members.

**WHEREAS:** the University has taken a series of actions to insure that internal employment practices reflect this commitment; and

**WHEREAS:** the University has initiated action to introduce into its curricula subject matter which will reflect the contributions to American society and the heritage of minority groups; and

**WHEREAS:** the Student Assembly of The Ohio State University in cooperation with student groups, faculty members, and administrative officers has initiated a program to use their best efforts to insure that off-campus housing available to students is available in accordance with Ohio law relating to civil rights and equal opportunity; and

**WHEREAS:** The Ohio State University has within its faculty and staff knowledgeable scholars with competency to seek solutions to a wide range of socio-economic problems; and

**WHEREAS:** a university, because of its inherent capability and of well-defined service mission, should exercise a leadership role in designing and implementing such solutions; and

**WHEREAS:** University Officers have already begun action programs within the University and within the community to deal with various socio-economic problems; now, therefore,

**BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University endorses the programs already initiated by the University to deal with such problems, and “That the Board directs the appropriate official of the University under the direction of the President of the University to take such steps and to initiate such programs as will attempt to insure that University and University-related activities are conducted in conformance with Ohio law relating to civil rights and equal opportunity and as will insure that the University play its proper role in exercising leadership in dealing with important current socio-economic problems.”

---

24 PETITION: IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, FRANKLIN COUNTY OHIO 240650

In the Common Pleas Court of Franklin County, Ohio, Case # 240650 was filed by eleven (11) non-university personnel including parents of students and students on behalf of The Ohio State University on May 28, 1970. Nine (9) individual defendants, along with three organizations, are listed. Among the nine individuals, the following four (4) Black students were included as defendants: Paul Cook, Michael White, William T. Kilgore, and Roger Barriteau. Edmund William Boston, another Black man not believed to be an OSU student according to the petition, was also named as were David Kettler, Loraine Iris Cohen and Phillip H. Greenberg, all OSU professors at the time.
of Black student organizations; photographs published in several newspapers attest to these facts. More importantly, during 1968 Ohio State University initiated criminal prosecutions for thirty-four BSU members, although White student occupants of Bricker Hall were neither named nor charged among the infamous “OSU 34.” Thirty-four African-American students were arrested and eventually convicted in some instances; some never recuperated from the shock of facing felony charges, expulsions, and social recriminations from both the White and the Black communities. As such, the Black Student Union was vilified; and Black student activism was criminalized at The Ohio State University. Although Ohio State students did not suffer experience of physical deaths which tragically occurred at Kent State University on May 4, 1970 from Ohio National Guards gunfire, many Black student activists as representatives of Black student organizations suffered the deaths of their dreams for better lives than their antecedents because of college educations denied given their social activism.

Unrequited issues between 60s and 70s Black alumni, both activists and observers, and Ohio State University impede an on-going, amicable relationship between Black alumni and their alma mater. The history of the “OSU 34” occupies the role of the “800 pound elephant” unacknowledged in the middle of the room. This is a subject about which President Gordon Gee gingerly, but openly discussed at the 2010 All Decades African American Alumni Reunion. Findings from this study, anecdotal participant data, such as that described by Trochim and Donnelly, have the potential to ignite a different kind of discourse guided by a different purpose than the discourse between officials and Black students during the 1960s Black student movement. Decriminalizing Black student activism has the potential of improving a four-decade old non-productive discourse between Black activist alumni and the university. In April

25 University Forum: Ohio State’s Only Independent Newspaper published “Administration Building, April, 1968” on October 3, 1969. The article recaps the events, and made this editorial assessment about OSU:

While some campuses tried to work out their problems, OSU became at best repressive and reactionary. On May 31, thirty-four students were charged with kidnapping, conspiracy, blackmail, and making menacing threats, totaling up to 305 years of prison terms. On July 11 eight Blacks were dismissed from the university, although none of them had been found guilty of any of the charges brought forth in their campus hearings. The trials in Federal courts of the thirty-four Blacks began in June of this year (1969).
2010, President Gee at OSU advertized his vision for the university progressing from “excellence to pre-eminence” as a public “Ivy.” It would be very significant, if this study could serve as a change agent in that future vision for The Ohio State University.

Significantly, the experiences and perceptions of African-American students on large, publicly-funded, traditionally white college campuses during the sixties and seventies have insufficiently been studied through the students’ own phenomenological lens. Except for Harry Edwards’ three-year qualitative study involving 368 Black students attending traditionally white universities, a student-focused study, researchers have generally taken the institutional perspective about the Black Student Movement; and Edwards’ research did not include Black students at Ohio State. In the specific instance of Black students at The Ohio State University during the 1960s and 1970s, they have neither been considered nor queried about their experiences as observers or participants during the Black Student Movement. Except for journalists’ reports of the protest events at the time and public documents, one would easily believe no such phenomenon ever occurred at The Ohio State University.

Black students’ invisibility in Ohio State’s history of student activism is a definite problem; these students’ invisibility and lack of voice constitutes a gap in the scholarship and literature about the Black Student Movement in the United States, and in the history of The Ohio State University. Ohio State University’s website, cited below, displays a mere four-sentence paragraph to chronicle the events and activism of Black Student Union leaders and other visible BSU members, many of whom the university pursued through criminal prosecution for participating in campus protest events. The fact is that Black Student Union members met repeatedly with OSU administrators in scheduled meetings about Black students’ needs and social injustices at OSU beginning Winter Quarter 1968. Nothing in the brief internet history of OSU’s Black Student Union provided below attests to the shift in the relationship between the BSU and OSU. Although the university shifted the relationship from one of cooperation to contention, nothing in this description suggests the magnitude of OSU institutional resources employed to affect the
arrests, suspensions, and expulsions of Black student activists who defended themselves in protracted federal, state, county, and municipal litigation long after the 1968 and 1970 protest events.²⁶

The Black Student Union (1968) was the first Black student organization to develop as a response to University policies regarding minority students, and began protests in an effort to bring the University into a position that was more accommodating to the largely heretofore ignored needs of minority students. By 1970, the BSU was no longer functioning, but was replaced by Afro-Am in January of 1970 which succeeded in paving the way for the University’s Black Studies Department and the Office of Minority Affairs. Also, 2 February 1970 saw the first issue of “Our Choking Times,” the first Black Student Campus Publication. Afro-Am was succeeded by the All-African Student and Faculty Union. Black Studies Department (Now the African American & African Studies Department), originally established as an academic division in October 1969, obtained formal department status in 1972. A Black Studies Library was dedicated on November 10th, 1971. ²⁷

The website acknowledges that OSU’s administrative attention to the needs and unique experiences of Black and other minority students was the principal “demand” made by the Black Student Union in 1968; interestingly, though, no mention was made of the BSU leadership in the Spring Quarter 1970 second student occupation of the Administration Building. The brief website BSU description above does, however, link the inception of Ohio State’s Office of Minority Affairs (OMA) in 1970 with the Black Student Union; the OMA is very clearly cited by the university as one of several by-products of Black students’ social activism at OSU. The following two OSU website excerpts describe the inception of the Office of Minority Affairs, a well-funded aspect of Student Affairs at Ohio State and source of pride for the University’s President, E. Gordon Gee. These excerpts suggest a prominent status the OMA has among Student Affairs programs at OSU, but they also progressively obfuscate the relationship between the Black Student Union and the auspicious strides both immediate and eventual, in which the university takes pride.

Founded in 1970, the Office Of Minority Affairs (OMA) is a long established vehicle of The Ohio State University with a specific mandate to recruit, retain; and ultimately gradu-

²⁶ http://library.osu.edu/sites/blackstudies/OSUFirsts.php (accessed 03/12/2010)
²⁷ Ibid.
ate students (with one or multiple degrees). OMA also provides leadership opportunities for minority students, and selected initiatives to include faculty, staff and community. These services include pre-collegiate, collegiate, post-baccalaureate, and other diversity initiatives.  

The Office of Minority Affairs (OMA) was created in 1970 to provide leadership for The Ohio State University in supporting the success of minority students, faculty, and staff. OMA directly serves and celebrates the contributions of African Americans, Appalachians, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, Native Americans, and Hispanic Americans. The office emphasizes the recruitment, retention, and timely graduation of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. OMA promotes a welcoming climate and serves in an advocacy role for minority individuals both at Ohio State and in the larger community.

Eventual university concessions made, considering Black student activism in 1968 and 1970, created not only opportunities for Black students, but for other “minority” students, for Black and other “minority” faculty and staff, and for White students, staff and faculty working at The Ohio State University, as well. A Black Studies curriculum and later a department of African American and African Studies merely represent the “tip of the iceberg” of university improvements for which we should thank the courageous members of the Black Student Union in the Black Student Movement.

The voices and perspectives of African American students at OSU marginalized in social science scholarship on 20th century African American social movements has created lacuna in the literature. This study has sought to correct this lacuna.

**Principal Research Questions**

The forty-two years since the 1968 campus events at OSU have caused some Black OSU alumni to thoughtfully and consciously re-assess their motivations, their behaviors, and the phenomenon they perceived at the time. Time, maturation, and retrospection foster different perspectives about significant life events. As such, the following questions were developed to tap and to re-visit the events and event-makers of the Black Student Movement at OSU during the 1960s – 1970s.

---


29 http://oma.osu.edu/ (accessed 06/22/2010)
How did African-descended OSU students/alumni as participants, or observers in the Black Student Movement, experience the events and activities of the late 1960s – early 1970s given the adverse media coverage associated with college campus student activism?

How did African American students/alumni feel they benefitted or suffered, given their student-life experiences at Ohio State during the 1960s and 1970s Black Student Movement?

CHAPTER 2

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Published Primary Literature

Published autobiographies, a published memoir, and a biographical sketch of renowned African American student activists involved in mid-twentieth century campus activism were reviewed. Five Black student activists who attended American universities during the 1950s and 1960s were selected for the literature review using the following criteria: each has a published autobiography or biography which documents their beginning activism related to their own student experiences before or during their college careers; each attended a traditionally White institution (TWI) or an institution overwhelmingly influenced by White governance over a predominantly Black student population. These selection criteria provided an opportunity to compare the social histories and personal activist stories of renowned Black student activists with the social histories and activist stories of marginalized student activists from Ohio State in the current study. Although each of these renowned five student activists played a uniquely compelling role in the Black Student Movement, Professor Harry Edwards’ personal history and student activism have particular prominence in this study because of Edwards’ seminal work, Black Students (1970).
Discussed extensively in the Published Secondary Literature below, *Black Students* is a comprehensive study which used qualitative research methods to study 368 Black students who, to varying degrees, actively participated in or more passively observed the Black Student Movement while they attended TWIs during the 1960s. Edwards’ work and findings established a student activist typography reflecting the first-hand experiences and varying worldviews of Black students during the 1960s, as follows: the radical activist, the revolutionary, the militant, the anomic activist, and the conforming Negro. Accordingly, each of the following five historic student activists featured in Published Primary Literature has been situated within Harry Edwards’ five-tiered typography of Black student activist: Stokeley Carmichael (1941-1998), Angela Davis (b. 1944), James Forman (1928-2005), Harry Edwards (b. 1942) and Charlayne Hunter-Gault (b. 1942). Stokeley Carmichael, also known as Kwame Ture, and Charlayne Hunter-Gault had social activist histories beginning in high school; whereas Harry Edwards and James Forman became social activists as college undergraduates. Angela Davis’ social activism began in elementary school. Only Carmichael attended an historically Black university (HBCU), Howard University in Washington, D.C. Davis attended a TWI in the Northeast. Edwards attended both a junior college and a four-year university in California. Forman and Hunter-Gault attended TWIs in the Midwest; but Hunter-Gault left Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan to attend the University of Georgia at Athens, Georgia (UGA) as a calculated tactic to desegregate that institution. All five of these student activists distinguished themselves and served the African American community as social activists in their adult lives and careers.

---

30 Howard University, Washington, D.C.: co-educational with federal support. It was founded in 1867 by Gen. Oliver O. Howard of the Freedmen's Bureau, to provide education for newly emancipated slaves. A normal and preparatory department was opened the same year. In 1868 the collegiate department and the departments of law, pharmacy, and medicine were opened, followed by the theological (1871), dentistry (1882), music (1883), and engineering and architecture (1910) departments. The university also has schools of fine arts, nursing, business and public administration, and social work. The Founders Library houses the Moorland-Spingarn and Channing Pollock collections on African-American literature and history, which date back to the 16th century. Although predominantly a black university, the school has been open since its founding to all qualified students.

http://www.answers.com/topic/howard-university
Charlayne Hunter-Gault’s autobiographical sketch appeared as a chapter in the Collier-Thomas and Franklin text, *Sisters in the Struggle: African American Women in the Civil Rights – Black Power Movement.* 31 Hers is the story of a high school graduate who was recruited by the Atlanta, Georgia community social activist networks to apply for admission at the University of Georgia in 1960. UGA at Athens, Georgia was an all-White institution with no intention of admitting a Black student. Hunter-Gault’s case would be a test case, which local activist organizations and NAACP were eager to litigate in federal court. Hunter-Gault’s recollection of her early activist behavior, “Heirs to a Legacy of Struggle” was guided by her middle-class social status in Black Atlanta and the leadership baton handed to her by Atlanta movement center activists:

And so it began, a new history for the University, the state, and for my classmate Hamilton Earl Holmes and me. I was nineteen and he was twenty and neither one of us had given much thought to making history. What we wanted, in a real sense, was to fulfill our dreams—dreams that we had nurtured for as long as we could remember…My dream was of becoming a journalist, my role model—the comic strip character Brenda Starr…her life was glamorous, challenging, mysterious, and fun. It never occurred to me that such fun was not intended for Black girls in the Deep South.

On January 9, 1961, I walked onto the campus at the University of Georgia to begin registering for classes. Ordinarily, there would not have been anything unusual about such a routine exercise, except, in this instance, the officials at the university had been fighting for a year and a half to keep me out. I was not socially, intellectually, or morally undesirable. I was Black. And no Black student had ever been admitted to the University of Georgia in its 176-year history…

This was the Deep South and laws dating back to 1896 when the ruling in *Plessy v. Ferguson* dictated “separate but equal.” And while separate was always the case, it was never equal, except inside our communities, in places that laws could not touch. Where black parents like the Hunters and the Holmes and the people in the communities where they lived … could not give us first-class citizenship, they labored instead to give us a first-class sense of ourselves. 32

Hunter-Gault’s story significantly informs this study; her inclination toward social activism reflects the social movement research which predicts intergenerational social activism among middle-

---


32 Ibid. 75 – 82.
class Black families especially where previous social activist networks had been established. Hunter-Gault was one of two “test case” applicants for UGA. She and Hamilton Holmes, another Black high school graduate from Atlanta, applied simultaneously to UGA. Her admission to UGA was finally approved after two years of litigation. During those two years, she had matriculated at Wayne State University in Detroit; but faithful to her social activist principles, doing what was for the “greater good, Hunter-Gault continued her bid for admission to UGA as the first African American woman to do so.

During the 1960s, Atlanta had a vigorous Black Student Movement primarily emanating from the Atlanta University Center; Atlanta student activists were engaged in eliminating barriers to the franchise for Blacks and eliminating discrimination in public accommodations. Hunter-Gault’s case is the very unique

33 Hunter-Gault’s social activist history is a “textbook example” of several research studies, as follows: Jennings 2002 study, “Generation Units and the Student Protest Movement in the United States: An-Intra- and Intergenerational Analysis;” Stewart et. al. 1998 study, “Women and the Social Movements of the 1960s: Activists, Engaged Observers, and Nonparticipants;” and the Corning and Myers 2002 study, “Individual Orientation Toward Engagement in Social Action.” Each of these studies is addressed in more detail in the Published Secondary Sources of this manuscript.

In Jennings’ protracted 32-year longitudinal study of the high school class of 1965 seniors, we can locate the case of Hunter-Gault who was certainly a product of an intergenerational social activist family unit and network in her Atlanta community. Jennings study suggested that intensive political participation during one’s formative years fosters lifelong engagement.

Stewart, Settles and Winter’s research among both three samples of college-educated black and white women also defines Hunter-Gault’s pursuit of her dream occupation as a journalist instead of a professional social activist like the others featured in the our published primary literature. The Stewart study asserts that participation in social movements has been found to have other implications for women later in life… “one important consequence of efforts to include attention to women’s political experiences has been discussion of the need to recognize the fact that the ‘public’ and the ‘private’ are neither fully separate nor distinguished by formal or informal occupational roles in later life. Hunter-Gault’s career as a television broadcast journalist in the national media is an example of an genre of activism which challenges the status quo merely by occupying roles previously unavailable to Blacks.

Corning and Myers’ primary research among several hundred undergraduates yielded an “activist orientation scale, ” on which Hunter-Gault’s case would score highly. Aside from the intergenerational influences discussed by Jennings, and despite the recognition of true “activists” like Hunter-Gault in the Stewart study, Hunter-Gault’s student activism meets or exceeds Corning and Myer’s definition of “activist orientation” as an individual’s developed, relatively stable, yet changeable propensity to engage in various collective, socio-political, problem-solving behaviors spanning a range from low-risk, passive, and institutionalized acts to high-risk, active, and unconventional behaviors. Additionally, Hunter-Gault’s activist behavior was in pursuit of collective, as opposed to individual interest/goals, addressing a problem and injustice perceived by the African American community, with the conscious intent of behaviors oriented toward producing a change in the status quo.
case of Black student activism directed specifically toward a Southern traditionally White institution, a
definitive change of course in the landscape of higher education in the South. As a credit to Hunter-
Gault’s student activism and the collective work of African-Americans in the Atlanta community, at the
entrance of University of Georgia, Charlayne Hunter-Gault’s and Hamilton Holmes’ images and names
are engraved on an auspiciously fixed brass sign designating an administrative office/classroom building
at the main campus entrance.

This study situates Hunter-Gault among the “radical activists” in Edwards’ five participant types
of “reluctant revolutionaries” which evolved during the Black student movement; she is a social product
of a Southern middle-class African American family who was able to qualify for admission to a TWI
through traditional admissions standards. By the time she became a “test case” for UGA entrance, Hunter-
Gault was a seasoned student entering her junior year in college. She was, like other “radical activists,”
more politically sophisticated at the domestic level, and more experienced with more organizational
ability than any of the other four “types.” As a “radical activist’ she was less interested in premeditated
violence or destruction, preferring institutional challenges to educational discrimination against Blacks,
but she was willing to personally employ means more radical than non-violent direct action, if necessary.

Dissimilar to Hunter-Gault, Harry Edward’s family background and autobiography, The Struggle
That Must Be: An Autobiography, describes his impoverished but close-knit family which nearly
imploded before Edwards could finish high school. His parents both suffered the overt effects of
systemic racism: under-education, insufficient employment opportunities, sub-standard housing, acquired
addictions to alcohol, uncontrolled parturition, and insensitive social service agencies in East St. Louis,
IL. Edwards’ college dreams were constructed as much by his own father’s fantasies of enjoying the
“greener pastures” which Harry’s career as a professional athlete would provide them; but Harry refused
to pursue athletics professionally. Being pushed into athletics did however create the opportunity for
Harry to attend college, although he had graduated high school essentially unable to read, struggling
academically through junior college, but excelling in athletics while being socially and culturally abused.
Edwards’ own activism developed later than the other activists in this review; he was already in college
by the time his activism, and reading skills, awakened from their dormancy. Edwards’ auto-biography was written well after his own student activist days at San Jose State University in the mid-sixties; it was published exactly ten (10) years after his phenomenological research of Black students in the Black Student Movement,

Edwards’ college life was fraught with issues typically experienced by Black students in the mid-sixties: discrimination in campus housing or living in sub-standard housing, insufficient financial aid, and abuse by college athletic coaches and directors.

I had no job and no place to stay. I slept in the lobby of a men’s dormitory until I was finally able to move in with sixteen other Black athletes who had somehow managed to get the key to a two-bedroom apartment near the campus. I later found out that the absentee landlord did not even know that the apartment was occupied, much less occupied by sixteen Blacks!

Edwards reported being abused as an athlete by White coaches; this ignited his social activism and his persistence toward graduation, which became Edwards’ principal reason to exist. Edwards’ father discouraged him from pursuing a degree in order to pursue a profession in athletics. Edwards did persist to completion of his undergraduate degree from San Jose State University, although an athletics scholarship at a California junior college had been his conduit from athletics to academics. Graduating from San Jose State with distinction in 1964, Edwards began his master’s work in sociology on a fully funded Woodrow Wilson Fellowship at Cornell University, an Ivy League university. His activism was heightened after experiencing a more insidious racism practiced against Black students at Ivy League institutions. Edwards returned to the West coast for an assistant professor position after earning his Master’s and PhD degrees from Cornell.

Aspects of Edwards’ own commitment as a student activist and his nurturing other students’ activism are quite remarkable. Edwards mentored many athletes helping ignite their interest in activism against social injustices. He organized a boycott of Black athletes and fans against the New York Athletic Club (NYAC) indoor track classic at Madison Square Garden:

With the aid of the Columbia University Black Law Student’s Association, H. Rap Brown and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and a man named Marshall Brown who had contacts with over a score of Black community based groups in Harlem and Newark, New Jersey,
we were able to surround Madison Square Garden with more than twenty thousand people the night of the meet.\textsuperscript{34}

Edwards’ visible mentoring and activism, such as organizing athletes to demonstrate at the 1968 Olympic Games in Mexico City, attracted COINTELPRO surveillance. Edwards abandoned the idea and travelled to Canada where he addressed the Black Writer’s Conference at McGill University in Montreal. “On the nineteenth of October, 1968, Tommie Smith and John Carlos staged a protest demonstration on the victory podium at the Mexico City Olympic Games that has emerged as a high-water mark in the liberation efforts of Black youth during the 1960s.”\textsuperscript{35} Edwards, like some participants in the current study, experienced governmental scrutiny because of his social activism. Edwards was eventually able to retrieve, through the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)\textsuperscript{36} Exempt process, official copies of U.S. Government Memoranda initiated by the Director of the F.B.I. dated October 21, 1968 and November 5, 1968 respectively. These government documents imply Edwards’ complicity with Smith and Carlos Black Power demonstration in Mexico. The October memorandum reads, in part:

\begin{quote}
On 10/19/68 Legal Attache (Legat) Mexico City, telephonically advised that Harry Thomas Edwards was rumored to be in Mexico City and was possibly responsible for unpatriotic action by U.S. Olympic athletes when they gave Black Power sign while U.S. National Anthem was played during presentation awards. Legat requested immediate information as to Edwards’ whereabouts, as well as photographs and description of him.
\end{quote}

The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Washington, D.C., on 10/23/68 furnished copies of Canadian “Non-Immigrant Arrival-Departure Cards” provided by Canadian immigration authorities on individuals who indicated the purpose of their travel to Canada was to attend the Congress of Black Writers. One such card contained the following inform- 


\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 203.

\textsuperscript{36} The U.S. Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) is a law ensuring public access to U.S. government records. FOIA carries a presumption of disclosure; the burden is on the government - not the public - to substantiate why information may not be released. Upon written request, agencies of the United States government are required to disclose those records, unless they can be lawfully withheld from disclosure under one of nine specific exemptions in the FOIA. This right of access is ultimately enforceable in federal court.  
\url{http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nsa/foia.html}
Edwards’ family history defies being categorized within his five types of “reluctant revolutionaries” social activist model advanced in his research of the Black Student Movement, *Black Students*; However, his trajectory of activism strongly resembles the description of the “militant “who evolved to become the “revolutionary.” Older mentor-activists passed Edwards the baton of social activism and he has done likewise with hundreds of students he teaches through his professorship. He also published *Revolt of the Black Athlete* in 1970, and has been a consultant for major athletic franchises.

Dissimilar to Edwards but similar to Hunter-Gault’s entry into social activism, Stokely Carmichael’s student activism originated while he was enrolled in a predominantly white New York City high school; his autobiography is entitled *Ready for the Revolution: The Life and Struggles of Stokely Carmichael (Kwame Ture)*. Carmichael is world renowned for his activism in SCLC, SNCC and All African People’s Revolutionary Party (AAPRP). Carmichael’s recollections of his family’s influence in the decision about which college he would attend after high school was similar to recollections of participants in this study.

As I began my senior year at Science, the question of college became paramount. Not whether I was to go, but where? Within the family, that I would go to college had long been taken for granted. Whatever else happened, the son was going to college.

Early in my senior year the Young Communists at Science organized a bus for a demonstration against the House Un-American Activities Committee in Washington. I was on the bus… The demonstration was in progress… when our bus pulled up… As we approached the pickets, I saw something that would profoundly affect the direction of my life. A section of the line was black. The marchers were not only all African, but they were all about my age. I jumped in the line and the brothers and sisters told me about Howard and NAG [Nonviolent

---

37 Ibid., 203.


39 AAPRP: All-African Peoples’ Revolutionary Party, originally organized by Ghana’s Kwame Nkrumah during the 1960s. The Party has active chapters in the United States and Guinea Bissau.
Carmichael’s parents and his uncle, a psychiatrist and the family authority on all things educational, made their final decision about where Stokely would attend college. The parents wanted Harvard and Stokely wanted Howard, but his uncle declared, “A serious student could get an excellent education at either place, as good an education at Howard as at Harvard. Besides which, he said, the friends you make in college tend to be friends for life. So Howard it was to be. Besides, it sure was a lot more affordable. Carmichael’s own decision had been validated by his family; and although Howard would receive the application form, Carmichael recalled that he was really joining NAG:

Howard University would open up vast new horizons for me…I received a unique education there…At Howard I was educated as much by my fellow students as by the faculty; as much from the location of the school, the friends I made, and the spirit of the times as from anything to be found in the curriculum; as much from the character of the administration as from the university.

Carmichael also explains in detail how Howard University, an HBCU, had some similar features of TWIs. Howard was the only HBCU in the United States funded by the federal government; Howard’s budget was controlled “…for some curious reason the congressional committees that controlled the university’s budget seemed to attract a disproportionate number of Dixie-crat politicians…the political beneficiaries and institutional protectors of white supremacy …” As a student activist with NAG, which was never recognized as a legitimate student organization there, he had resented being expected to be presentable for White folks. Carmichael stated, “We resented the patent condescension. According to which the educational mission was to ‘civilize young Negroes fresh from the cotton fields.’ The assumption was that America had a ‘Negro problem,’ which was us.” Carmichael understood the tightrope which Howard’s administrators had to walk during Congressional budget hearings; and he

41 Ibid., 113.
42 Ibid., 110.
eventually realized that Howard’s failure to officially recognize NAG meant the university could remain publicly aloof. The university never moved to eliminate the Nonviolent Action Group. “They never tried to coerce or threaten us with expulsion or other administrative sanction…By disclaiming knowledge or responsibility, they did not have to move on us, and they never did.”

Carmichael’s history as a student activist was legendary, especially within the visibility of SNCC and The Black Panther Party. His most noted acclaim was acquired as a student demonstrator for the Black franchise in Mississippi where he invoked the term “Black Power.” However, Carmichael’s social activism, nurtured and developed at Howard, originally focused on the formal reach of the U.S. Congress into the affairs of Howard University, and the harassment of Howard personnel who had leftist political leanings. Carmichael’s story is not inconsistent with those of the participants in this study, especially considering his upper middle-class background and family permission to become active early in his life. Carmichael’s student activism is situated within Edwards’ reluctant revolutionaries as a “radical activist;” Carmichael, like Hunter-Gault.

Angela Davis’ family background, discussed in her autobiography, was similar to Carmichael’s family background. More widely renowned for her Soledad Brothers activism and for being on the FBI’s most “wanted” list than as a student activist, Davis was the eldest child of college educated parents, except that her family resided in Birmingham, Alabama, not New York City. Angela cites her earliest social activism during elementary school:

---

43 The Soledad Brothers were three African American inmates charged with the murder of white prison guard John V. Mills at California’s Soledad Prison on January 16, 1970. George Jackson, Fleeta Drumgo and John Clutchette were said to have murdered Mills in retaliation for the shooting deaths of three black prisoners during a prison fight in the exercise yard three days prior by another guard, Opie G. Miller.

Activist and author Angela Davis took up the cause of the Soledad Brothers after reading about the case in February 1970, and became the chair of their defense committee. Davis said, ‘The situation in Soledad is part of a continuous pattern in the Black community. Three Black men who were unarmed, who were not trying to escape, are killed, and this is called justifiable homicide… One white guard is killed, and this is immediately called murder.’ (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soledad_Brothers)
...I learned in the first grade...that just because one is hungry, one does not have the right to a good meal... It was agonizing for me to see some of my closest friend waiting outside the lunchroom silently watching the other children eating. For a long time, I thought about those who ate and those who watched. Finally, I decided to do something about it. Knowing that my father returned from his service station each evening with a bag of coins, which he left overnight in a kitchen cabinet, one night I stayed awake until the whole house was sleeping...I slipped into the kitchen and stole some of the coins. The next day, I gave the money to my hungry friends."  

By the time Davis was ready for secondary school in the early 1960s, the family decided she would do that in New York City, where she would reside with a White socially-active family and attend a privately run and funded school operated by socialists. The family had considered the advantages and disadvantages of Angela attending Fisk University where she could pursue her ultimate goal of becoming a pediatrician at Meharry Medical College, also in Nashville, Tennessee. The family decision for Davis to leave the South was rooted in their desire for her to see and experience a different lifestyle than a typical Southern lifestyle. Davis said that the pervasive ambivalence in her Alabama schools was very affirming to her identity as a Black person, but that many teachers also tended to inculcate in the children the official, racist explanation for the misery of Blacks, i.e. her first introduction to class differences among Black people. “And they encouraged an individualistic, competitive way out of his torment. We were told that the ultimate purpose of our education was to provide us with the skills and knowledge to lift ourselves singly and separately out of the muck and slime of poverty by ‘our own bootstraps’.”  

Davis recalls that about the time she entered high school, the Civil Rights Movement had begun to awaken Blacks in Alabama from their deep sleep. She notes that judging from the general inactivity at Parker High School one would never have known that Rosa Parks had refused to move to the back of the bus. Furthermore, about that time, she says, the NAACP was declared illegal in Alabama and its members were threatened with imprisonment.  

Some of us were affected by the boycott...On a few occasions, a small group of my schoolmates and I spontaneously decided to sit in the front of the bus to show our support of our sisters and brothers. Inevitably a shouting match ensued between us and the bus.

driver. Black people on the bus were forced to take sides... there was no extensive organized movement at that time in Birmingham, some of them were afraid of our audacity... 

Davis’ parents were NAACP members who, like other members, paid their membership dues and received bomb threats until the NAACP had been officially dissolved and replaced by the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights, which was led by Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth. Angela Davis, another product of the Southern middle class of Birmingham, Alabama, like Charlayne Hunter-Gault from Atlanta, had been informally but systematically under the tutelage of not only her parents but also some of the most auspicious historical persons in the American Civil Rights Movement from elementary school forward. Her undergraduate years at Brandeis University in Waltham, MA were years she described as ones filled with isolation and alienation:

Brandeis University was different. There were no roads leading outside. Its physical and spiritual isolation were mutually reinforcing. There was nothing in Waltham, but a clock factory, and Cambridge and Boston were unreachable for those of us who couldn’t afford a car. I searched the crowds of freshmen for others who were Black. Just knowing they were there would have made me feel a little more comfortable. But the full scholarship Brandeis had bestowed upon me was apparently a guilt-motivated attempt to increase their Black freshman population of two...I felt alienated, angry, alone and would have left the campus if I had had the courage and had known where to go. Since I was there—to stay, it seemed—I lived with this alienation and began to cultivate it in a romantic sort of way.... It didn’t help the situation that I had gotten very much involved in the writings of the so-called “existentialists”: Camus and Sartre...Only in the artificial surroundings of an isolated, virtually all-white college campus could I have allowed myself to cultivate this nihilistic attitude. It was

46 Ibid.

47 Henry Hampton and Steve Fayer, Voices of Freedom: An Oral History of the Civil Rights Movement from the 1950s through the 1980s. (New York City, NY: Bantam Books, 1990), 124 – 125. Fred Shuttlesworth, the black civil rights activist and minister of Bethel Baptist Church, had fought the segregationist forces of Birmingham for seven years. His own home had been bombed twice. When he had attempted to enroll his daughter in a white grammar school, he had been chain-whipped outside the school by angry Whites. Shuttlesworth was the founder of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights (ACMHR) established to replace the NAACP after the NAACP was banned by the state of Alabama during the Montgomery bus boycott. He was also one of the founders of SNCC and was himself listed as a student activist in Aldon Morris’ study of Blacks in social movements.

48 Like Hunter-Gault, similarly Angela Davis was another prototypical example of the Jennings 2002 study, “Generation Units and the Student Protest Movement in the United States....” Essentially, the Jennings 32-year longitudinal study found that intensive political participation during the formative years fosters lifelong engagement.
as if in order to fight off the unreal quality of my environment, I leaped desperately into another equally unreal mode of living.  

Davis, also influenced by James Baldwin’s *Go Tell It on the Mountain*, recalled that Baldwin had come to Brandeis, an event which coincided with the Kennedy administration’s infamous “Cuban Missile Crisis.” Struck by Baldwin’s announcement “that he could not continue his lectures without contradicting his moral conscience and abdicating his political responsibilities,” Davis’ concern for the people of Cuba and the millions of others who would have been destroyed if a nuclear conflict had occurred manifested in her return from nihilistic thinking to purposeful social activism, i.e. participating in rallies, teach-ins, and demonstrations on Brandeis’ campus. “During the brief period of protest, I was drawn toward the people with whom I felt I had the most in common—the foreign students.” She also heard the eloquence of Malcolm X for the first time in 1962 at Brandeis:

Malcolm X began his speech with a subdued eloquence, telling about the religion of Islam and its relevance to Black people in the United States. I was fascinated by his description of the way Black people had internalized the racial inferiority thrust upon them by a white supremacist society… He was addressing himself to an all-white crowd and I wondered whether…the four or five other Black people in the audience felt, from that moment on, as outrageously misplaced as I did. Although I experienced a kind of morbid satisfaction listening to Malcolm reduce white people to virtually nothing, not bring a Muslim, it was impossible for me to identify with his religious perspective.

Davis’ student activism blossomed into the notoriety she later received for her advocacy of prisoner rights in California, and her association with the Soledad Brothers which earned her the infamy

---
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53 Henry Hampton and Steve Fayer, *Voices of Freedom: An Oral History of the Civil Rights Movement from the 1950s through the 1980s*. (New York City, NY: Bantam Books, 1990), 540 – 541. In the fall of 1969, Davis was hired to teach in the philosophy department at UCLA. She had joined the Communist Party the previous year. But before she was able to teach her first class, she was fired by the regents of the University of California, of which then Governor Ronald Reagan was an ex-officio member. As a result of the significant publicity the firing generated, prisoners including George Jackson, a prisoner at California’s Soledad Correctional Facility, corresponded with Davis. Davis said she began to recognize through the
of being on the FBI’s “most wanted list” for felony charges from which she was subsequently acquitted. A senior citizen by definition, Davis is still in 2010 a prominent social activist particularly for women in penal confinement and against American military intrusions internationally, and a highly sought public speaker throughout the world. Given Davis’ social and educational history, her student movement activism has been situated in Edwards’ scale of “reluctant revolutionaries” as another “radical activist.”

James Forman (1928 – 2005), better known for his civil rights activism career, was a student activist at Roosevelt University in Chicago and a member of SNCC. Forman’s autobiography, reads less like an autobiography and more like a memoir, but several passages and excerpts have informed this study, nevertheless. Forman’s college career included brief enrollments at Chicago’s Wilson Junior College and USC (University of Southern California) after he was discharged from the U.S. Air Force in the early 1950s. In the fall of 1954, Forman entered Roosevelt University which had only been founded nine years earlier by the president of the state YMCA college. Roosevelt became a haven for veterans who could not get in anywhere else because of quota systems. The staff at Roosevelt had a high work she did in the case of the Soledad Brothers that it was very important to bring into the movement of that period a consciousness of what happened to people in prison.

54 M. H. Abrams, A Glossary of Literary Terms: Seventh Edition. (Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle, 1999), 22. Autobiography is a biography written by the subject about himself or herself. It is to be distinguished from the memoir, in which the emphasis is not on the author’s developing self but on the people and events that the author has known or witnessed, and also from the private diary or journal which is a day-to-day record of the events in one’s life, written for personal use and satisfaction, with little or no thought of publication.

55 YMCA: Young Men’s Christian Association. YMCA College board of trustees had wanted a head count of Black students because they were planning to establish a quota due to all the young Blacks returning from duty in the U.S. Armed Forces and using their Veterans’ Benefits to enroll in college. Roosevelt University was established as an alternative to integrating YMCA College.

56 The history of Blacks in the U.S. military during and after World War II helped create another method of entry into higher education, given the G.I. Bill of Rights for Veterans which included financial benefits for college attendance. Returning G.I.s constituted a sizeable proportion of Blacks in higher education because more Black males were then able to afford college expenses. The term “G.I.” literally is an abbreviation for “government issue;” mid-twentieth century U.S. military personnel/veterans were often referred to as “G.I.s”
percentage of Black people who occupied not only blue-collar jobs but also white-collar administrative positions.

Although Forman recalled being an ROTC student in high school, a vision far removed from his Air Force experiences, Forman’s G.I. Benefits enabled him to attend Roosevelt University where St. Clair Drake, a professor there, mentored and helped shape Forman’s ideas and concepts about organizing activism around Black people’s concerns:

The greatest, most direct, and longest-lasting influence on me at Roosevelt was that of St. Clair Drake who also became a personal friend and collaborator in many ventures after I graduated. My relationship with Drake began when I went to interview him for *The Torch*, the school newspaper, in the fall of 1955. He had just come back from Africa and his excitement about the new political independence of Ghana, about the continuing liberation struggles in countries like Kenya, about the newborn struggles of countries like Algeria, was contagious. Drake stirred us by the vividness with which he lectured, the energy with which he taught and led discussions, and the amount of knowledge he disseminated.

Because of teachers like Drake and because Roosevelt had an older student population than most schools, our brotherhood included not only students but also faculty and community people. We read many of the same books, shared similar experiences, and had the same basic values. We formed a sort of unity around common interests—above all, racism U.S.A. At Roosevelt, I was president of student government then…the second black to hold that office in the school’s ten-year history…We decided to raise some money for some station wagons to support the Montgomery bus boycott… [which] had a very significant effect on the consciousness of black people throughout the United States.57

Forman’s activist orientation, developing from his high school exposure to the philosophies of W.E.B. Du Bois, took root in his social activist organizing in the Air Force, where he decided that “we [Black military men] should not commit suicide on a mass basis, we should save most of our energy for an organized struggle.”58

The five social activists reviewed here are college contemporaries of the participants in this study; they were all influenced to some extent by the social, economic, domestic and international events of the post-World War II era, which brought into clear visibility the starkly unjust differences in the status and


58 Ibid., 64, 65.
lives of Blacks and Whites in America. Forman and Edwards were reared in economically strapped blue-collar families who could provide only minimal emotional support to their sons’ educational pursuits, as was the experience of some participants in the instant study. Carmichael, Davis, and Hunter-Gault came from upper middle-class families who had themselves been socially active, modeling social activism and nurturing their children’s social activism, and exerting overt influence in their children’s college selections and occupational choices. The voices and experiences of these five publicly acclaimed social activists, who were also student activists, have been placed “in conversation” and in context with the thirty former students of OSU who experienced aspects of the same phenomenon, the Black Student Movement.

This review has provided broader context of the times from the perspectives of 1950s and 1960s. Black students who chose to actively participate on campus, or to passively support and observe the Black Student Movement, or to make careers and occupations of social activism learned as students just like those who placed themselves more in the midst of the public struggles to end injustices for Blacks [Carmichael, Davis, Edwards, Forman, and Hunter-Gault] are all central to understanding the experiences of thirty Ohio State University study participants. Only Davis and Hunter-Gault were products of the Southern middle-class, although educated in Northern universities; while Carmichael, Edwards and Forman were products of the industrialized North and educated in the North and the West. On the other hand, our present study participant/interviewees were unanimously social products of the Midwestern upper-middle or middle class, and educated in the same prestigious university. As similar as the social histories of both groups were, their student activism reflects dialectically diverse patterns of behaviors and commitments irrespective of where they were reared, or of whether their antecedents had been social activists. Evolving from overt student activism, or even dormancy, fourteen of the fifteen Black students including the five renowned activists and those in the present study have demonstrated adult social activism, which can be considered both a lifestyle and a skill-set developing from their student histories.

Published Secondary Literature
Research Studies on the Black Student Movement

Several literary canons were read for insight, background and discernment about the Black students’ experience during the Black Student Movement; unequivocally, the literature reveals there was no singular Black student experience or reaction to the complex phenomenon we know as the Black Student Movement. The following discussions of the literature appear less in order of their importance to the study, but more so as they relate to various aspects of the typologies or profiles developed and revealed to contextualize how the thirty Black alumni, former students at the Ohio State University experienced the period of social activism on their campus, which influenced and even defined their entire lives. These scholars in political science, sociology, women’s studies, and higher education have, in some instances, exclusively examined the behaviors, attitudes, and motivations of African American student activists in general; their works are placed in conversation with one another to help understand the various experiences, observations, attitudes and worldviews of Black students toward the phenomenon we call the Black Student Movement.


Edwards’ Black Students has served as the essential backdrop/framework for an African American perspective about the activist behaviors of Black students at the Ohio State campus during the 1960s and 1970s. Significantly, the Edwards study was student-focused; he relied on in-person interviews and group meetings, “…conversations—both of the [audio] taped and the written types—were augmented
by notes drawn from observations of the student subjects within the context of their conversations and
activities with their peers." Edwards conducted a three-year qualitative study involving 378 students
whom he taught and lectured on more than sixty (60) predominantly white college (two-year and four-
year schools) and university campuses across America from Summer 1966 through Summer 1969.
Edwards’ defined central task in the text was “to present the historical development of the Black student
movement – the factors underlying the emergence and waning of its various phases; the characteristics
and the philosophies of the movement’s [then] present participants; and its possible future directions.”
Edwards also defined the Black Student Movement as a vigorous phenomenon which struck the American
educational system with a force. Edwards’ work also addressed three other issues relevant to the OSU
students in this study: (a) the relationships between Black student groups and the Black community; (b)
the relationship between Black students and the American colleges or universities; (c) and institution-
alized racism. The following questions were posed to Black students in the Edwards study; the questions
dealt with issues Edwards thought were relevant to students in the 1960s:

(1) What are your feelings about separate housing and dining facilities for Black students?
(2) How do you feel about demands for autonomous Black Studies curricula?
(3) What do you think about separate instructional facilities for Black students?
(4) How do you feel about having only Black instructors teaching Black courses
(5) What do you think are legitimate means to be used in achieving the immediate and long-range
goals of Black people?
(6) What is your opinion of the potential for Black-White coalitions in the struggle against racism
and injustice?
(7) What do you think about the demands being made to increase the number of Black students on
campus?

60 Ibid., 3.
(8) What do you think about recruiters being on college campuses and representing such organizations as the United States Marine Corps, Dow Chemical and Chase-Manhattan Bank?

(9) What do you feel about the rebellions of Black athletes on college campuses today?

Published in 1970, Edwards’ findings about Black students in political activism during the sixties resulted in a five-category construction or typology of “Reluctant Revolutionaries” which appreciably informed the instant study. Edwards’ typology has been used as the framework which the ten study interviewees and the five student movement activists [featured in the primary literature review] were assessed. Edwards’ typologies and brief descriptions follow:

(1) the radical activist, usually older academically and chronologically than his Black student peers, usually a senior or graduate student in his middle or late twenties, usually from a middle-class family, usually qualified for college entrance through traditional merit admission procedures, and gradually evolving from a primary emphasis on earning the college degree to the participation in political activities axial to the struggle of Black people;

(2) the militant, usually younger academically and chronologically than the radical activist, usually an undergraduate in his teens or early twenties with neither any practical political experience nor any cohesive ideology which would guide his political activism, showing a penchant for faddish attire, behavior and rhetoric, but definitely inclined to force the white racist establishment to allow Blacks greater mobility in the existing social order although lax on attending BSU activities and meetings, and usually from a sheltered middle-class family;

(3) the revolutionary who highly valued Black pride and cultural ties with Africa, usually more inclined toward bullet solutions than ballot solutions to political inequities, indistinguishably from any specific socio-economic group, more likely than his peers to have entered college through traditional merit admissions, inclined to enroll only in courses relevant to his interests, less devoted to graduating

---

from college than having the campus as a forum and stage to politicize other Blacks, less likely than his Black peers to maintain close family ties, and usually a well-read and glib public speaker who is ideologically focused;

(4) the anomic activist who are usually the youngest participants in the Black Student Movement both academically and chronologically, a social product of the Black experience in America motivated toward activism and college attendance near home by known radical activists and militants, a likely college drop-out and “rebel without a cause,” and usually the stereotypical Black student activist created by sensation-seeking white journalists; and

(5) the conforming negro a passive participant in the movement who most closely epitomizes the philosophies, values, and attitudes of the traditional Black middle class, although these participants are generally from working class families who are aspiring for entrance into the middle class, usually individual achievers primarily concerned with earning a college degree as both social capital and as the key to economic success, and usually maintains close family ties and has a serious commitment to finish college.

Edwards’ 1970 assessment of the BSM follows:

The Black student movement, then, has progressed from the naiveté of the “integrationist” oriented phase in the early sixties to the [then] present phase with its emphasis on “Freedom By Any Means Necessary.”

In the space of a decade, Black student activists and protesters have gone from the espousal of a political strategy based upon the religious notion of redemptive suffering to an adamant belief in and advocacy of the strategy of creative disruption.62


Black Students in Protest: A Study of the Origins of the Black Student Movement63 by Anthony Orum originates the Black Student Movement in the early to mid 1960s during the traditionally historical period of the civil rights era.64

62 Ibid.; 2, 3.
The present study is a sociological rather than an historical treatment of the role of black college students in the civil rights movement. February 1, 1960, signaled the beginning of a long series of political demonstrations by black high school and college students throughout the United States.

Orum’s quantitative student-focused study sought to answer some of the same questions which Edwards had in his qualitative student-focused study conducted six years afterwards. Orum’s goal was “determining the characteristic motivation of the typical black student protestor as well as the social and economic conditions that provoked him to protest.” Data for his analysis consisted of hundreds of black students’ replies to survey questionnaires. His objective was to develop the truest picture of the Black students’ participation in the “civil rights movement. The Orum study is specific to Black student activism at twenty-five HBCUs.

Orum’s mid-1960s quantitative study findings seem essentially consistent with Edwards’ late-1960s qualitative study findings, i.e. personal background and values orientation constitute a set of predisposing conditions which influence students’ likelihood toward social activism. Both Orum and

63 Anthony Orum, Black Students in Protest: A Study of the Origins of the Black Student Movement. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association, 1964. The Orum study was student focused; data were developed from hundreds of mailed survey responses from Black students as opposed to newspaper documents and other primary sources.

64 Orum, like other scholars, obviously failed to delve deeply enough to dispel the popular civil rights viewpoint about the origination of Black students campus activism; they have been apparently unaware of the research findings about Oakwood College (AL) in 1931, an HBCU organized by Whites for Black students who desired higher education. Holly Fisher reported that “Prior to the U. S. Supreme Court’s landmark Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954, Oakwood College students often displayed strong determination and perseverance in organizing their own social and civil rights ‘movements’ within the SDA(Seventh Day Adventist) church. And V. P. Franklin’s research is consistent with Fisher’s “(t)o a very great extent, the black college rebellions in the 1920s were generated by the cognitive dissonance black collegians experienced when they left the real world of the ‘New Negro’ and entered the Victorian environment maintained on campus by white and black administrators.”


Edwards stress the impact of socio-economic status relative to students’ social activism; and Orum more specifically than Edwards contended that activists typically came from middle-class rather than lower-class environments: that parents of social activist students are generally better educated, have higher annual incomes, and hold jobs of higher prestige than parents of non-activists, as follows:

The social structure of a college community, like all other social settings, is comprised of a variety of statuses and groups. Any student can occupy rather diverse positions and play various roles in this community: he may simultaneously belong to the college newspaper staff, a fraternity on campus, and the dramatics club. His active involvement in the college community also can have an important influence on his political attitudes, if only because he is exposed to the opinions of his fellow students and the faculty.  

Additionally, Orum noted that investigations in the U.S. suggest that people actively involved in their communities, especially the leaders, are more willing than others to tolerate and accept controversial political ideas; he goes on, “…the likeliest prospects for participation in student protest are concentrated among the sophisticated and most politically active.”

At the same time, but equally significantly, Orum indicated that the *sine qua non* of participation in movements is social isolation, whether defined in terms of number of friends or of memberships and involvement in organizations. Orum cited the following poignant examples:

Studies of Poujadism in France, of Nazism in Germany and McCarthyism in the United States show that the segments of the population most estranged from their communities provide movements with some of their greatest following…the apparent affinity of working-class members for extremist movements may be partly due to their social isolation, as defined in terms of a small number of memberships and little activity in organizations.

Accordingly, although family histories of social activism and family role models have been shown to influence Black students’ participation in the movement, the adversity of housing discrimination, financial difficulties, and social isolation in particular are issues which caused many Black students to

---
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protest. Angela Davis described the extreme isolation and alienation she experienced as an undergraduate at Brandeis University; consequently, she bonded with foreign students with whom she had more in common than Whites from the U.S....and began studying Camus and Sartre. These conclusions are also in alignment with data from interviewees in the instant study. Several interviewees described debilitating isolation as a common reaction and an impetus toward activism during the Black Student Movement. At the same time, both histories of Black students being socially active as well as the experience of finding oneself socially isolated provide a combined likelihood that a Black student would be attracted to the Black Student Movement, especially at a traditionally white institution (TWI) such as The Ohio State University.

Orum’s conclusions inform Edwards’ inability to exactly pigeon-hole the “revolutionary” within a socio-economic class, or to define a category which more clearly describes Black student activists from upper middle-class backgrounds such as Angela Davis, Stokely Carmichael, and Charlayne Hunter-Gault. The Orum study attempted to determine which interpretation of participation in social movements, the elitist or the marginal, provides the better explanation of black student protest. He examined the two perspectives in light of three variables: (a) membership in campus organizations, (b) attitude toward change on the campus, and (c) academic success. Orum’s conclusions consistently suggest that in the elitist perspective, the relationship between membership in campus organizations and activism is positive and relatively strong: the more memberships, the more active in social causes. However Orum did distinguish between student memberships by type of organization.

…we distinguished among several kinds of college organization: student government, the editorial staff of a campus publication, the business staff of a campus association, a fraternity or sorority, inter-collegiate athletics, an organization concerned with world or national issues, an association with a special interest [such as] the psychology club, the music or drama club. The majority of students, 57 percent, belong[ed] to a fraternity or sorority…

68 Ibid., 83.
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Although Edwards and Orum have provided ways for the present study to better understand the diverse reactions and experiences which Black OSU alumni reported, an extremely important difference in these two studies is that Orum’s respondents were HBCU students whereas Edwards’ respondents were TWI students. Opportunities for organizational memberships, for example, were seriously different for Black students at traditionally white schools; the likelihood that a Black student would be elected to a post in student government would be nearly nil because skin color and race spoke louder than a Black student’s rhetoric or worldview.\(^7\)

Gail Thomas’ edited 1981 text, *Black Students in Higher Education: Conditions and Experiences in the 1970s*, includes several important articles written by higher education researchers and professors whose works significantly inform the present study. Even though the present study has chosen not to privilege the institutional perspective of the university and Black students, the comprehensive educational research data constituting a zeitgeist for higher education immediate following *Brown v. Board* decision in 1954 is necessary. The article by James R. Mingle, “The Opening of White Colleges and Universities to Black Students,” was essential in trying to establish a credible number for this study’s theoretical sample:

Of the approximately 45,000 black students enrolled in higher education at the beginning of World War II, only about one in ten was enrolled in a predominantly white college or university. Although there was no legal segregation in the colleges of the North and West, the level of black enrollment outside the South on the eve of World War II was miniscule. Black migration northward and the GI Bill for veterans substantially accelerated black enrollment after World War II...[It was] estimated that black enrollment in white colleges outside the South in 1947 was 61,000, which was about 47 percent of all black enrollment but only 3 percent of the total enrollment in these colleges.

In 1967, black enrollment experienced a dramatic increase. It reached 8.4 percent of all enrollment in 1971, paused at that level for two years, then increased again annually from 1974 to 1977.

The significant increase in black enrollment beginning in 1967 was preceded by the Higher Education Act of 1965, which greatly expanded available financial aid through the College Work

---

\(^7\) With the glaring exception of the Black athlete at a TWI in the 1960s and 1970s, Black students' likelihood of holding an auspicious membership in any other campus organization was unheard of.
Study Program, Educational Opportunity Grants, and the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. These programs were followed by the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (BEOG), established in 1972.\footnote{James R. Mingle. “The Opening of White Colleges and Universities to Black Students,” in Black Students in Higher Education: Conditions and Experiences in the 1970s, ed. Gail E. Thomas (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981), 18-29.}

A 2009 doctoral dissertation, “The Black Student Movement: An Afrocentric Narrative History of the Struggle to Diversify Higher Education, 1965 – 1972” is the only comprehensive historiography of the Black Student Movement during the movement’s resurgent phase. Rogers’ 2009 doctoral dissertation was particularly instructive for this study. Aside from privileging organizational efforts and actual achievements which Black students made during the movement, Rogers notes that the Black Student Movement “has been marginalized in general studies of the Black Power Movement and student activism in the 1960s.”\footnote{Ibram H. Rogers. The Black Campus Movement: An Afrocentric Narrative History of the Struggle to Diversify Higher Education, PhD diss. (Temple University) 2009; 11.}

Of particular interest to this study is that Rogers is one of few scholars who situates scholarship of what he calls the “Black Campus Movement” or the Black Student Movement within the field of higher education for examination. Rogers’ research questions: What happened? What forced the radical reformation of higher education? are very similar to those of Williamson who researched the BSM at University of Illinois. Although Rogers also cites the beginning of the BSM earlier than the popularly cited 1968 origins at San Francisco State, his gaze, too, on the origins are limited to the traditional historical gaze of mid-twentieth century Black Liberation struggles.

Rogers’ historiography has further informed the instant research by listing works producing a long list of TWIs that experienced the BSM in the sixties and seventies by countless scholars. Among the number of TWIs studied, no fewer than twenty scholars have weighed in on the Black Student Movement at an exhaustive representation of both public and private colleges and universities.\footnote{Between Rogers’ 2009 research, and Edwards’ 1970 research of the BSM at multiple TWIs, we find the following list of universities which have been studied by no fewer than 20 scholars: Brandeis University, Northwestern University, Columbia University, Queens College, SUNY- Albany, Wellesley College, Yale} Not one reference
among more than 182 bibliographic references in Rogers’ own document, including journal articles and unpublished doctoral dissertations and master’s theses, has been written about The Ohio State University and its protracted history with the Black Student Movement.

Although nothing in Rogers’ dissertation alludes to an examination of the BSM at Ohio State during the time frame of his study, 1965-1972, one lone book chapter citing the Black Student Movement by William Nelson does appear in *Out of the Revolution: The Development of Africana Studies.* Dr. Nelson, one of several persons named Chair of Black Studies at Ohio State University over the past forty-one years, he does discuss the beginnings and evolution of “Black Student Associations or Unions to mount political assaults against reactionary policies… Beginning in the school year 1967-68, protest demonstrations by small groups of Black students produced the first major efforts on the part of American universities to recruit Black students…” 75 In his article, Dr. Nelson shifts the focus from the Black Student Movement to the Black “Studies” Movement which is privileged in his assessment of movement efficacy. “One key ingredient of the quest by Black students for power and recognition on university campuses was the demand for Black Studies…Black Studies programs have had a revolutionary impact on American higher education.” 76 The perspectives of the article, while somewhat helpful, continually conflate the Black Student Movement with the Black “Studies” Movement, a decidedly different gaze than taken in this study.
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The Black Student Union Historical & Contemporary Developments, is a 2009 publication of the Center for the Study of Black Students written by Professors Richard C. McGregory, Jr. and Roger I. Pulliam. The Center has compiled this unique resource on an historic organization, the Black Student Union, created from the protracted struggles of Black students of the 1960s in traditionally white colleges and universities during the Black Student Movement. This publication not only chronicles the history of Black Student Unions, but also outlines the Center’s perspective for the future of Black Student Unions. Cited in the publication is the principal motivation for Black students’ collective organizing at their TWIs simply stated in the words of Edmund W. Gordon from The Covenant with Black America:

Without question, education is the key to progress and prosperity in the United States today. Whether fair or not, educational opportunity and academic achievement are directly tied to the social division associated with race, ethnicity, gender, first language, and social class. The level and quality of educational attainment either open the doors to opportunity or close them.\(^{77}\)

Consistent with other sources about the history of Black students’ organizing efforts during the sixties, such as Thomas and Orum, the Center also contends “…there were significant occurrences that resulted in the arrival of a large number of African American students at predominantly white institutions (PWIs): Brown v. Topeka, KS Board of Education, … the [assassination] of Martin Luther King, Jr. in [April] 1968, and the Higher Education Act [HEA] of 1965.”\(^{78}\) The authors suggest, as have other sources, that the BSUs historically functioned as “the Black community” for students who found themselves isolated on rural college campuses; they were their own barbers, beauticians, and seamstresses.

\(^{77}\) Richard McGregory and Roger Pulliam, The Black Student Union Historical & Contemporary Developments. Whitewater, WI: The Center for the Study of Black Students, 2009), 39 – 41. Collegiate level organizations patterned after the original BSUs have assumed not fewer than 68 names or titles for their organizations. Black Student Union is the most populous name; variations range from Association of Black Collegians, Pan African Student Union, Brothers and Sister United, Coalition for Ethnic Awareness, the African American Student Union to the Malcolm X Institute of Black Studies and United Black Students. Other than BSU, the most common out of the sixty-eight names were the Black Student Alliance and the Black Student Association. The standardization of the name reflects their common goals and objectives, emblematic of racial pride and racial identity.

\(^{78}\) Ibid., 7.
The Center for the Study of Black Students has initiated and organized annual conferences, and has conducted studies about the continuing efficacy of BSUs. The authors assert that the importance of BSUs as either individual or collective organizations in higher education is continuing their legacy and enhancing their status as follows:

1. Working to forge a balance between educational, academic, professional, and social pursuits.
2. Establishing programs and agendas to support and encourage BSU members to pursue graduate and professional study.
3. Introducing first year students to civic projects with implications for community development.

The Center’s 2007-2008 BSU Survey yielded results showing the continuing viability of BSUs at predominantly white institutions (178 PWIs responded to the Center’s survey): (a) BSU advisors are more frequently “staff members” (78.6%) rather than “faculty members” (21.4%); (b) BSU member-ships vary significantly: from fewer than twenty-five members in more than half of the responses to more than one hundred members in several instances. BSUs continue to network across the nation, enriching college life and creating possibilities for Black students to share resources, and ideas especially on geographically isolated campuses. A particularly interesting observation made in this publication, one which definitely informs the present study, follows:

The African American alumni presence on campus, similar to the BSU, has historical parallels. The movement from student to alumni status was reflective of the challenges alumni faced as students. Therefore, many alumni view their Alma Maters with some sense of distrust. In addition, alumni often view these institutions at arm’s length with minimum identification.

---

79 Ibid., 2.
80 Ibid., 7. The Office of the National Black Student Union identified over 1,000 campuses that have some semblance of a Black Student Union during its survey in the summer of 2007.
81 Ibid., 16.
African American OSU alumni from the historic student movement consistently echo the sentiment stated, a combination of distrust and disdain, given their bittersweet experiences at the university. Not only in the NBSU assessment above, but also in the data collection processes of Harry Edwards’ 1960’s study and in the data collection process of the present study, reluctance to be interviewed, and to be fully candid in the interviews was “…due to the complex suspicion which is inherently a part of the movement…” Edwards also indicated that the “highly dogmatic responses of students to formally asked questions made the tactic of using a questionnaire or interview schedule rather undesirable. As an alternative, data were gathered by engaging 378 students in informal conversation.”

The National BSU definitely advocates for Black Alumni Reunions, which have been one of the main methods of confraternity and camaraderie, among Black students who experienced the Black Student Movement, particularly at traditionally white institutions. The NBSU also takes the notion of re-uniting among Black alumni to a level beyond a social event: fund-raising and scholarships for contemporary Black students at TWIs.

Other significant research concerning aspects of the Black Student Movement since the historic 1960s include “The Political Behavior and Socio-Economic Backgrounds of Black Students: The Antecedents of Protest,” John S. Jackson’s 1971 study of Black students at three significantly different HBCUs in the South; and “Generation Units and the Student Protest Movement in the United States: An

---

82 Harry Edwards, *Black Students.* (New York City, NY: The Free Press, 1970); 75. Edwards also indicated that the "highly dogmatic responses of students to formally asked questions made the tactic of using a questionnaire or interview schedule rather undesirable. As an alternative, data were gathered by engaging 378 students in informal conversation."

83 Black alumni from OSU have always organized their own OSU Black Student Reunions throughout the past four decades; only recently has the university itself attempted to address the Black alumni in the reunion forum. In April - May 2010, the OSU Alumni Association and the OSU African American Alumni Society, hosted a University-sponsored Reunion for Black alumni at the newly erected Ohio Union. Former OSU football hero, Archie Griffin, has become the Black OSU poster-person being the President and Executive Director of the Ohio State University Alumni Association, and more recently an OSU Vice-President since the Alumni Association has been in 2010 formally moved within the rubric of OSU Student Affairs.

Intra- and Intergenerational Analysis,85 M. Kent Jennings’ 32-year long longitudinal study of 1965’s high school senior class, which was published in 2002.

The Jackson study sought to explain protest behavior in terms of background characteristics. The socio-economic status of respondents’ parents, the population and percentage of their hometowns, and their sex were all shown to be significantly associated with protest rates. Objectives of the study were (1) describing and explaining the political behavior of Blacks in college during the sixties and the seventies; and (2) offering some explanations for black activism. Students at three HBCUs: Fisk University and Tennessee State University both in Nashville, TN; and Arkansas Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College in Pine Bluff, AR were surveyed. More conventional political behavior such as talking politics, giving money, and participating in a campaign was one aspect of students’ behavior interrogated and less conventional or “unconventional” political participation, i.e. “protest activities” including civil rights marches, picketing, and participating in riots were placed in a scale of behaviors. The number of students altogether reporting “protest participation” was 448; and the political activity most reported was “displaying a button or sticker” (68 percent).

There [were] interesting comparisons [however] of specific activities. For example, only 4 percent gave money to traditional political causes, making it the lowest category of all. By contrast, 46 percent gave money to black causes, making it the second most popular form of protest participation.86

Although the entire college population [was] not mobilized and politicized, the responses to protest activity queries do give evidence of substantial participation in difficult and potentially dangerous enterprises. Demonstrations and marches led the list and donating money was close behind…almost half the students had joined a march or demonstration, and almost the same number had donated money to a black cause.87

Findings from the Jackson study, which were important to this study, were (1) that the widespread growth of Afro-American groups on campus was seen as one of the most accepted ways of participating


86 Ibid., 672.

87 Ibid., 666.
in the black student movement, (2) that certain individual characteristics such as gender, and year in college also influenced levels and kinds of political activity,\(^8\) and (3) that three-fifths of students from less educated parentage did not engage in protest activities, whereas less than one-fifth of students from more educated parentage also did not engage in protest activities.\(^9\) Jackson concluded that the dominance of males in protest activities approached or exceeded the pattern ordinarily expected for males in conventional political participation that there were no systematic differences between the age groups in their rates of protest activities. And finally there was no significant relationship between the student’s year in college and protest activity levels.

In the Jennings’ study, “Generation Units and the Student Protest Movement in the United States: An Intra- and Intergenerational Analysis,” the researcher’s position was that the student protest movement in the USA provided exceptional opportunities to observe how formative political experiences could affect intragenerational cleavages throughout the adult lifespan and how these cleavages could reflect on intergenerational continuities. Long-term national panel data from the high school class of 1965 and data from their parents and offspring were used to take advantage of those opportunities. The results show that a sharp rift in political participation and attitudes emerged between protesters and non-protesters during the protest era, a rift which persisted into mid-life and one which testified to the conceptual utility of generation units. Continuities across the three lineage generations were demonstrated by the moderate similarities in the ideological and participatory orientations which are associated with the protest status of the student generation. Jennings objective was to build on his previous account of a national sample of

---

\(^8\) Jackson found that males were more likely to be involved in direct action protest activities; however, the student’s classification in college, e.g. sophomore or senior, did not prove to have significance in the rate of participation in the Jackson study. These data on student’s year in college (classification) are different that those in the Edwards study; the more politically savvy students in the Edwards study were either upper class students or students chronologically older who often were veterans of the U.S. military.

\(^9\) Essentially, students from less educated families had higher rates of nonparticipation in protest activities. These data are consistent with Harry Edwards’ contentions about students he classified as “the conforming Negro” whose parents are generally less educated than students in other categories. This gaze is somewhat different than the typical gaze of contrasts between upper-middle income family background versus lower income family background.
protesters and non-protesters by tracking them into the fullness of middle age; his theory of “generation units” is that both life stage and period effects might be expected to move the generation units toward convergence. Simply stated, Jennings research question was whether student protesters and non-protesters of the late 1960s and early 1970s have politically distinguishable parents, and whether they in turn had politically differentiated offspring of their own.

A longitudinal study, Jennings’ work drew from University of Michigan’s long-term political socialization project which included interviews with 1,669 high school seniors graduating in 1965; attempts were made to re-survey these students in the seventies, the eighties, and the late nineties when they would have finally reached 50 years of age. Most of Jennings’ analysis was restricted to the four-wave participants who were college graduates as of 1973. “Of these 316, 94 (30%) had been former protesters, with almost three-fourths of them citing the Vietnam War and about one-half reporting multiple acts of protest.” A wide variety of protest behaviors were reported by respondents: wrote a letter to the editor; gave money for a political cause; attended political rallies; displayed stickers and buttons; tried to influence others’ how to vote; did any work for a party, candidate, or issue; worked with others to solve some local problems; and took part in a protest march, a demonstration, or sit-in.

One of the more important results of the Jennings study was that intensive political participation during the formative years fosters lifelong engagement. “Non-protesters followed the classic starting –up curve and made slow but steady progress. Nevertheless, as they approached the mid-century mark, they still lagged behind their protesting classmates, who—despite their earlier anti-establishment deportment—maintained relatively high levels of conventional participation…protesters children were

---

90 Nine hundred thirty-five (935) individuals were contacted through all four phases of the study, i.e. an adjusted retention rate of 56% across the 32 year period of research.

91 Although no references were made in any aspect of the study regarding the racial backgrounds of the respondents, the assumption here is that some of the 316 respondents were African American.

92 Ibid.; 305.
also proving to be considerably more active than those of non-protesters.” Results of Jennings’ work are consistent with what we have discovered about the tendency toward social activism demonstrated by three-fifths of the historic Black student protesters in featured in the published primary literature: Angela Davis, Stokely Carmichael, and Charlayne Hunter-Gault, all of whom modeled their activism from their parents’ social activism. As discussed by Jennings, and in the Edwards study, the inverse example of the second most populous type of “reluctant revolutionaries,” the “conforming Negroes,” were the students whose parents were the least likely to participate in protest activities. These data have applicability to the varieties of collective activism demonstrated by African American students at Ohio State during the sixties and the seventies.

The instant study did not consider the Black Student Movement as gender neutral, nor has it made any specific pitch for women in the movement although students who were women, and some non-student Black women94 figured very prominently in the Black Student Movement. Nevertheless, the following research concerned women in social movements and seemed appropriate for this literature review. The 1998 Stewart, Settles, and Winter study95, “Women and the Social Movements of the 1960s: Activists, Engaged Observers, and Nonparticipants;” has relevance for Black women, and some Black males, who less overtly supported the Black Student Movement. Stewart, Settles and Winter concluded that protest activism in women predicts adult political participation in much the same way as it does for men; they also suggest that participation in social movements has been found to have other implications for women later in life… there is an inclination in retrospective research of the BSM to overlook the presence and impact of “engaged observers” and “nonparticipants” in social movements.

---

93 Ibid.; 322.

94 Women such as Ella Baker who nurtured and encouraged the birth of SNCC, and Fannie Lou Hamer, a SNCC staff person, who earned her permanent place in the annals of the 1964 electoral politics of the Democratic National Party and as the legendary spokesperson for the Mississippi Freedom Democrat Party.

Many women in the generation that attended college during the 1960s have reported that they were influenced by the social movements of that era, even women who did not participate in them. In addition to political activists, social movements also appear to include “engaged observers”---individuals who are attentive to movement writings and activities, and express moral and even financial support for them, but who take no other action. Although activism in a movement may be the best indicator of future political action, engaged observation may be related to other indicators of political socialization…Evidence to support this notion is drawn from studies of three samples of college-educated white and black women.96

In Harry Edwards’ “reluctant revolutionaries” typology [Black Students], he, too, recognized the same kind of seemingly disengaged Black students, or “engaged observers” of the movement. Edwards’ description of “engaged observers” classification in his five-tiered typology was called “the conforming Negro.” Edwards finally concluded that “although many students were in full sympathy with the new tactics and gave them…verbal support, they themselves were not yet ready to violently engage police, national guardsmen, and state troopers in armed rebellions.97 “Engaged observers” and “nonparticipants” have appeared in the stories collected from 1960s – 1970s alumni at Ohio State in the instant study.

This final group of works was published within the last two decades; these publications deal with the movement histories of TWIs which had Black Student Unions (BSUs), Black Student Associations (BSAs) or other similarly named Black student organizations which challenged in non-institutionalized ways their respective administrations for changes in programs, services, or curricula. Although two of the universities discussed are Ivy League institutions and the other two Land-Grant universities could be considered “public Ivies,” the universities reacted similarly to Black students’ demands for inclusion and change in their student life experiences on campus. In The Black Student Protest Movement at Rutgers (1990), Professor Emeritus Richard P. McCormick not only examined the forces and conditions which produced the protest movement and the tactics used by Black students: demonstrations and building occupations, but he also interviewed ten former students. Former student and alumna of University of

96 Ibid.
97 Ibid., 63.

The McCormick text about Rutgers University, the land-grant state university with campuses in New Brunswick, Newark and Camden, NJ, evolved from the university’s decision to commemorate the Black Student Movement, and the inception of the New Jersey Educational Opportunity Fund. The 1988-89 event called “Challenge’69: Retrospect and New Visions” was the impetus for Dr. McCormick’s research and the ultimate publication. Rutgers’ Black students’ entry into campus social activism began in reaction to a Rutgers alumnus and 1963 graduate who, as a SNCC worker in Georgia, had been arrested, beaten severely, and charged with a capital offense in Georgia; Black students organized to pay his legal defense fees. “[S]upporters were instrumental in mobilizing more than three thousand persons, including black and white Rutgers students, to demonstrate at Princeton against the appearance of Mississippi Governor Ross Barnett, a notorious advocate of segregation.” These students at Rutgers had already been involved in local political activities through NAACP campus chapters, and the 1963 March on Washington, but Black student organizations from the various campuses began to meet and organize collectively. Although Rutgers had distinguished itself by independently raising funds for increasing Black enrollments and Black faculty hiring well before the campus protests of 1969, Black students’

---


99 At that time Rutgers College at New Brunswick was for males only; Douglass College also at New Brunswick was for women students. The Newark campus was largely commuter students with its Black student population being principally from Newark. There were three student organizations for Bla: Newark’s Black Organization of Students (BOS), and ; and New Brunswick’s Student Afro-American Society (SAS) with a male membership and the Douglass Black Student’s Committee with a female membership.
heightened awareness of systemic discrimination in higher education and other issues specific to Rutgers induced members of the Newark members of the BOS to occupy and barricade themselves inside Conklin Hall, the main classroom building at Rutgers’ Newark campus on February 24, 1969.

On Wednesday evening, there were demonstrations on the New Brunswick campuses. About fifty Black students at Rutgers College and a slightly larger number at Douglass College entered their respective dining halls, filled their trays with food, dumped them on the floor, and departed. On the following day some thirty individuals, students and community activists occupied the Campus Center at the Camden branch of Rutgers to secure attention for their grievances. These dramatic actions had been orchestrated by the organizations of African American students on the several campuses to express their frustration with the unresponsiveness of Rutgers University to previous statements of their concerns.100

Among his research efforts, Professor McCormick personally interviewed ten former Rutgers students. Some are quoted, as follows. A female student who arrived at Rutgers (Douglass College) in 1966, a good student who had also been prominent in extracurricular activities and not in the academic “high risk” category, reported that she felt a sense of estrangement, although her fellow white students were friendly and considerate. This student became one of the women leaders at Douglass College. She also reported that the small number of Black women were “always being probed and examined” by Whites; they were looked to as a source of information.101 A male student, an out-of-state transfer to the Newark campus who “had participated in desegregation efforts in Georgia assumed the campus NAACP presidency in 1967, but later he and other members decided that the organization was not the appropriate vehicle to attain their goals.”102 Another woman student who “had grown up in Florida but moved to Newark in 1967 to live with her mother became a member of CORE, joined the campus NAACP chapter and then joined the Black Organization of Students (BOS) where her intelligence, zeal, and talent for writing quickly elevated her to a leadership position.” In her own words, “…programs for our Black people will be for Black progress, by Blacks, through Black self-help.”103

100 Ibid., 12.
101 Ibid., 17.
102 Ibid., 17.
103 Ibid., 36.
Rutgers University responding to student protests by fall 1969 showed some initiative in supporting the enrollment of disadvantaged undergraduates. Although Rutgers and other universities already received federal funds for Upward Bound students, the Urban University Program was initiated university wide by the Board of Regents. These and other concessions made from student protests are the institutional and student gains which can be credited to the Black Student Movement. As noted by McCormick, there were similar demonstrations on scores of campuses during the 1968-1969 academic year. Their common objective was to compel predominantly white institutions to change their policies and attitudes to accommodate the needs of a multiracial society. All ten alumni interviewed by Dr. McCormick would, by Edwards’ “radical revolutionaries” standards, be considered “radical activists.”

“In Defense of Themselves: The Black Student Struggle for Success and Recognition at Predominantly White Colleges and Universities” appeared in the Winter, 1999 issue of the Journal of Negro Education. In this article, Dr. Joy Williamson likewise offers the position that Black students at predominantly White colleges and universities reevaluated the education they received, being heavily influenced by Black Power advocates and protests off campus. “In Defense of Themselves…” documents the support systems Black students created to ensure their psychological and academic well-being such as BSUs, Black cultural centers and academic support services like tutoring and study groups. The number of African American students at UIUC, while arguably low during the late 1960s, was significantly higher than at Brandeis University where Angela Davis reported having to bond with foreign students to pull herself from the nihilistic malaise she had fallen into from isolation and alienation at Brandeis during the early 1960s. While the 1960s institutional viewpoint of BSUs was negative, Williamson’s study shows how instrumental Black students’ creativity was to their survival academically and psychologically. Williamson’s assessment of these radically new organizations, programs, and activities is consistent with the research done by the Center for the Study of Black Students at the University of Wisconsin- Whitewater by professors Richard McGregory and Roger Pulliam; The Black Student Union Historical & Contemporary Developments documents that BSUs in 2007 numbered more
than 1,000 on campuses around the nation.\textsuperscript{104} Williamson’s observation that the BSA, for example, seen as a disruptive organization during the 1960s, and McGregory’s data on BSUs shows that a radical organization of the sixties has become relatively commonplace and institutionally accepted within four decades; interestingly though these organizations and their members activism are still necessary.

Williamson’s explanation for the persistence of such programs and organizations is that Black students continue to be disadvantaged on White campuses relative to their White peers and continue to suffer from isolation, alienation, and lack of support.\textsuperscript{105}

In \textit{Black Power on Campus: The University of Illinois 1965 – 1975}, Joy Williamson examines the Black Student Movement at her alma mater from an institutional perspective. In this text, Dr. Williamson makes a definite commentary on “how social movements influenced institutions of higher learning …and… a commentary on the nature of higher educational reform…analyzing the interactions between students and administrators and how their relationships shaped higher education.”\textsuperscript{106} Williamson chronicles the evolution of Black consciousness at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC); she also defines this as a microcosm of similar movements across the county paralleling events and the Black Student Movement at Ohio State. Her research shows that “increased university admission rates in the late 1960s did not lead to increased acceptance for Black students. Williamson’s study of Black students’ activism at UIUC suggests that, in reaction to institutional apathy, Black students advocated Black unity, celebrated Black culture, and employed aggressive tactics to initiate a period of institutional reform during this highly contentious era in the academy. Her study is relates to questions in

\textsuperscript{104} Richard C. McGregory and Roger I. Pulliam, \textit{The Black Student Union Historical & Contemporary Developments}. (2009), 7.


the instant study since UIUC and OSU tended not to respond to Black students’ needs, but tended to over-react to direct action tactics such as sit-ins, rallies and other public demonstrations.

Williamson’s examination of UIUC had two purposes, which mirror the purpose and significance of the instant study: commentary on how the Black social movement influenced institutions of higher learning beyond the creation of Black studies curricula, and commentary on the nature of higher education reform during the late 1960s and early 1970s. In this respect, Williamson’s purpose for researching her alma mater are very similar to those for the study of OSU’s 1960s-70s alumni. Her work “analyzes the interaction between students and administrators and how their relationship shaped higher education.” Williamson also considers the effect of federal initiatives such as the Higher Education Act of 1965, which somewhat addressed financial aid deficits for Black students; but also shifted the focus narrowly toward financial aid and admissions away from other systemic issues that Black students endured. Her study also illuminated the highly charged contentions which the establishment managed to criminalize where Black students were concerned. And her study also looks at the internal relationships among the BSA (Black Student Association) and well-established Black GLOs; frictions developed given perceived differences in organizational ideologies. BSAs were taking cues from more radical Black Power groups who operated off-campus principally. She says, “BSA publications walked a fine line between providing a working definition of Black Power that was neither too broad as to be meaningless nor too narrow to be prohibitively restrictive.”

Williamson advises that African American students varied in the way they reconciled being Black at a White university. William Glasker did a similar study at the University of Pennsylvania, *Black Students in the Ivory Tower: African American Student Activism at the University of Pennsylvania, 1967 – 1990*, where he is an alumnus and a faculty member. Glasker’s objective in writing his book was documenting the collective efforts and actions of African American students.

---


108 Ibid. 105.
students and the African American community at the University of Pennsylvania… especially in the period from 1965 – 1978. Glasker has also described the movement from an organizational perspective: students in organization and the university as an organization with competing goals and methods of communication.

*Harlem vs. Columbia University: Black Student Power in the Late 1960s* is a very recent (2009) publication about the historic Black Student Movement. Stefan M. Bradley, its author, places more emphasis on the institutional perspective about the protest events of the sixties than a student perspective. Bradley’s study of Black student activism at Columbia University, an Ivy League school, focused on the relationships formed between Black student activists and Blacks in Harlem who bonded and worked successfully to prevent the University from constructing a gymnasium on land being used by the Harlem community. *Harlem vs. Columbia University: Black Student Power in the Late 1960s,* “…attempts to draw out some of the important factors that contributed to the 1968-69 uprisings on the Morningside Heights campus… focus[ing] on issues of landownership and spatial control as they relate to power in the United States… [it] also speaks to issues of social protest movements because the Civil Rights, Black Power, New Left, and student protest movements all collided on Columbia University’s campus in 1968 and 1969.”

Bradley situates a small number of African American students in 1964 as members of a discussion group which later evolved into the Students’ Afro-American Society; one of the founding members of this group, Hilton Clark, had been a second generation Columbia student (both parents). The elder Clark called out middle-classed Negroes, especially those educated in Ivy League colleges, whom he thought had become apathetic and had abandoned the masses; his sentiments were published in

---


110 Ibid., 11. Hilton Clark’s father, Kenneth Clark, was a renowned psychologist and activist who was published and widely respected in the Black community.
the Black media and in *The New York Times*.

As an advisor to his son and their organization, Kenneth Clark encouraged the Students’ Afro-American Society (SAS) to engage themselves more actively with members of the Harlem community adjacent to the prestigious Ivy League university. SAS members between 1964 and 1968 generally protested for structural changes at the university: increased Black student enrollment, increased Black faculty, Black staff across the board, and a Black Studies curriculum; however the most memorable accomplishment for SA at Columbia was their coalition with members of the Harlem community. They were able to foil the efforts of Columbia in its effort to expand into territory more dear to Harlem Blacks. Their mantra was “Gym Crow Must Go!” Black students from Columbia served as glib spokespersons for the Harlem community. “The Black militants of SAS, in spite of their claim denying the protest not to want student power, sought the power to change their university in relation to the surrounding community. By stopping the construction of the gymnasium in Morningside Park, they would undoubtedly change the structure of Columbia University, and hopefully the way their school treated its neighbors.”

His research did, however, include minimal reflections of some Columbia student militants many years afterwards. Their comments are consistent with some comments made by Black Ohio State alumni from the same period. Bradley reported that “[w]hen looking back upon their experiences at Columbia, many of the black students who were in Hamilton Hall or who protested for Black Studies have mixed feelings. Most appreciate what they were able to achieve with a degree from Columbia… Some of the other students however were traumatized by their experiences… A football player and fraternity member left the university after the demonstration to ‘keep his sanity’…” Another Columbia alumnus, at the university’s fortieth commemoration, expressed that he still felt uneasy on Columbia’s campus. Others remembered “the events of the Columbia rebellion in a light-hearted way, recalling the sex, drugs, and

---


rock ‘n roll’ aspects of the demonstrations…they recall the humor and sense of satisfaction that were
associated with dissenting. Bradley’s description of Columbia’s Black student protest involves some of
the same issues as OSU’s Black students such as a Black Studies curriculum and increased numbers and
visibility of Blacks employed in both faculty and staff roles; however, academic advisement at an Ivy
League institution would not be neglected to avoid a bruise on the institution’s reputation. Hilton Clark’s
father, however, as an advisor to Black students in organizational development and advocacy for issues in
the Black community outside the university, had an identical counterpart in Dr. Charles O. Ross at
OSU.

Cheralyn Johnson’s published qualitative research, Guests at an Ivory Tower: The Challenges
Black Students Experience while Attending a Predominantly White University, is quite instructive since
her composite case study “Latrice” was developed from interviews with several students at a large, TWI
privately-funded university in the northeast. The case study composite has come to the large TWI from an
all Black high school. The composite case resembles a composite of issues and concerns expressed by
interviewees in the instant study. Johnson’s research has revealed that about eight in ten Black students
attend TWIs, that Black students are three times as likely to leave college [“stop-out”] at the end of their
sophomore year for academic reasons when compared to the total TWI population. And more than half of
these Black students have left for non-academic reasons. These students have also faced or encountered
psychosocial barriers. Johnson’s research was instrumental in designing data collection tools for the

113 Ibid.: 193 – 196.

114 Dr. Ross, a professor of Social Work and the first appointed Director of OSU’s Black Studies program,
advised the Black Student Union leaders and members, and demonstrated his abiding commitment to the
Black people in Columbus. In fact, Dr. Ross’ advocacy for the Black community resulted in his being
disciplined and ultimately fired from his some of his university roles. The Columbus Dispatch published no less
than forty (40) articles illuminating the social activism modeled for Black students at OSU by Black professor
of Social Work and founding Chair of Ohio State’s Black Studies program, Dr. Charles O. Ross. Ross’s
mentorship with students on campus and his activism with the Black neighborhoods off-campus was, at
minimum, an irritant, as described by the Dispatch, for the university. These articles began appearing as
early as June 2, 1971 and continued at least until September 12, 1972. For example, the Columbus Dispatch
headliner reads, as follows: “Franklin County Court of Appeals Rules That William Kunstler Cannot Represent
Charles O. Ross In Appeal in Connection With 1971 Incident at Linden-McKinley High School.”
instant study: survey protocol and interview protocols. Themes coming through her research: isolation, loneliness, alienation, racism and environmental dissatisfaction\textsuperscript{115} were also apparent in the instant research. Johnson’s study was one of the most recent studies; her findings suggest that not much has changed experientially in the student-life or academic-life arenas for Black students since the 1970s.

The historic period of student activism during the 1960s and 1970s has inspired sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists, historians, and educational researchers to examine the student movement in the United States: (Bradley:2009), (Corning and Myers:2002), (Cox:2006), (Edwards: 1970), (Giles:2008), (Fisher:2003), (Fleming: 2001), (Flowers:2005),(Franklin:2003), (Glasker:2002), (Jackson: 1971), (Jennings:2002), (Joseph:2003), (McCormick:1990), (Nelson:2000), (Orum:1968), (Ransford:1972), (Rhoads:1998), (Rogers:2009), (Rojas:2007), (Safier:2008), (Stewart, Settles and Winter: 1998), (Shea:1992), and (Thomas:1981) among others not reviewed in this document. Producing this plethora of secondary literature sources, most scholars acknowledge that student activism on the nation’s college campuses was spawned by African American student sit-ins protesting discrimination in public accommodations at Greensboro, NC. Activism and protest events involving Black students on traditionally white campuses have been given much less attention in the academy. However, the scholarship and literature recently produced by a few African American scholars has revealed that African American college students have consistently been social activists on their campuses, beginning as early as the first decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century (Franklin: 2003; Fisher: 2003).

Unfortunately, the prevailing tendency among scholars of the Black Student Movement has been to privilege how Black student activism impacted the Civil Rights Movement, for example (Carson: 1981), (Etheridge: 2008), (Hampton and Fayer: 1990) in general, and how the BSM specifically impacted the university campuses where the protests occurred (Bradley: 2009), (Glasker: 2002), (Williamson:

\textsuperscript{115} Cheralyn A. Johnson. *Guests at an Ivory Tower: The Challenges Black Students Experience While Attending a Predominantly White University.* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005): 2.3.
The institutional perspective of the Black Student Movement has overshadowed the students’ perspective of the Black Student Movement. The literature on Black student activism, privileging the Black students’ perspective, is nearly non-existent, except for Orum’s 1968 quantitative study of Black student activism at HCBUs, Jackson’s 1971 study of student activism also among students at HBCUs appreciably informed and augmented the qualitative scholarship of Edwards’ 1970 study, McCormick’s 1990 qualitative work about Black Rutgers students, Williamson’s 1999 study, and Johnson’s 2005 qualitative study about Black students at traditionally white institutions. Although Bradley (2009), Glasker (2002), Williamson (2003), and Rogers (2009) specifically dealt with Black students’ social activism at TWI’s, their perspective was more an institutional perspective. Delving into the circumstances and the histories of neglect and racism at both Ivy League universities and public “Ivies” and how the BSM impacted the institutions, while helpful, still leaves the voices and the experiences of Black students in the margins. Insufficient attention has been paid to “how” Black students perceived these historic events, and “how” Black students feel they benefitted or suffered from being student activists.

None of the published secondary literature, except Nelson’s 2000 book chapter, even referred to the BSM as it manifested at Ohio State University. Dr. Nelson enjoys the respect of his colleagues and his former OSU students for his contributions to the development of OSU’s African American Studies department; however, his book chapter provides more insight and information into the BSM at University of Illinois than it does about OSU. Ohio State’s Black student activism was not included in any of the studies cited above, including the Edwards study which involved Black student activists at more than sixty traditionally white institutions. Scant information exists about the Black Student Movement at OSU aside from newspaper articles and a few court documents. Given the BSM, OSU consequently instituted programs, curricula, and services which evolved from the overt activism of OSU’s Black students. Nonetheless, no studies prior to the current study have attempted to capture the essence of the Black Student Movement at OSU from the perspective of the students involved. Clearly, only the published autobiographies of acclaimed Black student activists: Carmichael, Davis, Edwards, Forman, and Hunter-
Gault provided the most corroborating data for a study of both “how” and “what” Black activists experienced in the 60s and 70s. In this light, their published works and this study help fill the lacunae.

CHAPTER 3

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study has been an inquiry process to explore a social or human problem. The enterprise has also specifically been a student-focused, phenomenological investigation into the Black Student Movement at OSU. The study has employed semi-structured interviews (a qualitative approach) with ten African American alumni who attended Ohio State during the 1960s and the 1970s, and a survey protocol (a quantitative approach) with an additional twenty, for a total of thirty African American 1960s-1970 OSU alumni, and document analyses (an additional qualitative approach) to answer the two principal research questions through primary source data.

The choice of phenomenology\textsuperscript{116}, a qualitative methodology, as the preferred design evolved not only from the research questions, but also evolved from an assessment of the improbability of answering the research questions through quantitative methodology. Another consideration for using phenomenology, an exploratory methodology, included the lacunae in the literature about the Black Student Movement, a situation lending itself more toward qualitative research, which is largely exploratory. As

\begin{footnote}
116 William Trochim and James Donnelly, The Research Methods Knowledge Base. Third Edition. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning, 2008), 180. The phenomenology tradition emphasizes the study of how the phenomenon is experienced by respondents or participants. It has a long history in several social research disciplines, including psychology, sociology, and social work. Phenomenology is a school of thought that focuses on people’s subjective experiences and interpretations of the world. . . . the phenomenologist wants to know how the world appears to others.
\end{footnote}
noted by research textbook authors, Trochim and Donnelly contend “…the main reason that a researcher might consider doing a qualitative study is when the state of knowledge in an area is quite limited; when constructs are not well understood, defined or measured; or when prior research has apparently hit a dead end…Thus, it is impossible to plan a study with the same level of detail and probability as a typical quantitative study.” ¹¹⁷ These authors also advise that qualitative research is typically the approach of choice in circumstances that have one or more of the following four characteristics: (1) for generating new theories or hypotheses, (2) for achieving a deep understanding of the issues, (3) for developing detailed stories to describe a phenomenon, and (4) for mixed methods research.

Qualitative research enables us to get at the rich complexity of the phenomenon, to deepen our understanding of how things work. Although quantitative research can describe a phenomenon generally, across a group of respondents, it is very difficult to learn from quantitative study how the phenomenon is understood and experienced by the respondents, how it interacts with other issues and factors that affect their lives…in social research, there are many complex and sensitive issues that almost defy quantitative summarizations.¹¹⁸

Although the research questions could be answered using other qualitative methods such as ethnography or case study, neither of these two approaches were as feasible with the time and budgetary constraints of a non-funded thesis study. Additionally, ethnography is generally conducted as it occurs progressively with the researcher in direct interaction with, or in personal observation of study subjects, an impossibility in this study. A case study would necessarily involve a broader spectrum of interviews and a thorough review of the institution in question in too brief a time frame for the instant thesis; additionally, a developed case study is somewhat inconsistent with giving privilege to the voices to marginalized African American students from the sixties and seventies. Phenomenology was determined to be a much more suitable methodology for a retrospective venture with alumni in this instance from respondents who experienced, through participation or observation, a complex amorphous phenomenon such as a social movement. Phenomenology was the more appropriate way through which to interrogate


¹¹⁸ Ibid. 143.
past experiences, and to gather a deeper understanding of the brief written participant responses on surveys, and oral interviews about publicly-staged OSU campus protests events, privately held organizational meetings and other less formal, but collective social interactions. Although the phenomenon or object of this enterprise is the Black student movement, more importantly, former OSU African American students and how these students experienced the phenomenon is the subject of this enterprise.

Trochim and Donnelly further advise:

Interpretation occurs at two levels...first there is the level of explanation, or accounting for how something seems to happen in a particular context. The second aspect of interpretation is related to understanding the apparent meaning of the experience for those being observed. How does a person seem to feel, think, behave in a given set of circumstances? The goal is to go beyond surface characterization to something called ‘thick description’ Thick description means that the story is told in detail, communicating the essence of what it is like for the participants.\(^{119}\)

John Creswell, another widely published and quoted research theorist, also informs us that the purpose of a phenomenological study is understanding and “… describ[ing] the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or phenomenon…” Creswell further describes the intentionality of consciousness, which informs the questions in this study and the choice for this qualitative approach, as follows: “This idea is that consciousness is always directed toward an object. Reality of an object, then, is inextricably related to one’s consciousness of it.”\(^{120}\) “[C]onsciousness is a unified intentional act…that does not mean it is deliberately willed, but that it is always directed to an ‘object’… in other words, to be conscious is to be conscious of something.” Given Creswell’s guidance, it was important to assure that study participants and the researcher were unified in our understanding of

\(^{119}\) Ibid.; 179.

the phenomenon, especially since the neither term “social movement” nor the label, Black Student Movement, were in the vocabularies of Black students during that period. This enterprise has worked toward for an African American, student/alumni perspective, not an institutional perspective, of the 1960s-1970s OSU campus atmosphere and protest events. The perspectives and experiences of former students, now alumni, are intentionally privileged over the perspectives of Black student protests proffered by Ohio State University through the media and the Ohio Criminal Codes (OCR) passed into law resulting from student protests on campus during the 1960s and 1970s.

**Research Questions (2)**

1. How did African-descended OSU students/alumni as participants, or observers in the Black Student Movement, experience the events and activities of the late 1960s – early 1970s, given the adverse media coverage associated with college campus student activism?

   a. How did African American students at OSU experience social activist organizations such as Congress on Racial Equality (CORE), Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC)?
   
   b. How did African American students at OSU experience “Greek-Letter” organizations (GLOs) during the Black Student Movement?

2. How did African American students/alumni feel they benefitted or suffered, given their student-life experiences at Ohio State during the 1960s and 1970s Black Student Movement?
c. What themes emerge from alumni who participated in collective campus protest activities called the Black Student Movement?

d. What themes emerge from alumni who did not participate in campus protest activities?

**Study Population and Sampling**

**Theoretical Population**

The actual number of African American students who were enrolled at Ohio State University between 1962 and 1972 is highly debatable, unclear and contestable, even though the researcher exhausted several strategies to determine a credible study sample. Ohio State University, like most traditionally white institutions, had not continuously maintained race or ethnic group data on its student population. Dr. James Mingle, a researcher in higher education, suggested that legal segregation did not exist in colleges and universities of the North and West during the 1940s; he estimated that Black enrollment in white colleges outside the South in 1947 was 61,000, which was essentially about 47 percent of all Black college enrollment, but a mere 3 percent of all enrollment in northern and western institutions:

Black enrollment nationwide represented 6 percent that year [1947], a high point which would not be reached again until 1967… [Black enrollment]… reached 8.4 percent of all enrollment in 1971, paused at that level for two years, then increased again annually from 1974 to 1977…The significant increase in Black enrollment beginning in 1967 was preceded by the Higher Education Act of 1965, which greatly expanded available financial aid through the College Work Study Program, Educational Opportunity Grants, and the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. These programs were followed by the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (BEOG), established in 1972.\(^{121}\)

Similarly Richard McCormick,\textsuperscript{122} in his discussion of the Black Student Movement at Rutgers University, reported there were “no comprehensive and reliable data on the number of Black students enrolled in predominantly white colleges and universities prior to 1968...[however]...a rough estimate is that [Blacks] made up no more than 2 percent of such enrollments in 1967.” Rutgers University reported “perhaps one hundred Black undergraduates in 1965; by 1968, their number had grown to over four hundred, when they constituted about 3 percent of the undergraduate enrollment. The instant study has taken the position that Black student enrollment at Ohio State would have been consistent with Rutgers and other such Land-Grant, publicly funded universities during the sixties and the seventies, i.e. 1 to 3 percent of the total student body. Alumni informally polled during the study estimated a range from 200 to 500 African American students enrolled each year during the ten-year period being studied\textsuperscript{123}. Fall Quarter 1964, the researcher’s matriculation quarter, OSU released enrollment data reporting forty thousand undergraduates on the Columbus campus. Based on the calculations above, the theoretical population for the ten-year study period is generously estimated at 5,000. Absolute figures were impossible to determine. Irrespective of the numbers, the essence of the findings in this study are much more about how the study participants experienced the Black Student Movement at Ohio State, not about the number of Blacks enrolled there at that time.

Study Recruitment Strategies

The sample was recruited through four different recruitment strategies, as follows: (1) “criterion,” wherein all study participants self-report they had been enrolled as students at OSU’s Main Columbus Campus for a minimum of three academic quarters, and all participants self-identify as


\textsuperscript{123} The estimate of 200 – 500 Black students annually enrolled at OSU include no fewer than twenty-seven (27) alumni who were enrolled between 1962-72, but who have been confirmed deceased; their names appear in Appendix H.
African-descended or African American or Black\textsuperscript{124}; (2) “stratified,” wherein all study participants had been students between 1962-1972;\textsuperscript{125} (3) “snowball,” wherein study participants identified by other participants who knew which cases were “information rich;” and (4) “opportunistic,” happenstance i.e. following new leads which took advantage of the unexpected, e.g. two funerals where African-descended OSU alumni were planning to congregate. The “snowball” technique produced alumni contact information, telephone calls, e-mail addresses and correspondence, and researcher personal contacts with other alumni. Memorial services for two deceased alumni during 2009 and 2010 produced unexpectedly “opportunistic” recruitment activity.

No intent, nor effort was made toward random population sampling. In this study, only alumni from a specific racial/ethnic group were sought out as participants. At the same time, the sampling in this enterprise was purposive sampling. Seeking only Black alumni from 1962-1972 was a “stratified” recruitment necessity to identify only Black alumni who were enrolled at OSU during that specific period. Researchers and textbook authors, Trochim and Donnelly, instruct that “[i]n purposive sampling, the researcher samples with a purpose in mind… seeking one or more pre-defined groups…”\textsuperscript{126} They further suggest that non-probability samples may or may not represent the theoretical population well, making it difficult to know how well or whether the sample really does represent that theoretical population. Taking these methodological perspectives into account, this study did not anticipate being able to broadly generalize the data to all African American students who ever attended OSU. However, the researcher did

\textsuperscript{124} Although the OSU Alumni Association required only 15 credit hours’ OSU attendance to be considered alumnus, the researcher decided that 15 credit hours was too brief an academic experience for alumni to have a credible experience at the university. The researcher also was only interested in those alumni who self-identified as Black, African-American or African-descended.

\textsuperscript{125} 1962-1972 was determined for the study period in order to include students enrolled before, during, and after two Bricker Hall sit-ins 1968 and 1970, which were national media documentation and resulted in student arrests.

expect to generalize to whatever finite number of Blacks students might have been identified between 1962 and 1972 at Ohio State despite the relatively few participants.

Primary sources planned to recruit for study participants were the OSU Registrar’s Office, the OSU Office of Minority Affairs, and the OSU Alumni Association. Secondary recruitment sources included organizations such as Greek-Letter graduate chapters in the Columbus metropolitan area, and the OSU African American Alumni Society. Soliciting the membership roll and the attendance list for the African American Alumni Society’s 2010 All-Decades Reunion, and attending the 2009 OSU Alumni Recruiter Training in Columbus produced many study participants. Soliciting alumni contact information from various Columbus area graduate chapters of the Greek-letter organizations which operated at OSU during the ‘60s and ‘70s produced no formal results; however, individual members of Greek-letter organizations were extremely instrumental in identifying and locating participants for the study.

Accessible Population was estimated to be 300. Unfortunately, the researcher’s inquiries to the OSU Registrar’s Office, to the Office of Minority Affairs, and to the OSU Alumni Association produced absolutely no data about Black student enrollment at Ohio State during the 1960s and 1970s. Neither the OSU Registrar’s Office nor the OSU Office of Minority Affairs responded to researcher requests for information on former OSU students. Neither the OSU Alumni Association, nor the African American Alumni Society, nor any of the Greek-Letter graduate chapters would release membership rolls or demographics to the researcher.

127 The Ohio University State Alumni Association is the original non-profit organization for OSU alumni. All Ohio State alumni and friends are welcome to join the Alumni Association. If you attended for 15 or more credit hours or have graduated from Ohio State, you may join as an Active member. Friends of the university may join as Associate members. More than 60 Ohio State alumni societies allow members to serve the university based on their individual interests and experiences.

Alumni society activities include service projects, reunions, student recruitment, alumni placement, and professional development. Browse our listing and contact a society leader for details.
A desultory, although a fecund source for determining both the theoretical and the accessible populations was a list of African American alumni who planned to attend the African American Alumni Society’s 2010 All Decades African American Reunion in late April 2010. Although two hundred, thirty-four (234) names appeared on the AAAS Reunion list, only fifty-four (54) persons with graduation dates during the 1960s and the 1970s were listed among registered reunion participants. Another source, a google website list of OSU football players, was also accessed for names of African American student players during this period; nine (9) athletes could be identified as African American, but three (3) of that eight were already deceased, yielding only six (6) as possible study respondents. One alumnus of those six football athletes was already on the AAAS All Decades African American Reunion list cited above.

There were twenty-six (26) African American alumni who attended OSU during the 1960s -1970s who are now confirmed as deceased; their names appear in Appendix G. The accessible population estimate is based on alumni lists complied by the researcher from scrapbook photos owned by various participants, alumni names which came from “snowball sampling” and alumni names gathered at “opportunistic” chance meetings at two Black alumni memorials during 2009 and 2010. These name lists were compiled, along with alumni names from public website sources, the attendance list from the 2010 All Decades African American Alumni Reunion, and from the list of confirmed deceased alumni from the period studied.

Based on the above recruitment activities and strategies, the number of African American students who could be identified and were enrolled at OSU during at least three academic quarters between 1962 and 1972 constitute a constructed sample of approximately 300 in the “accessible

---

128 The OSU African American Alumni Society (AAAS) is one of the 60 societies referenced in the footnote above; it caters to the interests and experiences of OSU’s African American alumni. Reunion Attendees List is being maintained among researcher’s field notes. This list was made available to the researcher only because she was a reunion registrant who received the paid list of Reunion Attendees in April 2010.

Data Collection Procedures

Data Collection Locations:

Interview and survey data were collected in three Ohio cities, as follows: Columbus, Dayton, and Kettering. Columbus surveys were administered and interviews were conducted by the researcher at the

130 OSU attendance for fifteen credit hours is the minimum required for former students to qualify as members of the official OSU Alumni Association. Qualified participants in this study needed to have enrolled fulltime for at least three academic quarters.

While by enrollment estimates of 21st century at OSU, the total number of Black students estimated on campus seems low, by comparison in the McCormick study of Blacks at Rutgers during the sixties was estimated equally as low. McCormick’s data suggested a mere two hundred Blacks had ever received baccalaureate degrees from Rutgers out of twenty-four thousand awarded from that institution between 1952 and 1967. McCormick and Thomas both cite the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 as giving impetus to a surge in enrollments by Black students at traditionally white institutions. This study aligns with McCormick that unfortunately no comprehensive or reliable data on Blacks enrolled at TWIs before 1968 exists.

http://ohiostatealumni.org/membership/Types/Pages/default.aspx (accessed 06/25/2010)

131 According to Trochim and Donnelly, N is the number of cases in the sampling frame; n is the number of cases in the sample. The Research Methods Knowledge Base. Third Edition. (Mason, OH: Atomic Dog, 2008), 43.
OSU Main Campus in the Ohio Union and in the Longaberger Alumni House; at a public restaurant selected by one interviewee; and at a downtown Columbus hotel lobby selected by another interviewee.

At both Dayton, OH and Kettering, OH, interview and survey data were collected at participants’ residences. Archival records and documents were collected by the researcher from alumni in Cleveland, OH and in Columbus, OH. Data were also collected from three participants in Atlanta, GA. In Atlanta, GA locations for data collection included The Georgia State University Library, and public restaurants.

Data Collection Procedures

(See Appendix A) Initially, participants/members of the sub-sample \( n=30 \) were introduced individually to the study by use of the Informed Consent Form and process [approximately 5-7 minutes]. The informed Consent form notified study participants that their Individual Interviews would be voice-recorded; that their agreement to participate and signature were also their agreement to be recorded. Each participant was given an identical original duplicate of the form which was signed by both the researcher and the participant; participants were instructed to maintain the signed copy for their own use.

(See Appendix E) After signing the Informed Consent Form, each participant was asked to sign, “Authorization to List Name in Study Participant Table.” This form represents the participant’s authorization to be listed among other study participants in a table, which is located in the manuscript’s Appendix. On this form, participants were asked to specifically “agree” or “decline” having their names and academic data appear in a Study Participants List when the final report is published; the signed agreement or declination was secured from each study participant to assure their instructions were followed. Having this signed declaration leaves very little opportunity for inadvertent disclosure.\(^{132}\)

\(^{132}\) Both Morris in The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities organizing for Change (p.330) , and McAdam in Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970 (p.254-260) include Appendices listing the people they interviewed or surveyed. The ability to “know” just who are the study participants seems to lend credibility to the enterprise, especially in light of propagandized “rebelliously dangerous” images of the ’60s..
Next, participants were provided with a survey protocol and a pen. Survey completion required approximately ten (10) minutes of each participant’s time.

Those who consented to an individual interview spent approximately an hour or less of their time for this part of the study. The researcher conducted individual interviews in a private, or semi-private area, with one exception. Six of the interviews conducted were semi-structured and open-ended employing Protocol II, which interrogated “how” alumni experienced the OSU Black Student Movement, a more phenomenological approach to answering the research questions. Three interviews were conducted using Protocol I, which had been originally developed to interrogate “what” the alumni experienced during the Black Student Movement, more a case study approach to answering the research questions. The researcher as a study participant was interviewed by another Georgia State graduate student employing Protocol I. During the OSU African American Alumni Association (AAAS) Reunion in April 2010 in Columbus, Ohio, one survey respondent spontaneously requested to be interviewed right before he left the reunion; he was interviewed at his insistence on the spot, in an Alumni Hall reception room; his recorded interview was entirely impromptu and unstructured.

Data Collection Protocols (3):

Appendix D is the survey instrument developed to elicit several categories of data: (a) participant family background data and participant college-level academic achievement; (b) participants student–life experiences at OSU, i.e. their own student activist behaviors, their academic- life experiences, their residence-life experiences, and experiences which they perceived as racial discrimination or racial prejudice; and (c) their feelings about scenarios typically arising in informal discourse among Black alumni.

Accordingly, the survey protocol has three distinct sections which correspond to the three categories of data sought through this measure. The top section [category (a) above] includes nine (9) queries to gather contextualizing data on the study participants, aside from being Black and in-residence
during the period being studied. The middle section [category (b) above] contains twenty-four (24) queries to elicit specific examples of experiences which characterize participants’ student life at OSU. The bottom section [category (c)] includes six (6) statements heard frequently during informal alumni discourse; participants are asked to “agree/disagree:”

The top section [category (a)] interrogates specific participant personal background information such as gender, state of residence, whether an OSU degree was conferred, which degrees the participant received from OSU, participant family/antecedents’ affiliations with social activist organizations\textsuperscript{133}, and whether these family antecedents attended college;\textsuperscript{134} there are nine items in category (a). The middle section [category (b)] interrogates individual experiences related to student activist behavior, academic-life, residential and social life, discrimination, and military service. There are a total of twenty-three “yes/no” items, as follows: nine (9) items which query alumni activists behaviors and sentiments; five (5) queries about participant academic-life issues; four (4) queries about their residence life; three (3) items about racial discrimination ; and two (2) ask about the Vietnam War and preparation for military service. The bottom section [category (c)] the participant’s feelings and attitudes frequently expressed by Black alumni in casual discourse. The six statements represent “feelings about” situations and or events, with which participants are asked to “agree/disagree.” These last items on the survey have been designed to cross-check and contextualize participant responses in the middle section [category (b)].

Appendix B is an interview protocol, Interview Protocol (I): Questions on this protocol were designed to gather qualitative data from a case study approach, and to enhance data from the surveys. These questions were developed to elicit more detail and context than could be interpreted from simple “yes/no” or

\textsuperscript{133} The John Jackson 1971 study informs this particular aspect of a student’s background; his study sought to explain protest behavior in terms of background characteristics and with describing the behavior of contemporary black college students.

\textsuperscript{134} Jennings on “Generation Units and the Student Protest Movement in the United States: An Intra- and Intergenerational Analysis” informs this group of queries also; long-term national panel data from high school class of 1965 and data from their parents and offspring were used...
“agree/disagree” survey responses from participants. Appendix B was expected to help answer Research Question #1: How did African-descended OSU students/alumni as participants, or observers in the Black Student Movement, experience the events and activities of the late 1960s – early 1970s?
   
a. How did African American students at OSU experience about social activist organizations such as Congress on Racial Equality (CORE), Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC)?

b. How did African American students at OSU experience “Greek-letter” organizations (GLOs) during the Black Student Movement?

Appendix C is an additional interview protocol, Interview Protocol (II): Questions on this protocol were designed to be capture qualitative interview data from a phenomenological approach; this protocol was designed to provoke a different level of thought on trends which became evident as data from the Survey Instrument, Appendix A, were being progressively analyzed. Appendix C was expected to help answer Research Question #2: How did African American students/alumni feel they benefitted or suffered, given their student-life experiences at Ohio State during the 1960s and 1970s Black Student Movement?

   c. What themes emerge from alumni who participated in collective campus protest activities called the Black Student Movement?

   d. What themes emerge from alumni who did not participate in campus protest activities?

Data Analysis Criteria

Contrary to typical methods of data analysis in quantitative studies, qualitative methods of data analysis judge the research from different perspectives, although both attempt to achieve the same goal: truth seeking. Traditional criteria for judging quantitative research include internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity. There are specific formulas or methods to see data through a lens or
framework which all others can also repeat, augment, and agree on. The role of the researcher, in particular, is a purposefully neutralized one, which is imputed to taint the research findings if construed as other than neutral and therefore “subjective.” The overarching perspective of quantitative research is linear and therefore assumes that only standardized perspectives are suitable to examine or to account for the object of the research.

Regarding the “quality of qualitative research,” Trochim and Donnelly provide the following background and insights:

Some qualitative researchers reject the framework of validity that is commonly accepted in more quantitative research in the social sciences. They reject the idea that there is a singular reality that exists separate from our perceptions. In their view, each of us sees a different reality because we see it from a different perspective and through different experiences. They don’t think research can be judged using the criteria of validity.

Research is less about getting at the truth than it is about reaching meaningful conclusions, deeper understanding, and useful results.135

Since the instant study has sought an understanding of the Black Student Movement from the perspective of African American OSU students, a phenomenological approach, the criteria or standards for judging this qualitative research needed to be appropriate to the objectives of the study. Alternative criteria for judging qualitative research according to Trochim and Donnelly include credibility,136 transferability,137


136 Ibid.: 149. The credibility criteria involve establishing that the results of qualitative research are credible or believable from the perspective of the participant in the research. Since from this perspective the purpose of qualitative research is to describe or understand the phenomenon of interest from the participants eyes, the participants are the only ones who can legitimately judge the credibility of the results.

137 Ibid.: 149. Transferability refers to the degree to which the results of qualitative research can be generalized or transferred to other contexts or settings. From a qualitative perspective, the transferability is primarily the responsibility of the one doing the generalizing. The qualitative researcher can enhance transferability by doing a thorough job of describing the research context and the assumptions that were central to the research.
dependability, dependability, and confirmability. These criteria have been applied to analyze the data collected in the present study.

Since qualitative data can be collected through a variety of methods including in-depth interviews, and written documents, this study has utilized them both, a survey instrument, and secondary analysis, which like content analysis, makes use of already existing data sources. According to Trochim and Donnelly, secondary analysis typically, but not always, refers to the re-analysis of raw data rather than text. In the present study, the results of qualitative research published by Orum in 1968, and by Edwards in 1970 have been utilized along with various other primary source data to explicate student activist behaviors and the phenomenon about which study participants were asked to comment. Since no research could be found on the Black student movement at Ohio State University, primary source data from study participant interviews and other primary source documents have been analyzed to construct a profile of Black student activists at OSU and the Black Student Movement, as they saw and perceived it during the 1960s and 1970s. Like other examples in historical research involving African Americans [such as plantation life in the South where the enslaved were depicted by White historians as docile, benign and “happy’ with their enslavement lifestyles], the perspectives of African American students at OSU were influenced by their history of racial oppression in the United States and by their African American worldview which placed a premium on higher education unparalleled by Whites from similar

---

138 Ibid.; 149. The traditional quantitative view of reliability is based on the assumption of replicability or repeatability...whether you would obtain the same results if you would observe the same thing twice. The idea of dependability, on the other hand, emphasizes the need for the researcher to account for the ever-changing context within which research occurs.

139 Ibid.; 149. Qualitative research tends to assume that each researcher brings a unique perspective to the study. Confirmability refers to the degree to which others can confirm or corroborate the results. For example, the researcher can actively search for and describe negative instances that contradict prior observations.

140 Ibid.; 152.

141 Other primary source data in this study have included published autobiographies of renowned 1960s Black student activists; public records such as the Ohio Code Section 3345 and published newspaper articles regarding the events at Ohio State University during the Black Student Movement.
socio-economic strata. Dissimilar to traditional historical research where African Americans have been objectified and marginalized in the results, the present study has sought to privilege the perspectives of these OSU students from the days of the Black Student Movement. Alternative ways of truth–seeking and fact-finding are essential for an African American perspective on major historical events in America.

Credibility analysis has been achieved noting the consistent repetition in issues raised during the data collection process by an overwhelming majority of study participants, e.g. fears of failure and social reprobation, of physical harm, of academic reprisals, isolation and alienation, and coping mechanisms created through group affiliations. Transferability analysis has been accomplished through careful comparisons of the findings in other seminal research of a qualitative nature by sociologists, Anthony Orum and Harry Edwards. Replicability has been inferred based on the primary data from the present study of OSU participants who also attended other universities, and based on the studies of Black students in protest modes during the same period of time at Columbia University, the University of Illinois, and Rutgers University. Confirmability has been achieved through the review and analysis of other primary source data such as published autobiographies of renowned Black student activists from the period, and from the researcher’s review of the Ohio Revised Code, Section 3345, and published articles from periodicals and newspapers from the period being studied. Finally, the researcher’s informal discussions with study participants subsequent to the data collection have completed the circular process of credibility analysis legitimizing the believability of the phenomenon and the perspectives of Black OSU students.

The themes developed from the individual interviews are axial in the data analysis. In this regard, Trochim and Donnelly further advise that…

Interpretation occurs at two levels…first there is the level of explanation, or accounting for how something seems to happen in a particular context. The second aspect of interpretation is related to understanding the apparent meaning of the experience for those being observed. How does a person seem to feel, think, behave in a given set of circumstances? The goal is to go beyond surface characterization to something called ‘thick description’ Thick description means that the story is told in detail, communicating the essence of what it is like for the participants.
The use of expressive language and the presence of voice is a particularly distinctive feature of qualitative research reports in contrast to quantitative studies.  

CHAPTER 4

IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS

Data Analyses from Individual Interviews

Group Demographics

Data from ten alumni interviews were transcribed and coded. Women comprised 70 percent (7) of the ten interviewees consulted; men comprised the other 30 percent (3). Three of the seven women interviewed actually earned undergraduate degrees from OSU. In summary, two of the three males interviewed actually earned OSU undergraduate degrees; the third male briefly attended Moritz College of Law at OSU. Half (5) of those interviewed earned degrees from Ohio State and the other half (5) did not. All ten interviewees earned degrees at some university. The five interviewees who did not earn an OSU degree did, however, earn undergraduate, graduate, and terminal degrees from other universities; two interviewees from this group of five earned the Juris Doctor (JD), a terminal degree.

Discussion: Four Principal Themes Developed from Interview Data

142 Ibid.; 179.

143 Twelve (12) total participants agreed to an interview for this study. Eleven (11) were former OSU students or alumni, and one was a retired OSU staff person who had worked closely for 30 years among African American students and faculty. Data from the staff person’s interview added necessary context regarding Black students’ organizing activities, which were unofficially sheltered under a succession of directors and chairpersons assigned to manage Black Studies at OSU from its inception and in all its manifestations; her information also provided context to the movement events and mood of the Black Student Movement over an extended period of time, some of which was outside the scope of this study. Data from the eleventh alumni interview was not transcribed or incorporated because the participant’s recollections were admittedly vague, and her periods of OSU attendance barely met the qualifying requirements.

144 Did not earn an OSU undergraduate degree, but earned the Juris Doctorate afterwards at other universities: D. Janine Thompson and Leonard Tate.
This study has been a qualitative introspection into the student life experiences of Black students at Ohio State University; it has employed the viewpoints and gaze of these former students to understand the Black Student Movement at OSU from the experiences of these former students. Four recurring themes emerged from the semi-structured interview data: (1) isolation, (2) fear, (3) community, and (4) persistence to completion. Themes are defined below, utilizing anecdotal references and examples provided by the ten interviewees in this study.

**Isolation**, i.e. feeling psychologically and/or physically alone, was discussed in terms of various campus experiences: in dormitory housing experiences where two Black female students were among a total of 400 dormitory residents on OSU’s newly developed North campus in an “experimental” setting; feeling psychologically and racially miniscule in large 500-seat classroom settings; feelings of isolated “not belonging” or not being able to belong to the club for future engineers as one of only four Blacks in the College of Engineering. Alienation resulting in self-imposed isolation was painfully recalled by a Black female student who had been openly and sarcastically belittled in a large classroom by two different professors in separate classes. Isolation and alienation due to the systematic neglect in academic counseling situations was recalled by two different female students; several participants reported never receiving any academic counseling or advisement. Another participant reported being advised to enroll in two 5-hour physical science courses during the same semester, along with a full schedule of other courses; she flunked the science course not needed for her major and injured her grade point average.

**Fear**, i.e. feeling afraid of what might happen was reported by 50 percent of the interviewees in terms of apprehension over failing grades or academic probation; apprehension over losing social and financial support from family, worry over the possibility of physical assault or verbal confrontations or racial epithets; being afraid of police brutality; worry over being sent to die in the Vietnam War, and general paranoia although someone, such as professors, really did have your occupational demise in their plans. One male participant described the “good Samaritan” efforts of a frat brothers devolve into bogus criminal charges, which caused an enrollment suspension, which resulted in the student being drafted into
the military. Another female participant reported being fearful of speaking out in class; her recall was so impassioned that she began to look threatened all over again during the interview.

*Community* was a commonly expressed experience participants remembered fondly. Most participants found their “community” among members of their Greek-letter organizations and church affiliations. Sorors and frat brothers bailed out one another financially, academically and socially. Rooms, food, books and transportation were shared. Lifelong friends and life partners were discovered and maintained at GLO social events held at the South Terrace in the Ohio Union. A female GLO member, a mere “pledge” at the time, recalled being given both tuition by a soror and an edict for unwavering persistence at OSU until she actually earned her degree; she also recalled that the sorority found her an off-campus residence with another soror, and a job to further support her persistence toward that bachelor’s degree. Two thirds of all study participants were affiliated with one of the five Greek-letter organizations founded by Black collegians; 145 Comments made by all non GLO interviewees indicated that GLO affiliation percentages would have been greater except for constraints such as a too low grade point averages, or insufficient funds for the modest initiation fees. In some instances, interviewees included members of the Black population in Columbus, OH part of their “community,” especially if they had relatives “in the City.” “Town” students (commuters) shared their community: homes, families and other resources especially with out-of-state students. The “community” which Black OSU students created was one of necessity, which taught a variety of coping skills and lessons not available through textbooks and traditional classrooms.

*Persistence*, especially in the face of sundry adversities, was replete and paramount in the minds and anecdotal stories of these students. The histories of “drop-outs,” “stop-outs,” unplanned pregnancies, the military conscription, criticisms from parents who had not experienced the academy and even recriminations from parents whose HBCU experiences had no parallel to the gargantuan Ohio State University failed to daunt the persistence of participants in this study. Whether they finished at OSU or

145 During the 1960s, the five GLOs on the OSU campus were Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, and Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity.
elsewhere, they did, in fact “finish,” achieving the goal which each believed would enable their chances for living “the American dream.” One male interviewee reported that it took him seven years to complete one Bachelor’s degree; a “stop-out” which enabled his being drafted, and fatherhood preceded by marriage and other responsibilities slowed his rate of college attendance. Unplanned pregnancies and resulting family responsibilities were a typical cause for protracted enrollment during the undergraduate phase for these students. One student recalled she serendipitously missed being charged criminally for the 1968 Bricker Hall “take-over;” she had to leave campus to retrieve her infant from the babysitter. This same student received her Bachelor’s degree within five years of enrollment, with three small children in tow at her 1971 commencement. Four of the six women interviewees “flunked out” of Ohio State; all four of these women finished undergraduate school elsewhere and also earned graduate or professional degrees afterwards. Persistence was a paramount theme, especially in light of the negative press given the Black student Movement.

These themes were contextualized to answer the two research questions, as follows: “What were the experiences and attitudes of African American OSU students/alumni as observers, or participants in the Black Student Movement, given the adverse media coverage associated with college campus activism?” but also “How did African American students/alumni feel they benefitted or suffered, given their enrollment experiences at Ohio State University during the 1960s and 1970s Black Student Movement?”

Since this study is “social research” and “…theoretical, meaning that much of it is concerned with developing, exploring, [and] or testing the theories or ideas that social researchers have about how the world operates, …[t]he research questions [have been] often stated in the context of one or more

146 Not only did the Columbus Dispatch and the Lantern publish articles which cast doubts on the protest behaviors of Black students, but students also received negative “press” from segments of Columbus’ Black population. Some older Blacks in Columbus thought student activists were ruining their already limited access to OSU, which was viewed as a privilege regardless of the racially adverse environment and issues.
theories that have been advanced to address the problem.\textsuperscript{147} Two such theories undergird the essence of the research questions, and how the participants’ responses are interpreted. As such the language and concepts of social movement theory, especially Morris’ “indigenous perspective,”\textsuperscript{148} have informed and shaped the questions through which Black alumni were asked to recollect their consciousness using various survey protocol questions. Additionally, Harry Edwards’ construction of “Reluctant Revolutionaries,” a five-tiered typology of Black student protest behaviors and ideologies, is equally instructive as an interpretive lens for participant responses in the instant study. Edwards’ categories were developed from qualitative and ethnographic data which he gathered while lecturing and organizing Black student groups on more than sixty predominantly white colleges and university campuses in America during a three-year period from Summer, 1966 to Summer, 1969. There were 378 participants, Black students at TWIs, in Edwards study.\textsuperscript{149}

Themes produced from participant data: isolation, fear, community, and persistence to finishing their educational objectives are replete throughout the interview data. Overwhelmingly, participants experienced isolation which some theories suggest fostered activist organizing. Fear of both failure and reprisals was expressed and experienced consistently. Community developed through social huddling in the significant experience of Greek-letter organization memberships was paramount for these alumni during the movement. However, despite the possibilities and experiences of being arrested, jailed, sued, and not getting the education for which one’s family had sacrificed, Black alumni generally expressed feelings of pride and acquisition of social capital because of their affiliation with OSU. Several thought of their experiences as beneficial in their ideological and political training, which they had not expected to get at OSU; some even thought of their student activist days as exhilarating and exciting. Conversely,


some study participants’ experiences at OSU during this period remain a source of consternation and
distaste, except for their lifelong friendships made with other African American students.

Respondents do not generally remember any civil rights organizations recruiting students on
campus; but some vaguely remember a campus chapter of NAACP in the 1970s. None of males who
served did so as officers even though seven of them had been in R.O.T.C. Generally respondents’ rhetoric
about social activism was more fervent than their admitted participation in social activist events; this does
not prove or disprove that they were social activists since activism can take form in many more ways than
showing up for public demonstrations. The fact that only 60 percent of these respondents actually resided
“on campus” might also account for the 60 plus percent who reported attending rallies and marches. The
smaller percentage who reported actually being present for the Administration Building\footnote{What was universally called “the Administration Building” in the 1960s has since been named Bricker Hall.} “take-over”
could have been influenced by both “drop-outs” and “stop-outs,” and by graduation; half of those
interviewed reported being graduated (1), “stopped-out” (2) and “dropped-out” (2) between 1962 and
1972. The other half of those interviewed provided significant context about how they perceived the
“take-over.” The following compendia of interview data are provided to construct an aggregate image of
the data from all ten interviews conducted; these data will partially explicate the principal research
questions and sub-questions, thereby addressing the thesis. Based on their interview data, the following
five respondents had the most direct experiences in the Black Student Movement: Reggie, Vonnie,
Leonard, Andrea, and Charlotte. These interview data are excerpted from gross interview transcriptions.

Reggie: Active Member of the Black Student Union

Reggie described himself as an active member of the Black Student Union and reported,

“You automatically belonged, if you were a Black student. There was no joining! I could
have been a leader, and in a sense, I was. My role was to sort of “protect people” and to advise
people what to do, what not to do, and so forth. In this country there was a way to do things so
as not to get hurt!” I was an older student, you know, back from Vietnam. And at 23-22 years of age, I had a fair understanding culturally of how things worked in this country. I was advising young folk to “…don’t go into the administration building.” I’m sure, I saw the petition letter and could have signed it myself. I was of an age where I knew that individual letter-writing campaigns would be much more effective.

They [Black students] got charged; it had to do with disruption. Okay. It was the “administration building take-over;” that was the main transgression. It was taking the protest from outside to the inside, that’s what it was. Nobody was harmed; nobody was beat up. None of the staff in the administration building were threatened. But rightly, or wrongly, the kids probably should not have gone inside. Because what happened was, they signed a formal protest petition and were expelled from school. Okay! Whether they had participated or not, but if they had signed the demands… Boom! They were expelled from school! There was a lot of yelling and screaming, too, which always clouded the issues.”

“…and it was particularly hard to go to school back then. I know in my own case, my grades weren’t good enough to get a student loan. There were no real student loans; there were “grants,” gifts of money. I had to drop out a couple times, a couple different quarters. Money I had counted on coming I didn’t get. There were rules the university had to follow, or chose to follow. We didn’t know, but there were rules. And the rule back then was…I remember, I might have been .3 to .6 tenths of a point below what I needed to have been academically to get a loan. Okay, the cut off, I think, was 2.5. You had to have a 2.5 g.p.a. If you had a 2.499, you could forget get it [the loan].

Regarding Black student activism, Reggie responded,

“Oh, my understanding it’s two-fold: 1st and foremost, a perception by Black students in question that there’s a need for activism. Their perceived need for activism may be based upon some injustices they see with respect to the institution: rules, requirements, so on and so forth. And the other side of it refers to the institution. And, which raises the question, was there, in fact, uh, discrimination, uh, different treatment of the Black population compared to the majority. Social activism did not really start by Black students until approximately 1967. It grew from letter-writing campaigns to, uh, protests. [And] There was a “take-over.

There were Black students who had their protests…It [BSU] was an organization that put out a newspaper [Our Choking Times], the students wrote it. There was the on-going protest against the Vietnam War which was pretty much managed by a majority of white kids. And all this was going on simultaneously.

And, uh, one of the things that Black kids knew astutely, because we had witnessed policeman all over campus, the National Guard was there. And, uh, we intuitively knew as Black people that somebody was going to get killed; okay? And sure enough, happened. It happened at Kent State. But all the state campuses had the National Guard in force; you couldn’t go to class. So, finally, Ohio State cancelled classes for that Spring Quarter! But the Black kids, upon seeing what was going on, basically got off campus! Okay? There were no Black kids on campus during that time. They just left because somebody was going to get killed! Oh, yeah, J. Edgar Hoover was

---

everywhere. Black kids knew that they did not need the aggravation from the FBI, Columbus police, whoever, and campus police interfering with their goal of graduation.\textsuperscript{152}

Reggie, in the late ‘60s, was a mid–twenties Vietnam War veteran who had been drafted during a time where he was working and saving to return to OSU, a “drop out” for lack of financial aid. He proudly reports that he is third or fourth generation to attend college in his family, which has been in the building construction business. He also reported that because of his family background in the building trades, he was assigned to the Army Corps of Engineers which kept him away from the most dangerous Vietnam duty sites. He continued describing the lengthy family history of his ancestors in colleges, including his dad’s brother who attended Tuskegee, one of the famous group of “Tuskegee Airmen., and said that among his family members, ten (10) hold degrees they earned from Ohio State University, including two (2) of his four offspring … Reggie, a former OSU football player, is now a 67 year old retired professional who finally earned his Bachelor of Arts from Ohio State in Summer Quarter 1971. Reggie’s central Ohio middle-class background, his political ideology, and his leadership role in the Black Student Union at Ohio State would situate him in Edwards’ “radical activist” category.

Asked whether his activist behavior in the BSU has been beneficial or detrimental, Reggie said

“We love the school; it’s great training ground for going out to the world. Okay, Ohio State is a microcosm of the world. It’s like what Mat Schnell said about Woody Hayes,… “He treated everybody the same, Bad!”

Vonnie: Active Member of the Black Student Union

Vonnie described herself as a member of the Black Student Union; she first enrolled at OSU during 1969 and remained until 1971 before dropping out of school. This is how she described the BSU,

…when I think back about different guys that I knew [pause] that really “stepped up to the plate”; now there were many people that participated as far as “support,” you know, the supporting people…[But] the majority of the people that I was involved with in the Black Student Movement, the heads; I couldn’t say they were spiritual people.

I did feel a need to join the BSU…mostly for the change of it all. But once again, being as sheltered as I was, I could only see the small injustices. You know, so many times, and it goes

\textsuperscript{152} ibid.
back to Women’s Studies, so many times things have been done to you, and you really don’t see them for what they are, until somebody brings it to your attention; and, then, you’re sitting in those groups and you’re listening; and, all of a sudden, the light bulb comes on!

So the group was very enlightening more than anything else; I don’t know if I was really strong enough to stand up and take a stance, but I was there for support. [pause] Because, the guys that were, uh, even like the Mike Whites, the people in the forefront they were so radical as far as the campus was concerned. 1969 through 1971; and that was during the time of the Black [pause] really, the height of the movement itself...the take-over of the administrative offices.153

Vonnie reported she was neither a member of a Greek-letter organization, nor a religious organization, nor a civil rights organization. In response to why she thought so few Black students previously reported they didn’t attend religious activities, her response was:

I didn’t even think about joining a church! It never occurred to me. As a matter of fact, I didn’t even go! …the majority of homes we came out of, their families participated in that. But once people came onto campus, do they really “practice it,” or do you really think they believed in…? 154

She felt “…that because they [GLOs were] more a social activity, … you look at the social aspect of it versus the other public aspect of it and that…because of needing to have a “connective” a “connective feel.” … the majority of the people that were involved in sororities and fraternities came in, in groups, and they normally joined the sororities in groups. And, if you were on the “outside,” you were on the outside! And regarding Black student activists, like herself in membership with preeminent civil rights organizations, Vonnie’s response was:

Most of the people I was aware of in those organizations were much older people. And, once again, they really didn’t come in to campus to try to get to join or to participate in those groups. They weren’t as prevalent on campus, as you think they would have been. I don’t think that they came out on campus and tried to get people to join. And I don’t remember seeing Urban League on campus, trying to get people to join. After I stepped out of Ohio State, that’s when my growth took place; and I started understanding exactly what was going on. But I was at such a growing point when I was younger at Ohio State, and coming from where I came from, being so sheltered that I, really, uh, because a lot of things weren’t discussed around me, you understand what I mean? 155

153 Interview with Lavonda Clarke Fountaine, May 29, 2010.
154 Ibid.
155 Ibid.
In regard to whether she perceived her student activism at OSU as a benefit or as a detriment, Vonnie described instances during two distanced segment of her sojourn at OSU; in both instances she had been publicly humiliated by professors in classroom settings. She said:

Because when you have someone that, and [gallows laughter] I’m being really real about this whole thing, when you’ve got someone that is not used to being mistreated, or not recognizing the fact that they’ve really truly been mistreated, until it’s blatant. ; I remember the professor bluntly saying in front of the class, and I was a freshman during the time, he pulled my paper and said, “This doesn’t make any sense what this person wrote, and blah, blah, blah…” And he just degraded my whole paper. It took a hit on me, because, you know, I never returned to that class. And when I returned … and this was during the ’80s, I had a class that was very hard time in, and I don’t know why; I got “A’s” and “B’s” in every other class I ever took.

I had a woman that was professor, very well known and had been there a long time; [the class was convened in] a hall of [that held] 500 people. We were sitting, and she would call you down to pick up your papers. I’ll never forget her commenting, “Oh, yeah, you did really good!” And called my name. And I thought I’d had a rough time; and I just knew I had failed that exam. And so when I got down there, she looked at the paper and just said, “Here!” and just shook her head at me and handed me the paper. And everybody around me said, “What did I get on the paper?” Well, I had to tell them, I had failed the exam. It’s amazing that it happens in your freshman year, and you go back later, and it happens again. You know, spiritual warfare going on, too, a lot of times… but you have to say it. You’re sitting in a class and you’re in a battle.156

She concluded that:

there was a “fear;” the Black Panthers were at their height at that time. There were many people walking around campus, acting and looking like Black Panthers. They were having meetings. Quiet meetings [interviewer interpretation: quiet = secret]. Meetings, where you knew that they were rallying together for some kind of activity to take place. But if you weren’t in the depth of the group, where you didn’t know enough to step out [pause]. They would come around and say, “Come to this meeting.” There was also a “fear” because, you know, it was an unknown: what am I getting involved in?157

Vonnie is a not a first generation college attendee; she comes from a middle-class family background in southern Ohio. Although she did not complete her education at Ohio State; she earned an undergraduate and a graduate degree from other institutions. One of her two children earned a bachelor’s degree from Ohio State in 2002. Vonnie’s middle-class background, her youthfulness and political naivété in the Black Student Union during her most active participation between 1969 and 1971, and her

156 Ibid.
157 Ibid.
persistence in protecting her own personal educational goals would situate her in Edwards’ “militant”
group of reluctant revolutionaries.

Leonard: Active at Ohio State with BALSA, BGPSC, and BSU

Leonard described himself as being active at Ohio State with BALSA (Black American Law
Students Association), and the BGPSC (Black Graduate and Professional Students Caucus), and less
involved with, but affiliated with, the BSU (Black Student Union), although he first visited OSU in ’69 or
’70 when he was still in undergrad at Central State University, having been summoned to help the leaders
OSU’s Black Student Union in their organizing efforts. By the time he was enrolled at OSU he said the
Black Student Union was still functioning, but there were problems of leadership in-fighting, which he
had been invited to help mediate. Leonard stated that by the time he arrived in 1970, BSU activities had
slowed in terms of public demonstrations; and interactions between BSU representatives had moved more
toward meetings about issues which were mutually agreed upon. He also said BSU members and others
not really identified with the BSU had begun to wear dashikis and afro hairstyles as a show of solidarity
with the movement. He also described such speakers as Sonia Sanchez\textsuperscript{158} coming to OSU to address
students and to keep the energy up.

He also said he didn’t think he’d done a good job of mediating since the internal problems of the
BSU continued. Some members of these Black activist groups on campus wanted to merge or amalgamate
all the organizations into one; but, he said, it never happened that way. He recalled organizing with Black
Student Union leaders: John Evans\textsuperscript{159}, Mike Williams, and Mike White\textsuperscript{160}. Leonard said that as a law

\textsuperscript{158} Sonia Sanchez is a Professor of English, and a renowned member of the 1970s Black Arts Movement. She
was a popular revolutionary poet and motivational speaker for the Black community.

\textsuperscript{159} John S. Evans, Jr. an OSU alumnus from Cleveland, OH was the 1968 “poster person” for the 1968 Bricker
Hall student “take-over;” the student most identified with the OSU 34, Evans battled the university for years
to receive the degree he had earned, but had been denied due to his BSU leadership and student
activism.
student, he was somewhat more involved with issues in the Black off-campus community in Columbus; certain law school students and some upper level students from the Sociology department were also involved in prisoner litigations from the Ohio State Penitentiary, which was located relatively nearby the OSU campus.

He was asked about how or whether the BSU and Black students in general were influenced by Greek-letter organizations, religious organizations, Civil Rights organizations in view of the data collected from a previous survey among other African American students of the same time period. Leonard said he was not surprised that such a high percentage of Black students who were members of Greek-letter organizations.

The BSU provided a much needed connection for Blacks not in Greek-letter organizations as well as for some Black GLO members. Personally, I had been against joining a fraternity because I was under the impression that they were elitist organizations, and not interested in community issues like I was. I [eventually after going to graduate school] joined a grad chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity myself.\(^{167}\)

Leonard also stated the reason that so many joined GLOs at OSU was that Black students there didn’t have much of anything else available on campus. He stated he had not seen the relationship of spirituality or religion to the Black Student Movement, at least in his experience. Insofar as the civil rights organizations, Leonard said he personally had not had a lot of confidence in SCLC, NAACP, or the Urban League making changes in the Black community. He said he’d been much more impressed with a local Columbus radio personality, Less Brown, who seemed very effective in changing things. He also mentioned the name of a local activist group called RAN [an acronym], which he credited with a better “track record” than NAACP, SCLC, or the Urban League. Leonard stated he was unaware of any campus chapters at OSU connected with CORE, SNCC, or the Urban League. But he said he had a vague

---

\(^{160}\) Michael White, an OSU alumnus from Cleveland, OH was an astute student activist whose leadership skills and concern for the masses eventually landed him the elected position of City of Cleveland Mayor.

\(^{161}\) Interview with Leonard Tate, June 16, 2010.
recollected of an NAACP chapter or formation on campus. He was not really surprised that a smaller percentage of Black OSU students had been members of these traditional social activist organizations.

When asked how his OSU Black student activist behavior had either been beneficial or detrimental, Leonard said:

On one hand, being in the movement [Black Student Movement] helped a lot of students develop, i.e. their student activism helped raise the students’ political consciousness, which might not have happened otherwise… that period of time [of student activism] was exciting, although we were dealing with serious issues for Blacks [and he also considered the Black non-campus community].

He characterized his years in the Black Student Movement as some of the “best” years of his life. Weighing both sides, though, he described the detrimental, as well. Leonard shared that he often worried about some students who joined the BSU because it was “hip” or the trendy thing to do, just like adopting the “Black” clothing [dashikis] and hairstyles [Afros]. He said he was sure and sorry, that some students never really bought into the ideology of Black liberation struggles. He, too, felt like having the FBI trail him around, asking his friends and neighbors intrusive questions had been a negative by-product of being a student activist at OSU; but he went back to the fact that he felt the OSU Campus police had “watched” him because of some political stickers he had on his vehicle while he was at OSU. Leonard also said he felt that he, like others, had been under the probing surveillance of COINTELPRO.

Leonard is a semi-retired attorney, social activist whose northern Ohio middle-class background included college-educated antecedents; his family members had also been members of civil rights organizations. He was also a Vietnam War veteran whose G.I. benefits enabled him to pay for his college education, none of which was completed at Ohio State. Given his middle-class family background of social activists, his persistence toward completing his education as fervently as his persistence in correcting social injustices, Leonard would also be situated in Edwards’ “Reluctant Revolutionaries” as a “radical activist.”

Andrea: BSU Member Immediately Upon Campus Arrival

162 Ibid.
Andrea described herself as an OSU co-ed who resided in a new high-rise student dormitory in 1968, a residential experience not shared by most of the study participants. “I graduated in ‘77 uh; but I had a 7 year lapse from ‘71 until I went back to school in ‘77 to finish. About Black student activism, Andrea, a member of the Black Student Union, reported

… it was very active. When I first got to campus, uh, it was the year right after 1967; when the biggest, I think, racial upsets, well one of the of the biggest racial upsets came along in the sixties, and what I heard was about the “OSU 34.” They were really the point people for what was going on. They had been arrested, put out of school, and all kinds of things, for trying to get things done that needed, that they thought needed to get done for Black folks.163

When asked how leaders of the BSU got to be leaders, Andrea stated,

I think, they just stood out! I have no idea how they were selected. Some people just “step up to the plate,” and take the bull by the horns. And eventually, it’s sort of like they start to do something. They organize something; and then they take a vote on who the officers are going to be. And by that time, the people that have already been playing a leadership role in whatever was being organized are already in the forefront, and are kind of naturally voted into the jobs they have already been fulfilling.164

Describing the movement activities, a BSU member, Andrea reported:

it was also the beginnings, at that time, of protesting the Vietnam War. That was tops on everybody’s minds; you know, everybody had relatives in the War. And, when we did our protests back then, it was sort of “combined” activity, because it was combined with the Vietnam War, combined with what folks thought about the ill treatment and the lack of consideration for Black folks on campus, so a lot of times those things would go ‘hand-in-hand;’ and we would be protesting all those things together at the same time. I remember our magazine, I mean, our newspaper Our Choking Times.”

I won the May Queen Conquest in ‘69. The dorm officially picked a girl … a lily white girl to run [as the Lincoln Tower representative], to sponsor; but on the side they told me, ‘Well, you came in second on the judging, if you’d still like to run, we can’t officially sponsor you; but we’ll give you $50 towards your expenses. I actually “ran” as an independent… and that was the last one, because when we were getting ready to do the next one, the next year, was when they…sent us home from the riots.165

Regarding the Administration Building “take-over” in 1970, Andrea shared her feelings and experiences that day!

164 Ibid.
165 Ibid.
On the day when they closed campus down, I was out there marching and picketing. Kind of scared. At what was going to happen. We all knew pictures were being taken; there were so few of us, they knew who we were. But I thought it was [pause] the right thing to do!\(^{166}\)

When asked what she thought about the percentages of memberships and affiliations Black students had at that time in GLOs, religious organizations, and civil rights organizations, Andrea provided her unique insights. Although not a GLO member herself, about the 75% membership of Black students in GLOs, Andrea thought …

They needed that close relationship, social relationship extended; and, I think, a lot of them were in those sororities and fraternities because they also had parents. They weren’t the first generation in their families to go to college; and pretty much all the Black folks that went to college prior to our generation, I believe, I’ll bet the number would be higher than that as to who was in fraternities and sororities.

Regarding Black students’ lower memberships in civil rights organizations, Andrea stated,

I don’t think, because of mobility, especially if we weren’t citizens of the city that the college was in, mobility was limited back then. So, if you were on campus, and living on campus, you usually didn’t have a lot means with which to get off campus. And those organizations really didn’t come on campus. I got more involved in things like that when I went back to school in the later ’70s. Because I had married; I had a child and I had a car. And I had to drive back and forth. I was already living in a “community,” at that point, they were part of a community that I was living in.

Regarding whether her membership in the BSU had worked out as either a benefit or a detriment in her life, Andrea said:

What I thought about was that whatever you experienced at OSU was that when you left there and went wherever you were going, you were equipped to deal with the world. And when you got out there and compared yourself to other folks, you felt good. I can’t ever say on any job inter-view or wherever I work, that they weren’t impressed with that. That degree had social capital!\(^{167}\)

Andrea was a naïve political activist when she arrived at OSU from southwest Ohio in 1968; she had heard through news media about the “OSU 34,” the Black students whose social protests on the OSU

\(^{166}\) Ibid.

\(^{167}\) Ibid.
had caused them legal issues and notoriety. Andrea’s sister, eight years older, had preceded her at another publicly funded Ohio institution, but their parents had not attended college. Coming from a middle-income family, and having overt family support including family financial support from years of savings, Andrea’s social activism can also be situated within Edwards’ “militant” category of reluctant revolutionaries; she had been “ready for the revolution” when she arrived on campus. Andrea is still employed professionally. She, her husband, and two of their children have earned degrees from OSU.

Charlotte, BSU Member Inclined Toward Social Activism in High School

Charlotte described herself as a person inclined toward social activism while she was enrolled in her southwestern Ohio high school; I was writing and making speeches in high school and I was always a “champion for the under-dog.” Reared by grandparents in blue-collar occupations, but literally grilled daily about the value of “an education,” she was one of twelve students from her southwestern Ohio hometown to go to OSU fall 1964.

Regarding the high percentage of Black students in membership with GLO’s, she said Alpha Kappa Alpha was her family, and with very minimal family financial support and insufficient loan access through the university, she reported that the sorority came to her rescue.

I wouldn’t have graduated except for the AKA’s support. Spring Quarter 1966, a soror paid my tuition; another soror let me move into an apartment with her; and the sorority voted that I would get this job we had “dibs” on at SBX Bookstore to keep myself floating. The soror who paid my tuition told me I would not be leaving Ohio State University until after I had earned my “sheepskin.” And that’s when I left, after I graduated.\(^{168}\)

There was racism as far as the teachers were concerned, the professors. At the end of Spring Quarter 1966, she had an unexpected “stop out” due to a grade grounded in the professor’s racial prejudice. This created a two-year hiatus in her academic career at OSU.

\(^{168}\) Interview with Charlotte J. Stanford, April 17, 2010.
Regarding the Black Student Movement, Charlotte reports that after her return in 1968 the mood on campus had changed. She considered herself a member of the Black Student Union, albeit not a leader nor a major actor.

As a matter of fact, I was there inside the Administration Building at the take-over in 1968. But I had not signed the petition. Yeah, I was there. Now what happened that day was that by that time I had a daughter; I was there in the administration building with the other students, protesting. But I remembered that I had to pick up my baby from the babysitter; so I left. When I got ready to come back to campus, by that time, they had called the police: the campus police, but the excitement was over. So I missed some of that; so to that extent, yeah, I was kind of glad I wasn’t there. And had I not had to go pick up my baby, I would have been there. John Evans was the, uh, pretty much the spokesperson, but he wasn’t the only person, another guy named David Phears, and a few other people, including a friend named Cynthia Harris, uh, Cynthia Zachary; she was from Cleveland. So they were some of the leaders; and they were some of the “OSU 34”, I think.169

Regarding whether her student activism was more beneficial or detrimental based on the adverse media images, Charlotte had very mixed experiences from her OSU student activism. She said,

OSU was a “clinic” okay? A “clinic” about how to stand in the eye of the storm and still get through! I met other people who had the nerve to stand up for what they believed in too, you know, other activists; that was good! I stood up for myself in high school, because nobody else would, and was always concerned about other people, too. I always knew I’d have a job considered a “helping profession.” After I was forced out of school due to that racism “F” in Urban Sociology, I got a job with CMACAO170 in 1966 mostly because, they said, I had the right attitude about helping the poor and disadvantaged. So my social activism on campus helped me land a job in the real world, too.

I sort of “ignited a strike” against the School of Social Work at OSU. I had successfully petitioned to get the Math requirement waived; and they [the School of Social Work] told me to “keep quiet” about getting the waiver. But because I shared news of this academic relief (waiver of the math requirement) with other in Social Work students, the School of Social Work unloaded on me when I applied for admission to the MSW program. And about two years later, when the federal government was doing my background investigation for a federal job, I’m sure the School of Social Work faculty told the FBI I was a probably a member of SDS, which was untrue.171

They were still pissed about that “strike,” and the fact that I had a private word battle with a racist professor, Milton Ain, in the School of Social Work who didn’t like that I defended my African American ancestors when he insulted them in class..

169 Ibid.

170 Columbus Metropolitan Area Community Action Organization

171 Interview with Charlotte J. Stanford, April 17, 2010.
I had never even been to any SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) meetings and I was not a member; I barely knew who they were at the time. But since I had helped organize the student “strike” and the picket against the School of Social Work in dissent against that stupid math requirement, the FBI nearly de-railed my career in Criminology & Corrections. I did graduate work at Kent State. When I was hired as a Summer Intern in DC with the Justice Department, the FBI lied. They claimed I had been a member of SDS; but I convinced theFPS\footnote{FPS: Federal Prison System} Director I had not been an SDS member. My grad advisor at Kent State supported my position. Later, after I got hired fulltime by the Federal Prison System in Texas, the FBI again lied, reporting that I supposedly had an outstanding felony warrant pending in Columbus, OH. Again, I was able to convince the CEO I had no such outstanding warrant pending against me. They investigated it independently; and discovered I had been truthful. I retired from the FPS twenty-three years later.

Yeah, the negative propaganda associated with Black student activists trailed me well past my collegiate career. It feels pretty revolting to know your government wants to force you into social, political, and economic exile, and then castigate you for being socially unproductive, if you succumb to it! And they use the IRS against you, too! I just recently began understanding that I, too, was a near casualty of COINTELPRO.

…two of my children did, but only one went in undergrad. It was not my preference for them to go to OSU in undergrad, or to any traditionally white institution. Because I thought it was too tenuous; you have too much on your mind as a young person, but a degree from OSU opened a lot of doors for me in my professional life.\footnote{Interview with Charlotte J. Stanford, April 17, 2010.}

Charlotte would be considered a “militant” in Edwards’ reluctant revolutionary categories.

Kenny: Inconsistent Member/Supporter of the Black Student Union

Kenny described himself as an inconsistent member/supporter of the Black Student Union. He first attended Ohio State in 1966…and… graduated in 1973 with a Bachelors degree in Welding Engineering. He expressed internal conflict about making the decision to stay in the dormitory to study as opposed to attending rallies, marches, and Black Student Union meetings. But he apparently decided to attend the “take-over” as an observer, which somewhat resolved his conflict issues.

As a Black engineering student at Ohio State in the 60s, it was very difficult to find time because you don’t see a lot of Blacks. In all my classes: the Physics classes, the Math classes, and the Chemistry classes, even in the professional Engineering- oriented stuff, you’re the only one. In 66-67, it was tough enough getting through here, but the networking scene was far less in Engineering.
So fortunately after the riots and the sit-ins and all that, we finally had some Black Studies course. So, at the tail end of my matriculation here, I was able to do that, and that was good! I finally had an opportunity to take time to take an elective...by that time they had a Black Studies program...before I leave this institution, I said to myself, I am going to take some Black Studies classes so that I “know” something about Black History. And, so, fortunately my mind set was on doing that. 174

Kenny’s sense of isolation from other Blacks on campus and his desire to finish his degree requirements were in conflict. His discussion and knowledge of the internal affairs of the Black student Union was developed through his Omega Psi Phi fraternity brothers who were, by Kenny’s accounts, more active in the Black Student Union.

Now Danny [another frat brother] got kicked out for some other reason. He was walking down High Street. There was some civil disorder along High Street in front of the Union; I think, he saw a White student being pushed around and he decided to get involved; and it turned out that the person doing the pushing was a plain-clothes policeman, and Danny got arrested...and... got suspended. And being suspended back in that time meant, you know, you're not in school and you lose your student [draft] deferment. You get drafted. So, he got drafted and had to spend some time with the military! One other thing I’ll share with you is that going to a predominantly White high school helped prepare me for almost being ‘the only one’. 175

Kenny was one of approximately four (4) Black males during 1962-1972 that he knows attempted earning an Engineering degree from OSU; as Kenny recalls it, only himself and William Velman Matthews, also a member of the same fraternity, persisted to graduation in the College of Engineering. Kenny earned a Bachelor’s degree in Welding Engineering from OSU. He was enrolled at OSU almost six years trying to complete a 5-year Engineering program. His main issues with the university were the absence of Black professors who could have functioned as role models and counselors, and the advantages, he felt, Whites students had such as “systematic ways and means to cheat on tests,” thereby enabling their higher grades.

Kenny does not describe himself as “active” in the BSM, but he did report being an “observer” in Spring Quarter 1970 Administration Building “take-over.” He explained in the interview that he had been
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struggling so hard to keep his grades up that he didn’t have time to be more active during the movement. Kenny came to OSU from southern Ohio where he graduated from a predominantly White high school. His demographic data indicates that his family members were supporters of civil rights organizations; and he reported being first generation in his family to attend college.

Kenny’s rendition of his student activism and affiliation with the Black Student Union can be situated within Edwards’ “conforming negro”\(^{176}\) category of reluctant revolutionaries. According to Edwards, the following description seems to coincide with the campus activism and BSU membership activity reported by this interviewee:

The conforming negro student attends no Black student organization meetings on his campus… he most closely epitomizes the philosophies, values, and attitudes of the traditional middle-class negroes…although this type of student does not usually come from a middle-class back-ground. His family has most likely existed on the fringes of the socio-economic boundaries that separate the lower…and the middle-classes in Black society. He may be the …first person in his community to ever attend college. As a result of these distinctions, he is usually a source of pride to his parents and a special person in his neighborhood. His immediate activities are guided almost completely by his own individual achievement motivations.\(^{177}\)

The remaining four interviewees: Judy, Gwen, Karen, and Donna experienced very little, if any, conscious interaction within the Black Student Movement; their student-life experience, nonetheless, provided rich insights into why and how their social activism was either less demonstrative or non-existent unlike the five previous interviewees. Theirs are the stories of activists in incubation. Each of these former OSU students, “late bloomers” developed an activist orientation in their professional lives; three of them are retired, but one has professionally advocated for students in her Higher Education career.


\(^{177}\) Interview with Kenneth B. Thompson, May 3, 2010.
Judy: Picketed Just Once Against Off-Campus Housing Discrimination

Judy reported in the interview that she had experienced the Black student activism at OSU; her description of the “picketing” she did with other Black students during her four (4) quarters on campus seemed more an opportunity to bond with other Black students as opposed to an opportunity to make a political statement. She said she had never heard of any major civil rights organizations, except NAACP, before or while she was enrolled at OSU. When asked about how she made her political viewpoint known, she described a pervasive sense of isolation as her most vivid experience and recollection of OSU. Her response to “What is your understanding of Black student activism?” follows:

I don’t know what it looked on the whole, because, quite frankly, I was separated from a lot of Black students, because I lived on North Campus in the new dorms. They were ‘experimental’ dorms, and there were only two of us [Black students] in that dorm…Who was I going to talk to? [Laughs aloud] I was isolated! There was another Black female student there and the guys who lived next door; and the four of us would eat dinner together, and we were just friends. Who was I going to talk to? It was just like being in Vermont; picture this with-- the population of Blacks at 2%...178

Her primary contact with other Black students had been her cousin, also an OSU student at the time, who was a fraternity member. His fraternity membership was the basis for her understanding of how Black Greek-Letter organizations (GLOs) operated at OSU. Judy asserted that a GLO was your only way into a social life. “I think a lot of students who went there, their parents probably were in sororities and fraternities; and they were ‘legacies…”179 Although Judy complained vigorously about feeling isolated, she also shared these feelings and justifications about conflicting motivations at OSU,

I think that minorities on OSU’s campus back in the sixties had to study so hard to just get an average grade that they really didn’t [pause]. It’s not that they didn’t care or didn’t have time to be a social activist…school was, uh, you spent all of your time doing it. You spent all your time doing it, if you were smart! I really felt out of it…180


179 A ‘legacy’ is a person whose parent has been an active, fully initiated member of a Greek-Letter organization; she/he can be inducted into the society with minimal requirements and fanfare.

Judy had left OSU by the end of Summer Quarter 1964; her “stop out” due to poor grades was compounded by a campus-contracted viral illness which students referred to as “mono.” Judy came from a middle-class family background in southwestern Ohio. She was not first generation to attend college in her family; two aunts had earned college degrees. Judy is a currently a retired social service professional who completed her undergraduate and graduate degrees at other Ohio universities.

Judy’s interview data does not situate her within Edwards’ five (5) principal types of “Reluctant Revolutionaries;” she was apparently not a student activist by any account, although Judy was definitely an OSU student during 1963. She said she had never heard of the major civil rights organizations, except NAACP, before or while she was enrolled at OSU. Rather, Judy’s social demographics, her values orientation, and her OSU activities place her within Edwards’ sixth category, one which is anomalous and difficult-to-describe. In her case, the family’s entrepreneurial standing in her hometown, and their ability to finance her college education situate her within the upper-middle class; and “…like the ‘conforming negro’ type, the negro coming from the upper-middle class demonstrates little concern himself about the plight of the masses of Blacks, nor is he openly sympathetic with the efforts of Blacks who are.”

Nevertheless, by most accounts, the Black Student Movement was still itself incubating during her brief OSU sojourn in 1963; and the Black Student Union was another four (4) years from its full inception when Judy was on campus. Judy is a retired professional who worked in the public sector.

Gwen, Not a Political Activist at OSU but Learned Activism at CSU

Gwen described her four-quarter sojourn at Ohio State basically as did Judy; they both had been Black co-eds who felt isolated. “I flunked out of Ohio State in December of ’65.” “I was not a political activist; I was not a Black student activist, at that point in life. I really wasn’t a part of the BSM at Ohio State. I always felt like an odd person out at Ohio State. I recognize that it was a place I should never have gone to in the first place.”

At that point, it was the pre-dawning of my realization of things that I needed to speak out about, saying in front of anyone… we were leaving from a predominantly Black high school going into a predominantly White institution with 12,000 other freshmen, with no support systems there for us at all as Black students. As I said before, we were isolated and insulated; and… the classroom did not feel like a “safe” place to me. I did not feel comfortable in the classrooms at Ohio State. So, I wasn’t confident enough at that time.

What I did know was that I understood “where” the world told me my place was supposed to be in the whole scheme of things. What I did know was that I came out an environment, a very racist city, Dayton, OH, which had isolated us on one side of the city; and so none of it felt safe to me. I think, if I’d spoken out, I would have suffered retribution in the classroom, not only from the instructors, but also from other students. It may have, uh, isolated me even further. It may have caused me to get into some kind of trouble, or difficulty, that I couldn’t get myself out of. Uh, and so, I didn’t feel like I could say anything, even though I knew that there were injustices, and I knew there was racism. And I knew we weren’t all treated equally. I knew about it [social injustice]. But I wasn’t going to voice it there, not at Ohio State University in ’64-’65! [Gallows laughter follows].

When asked what her understanding of Black student activism, Gwen’s response was the nearest to this manuscript’s definition with examples, although she had not experienced any such phenomenon at Ohio State. “When I went to Central State in 1966, we had an extremely active student body; and we were protesting Wright State University, a mini Ohio State University, being built just 5 miles from Central State, a historically Black institution…; and we were protesting the idea that State [of Ohio] wanted to merge Central State with Wright State.” The perspective was very different. And most of the students were from out of State… the predominant population was from other places; they were from major cities: New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, DC, Baltimore, Los Angeles… And so the perspective was very different.

And so we protested in the streets, on campus. And we barricaded the campus [laughs heartily] so nobody could come on campus and shut it down, and went to the State house in Columbus …and a whole host of things. Amiri Baraka came and spoke many times. And we had a place in Dayton called the Unity House, and we got together and speakers would come, and we mobilized our causes, and had many conversations centered around, uh, activism and political causes. It [CSU] was a different place. And for the 1st time ever, in my whole life, I really began to learn about Black folks and our contributions, and our history and roles in this society; and it [CSU] was really where I found “my” voice, and started speaking out and gaining some confidence. I would never have done any of that at Ohio State.183

182 Interview with Gwendolyn M. Jones, May 29, 2010.

183 Ibid.
Although Gwen was neither an activist in the movement nor a sorority member at Ohio State, she shared some attitudes about the significance of Ohio State’s Black GLOs, which was quite similar to other participants’ attitudes. When asked her perspective on the high percentage of Blacks at OSU in GLOs during that time, Gwen responded,

…most of the Black students were not staying on campus, and so the small cadre of Black students who did live on campus tended to be members of the Greek organizations. And, may have even had Greek housing…because they were members of those groups. Those were the social organizations that had all the social events we attended; it [GLOs] was our support system. We were pretty isolated and insulated. It [a GLO] was a “safe haven;” and we knew about Greek organizations, Black Greek organizations, because we had grown up in communities that had those organizations which supported us during high school and before we ever came to college. It felt comforting and safe. And, I think, that’s why we joined. And we wanted that identity, too! I didn’t join one only because I didn’t have the grade point necessary to join.184

Gwen’s in-depth explanation of student activism, which she learned at Central State University, was revealed in the following excerpt, “…every movement and every cause has to have not just a leader, but there also has to be the “behind the scenes” people, getting the work done! Being involved from a different perspective, and using their connections and networking systems to help the cause.” Gwen’s background is middle-class and financial funding for her college education was from her family; she also was not a first generation in her family to attend college. Interview data in this case does not support categorizing this participant among Edwards’ reluctant revolutionaries at Ohio State. However, based on her activism and ideology which were developed from 1966 through 1970 during the Black Student Movement at Central State, Gwen would be considered an “engaged observer”185 in the incubating stage of becoming a “radical activist” while at Ohio State. Gwen is still in the workforce at a two-year public institution in southwestern Ohio; with of 36 years experience in Higher Education, she currently serves as a fulltime Student Judicial Affairs Officer.

---
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The last two interviewees, Karen and Donna, reported they had no significant contact organizationally nor individually with members of the Black Student Union at Ohio State University. They matriculated at OSU respectively during Fall Quarters 1962 and fall 1964. Donna graduated from a predominantly Black high school in central Ohio; Karen graduated from a predominantly White high school in southwestern Ohio. As above, interview data are excerpted from gross interview transcripts for this manuscript, as follows:

Karen, Not “Active” in Social Movements Back Then

Karen matriculated at OSU in fall 1964; the university told students that forty (40) thousand undergraduates were at OSU that fall. No one said how many Black students there were, but it appeared that Blacks were a miniscule portion of that number. Karen arrived with a good grade point average, a patchwork of scholarship money, and lots of family support; she said she had planned to go to OSU ever since her 9th grader field trip to OSU with her predominantly white, southwestern Ohio high school. Her experiences at OSU, like other Black students such as alumna Barbara Thornton in 1945, began with the news of allegedly insufficient dormitory housing. Karen consequently had to reside in an OSU Dean of Women approved off-campus rooming house for women. Reviewing her survey responses, one would think she had a smooth effortless four-year collegiate career. Karen graduated Spring Quarter 1968.

Some of Karen’s survey responses about her “experiences” at OSU seemed contradictory with the responses she provided on “how she felt about what was going on” at OSU: points subsequently resolved during her second interview. While she reported no academic issues, neither a “drop out” nor a “stop out” experience, no social or racial conflicts with non-Blacks, no perceived discrimination in campus restaurants nor social functions, and no adverse experience with OSU disciplinary measures, she disagreed that OSU professors treated all students fairly, and she agreed that both student protests were justified and that Black students had good reasons to be upset. She also “agreed” that she was equally able to participate in any campus activities like the non-Black students. These apparent contradictions
were discussed in her interview. Initially she said she had been aware of a few suspect racial incidents
which her sorors or friends had experienced, and she gave examples.

I realize, yeah, that did happen but only when we kind of talk about it; and we’re sitting
around and we have more time that you actually really know about someone getting a grade
undeserved and actually addressing it; and not being addressed by a staff person, and having
to leave. Because several students we know left school because they didn’t have what, uh,
the proper grades. But it turned out from their explanations that it had nothing to do with
them not being academically capable. It was that a person in authority decided and made a
decision, and that decision was not going to be overturned. So, I had friends who actually
dropped out and had to finish their degrees at other universities because of it.186

Gradually Karen’s facial expression changed; she was having an epiphany about her own
experience, one which had been nearly forgotten.

And I do remember one scenario, ‘cause you and I were in a class where we having to
identify rocks. I remember, uh, Oh, that Geology class! [laughs out loud] I took two classes
and I only needed one! And I was advised to take them; and I know, I remembered questioning
the professor. I was like “I only need one of them.” And I was told, “You need to take two.”
So I took the Geology class, and I took a Physics class; and had I only been able to take one,
I would have taken Physics by itself. In the end, I got a “D” in the Geology, and a “B” in the
Physics; and it brought my grade point down. And I only needed the one! Yeah! And that kind
of stuck with me, because I just kind of felt like there was something awry; or that we were
being not only not- instructed properly, in that case, but basically being improperly instructed
also.” “And those rocks we got from that bookstore? None, none of the rocks on that test looked
like, or tasted like ‘cause I know one we had to taste, right. Uh, uhn! So, when I got that “D,”
I was like [makes a startled, surprised face] !! [laughing out loud] I had never had a “D!187

Karen reported having memberships in a GLO, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, also a membership
in her aunt’s Baptist church when she lived off-campus, moving completely away from her OSU Dean of
Women approved rooming-house experience to her aunt’s eastside Columbus residence. She became
affiliated with SCLC and NAACP after she moved away from the campus. She said that her AKA
membership had been her only campus organizational affiliation; “coming to Ohio State, and becoming a
part of Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority, that was community.” Karen’s survey demographics showed that
her family members had held memberships in various civil rights organizations. Regarding the Anti-

186 Interview with Karen Banks Bright, April 10, 2010.
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Vietnam War movement, Karen expressed a feeling of responsibility to do well in college, although her survey indicates she did not march on or off campus against the Vietnam War.

When I got to college, I thought back on the opportunity I was going to get to attend college. But I had lost several of my friends from high school; they went that summer when I graduated. They went to Vietnam; and they were dead probably by the time we started our first class. Before, probably, before we started our first class. So, that always stuck with me. It’s kind of like not only was I going to school for my family, but also for those guys who never got an opportunity had they wanted to go.  

Regarding the Black student movement and the Black Student Union, Karen admitted that she had no real involvement; she graduated before students began formally organizing at OSU. However, she expressed a bit of remorse for not being involved, as follows: “I’m one that believes there’s a path that’s been, you know, put out there for us. So, sometimes people regret that they didn’t do one thing or another. And, I’m basically seizing as many moments as I can…

… since I wasn’t what you call “active” in social movements then. But was in the sorority that I've used the experience in the friendship community and my thoughts about my obligation to the young men that did die in Vietnam, and other people in my family. I’ve tried to take this part of my life to do that through the organizations that I work with now. And then I’ve been, even more hopefully, giving to in terms of supporting more organizations like Urban League, and NAACP.

She reported during the interview, “No, I wasn’t there [the 1968 administration building “take-over”]; but I did hear about it. And … when you’re out of the loop, and starting to be a professional, but not that far out… I thought it was something that was probably needed just because in the other question you just asked me. No, I wasn’t on academic probation; no, I didn’t so-forth, but that didn’t mean I didn’t have a “connect” to what was still going on. And what, just like Civil Rights and people who started universities way back in the day, somebody was having to keep pushing the envelope. On whether going to OSU had value and was worth her recommendations for others to attend, Karen’s advice was…

…going to Ohio State; yes, it is big. But if you can make it there, you can make it anywhere. And then, make that situation, make it smaller, if you need that sense of “community.”
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That’s why I say coming to Ohio State, and becoming a part of Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority, that was community. So with friendship and community … those two things were significant. Because in the largeness, there’s lots of resources; there’s lots of grants; there’s lots of opportunity; and …there’s lots of connections, all throughout the world.\textsuperscript{190}

Karen is currently a semi-retired educational consultant in a non-profit organization who earned a Doctorate of Education at the University of Minnesota. She is not the first generation to attend college in her family. Her father graduated from Central State University after serving in the U.S. military; her mother retired as worked as a domestic worker. Karen was admittedly not a conscious participant of the Black Student Movement at OSU. Her recollections of the absence of an organized BSM are consistent with other students/alumni recollections; before Spring Quarter 1968 was the “pre-movement germination” phase of the Black Student Movement at OSU. She essentially was not operating ideologically from any sense of student activism, but was more ideologically attuned with Black people’s struggles in general from the civil rights perspective, which was not inconsistent with goals of the student movement. Her insights, however, about the sense of “community” which formed among Black OSU students yoked by common experiences are consistent with other interviewee observations about Ohio State during the 1960s. Data from Karen’s interview do not clearly situate her collegiate experiences and history within Edwards’ rubric of “Reluctant Revolutionaries,” except in terms of family history the “conforming negro,\textsuperscript{191} or his sixth anomalous typography.

Donna, Neither Saw Nor Experienced Any of the OSU Black Student Movement

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{191} Harry Edwards, \textit{Black Students}. (Washington, DC: The Free Press, 1970); 93. “The conforming negro student most closely epitomizes the philosophies, values, and attitudes of the traditional middle-class negroes we discussed earlier… although this type of student does not come from a middle-class background. His family has most likely existed on the fringes of the socio-economic boundaries that separate the lower-middle class from the lower classes in Black society. He usually comes from a ‘respectable,’ hard-working, church-affiliated family, which has survived just above the poverty level…”
Donna arrived at OSU during Fall 1962; she also came from a middle-class family with some college educated antecedents. Her uncle, an OSU alumnus and a 1920s member of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity was able to pay for her college education. Donna graduated from a predominantly Black high school in central Ohio. Donna was enrolled at OSU for approximately three years, but neither saw nor experienced anything of the Black Student Movement. Donna’s student-life experiences closely resemble those of Judy and Gwen; she, too, felt an abiding sense of isolation, except for her membership in Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority.

… I didn’t really think they acknowledged the Black students at Ohio State. And we were always kind of operating on the outskirts of the Ohio State community…I didn’t even know who my advisor was. Nobody ever came forward. I could never find out. You know; so, no I never got any counseling. At least we tried to support each other. But now they don’t seem like they do. And it’s so large, I really feel like you get lost, plus I have a basis of comparison, going from a larger to a smaller school, with smaller classes. And I know I got a lot more attention, at a smaller school.\(^\text{192}\)

When asked whether she saw any benefit for today’s youth in attending OSU, based on her experiences as a co-ed, Donna said she discouraged them, “I really discourage them. Because when I talk to students today, they don’t have the same kind of support we had when we were there.”

Donna, as several others in this study, found refuge from isolation at the university through her membership in her sorority. Donna’s interview data suggests that she was not a student who consciously experienced the Black Student Movement. Her issues with OSU, however, provided context for the climate in which the movement incubated and erupted. Within two years of her transfer from Ohio State University to Central State University (CSU) in Wilberforce, Ohio, Donna received her Bachelor’s degree. Within Edwards’ rubric of “Reluctant Revolutionaries,” Donna’s history and OSU experiences place her in the sixth, anomalous, difficult-to-describe category; these “…members are insignificant in number and relevance to the revolt…comprised of upper-class negro families, demonstrat[ing] little concern himself about the plight of the masses of Blacks nor is he overly sympathetic with the efforts of

\(^{192}\) Interview with D. Janine Thompson, April 11, 2010.
Black students who are.”193 Donna is currently a retired attorney who wrote the State of Ohio’s “lemon law,” and litigated in the courts for women to work in Ohio’s construction industry through the construction trades unions.

Four major themes emerged from the respondents’ experiences at OSU during the sixties and the seventies: isolation, fear, community, and persistence to completion. Nearly half (40%) of those interviewed spoke at length about being isolated: how being among the “2%” felt, “I was separated from a lot of Black students, because I lived on North Campus in the new dorms. They were ‘experimental’ dorms, and there were only two of us [Black students] in that dorm…Who was I going to talk to? [Laughs aloud] I was isolated! There was another Black female student there and the guys who lived next door; and the four of us would eat dinner together, and we were just friends. Who was I going to talk to? It was just like being in Vermont; picture this with-- the population of Blacks at 2%…” [Judy] of the student body which Black students represented; isolated and how being one of only four Blacks enrolled in the College of Engineering for six years with no Black faculty or staff to guide your choices [Kenny]; about how it felt “always kind of operating on the outskirts of the Ohio State community…never even knowing who my advisor was” [Donna], and how isolation crept into a sense of social paralysis and fear “…the classroom did not feel like a “safe” place to me. I did not feel comfortable in the classrooms at Ohio State… I didn’t feel like I could say anything, even though I knew that there were injustices, and… I wasn’t going to voice it there, not at Ohio State University in ’64-’65! [Gwen] The isolation they experienced during the sixties at Ohio State, a university which has maintained an undergraduate enrollment of no fewer than forty thousand on its Columbus campus at least five decades was created from being one of fewer than 300 Black students scattered around OSU’s mammoth campus, which is larger geographically and in population than some students’ hometowns, a daunting experience.

---

Others experienced and spoke of the fear because we had witnessed police all over campus, the National Guard was there... we intuitively knew as Black people that somebody was going to get killed; okay? And sure enough, it happened at Kent State... all the state campuses had the National Guard in force; you couldn’t go to class” [Reggie]; the fear of “being suspended back in that time meant, you know, you’re not in school and you lose your student [draft] deferment. You get drafted... and have to spend some time with the military!” [Kenny]; the fear “On the day when they closed campus down, I was out there marching and picketing. Kind of scared. At what was going to happen. We all knew pictures were being taken; there were so few of us, they knew who we were. But I thought it was [pause] the right thing to do; ” [Andrea]; “…there was a “fear”; …the Black Panthers were at their height at that time. There were many people walking around campus, acting and looking like Black Panthers. They were having meetings. Quiet meetings! Meetings, where you knew that they were rallying together for some kind of activity to take place. But if you weren’t in the depth of the group, where you didn’t know enough to step out [pause]. They would come around and say, ‘Come to this meeting.’ There was also a “fear” because, you know, it was an unknown: what am I getting involved in?” [Vonnie] “Oh, yeah, J. Edgar Hoover was everywhere. Black kids knew that they did not need the aggravation from the FBI, Columbus police, whoever, and campus police interfering with their goal of graduation.” [Reggie]

And despite the isolation and fears of some, others were less constrained by their isolation and fear. Some found support and community through their sorority or fraternity. Some whittled the mammoth university down to a small size. And 60% of those interviewed got through the valley of fear at OSU, persisting to completion, thanks to the sense of community Black students created for themselves at OSU. “I wouldn’t have graduated except for the AKA’s support. Spring Quarter 1966, a soror paid my tuition; another soror let me move into an apartment with her; and the sorority voted that I would get this job we had “dibs” on at SBX Bookstore to keep myself floating. The soror who paid my tuition told me I would not be leaving Ohio State University until after I had earned my ‘sheepskin.’ And that’s when I left, after I got the sheepskin, graduated.” [Charlotte]. And “...going to Ohio State; yes, it is big. But if you can
make it there, you can make it anywhere. And then, make that situation, make it smaller, if you need that sense of “community.” That’s why I say coming to Ohio State, and becoming a part of Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority, that was community. So with friendship and community … those two things were significant.” [Karen]. “…most of the Black students were not staying on campus, and so the small cadre of Black students who did live on campus tended to be members of the Greek organizations. And, may have even had Greek housing…because they were members of those groups. Those were the social organizations that had all the social events we attended; it was our support system. [Gwen].

Data Analyses from Survey Protocols

Survey Participants’ Demographic Data: A total of 30 alumni including ten interviewees described above, self-identifying as African Americans and enrolled for three (3) quarters at OSU. The protocol, Appendix D, was designed to gather three categories of information: social demographics [Part A]; “what” their OSU experiences had been [Part B], and “how” they felt about these experiences [Part C]. These data helped construct a profile or general understanding of 1960-1970s Black OSU students.

Participants’ Gender

The sample included twenty (20) women, representing 67 percent of the sample frame, and ten (10) men, representing 33 percent of the sample.

State of Residence

All thirty (30), 100 percent, of the study participants identified themselves as Ohio residents during their OSU enrollment.

Table 1: OSU Alumni Survey Data APPENDIX D [Part A]

1962 – 1972 Black Alumni Social Demographics
Twenty-three (23), 76.6 percent, of the study sample reported their family members had held memberships in these organizations such as NAACP, SCLC, The Urban League, and CORE. The literature on social movements suggests that socially activist students generally have had socially activist parents or other activist family antecedents\textsuperscript{194}, and that they also tended to come from homes where family antecedents had also experienced colleges and universities as students themselves. As such, the decision


was made to “test” published findings against the instant study sample. Therefore, this item on the Survey Instrument asked whether the participants’ family members had been members or supporters of organizations associated with the Black Liberation struggles of the mid-twentieth century: NAACP, SCLC, The Urban League, or CORE, i.e. demonstrated social activism.

*Family History of College Attendance*

More than half, 53.3 percent, (16) alumni reported that antecedent family members had preceded them in higher education; as such, these participants were not first-generation college attendees.

*Participants Academic Background*

Clearly two-thirds of all study participants earned their baccalaureate degrees from Ohio State, which is a testament to perseverance especially given the adversities they reported as students. All study thirty participants, 100 percent, have earned bachelor’s degrees; and sixteen (16), 53.3 percent have earned graduate degrees. Twenty (20) participants, 66.6 percent, have earned at least a bachelor’s degree from Ohio State; and six (6), 20.0 percent, have earned both a bachelor’s and a graduate degree from The Ohio State University. Among the whole sample of thirty, there are three (3) holding Doctor of Law degrees; and another two (2) who earned Doctor of Philosophy degrees; and one respondent holds a Doctor of Education degree. Among the ten (10) interviewees, they hold a total of nineteen (19) degrees. Half of the interviewees have earned a baccalaureate degree and at least one graduate degree. There are two (2) interviewees holding Doctor of Law degrees; and another participant holds a Doctor of Education degree. Appendix G is the participants’ authorized listing of their names and their academic degrees earned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: OSU Alumni Survey Data</th>
<th>APPENDIX D [Part B]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>While at OSU, did you do or experience the following?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Reside in OSU dormitory housing or approved “rooming houses”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Receive official freshman counseling by staff/faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Receive a grade due to faculty prejudice or bigotry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Dropped out/couldn’t afford tuition, housing, books etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Had to “stop-out” due to academic probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Denied admission to OSU graduate or professional schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Felt discriminated against in campus restaurants/social events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Got “drafted” into U.S. military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Had social/racial conflicts with non Black classmates/roommates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Attend protest rallies, made speeches or signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Agreed with/supported Anti-Vietnam War Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Attended any SDS or WUO activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Canvassed/signed up voters for 1964 or 1968 national elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Joined a Greek-Letter Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this section of the survey questionnaire, participants’ “activist” activities and behavior were queried on ten separate items. *Item k* asked about their sentiments regarding the Anti-Vietnam War Movement: 80 percent of the respondents (24) agreed with the Anti-Vietnam War Movement. *Item w* asked about the 1968 Summer Olympics Black solidarity display of John Carlos and Tommie Smith. At the 1968 Olympic Games in Mexico City, track athletes John Carlos and Tommie Smith made an historic gesture of Black solidarity in protest of American social injustices toward African Americans. Their Black gloved right fists were raised above their heads on the medal winners’ podium; this overt gesture, which the entire international television viewing audience, became an international topic of discussion and an “embarrassment” to U.S. Olympics official and the U.S. government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Non-Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>Applied for admission to OSU graduate or professional schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>Had memberships in CORE, SNCC, Black Panther Party</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.</td>
<td>Signed petitions to abolish “Speaker’s rule”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td>Marched against Vietnam War</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td>Played any varsity sports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u.</td>
<td>Joined a church, mosque, or temple</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Joined R.O.T.C.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w.</td>
<td>Approved John Carlos’/Tommie Smith’s black gloved fists in protest at 1968 Olympics</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>Received Student Judiciary Board sanction for non-academic rule infractions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

195 At the 1968 Olympic Games in Mexico City, track athletes John Carlos and Tommie Smith made an historic gesture of Black solidarity in protest of American social injustices toward African Americans. Their Black gloved right fists were raised above their heads on the medal winners’ podium; this overt gesture, which the entire international television viewing audience, became an international topic of discussion and an “embarrassment” to U.S. Olympics official and the U.S. government.
from the U.S. Olympic Track and Field Team; 83 percent of the respondents (25) approved of Carlos’ and Smith’s display of Black solidarity at the 1868 Mexico City Olympics. Sixty-six percent or twenty (20) respondents reported that they attended protest rallies on OSU’s campus [Item j]; however only 33 percent reported participating in the Administration Building “take-over” [Item p]. Thirty percent (9) reported helping voters to register for the 1968 elections [Item m]; more than 86 percent (26) of the group reported they did not sign petitions to abolish the Speaker’s Rule [Item r], which was the impetus for the Free Speech Movement. Slightly more than thirteen percent (4) of the respondents reported that they did attend activities with the SDS and/or the Weather Underground Organization [Item l]; all four of these respondents were women. Respondents demonstrated considerably less social activist behavior than social activist rhetoric: fervent attitudes and sentiments regarding social injustices or issues. Only 30 percent reported doing voter registration canvassing. And 83 percent reported that they had been supportive of John Carlos’ and Tommie Smith’s social statement of Black solidarity at the 1968 Olympics in Mexico. As far as Anti-Vietnam War activism [Item k], 80 percent said they supported this movement, but only 33 percent said they actually showed up at marches against the war [Item s].

Six items queried participants’ academic-life experiences: b, c, d, e, f, and o.

- More than half (16), or 53 percent, reported that they did receive freshman counseling.
- Nearly two-thirds (19), or 63 percent, reported that they received course grades which they believed were the result of a faculty member’s discrimination and prejudice.
- Nearly half (12), or 40 percent, reported they were forced out or “stopped out” of school due to low grade point averages resulting in periods of absence, i.e. “academic probation.”
- One-fifth (6), or 20 percent, “dropped-out” due to insufficient financial aid [Item d].
- Nearly half (12), of 40 percent said they had to “stop-out” due to academic probation because of low grade point average [Item e].

Regarding Black students’ access to graduate and professional schools at OSU [Items f and o]:

116
Nearly twenty-seven percent (8) reported they actually did apply for graduate school or professional school admission; two of these eight respondents reported they were denied admission to either graduate school or professional school, although they had been qualified at the time. The remaining six (6) who applied to grad school of professional schools did complete those graduate degrees at OSU.

Regarding participants’ experiences of racial discrimination, items c, g, and i:

- Slightly more than half, 60 percent (18) of the respondents answered “yes” to whether they had had social or racial conflicts with non-Black classmates, roommates, or OSU staff.
- Slightly less than half, 47 percent (14) respondents reported “yes” they had felt discriminated against in campus restaurants or OSU social events on campus.
- However, 60 percent (18) experienced social or racial conflicts with non-Black classmates, roommates or OSU personnel [Item i].

Four questions [Items: a, n, t, and x] asked about participants’ non-academic, residence-life experiences.

- Nearly two-thirds, 63 percent (19), reported that they had resided in either university dormitories or in university approved “off-campus” housing [Item a].
- Exactly two-thirds, 67 percent, reported that they had been members of Black Greek-letter organizations [Item n].
- Merely 7 percent (2) members of this sample reported playing “varsity” sports; both respondents were men [Item t].
- Only 3 percent (1) respondent reported having received an OSU sanction for a non-academic OSU rules violation [Item x]. Experiencing discrimination in restaurants and at campus social

---

196 One alumna reported that during her graduate school interview, she was reminded by faculty that she had ignited and participated in a strike of the School of Social Work, and consequently she was being denied admission for the MSW program.
events [Item g] was reported by fourteen respondents (47 percent). Even more, eighteen 
respondents (60 percent) experienced social or racial conflicts with non-Black classmates, 
roommates or OSU personnel [Item i].

Related to participants’ organizational affiliations, there were four items.

- Thirty (30) percent of the total sample had affiliations with traditional civil rights activist 
  organizations [Item q].

- Forty (40) percent responded they did have memberships or affiliations with religious 
  organizations [Item u].

- But, sixty-seven (67) percent, had memberships in OSU Greek-letter organizations [Item n]. 
  These organizations have been present at OSU since the 1920s; they always represented the 
  primary social support system for Black students. 1960s-1970s Black alumni consistently 
  characterized their affiliation in GLOs as the axis for the sense of community they felt at OSU.

Two questions [items h and v] asked about participants’ experience serving and preparing for military 
service. There were only ten males in the study (including interviewees and survey respondents); but 80 
percent of all the men reported they had been drafted by the military to serve in the Vietnam War. The 
majority of all the men in the study reported that they had joined R.O.T.C. (Reserve Officers Training 
Corps. ROTC was a university requirement for all students, at that time, which could be substituted by 
alternative coursework for female students, for sure, and for men who did not intend to serve in the armed 
forces. None of the men in the study served as military “officers” despite having been members of 
R.O.T.C.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁷ Although this study has not generally made a specific issue of participants’ 
responses by gender, the items regarding military service, and students’ 
attitudes/activities regarding the Vietnam War do require some attention and analysis. 
A third of the entire study group were males; and a third of those interviewed were 
males. Interestingly, however, more than two-thirds of all the males in the study (70
Table 3: OSU Black Alumni Survey Data APPENDIX D[Part C]

“While you attended OSU, how did you feel?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. That professors treated all students fairly, regardless of race or ethnicity</td>
<td>AGREE 13.3%</td>
<td>DISAGREE 80%</td>
<td>NO RESPONSE 6.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students protests: picketing, rallies, marches were justified</td>
<td>AGREE 96.6%</td>
<td>DISAGREE 0%</td>
<td>NO RESPONSE 3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Black Studies program was needed</td>
<td>AGREE 93.3%</td>
<td>DISAGREE 6.6%</td>
<td>NO RESPONSE 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I was equally able to participate in any campus activities like non-Black students</td>
<td>AGREE 50%</td>
<td>DISAGREE 50%</td>
<td>NO RESPONSE 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Race relations on campus reflected race relations off campus in Columbus</td>
<td>AGREE 83.3%</td>
<td>DISAGREE 16.6%</td>
<td>NO RESPONSE 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Black students had good reasons to be</td>
<td>AGREE 96.6%</td>
<td>DISAGREE 0%</td>
<td>NO RESPONSE 3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

percent) enrolled in R.O.T.C. although they could have opted for different courses like the females for whom enrolling in R.O.T.C. was not an option. Two males interviewed had already served tours of duty in the military and saw their veterans’ educational benefits as mitigating the hazards to combat and war injuries; the third male interviewee expressed trepidation about going to the military, especially if his grade point was too low. Apparently the majority of the males surveyed in the study agreed with the two males who were also interviewed. Enrolling in R.O.T.C. not only strongly suggests that they not only did not object to being in the military, but that they wanted to assume leadership positions in the military after graduating.
Figure 4.1 Student protests were justified (Item #2)

Six survey items asked participants to agree or to disagree with popular discourse about “how” Black students’ felt about certain issues and student life experiences. Participants were overwhelmingly in agreement on five of the six sentiments routinely expressed by Black alumni in casual discourse.

Part C interrogations revealed both some surprisingly interesting response dichotomies, and three items on which overwhelmingly near consensus existed. Being equally able to participate in any campus activities like non-Black students [item #4] revealed an evenly split response: fifteen (15) agreed and fifteen (15) disagreed. Having lived “on campus” is seen as a factor in the equally different responses on this item. The fact that slightly less than two-thirds of the participants had the “on-campus” residence experience could explain such a sharp difference in their responses on this item. Students who lived “at-home” or in-town with other Black families spent significantly less time in campus activities. The same lack of experience of “on-campus” students about race relations in the greater Columbus community
might also apply. There was an 83.3 percent agreement, i.e. twenty-five (25) agreed that “race relations on campus reflected race relations in the off-campus Columbus community.” Here again the fact that about one-third of the study respondents lived “off-campus” either in university approved housing or in family homes or in commercial apartment houses is possibly a factor influencing their viewpoints.

Nearly 100 percent of the survey respondents felt both that Black students’ public protests/social activism were justified, and that Black students had good reasons to be disgruntled with OSU. On the other hand, a consistently small percentage of participants did not respond about either student protests being justified, or that Black students had cause to be upset with OSU policies and practices.
**Figure 4.2** Professors treated students fairly regardless of race (Item #1)

With 96.6 percent respectively, there was near unanimity on Item #2 and on Item #6 regarding whether student protests (picketing, rallies, marches) were warranted, and whether Black students had good reasons for being upset with OSU policies and practices. Clearly, Black OSU alumni were consistent among themselves in reporting “how” they felt about an atmosphere or environment of social and academic dissonance.

**Figure 4.3** Black students had good reason to be upset with OSU policies/practices in the 60s

---

**Figure 4.3** Black students had reasons to be upset with OSU practices (Item # 6)
Summary of Interview Data and Survey Data

Data gathered from both these primary sources have been analyzed using the credibility criterion. The survey of Black alumni from OSU during the 1960s and 1970s was designed to gather three categories of information: about the participants themselves, i.e. their social demographics [Part A]; about “what” their college-life experiences had been [Part B], and about “how” they felt about these college life experiences [Part C]. These interrogations were intended to construct a profile or general understanding of just who 1960-1970s Black OSU students were in terms of family background and social activist legacy, what campus experiences reportedly moved them toward collective discontent and social activism, and how they felt about the experiences, events and activities which have been characterized as the Black Student Movement at Ohio State University. Interview data with Black alumni from this period suggest that these students struggled with the conflicting inclinations to earn an education and to maintain their dignity in the face of racial discrimination in housing, academics and financial aid, asserting their Constitutional Rights as American citizens to free speech and freedom of assembly.

The Profile: Black students enrolled at OSU during 1962 – 1972 were generally not the first person in their families to have attended college (53%); their adult family members were more often members of Civil Rights organizations, such as NAACP, CORE, and SCLC (77%). These students were overwhelmingly members of Greek-letter organizations, or GLO hopefuls who had not joined due to grades and/or financial constraints (67%). Although their general belief that protests were justified was nearly unanimous (97%), these students were less inclined toward public protests on campus; only 2% of the study group participated in the 1968 Bricker Hall “take-over and only 10% of them participated in the 1970 “take-over.” These students were evenly split in their opinion about whether they had been able to participate in all campus social activities, clubs and organizations like White students; however, they believed they were much more likely to be graded on racism as well as merit in their classes (80%). Most of these students’ educations had been financed by family, churches, their own employment earnings, and
social organizations in the Black community, not by scholarships and loans even though they all met traditional scholastic standards for university admission.\textsuperscript{198}

Nearly two-thirds of these students had the college in-residence experience; however, those who lived “on-campus” most often lived in OSU approved rooming houses and commercial apartment houses. Nearly all these students also lived “in the city” at some point due to finances, relatives with space available, and discontent with campus issues. Several students shared anecdotal stories of classroom humiliations, grades clearly based on racsim, neglectful counseling episodes, fears of using their right to free speech at OSU, and isolations in “experimental” dormitories. Black OSU students from the sixties and seventies, were persevering; their stories entail “drop-outs”\textsuperscript{199} due to low grade point averages influenced by faculty racism and bigotry, “stop-outs” due to discrimination in financial aid.\textsuperscript{200} In the final analysis, Black OSU students from the sixties and seventies were tenacious and persevering in their educational pursuits despite the university’s covert but racialized environment and adverse setting they have described. Although only two-thirds of the students in the study group managed to earn their bachelor’s degree from OSU, all of them eventually earned baccalaureate degrees from other universities. Several study participants earned graduate degrees from Ohio State; and many others earned graduate and professional\textsuperscript{201} degrees from other universities.

\textsuperscript{198} OSU has traditionally had a selective enrollment standard; only student who met certain minimal academic and testing standards would be admitted.

\textsuperscript{199} A “drop-out” is an enrollment suspension by the university due to academic probation based on an insufficiently low grade point average; a “stop-out” is the student’s voluntary departure from university enrollment due to financial or other non-academic reasons.

\textsuperscript{200} The 1965 federal Higher Education Act did not reach the typical Black student until well into the next decade, except for College Work Study, which presented conflicts for Black students who needed more time for study.

\textsuperscript{201} No fewer than five Black students who attended OSU as undergraduates during this period survived and earned professional degrees as medical doctors: Emerson M. Harewood, Jr., Yvonne Cummings, Ray V. Pryor, Gladys Stull, and Yvonne Ferguson.
Data Analyses from Auxiliary Primary Sources

Data have been analyzed from other primary sources: personal Archives maintained by officers and members of the BSU, published autobiographies, including original issues of the OSU Lantern and one issue of an OSU Alumni Magazine, and public records electronically available via the internet. Analysis of these data relates to the confirmability, criterion as discussed by Trochim and Donnelly. Confirmability refers to the degree to which others can confirm or corroborate the results. As a reminder, the purposes: anchoring Black students’ perceptions of the movement in the “facts” as Black students experienced them, establishing a nexus between Black students’ activism and eventually reformed policies, practices, and programs at OSU, and re-defining the collective behavior of Black students as social movement behavior, motivated by interest in the greater good of all Black students, rather than as disruptive campus protests behavior on the part of a few rogue students.

In the absence of published peer-reviewed literature on Black student activism at Ohio State, interrogating the basis for discursive truisms made by study participants and by news media was necessary to ground students/alumni assumptions in factual information about which students agreed. Other foundational assumptions which needed verification aside from study participants’ four-decade recollections were that (a) the Black Student Union at OSU without formal membership rolls or cards did function as a viable organization representing social activists motivations, ideologies and interests of Black students; that (b) the organizational activities of the Black Student Union did address student-life

---

202 Original issues of these newspapers and articles were loaned to the research study by John Sidney Evans Jr. who was the “head” of the OSU Black Student Union during the 1968 events. These papers had been maintained in his personal archives.

issues;\textsuperscript{204} that (c) the organizational history and activities of the BSU did constitute the researcher’s understanding of the “indigenous perspective” or model of “social movement theory;” and (d) that participant reports of BSU members and other Black student organization leaders had experienced extreme forms of retribution and castigation due to their social activism tactics on OSU’s campus between 1968 and 1970.

Confirming these “facts” as experienced by study participants included the review of alternative or auxiliary primary source materials. Prompted by Harry Edwards who wrote that the State of California had “in response to…campus difficulties and anticipated future student rebellions…[took] a hard line on campus protests…,” the researcher decided to peruse Ohio laws. Edwards further reported that

In California, 75 separate pieces of legislation focusing upon campus conflict [had] already been put before the state legislature and 73 of these …laws would make campus trespassing, class disruption, and other actions deemed “detrimental” to the campus community, felonies, some punishable by as much as five years in the state penitentiary…\textsuperscript{205}

The \textbf{Ohio Revised Code: » Title [33] XXXIII EDUCATION}, a public document accessed via the internet, has been reviewed for comparability to Edwards’ report of state government backlash for student social activism. A review of the \textbf{Ohio Revised Code; » Title [33] XXXIII EDUCATION - LIBRARIES} reveals that the State of Ohio and OSU officials have legally mastered how to manage the social activism of students. Chapter 3345: State Universities contains an extensive explication of the rules and procedures, which were the state’s reaction to student protests from the 1960s through the 2000s. Parts of the ORC (Section 3345) seen as most capable of criminalizing student protest behaviors and of

\textsuperscript{204} Student life issues complained of by Black students included excessive force by campus police used on Black co-eds, faculty prejudice and bigotry through the power of the pen, discrimination in housing and public accommodations at businesses catering to the OSU student body, under-representation of Black students in the student body, and the need for course-work about Black people in American society and history. Other campus issues to which students’ activism attached were gross under-representation of Blacks on OSU’s faculty and professional staff, and allegations of unequal wages between Black and White non-professional campus workers, e.g. food service staff, janitorial staff, and facilities operation staff.

supporting and sheltering state officials from litigation at the expense of Ohio taxpayers are provided in
detail in Appendix I. Universities have always maintained administrative procedures to handle student
conduct; however legislative enactments concerning administrative actions on a campus elevate the
possibility of infractions to criminality not merely administrative misconduct.

Not necessarily spelled out in student handbooks, Ohio codes carrying sanctions can be traced to
events during the student protest movement at Ohio State University, as reported by interviewees in the
present study. Students may also be covered in certain instances, except when litigating against the
university. These legal statutes which most students, except astute law students, would not be able to
imagine loom like an invisible, but debilitating gas to subdue students who have been reared to believe in
First Amendment freedoms, including the rights to speak out and to assemble. The ORC have the more
detrimental effect on students’ ability to exercise their rights, including the right to free speech and the
freedom of assembly, while university officials have immunity from civil suits for decisions made in
these instances; and insurance premiums for university officials’ coverages are paid by taxpayer revenues
collected by the State of Ohio. Situating student protest behavior among other felonious crimes is over-
reaction at a minimum, and repression of individual and collective rights to public dissent, which Black
student leaders of the Black Student Union experienced. The suspension/expulsion/criminal prosecution
experiences of more focal BSU leaders are also s part of how study participants/alumni experienced the
Black Student Movement staged at OSU.

The Ohio State University Monthly: The Alumni Magazine for April 1968

Relative to the issues about which the BSU complained formally in February and again in April,
1968, both newspapers and the university’s April, 1968 alumni magazine, The Ohio State University
Monthly,²⁰⁶ provide textual data essential to validating the study’s assumptions. The alumni magazine

²⁰⁶ The Ohio State University MONTHLY: Official Alumni Publication. Vol. 59, No. 8; 10, 11.
features a two-page article entitled “Trustees Approve Housing Stand;” it also contains group photos of university officials meeting with members of the Black Student Union on campus:

A meeting between the Black Student Union and University officials last month brought a renewed pledge that Ohio State will work toward elimination of discriminatory practices in the University community.

“I know there is a problem, but I also know there is no instant answer, “Provost John E. Corbally told the gathering in Stillman Hall auditorium. “I think the future of the country depends on people slowly and unemotionally working on problems. We will be too slow for you, but too fast for others.”

Meeting with the students were: Executive Dean for Student Relations…Executive Assistant to President…Dean of Medicine…Assistant Dean of Dentistry…and Assistant Deans of Faculties. John Evans was spokesman for the Black Student Union and acted as moderator for the discussion.

The magazine also reports the resolution which finally establishes the university’s official position against discrimination in student housing on and around the OSU campus community. The resolution text reads:

“WHEREAS: The Ohio State University has through its administrative officers repeatedly expressed its support of both the legal and moral requirements for non-discrimination because of race, color, and creed in all aspects of University and community life; and

“WHEREAS: the University has taken a series of actions to insure that internal employment practices reflect this commitment; and

“WHEREAS: the University has initiated action to introduce into its curricula subject matter which will reflect the contributions to American society and the heritage of minority groups; and

“WHEREAS: the Student Assembly of The Ohio State University in cooperation with student groups, faculty members, and administrative officers has initiated a program to use their best efforts to insure that off-campus housing available to students is available in accordance with Ohio law relating to civil rights and equal opportunity; and

“WHEREAS: The Ohio State University has within its faculty and staff knowledgeable scholars with competency to seek solutions to a wide range of socio-economic problems; and

“WHEREAS: a university, because of its inherent capability and of well-defined service mission, should exercise a leadership role in designing and implementing such solutions; and

“WHEREAS: University Officers have already begun action programs within the University and within the community to deal with various socio-economic problems; now, therefore,

“BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University endorses the programs already initiated by the University to deal with such problems, and “That the Board directs the appropriate official of the University under the direction of the President of the University to take such steps and to initiate such programs as will attempt to insure that University and University-related activities are conducted in conformance with Ohio law relating
to civil rights and equal opportunity and as will insure that the University play its proper role in exercising leadership in dealing with important current socio-economic problems.”

*The Ohio State Lantern, Call and Post: Columbus Edition, Columbus Dispatch*

Media sources such as *The Ohio State Lantern*, the officially authorized student laboratory newspaper at the Ohio State University, the *Columbus Dispatch*, and *Call and Post: Columbus Edition* have consistently documented specific events which define and helped crystallize the Black Student Movement at OSU. Newspaper excerpts from original copies of these publications have been gleaned for textual and specific data related to the events and principal actors during the BSM at Ohio State. Data were excerpted from original issues of *The Ohio State Lantern*, which published feature headline stories frequently, as follows: Monday, April 15, 1968, “University Nixes ‘Demands’; Trespass Charges to Stay: Grievances Answered by Fawcett” by John D. Hofheimer.


Articles feature photos of the principal people, including OSU officials and Black Student Union leaders and BSU members. One article published the statement of John S. Evans, BSU leader who was one of the “OSU 34” about what transpired in the Administration Building on April 26, 1968:

A number of concerned students realized that Ohio State was a very racist institution. We decided to draw up a list of demands and present them to Mr. Bonner, Dean of Student Relations, on February 1. They were 1) Better housing, 2) More relevant Black courses, 3) Better treatment of foreign students, 4) More hiring of Black teachers and administrators, 5) More Black athletic participation, 6) Upgrading (boosting grades of Black student applicants). On February 7, we met with Vice-President Corbally, and what followed was over a hundred meetings with administrators leading up to April 24. On that day, two co-eds were harassed by campus police for speaking openly about Black Power on a campus bus.

207 *Ohio State Lantern*. Vol. 87, No. 123; p 1.
Columbus Edition Call and Post, May 4, 1968 Volume 55, number 17; pp.1 and 2a. Three front-page headlines in boldface appear; the main headliner, a boldfaced one-inch high read, as follows: “Turmoil on College Campuses Negroes Win at Ohio State…” The others read as follows: “OSU Students Seized Bldg. Eight Hours,” and “Demands At OSU; What was Granted.” By line author, Carole Morton, is quoted verbatim:

It has happened in institutions of higher learning throughout the country, and last week, at Ohio State University students and officials, the movement and revolt of black students against an ‘oppressive society’ finally hit home. At exactly 9 a.m. Friday April 26, some 60 Black Student Union (BSU) members entered the office of Gordon B. Carson, vice president of business and finance, armed with a list of demands and an ultimatum that they all be met by 12 p.m. May 3 or ‘the black people shall cease arbitration.

When Carson was unable to produce any concrete answers to solve their problems, the students decided to stay until he could.

The seizure came as a direct result of apathy and under-action on the part of the Ohio State administrators to resolve grievances presented them in early February.

The grievances asked for Negro university administrators and counselors, fair housing in apartments around campus, courses in Negro History, placement of foreign exchange African students in Negro months.

Almost three complete months have passed without any definite commitment from the university.

Two alleged discriminatory incidents by white university employees were added to the students’ list last Friday, April 26. This included an incident involving alleged discriminatory acts against four black co-eds

The Plain Dealer, a Cleveland, Ohio daily newspaper, published an article by Richard Zimmerman, “Trials Won’t Change BSU’s Fury” on Monday, July 14, 1969. The article featured head shots of nine (9) BSU students identified discursively as the “OSU 34.” Zimmerman reported this assessment:

Of all the many campus uprisings over the last several years, the takeover of the OSU administration building was one of the most restrained. No blood was spilled, no bones broken, no police called, no Mace sprayed. Yet nowhere in the entire country have the charges resulting from the capture of a campus building been more harsh. The Franklin County Grand Jury here returned indictments ranging from illegal detention (kidnapping) to blackmail to making menacing threats. Maximum penalty for kidnapping in Ohio is 30 years!

There were white as well as Black demonstrators in the OSU building the day of the takeover. But only Blacks were indicted. BSU’s demands, unlike so many demands made by militants
today, were negotiable and, in fact were negotiated but the end of the day’s takeover. The university already had begun to correct some of the situations listed in BSU’s rather standard list of demands but failed to tell anyone.

OSU Vice-President and Provost John E. Corbally Jr., who was in charge of the building in the day-long seizure, was and still is against the Grand Jury’s indictments. He preferred letting the university discipline the students. Because he negotiated with the students instead of calling police, Corbally, who was about the only top OSU official who then had the complete trust of both Black and White students, immediately was put on the OSU trustee’s blacklist.

Black Student Union members in Zimmerman’s photo lineup were part of the “OSU 34;” five of the nine featured in this article were women students. BSU leader Herndon Cummings is a participant in the instant study.

*University Forum: Ohio State’s Only Independent Newspaper* published “Administration Building, April, 1968” on October 3, 1969. The article recaps the events, and made this editorial assessment about OSU:

> While some campuses tried to work out their problems, OSU became at best repressive and reactionary. ...n May 31, thirty-four students were charged with kidnapping, conspiracy, blackmail, and making menacing threats, totaling up to 305 years of prison terms. On July 11 eight Blacks were dismissed from the university, although none of them had been found guilty of any of the charges brought forth in their campus hearings. The trials in Federal courts of the thirty-four Blacks began in June of this year [1969].

*New York Times* excerpt on Tuesday, July 29, 1969:

> An out-of-court settlement was reached today in the trial of 34 Ohio State University students indicted in a Franklin County Grand Jury following a takeover of the university Administration Building in April of 1968.

> The students, all Negroes, had been indicted on 12 counts. Each defendant was charged with five counts of Unlawful Detention, five counts of Conspiracy to Unlawfully Detain, one count of Blackmail and one count of Menacing Threat. Under Ohio law, all charges except Menacing Threats represent a Felony. Under the terms of today’s agreement, all charges were dropped against 10 students. Six students pleaded guilty to Trespassing and 16 admitted to Trespassing and Making Menacing Threats; both counts are misdemeanors.

> This ends the story of the 34 Blacks….However, there is still one question which was left unanswered for some time: why were these particular thirty-four chosen out of all the people, both Black and White, who were inside the Administration Building that day? The answer is simple: most of the people who were indicted had signed a list in Vice-President Carson’s office which was supposedly an excuse from classes for the day.
The Ohio State Lantern, on Thursday, January 23, 1969 published a story by Sandra J. White. The headline reads “Re-indictments Filed in Cases Against ‘34.’ ” Franklin County’s prosecutor introduced charges afterwards. The first indictment was for Menacing Threats and Blackmail. The second indictment listed five counts each of Illegal Detention and Conspiracy to Illegally Detain; these five counts corresponded to the five OSU employees who were allegedly forced by the defendants to stay several hours in offices on April 26, 1968. These five counts were portrayed as Kidnapping.

Summary of Auxiliary Primary Data

University retributions were taken specifically against Black Student Union (BSU) leaders including criminal charges and other legal issues emanating from the Spring Quarter 1968 and the Spring Quarter 1970 Administration Building occupations (“take-over”). 1968 BSU leaders identified collectively as “the OSU 34,” including John Evans, Ingrid Smith, Ward Strickland, La Quita Henry, Gloria Jones, Wendell Crosswhite, Mike Williams and others were indicted, suspended, expelled from college, and otherwise embroiled in legal entanglements for more than two years afterwards. Although legal defense tactics separated the “OSU 34” for trial purposes, in fact, the BSU members identified by the university as most culpable were BSU leadership as well as non-member onlookers. Organizations such as the National office of the NAACP, along with a bevy of local attorneys in the Columbus area, a Nationwide Insurance vice-president and others helped raise funds for their legal defense.

The Ohio State Lantern reporter, Mark Weaver, also reported that “[f]or the first time in its 100-year history, the Ohio Bar Association appointed a six-man committee to study the case, and that. …the Bar Association preferred the felonies be dropped and a long drawn-out trial be avoided. Weaver further reported that the Methodist Church in Franklin County assisted in the legal defense of the “OSU 34” because it was widely known that both Blacks and Whites occupied the building, while only Black students were arrested and indicted. The university through its alumni organ published articles and
photographs of OSU officials in scheduled meetings with members of the Black Student Union during
Winter Quarter 1968.

By Spring Quarter 1970, Black students in coalitions and alliances with other student groups
continued their campus activism; Black students who organized as Afro-Am\textsuperscript{208}, Black American Law
Students Association (BALSA), Black Graduate and Professional Students Caucus (BGPSC) had
resumed their public protests on campus. The 1970 student “take-over” of the OSU Administration
Building was covered by the national media. Published 18 years afterwards in 1988, \textit{Day By Day in the
Seventies: Volume One 1970 – 1975} listed under the category of U.S. Politics and Social Issues, the
following facts for April 29, 1970, “About 600 students are arrested during two days of demonstrations
on the Ohio State University campus.” The campus was closed down again; and students were sent home.
The saga continued when The Common Pleas Court of Franklin County, Ohio accepted the May 28, 1970
civil petition of non-university persons seeking suppression of Black student organizational leaders’
Constitutional rights to “free speech,” and their right to congregate. In this instance, five Black students
who occupied leadership positions in Afro-Am and Third World Solidarity Committee were named
specifically as defendants in this petition, as well as these specific organizations. The university, an
educational agency of the State of Ohio, allowed itself to be listed among a class of plaintiffs in a May
1970 petition filed in Franklin County Common Pleas Court against Afro-Am, an organization of Black
OSU students, and against other predominantly White student groups in coalitions. In that Court of
Common Pleas filing, plaintiffs including The Ohio State University admit in complaint # 22 the
following administrative failure to plan for or manage the non-academic sphere of university life:

\begin{quote}
Although the Board of Trustees of OSU is required to adopt regulations governing the
conduct of students, faculty, and visitors at the University and to take appropriate discipline-
ary action against persons violating such regulations, the Board of Trustees does not currently
have any such regulations in effect and has not initiated action to cancel the contracts of
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{208} Afro-Am was a Black student activist organization among undergraduate students at OSU; Afro-Am was
essentially the phoenix rising from the “ashes” of the Black Student Union in 1969-70.
individual defendants who are on the OSU payroll, to suspend or expel individual defendants who are students, or to eject individual defendants who are nonstudents.\footnote{See Appendix H, Franklin County Ohio Common Pleas Court Petition # 240650, May 28, 1970.}

These data suggest that the university did recognize the BSU and Afro-Am as legitimate OSU student organizations. Individual members of BSU and Afro-Am were not rogue students whose intent was mere disruption of normal campus activities, as implied by the university’s prosecution of individual Black students, although Black student leaders had been misrepresented as a disruptive rogue element in the university community.

These data from disparate news sources provide credibility, consistency, and confirmability regarding the campus phenomena, i.e. specific events beginning in Winter Quarter 1968 through Spring Quarter 1970 about which this study has asked alumni to recall. Primary sources report nearly identical information involving the members of the Black Student Union, the “OSU 34,” as well as reports of Ohio State’s reactionary and protracted pursuit of prosecution against the thirty-four Black students for their social activism. These sources also establish that the Black Student Union was considered a viable organization representing most of the Black student population, which was recognized by the university, the media, students, and the general public. These data also address the researcher’s assumption that the collective behavior of OSU students was political, organized and intended to serve the collective interests of all Blacks enrolled at Ohio State University.

\section*{CHAPTER 5}

\section*{V. SUMMATION:}

\subsection*{Study Limitations}

The major limitation of this study involved sampling issues: barriers to accessing archived OSU student demographic data, and key Black Student Union members’ reluctance to interview. University and alumni association reticence to provide 1962 – 1972 student/alumni population’s ethnic and racial demographics was an obstacle to a broader sampling frame. Officers of the AAAS had been unable to gather that information and construct those lists on a number of occasions. The 250 – 300 OSU Black Alumni who
attended the 2010 African American Reunion can be viewed as a by-product of the barrier from both OSU and its official alumni association regarding alumni from the sixties and the seventies. Maintaining racial/ethnic data on students has been, at times, an enlightened administrative policy in higher education for Black students’ inclusion, and at other times, a despicable administrative policy used for their exclusion. The moods of not only OSU, but also the country as a whole, have resulted in periods of vacillating policies during the latter half of the 20th century.

The other sampling limitation was BSU leaders’ inability to overcome their negative association with OSU from the Black Student Movement. Pivotal Black Student Union leaders who were fondly remembered by their colleagues in the interviews declined being interviewed, thereby creating a vacuum in the insights and attitudes of the Black Student Movement at OSU. Although four of the “OSU 34” from the 1968 “siege” had been located and recruited to participate, only one would participate in the interviews. Not fewer than two pivotal BSU leaders, who would have been part of the virtual sample, are already deceased. Although the objective of this study has been to privilege the voices, experiences, and perspectives of Black OSU students, the perspective of an OSU alumna who did not participate in the Black Student Movement applies, “…every movement and every cause has to have not just a leader, but there also has to be the “behind the scenes” people, getting the work done! Being involved from a different perspective, and using their connections and networking systems to help the cause.” As such, the insights, the information, and the perspectives of the Black Student Union rank and file will suffice for now.

**Implications**

An extrapolated phenomenological study of Black students’ social activism at OSU, purposefully focusing on a sampling of athletes, graduate and professional students would provide another perspective currently beyond the scope of this study. Although this study did not emphasize a gender perspective, there was some evidence of women students as leaders and organizers at OSU, this also should be
interrogated. An expanded study could be better accomplished through a grant-funded doctoral study and dissertation, enabling a broader sample frame, more extensive interviewing, and comparative analyses. Discourse about OSU’s Black Student Movement excludes consideration for other higher education reforms BSU members desired and helped the university to achieve; this exclusion could serve as the basis for a subsequent case study of Black student activism at Ohio State.

The profiles and data produced about Black student activists can be used as an effective recruitment tool for not only Black student organizations but also for recruitment into lifestyle activism roles as lobbyists and leaders in social activist organizations and other non-profit community work.

Conclusions

Having experienced historically negative student-life experiences at OSU, African-American students perceived university policies and practices as barriers and impediments to college graduation, their principal route as African Americans to the “American dream.” Their sense of “community,” developed principally through campus memberships in Greek-letter organizations, was nurtured and became manifest through organizations such as the Black Student Union which consciously organized African American students around issues such as racially charged police confrontations, grossly inadequate academic counseling, and racial discrimination in campus housing accommodations.

Themes of “fear,” and “isolation,” while very prevalent in the experiences and testimonies of the OSU study participants, were overridden by the other two themes: “community,” and “persistence” to completion of their educational goals. Overwhelmingly, participants agreed that there were good reasons to be upset with OSU policies and practices which presented obstacles to getting their degrees: grossly inadequate academic counseling, insufficient financial aid, and professors grading more on racism than merit to name only a few. The “isolation” from other Blacks on campus and being required to reside in hostile housing accommodations in university approved “off-campus” housing produced alienation.
experienced by participants; and, as discussed by Angela Davis, feeling isolated and alienated produced nihilistic thoughts and self-doubt to which some students succumbed. Half of the ten study interviewees either “dropped out” from failure to maintain required grade point averages, or “stopped out” due to insufficient financial aid despite having maintained satisfactory grade point averages.

Being “Black” definitely affected whether you felt you belonged at the “Scarlet and Gray.” Isolation, alienation, and fear of failing to meet the expectations of their families were experiences shared unanimously by all study participants. Membership in Greek-letter organizations and becoming second generation college graduates was the legacy and expectation of most study participants. Their GLO memberships provided not only a basis for a sense of “campus community,” but also basis for continuity within family lineages. All ten participants either held GLO memberships, or would have done so had their grades and finances been sufficient. As noted in Harry Edwards’ study, these students’ pursuit of the “American dream” was defined by the mid-20th century Black community in the United States:

> [t]he emphasis placed upon obtaining a college degree by the negro middle class [was] also a factor of tremendous importance in fomenting the spirit of rebellion among Black students …older members of the negro middle class have looked upon a college degree as a symbol of cultural superiority, refinement, good breeding, and a union card.\(^{210}\)

As further noted by Edwards, “[e]ven after passage of the school desegregation act of 1954, the discriminatory recruitment policies of northern educational institutions, the relatively high cost of tuition, and room and board still prevented middle-class negro parents from sending their children to prestigious, predominantly white schools in the north.”\(^{211}\)

Nevertheless, Black students at OSU persisted despite their issues with the university. Only one study participant completed her degree within the twelve quarters or four years more typical of Whites at OSU. In fact, she was one the five (50%) who eventually earned bachelor’s degrees from OSU. The other four showed “persistence” to graduating for as many as seven years on a single bachelor’s degree; indeed


\(^{211}\) Ibid.
all five who received OSU bachelor’s degrees experienced a combination of “drop-outs,” “stop-outs,” housing discrimination, course grades based on professors’ racism, and the social pressure from family members to honorably “represent” their families and the broader African American community.

“Persistence” among these Black OSU students was more diligently exhibited by the other 50% who eventually did earn their college degrees at other universities. In fact, a review of the study participant list [Appendix F] will show that nearly two-thirds of them “persisted” beyond the baccalaureate degree, earning graduate and professional degrees both at OSU and other prestigious TWIs.

This study has asserted that Black students’ negative academic and social injustice experiences on OSU’s campus became manifest as publicly-staged campus protests, i.e. the Black Student Movement during the mid-1960s and the early-1970s, and that the student-life experiences and student activism of Black OSU students have been discursively marginalized and reduced in the literature to a singular expressed desire for a Black Studies curriculum. The significance of this study has been in helping fill “gaps” in the canons of both African American Studies and Higher Education, eliminating the myopic view about Black student protests at OSU. The purpose of this study has been to provide a scholarly vehicle, i.e. this manuscript, through which the voices, the attitudes, the perceptions, and the experiences of Ohio State’s Black student population could be centralized as participants and/or “engaged” observers in the Black Student Movement. The objective of this study has been providing an opportunity for a scholarly retrospective history of the BSU at OSU with the intent of dissolving old contentions between historic Black Student Union leaders/members and The Ohio State University, and filling gaps in the literature. Arguably, OSU has not yet taken the steps toward self-criticism which Rutgers University and Columbia University have in reassessing the roles and responsibilities of both students and these institutions during the Black Student Movement. Both these universities officially revisited their histories with Black student activists; they have hosted major events commemorating the past, which have implications for the future. Similarly, the University of Illinois Press has shown its enlightened support revisiting the historic Black Student Movement by publishing two texts used in the present study: *Harlem
vs. Columbia University: Black Student Power in the Late 1960s (2009), and Black Power on Campus: The University of Illinois 1965 -75 (2003). The perspectives and experiences of Black students at OSU from the sixties and seventies have required and earned a centralized position in the scholarly literature and discourse.

At Ohio State University between 1962 and 1972, Black student activists were in various stages of social activist incubation and development, as was the BSM itself. This study was greatly informed by the research of Harry Edwards whose five categories of “reluctant revolutionaries” helped explain how and why Black student demonstrated their activism in diverse ways. Although the federal 1965 Higher Education Act should have made a definite difference for all students, systemic discrimination imbrued the proposed results. Black students got very limited benefit until after the Black Student Movement seemed more efficacious to university officials. The study’s ten African American OSU interviewees and the five historic Black student activists: Stokely Carmichael, Angela Davis, Harry Edwards, James Forman, and Charlayne Hunter-Gault were situated within Edwards’ “Reluctant Revolutionaries” typology. Of these fifteen Black 1960s students, the “radical activist” category claimed the largest number: five; only two study participants fit into this category. The “militant” category claimed the third largest number: three; all three were study participants. Based on their student activist histories, only two seemed to conform to Edwards’ “revolutionary” category. Only one person fit the category called the “conforming Negro,” also known in the literature as an “engaged observer;” this “engaged observer” was also a study participant. Finally, the second most populous of these fifteen 1960s Black students was Edwards’ anomalous and difficult- to- describe group #6; four study interviewees could not be placed, except in this category. Consistent with Edwards’ findings of students’ distribution into the “types,” the “radical activists” and the “militants” were more prevalent as conscious student activists. Most of those in his 6th anomalous category were clearly students whose enrollments OSU were between 1962- 1964, a time when no identifiably conscious “movement” was effect.
How did African-descended OSU students/alumni as participants, or observers in the Black Student Movement, experience the events and activities of the late 1960s – early 1970s, given the adverse media coverage associated with college campus student activism?

a. How did African American students at OSU experience social activist organizations such as Congress on Racial Equality (CORE), Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC)?

b. How did African American students at OSU experience “Greek-Letter” organizations (GLOs) during the Black Student Movement?

Succinctly, African American students at Ohio State came as representatives of their families and communities to get a “good” education from an institution earning both the academic degrees and the “social capital” believed necessary to achieve the “American dream.” These students were overwhelmingly from families with college experience and organizational histories in social activist organizations. But these students were politically reticent, or reluctant, in Harry Edwards’ terms. Black students most likely to attend OSU at that time were either encouraged to, or forced to, attend OSU as their families wanted; these students were existing in a socially un-empowered netherworld or interstice between adolescence and adulthood. They were not children, but they were still not adults; the families intended and the university pretended to be students’ alma mater. Instead Black students, like other students, became entangled in the university’s repressive pseudo-parental code, which induced some near apathy even though they experienced the racial injustices; yet others “stepped up to the plate,” demonstrating new vistas in social behaviors called “activism.” The pervasive feeling of “fear” was expressed from the most active of these students to the least active of them. Fears centered around not being able to finish college, not meeting their family’s expectations, and missing their opportunity to find the route to social and economic success. Black students who enrolled at OSU during the early 1960s came armed with
overwhelmingly good grades from college preparatory curricula, law-abiding family settings with two parents unlike the Moynihan’s social effigies propagated in his “tangle of pathology.”

Some study participants were very fearfully paralyzed, experiencing the BSM as an uneasy period in their early adulthood, given their experiences; but the overwhelming majority formed a “community,” which enabled them to be very persistent in pursuit of their educational goals. Former OSU Black alumni nearly unanimously developed and maintained a sense of community; the axial basis for this sense of community was principally their affiliations in Greek-Letter organizations. Even students who had not joined GLOs found the social and cultural events sponsored by GLOs as their principal non-academic outlets: talent shows, the annual “Q Sweetheart” competitions, and the AKA “Bachelor of the Year” Competition. Religious affiliations were less influential in their perspectives, unless these students lived “in town” with relatives or other Black families who encouraged church attendance. These students did not feel tied to Civil Rights organizations, unless they lived “in town.”

How did African American students/alumni feel they benefitted or suffered, given their student-life experiences at Ohio State during the 1960s and 1970s Black Student Movement?

c. What themes emerge from alumni who participated in collective campus protest activities called the Black Student Movement?

d. What themes emerge from alumni who did not participate in campus protest activities?

Themes produced from participant data were isolation, fear, community, and persistence to finishing their educational objectives. Despite the possibilities and experiences of being arrested, jailed, sued, and not


“Q’s” = Omega Psi Phi Fraternity.
getting the education for which one’s family had sacrificed, Black alumni generally expressed feelings of pride in acquiring the “social capital” associated with an OSU degree. Several thought of their experiences as beneficial in their ideological and political training, which they had not expected to get at OSU. Some even experienced their student activist days as exhilarating and exciting; younger, less politically experienced undergraduates tended to experience the Black Student Movement as fun and social. On the other hand, the more “radically active” participants, in retrospect, understood the FBI’s COINTELPRO; some Black students at OSU were affected by COINTELPRO, the remnants of which “trailed” these students well into their adult occupational lives. Several participants expressed a benefit of efficacy for having stood defiantly for their rights to a good education and for having an opportunity to form a community of activists. Participants who derived a sense efficacy from their activist experiences at Ohio State most often had no issues with their own children attending the university; in fact some participants were proud of their OSU history and wore it like an emblem. Irrespective of overt public activism or minimal consciousness of the movement, all study participants expressed the same remnants of isolation in various different setting, a variety of fears, conflicts and trepidations about everything from graduation, to the loss of family emotional support.

Future research might more clearly argue and prove that the activism of the BSU members at OSU can be credited for the hundreds of new positions and the hundreds of thousands of dollars budgeted annually, from which Blacks, other ethnic minorities, and Whites benefit. OSU’s Office of Minority Affairs, the African American and African Studies Program and its AAASCEC program, and the

---

214 At least one student activist inauspiciously named on the 1970 Franklin County Common Pleas Petition# 240650, Michael R. White, eventually won a contested mayoral bid for the City of Cleveland. Having honed his political skills in the Black Student Movement at OSU, Mike White became the 55th and longest-serving mayor of Cleveland, Ohio encompassing three four-year terms, from 1990 to 2002. He was Cleveland’s second African American mayor as well as the city’s second youngest mayor.

215 The African American and African Studies Department also provides faculty level direction for its Community Extension Center on Mt. Vernon Avenue in Columbus’ eastside community largely composed of Black residents. The AAASCEC is OSU’s “reach” into the Black community, which BSU members demanded during the movement, and for which the eastside “community” still holds the university accountable. In early 2010, the tenure track AAASCEC Director was arbitrarily removed from his duties; the
visibly more proportionate faculty hires among Black and other ethnic minorities in all disciplines and departments, as well as other “initiatives” are essentially 1968 BSU student demands for which the university has taken credit without acknowledging the genesis of these improvements.

**Recommendations**

This manuscript does not pretend to establish a panacea for anything. However, since President E. Gordon Gee\(^{216}\) has declared that his goal is for OSU to be the preeminent “Public Ivy” in the United States; toward this goal, the researcher recommends that strategies for OSU becoming the preeminent “Public Ivy” be broadened to include the university’s more in-depth, critical self-assessment of its own role in the Black Student Movement. Institutions such as Rutgers University and Columbia University have had formal recognitions of the benefits Black student activism brought to their institutions. OSU uses social capital earned by a select few emblematic Black alumni, such as Archie Griffin, as its “public face of diversity.” Unfortunately, 42 years since the historic Black Student Movement, the university seems disinclined to acknowledge either its overreaction to, or its benefit from the legacy of the Black Student Movement. As a major research institution, OSU has the resources both from “real” and social capital earned by Black students and Black alumni to truly achieve an atmosphere of student-life embedded in social and academic equity and justice for Black students, and all OSU students. Although strides have been made, the goal of preeminence is far from being achieved in the perceptions of Black students and Black alumni. The path to preeminence which President Gee aspires needs enough room for a discourse which includes representation from OSU’s historic Black Student Union.

Howard Zinn has pointed out in *A People's History of the United States* that "the history of any country, presented as the history of a family, conceals fierce conflicts of interest (sometimes exploding,

---

\(^{216}\)E. Gordon Gee is OSU’s current and the only OSU president who has served two separate terms as president of the university.
most often repressed) between conquerors and conquered, masters and slaves, capitalists and workers, dominators and dominated." U.S. history is essentially that type of hidden history. Without denying important mitigating factors, the United States of today is strongly linked to the values and premises on which it was founded. That is, it is a settler colony founded primarily on two basic pillars, upheld by the Judeo-Christian tradition: genocide of indigenous peoples and slave labor in support of a capitalist infrastructure. Although the Bible repeatedly exalts mass slaughter and oppression, Judeo-Christian morality is publicly held to be inconsistent with them. This dissonance, evident within the nation's structure from the beginning, informs the state's first function: to oversimplify and minimize immoral events in order to legitimize history and the state's very existence simultaneously.217

Readers are thus left with the following words for contemplation: from the

Often what we do not know is not a mere gap in knowledge, the accidental result of an epistemological oversight. Especially in the case of oppression, a lack of knowledge or an unlearning of something previously known often is actively produced for purposes of domination and exploitation. Sometimes this takes the form of those in the center refusing to allow the marginalized to know….Other times it can take the form of the center’s own ignorance of injustice, cruelty, and suffering, such as white people’s obliviousness to racism and white domination. Sometimes these “unknowledges” are conspicuously produced, while other times they are inconspicuously generated and supported.

--Rock Ethics Institute, March 2004

217 http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/soledadbro.html
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APPENDICES

Appendix A:

Participant’s Informed Consent Form

Georgia State University
Department of African American Studies

Informed Consent

Title: The Black Student Movement at The Ohio State University

Principal Investigator: Jonathan Gayles, PhD.

Principal Student Investigator: Greer Charlotte Stanford-Randle

Sponsor: N/A

I. **Purpose:** You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of the study is to determine former students’ (alumni) attitudes about and experiences during student protest activities, and events in which Black (African-descended) alumni participated while enrolled during [1962-1972] at The Ohio State University’s Main Campus, in Columbus, OH.

If you are an ALUMNI [someone who completed coursework during at least three (3) quarters during 1962-72] please complete this questionnaire.

If you are NOT an OSU alumni, please return this “consent form” to the researcher. Thank you; and please accept our apologies for the inconvenience.

II. **Procedures:** If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete a survey questionnaire; you might also be asked to participate in a voice-recorded individual interview session with the student principal investigator, after you complete the questionnaire. Your completion of the survey questionnaire can either be completed in a private room, or in a semi-private room with other survey respondents. Interviews and survey questionnaires can be completed between April – June, 2010 at The Ohio State University African American and African Studies Community Extension Center (AAAS/CEC) [905 Mount Vernon Avenue, Columbus, OH 43203], or at the Ohio Union on the OSU Main Campus during the All Decades African American Alumni Reunion, or at another mutually agreeable location.

No financial remuneration is offered for your participation in this study.

III. **Risks:** In this study, you will not have any more risks than in a normal day of life.
IV. **Benefits:** Participation in this study may not benefit you personally. On the other hand, your input will be helpful to the researcher who is gathering information which can be valuable to current and future Black (African-descended) students of The Ohio State University for improved academic and social satisfaction; the information to be collected is also expected to be valuable to the university (O.S.U.) in developing curricula, programs, and activities which augment persistence to graduation among Black students, thereby enhancing the O.S.U.’s current “Students First” initiative.

V. **Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal:** Participation in research is totally voluntary. You do not have to be in this study. If you do decide to be in the study and change your mind later, you have the right to drop out at any time. You may skip questions or stop participating at any time. Whatever you decide, you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

VI. **Confidentiality:** We will keep your records private to the extent allowed by law. The faculty Principal Investigator, Dr. Jonathan Gayles and the Student Principal Investigator, Greer Charlotte Stanford-Randle, exclusively, will have access to the information you provide. If you desire anonymity, we will use a code: AAS/OSUBSM: [your initials] rather than recording your name on stored study data and records. The information you provide will be stored via hard copy in a locked filing cabinet. “Keys” to the data (i.e. code sheets) to identify research participants will be stored separately from the data to protect your privacy. However, your full name and other facts might appear when we present this study or publish its results if, and only if, you sign a separate “Authorization to List Your Name in Study Participant Table.”

VII. **Contact Persons:** Contact Dr. Jonathan Gayles, Principal Investigator and Faculty Advisor (jgayles@gsu.edu), and Greer Charlotte Stanford-Randle (gifatokisullah1@student.gsu.edu) or greer9@comcast.net, Principal Student Investigator at 404/840-3029 [or 404/413-5135 AAS Department] if you have questions about this study.

VIII. **Copy of Consent Form to Subject:** If you are willing to volunteer for this research, please sign below; and give it to the researcher. Be sure to take your own original duplicate, also signed below by the Student Principal Investigator.

____________________________________________  _________________
Your Name/Participant [your current name]        Date

____________________________________________  _________________
Principal Student Investigator                    Date

XX. Georgia State University Disclaimer:
If you have any question about this study, or believe you have suffered any injury because of participation in the study, you may contact Dr. Jonathan Gayles, Ph.D., Principal Investigator at 404/413-5142 or jgayles@gsu.edu; GSU: African American Studies Department, One Park Place, Atlanta, GA 30303.
APPENDIX B: Participant Interviewee Protocol (I)

The Black Student Movement at The Ohio State University

**Interviewer:** Greer C. Stanford-Randle  
**Interviewee:** ______________________________

**Date:** __________  
**Location:** ______________________________

**Start Time:** ________ am/pm  
**End Time:** _________ am/pm

1. How did you happen to choose OSU for your college education?

2. How did being a Black person at OSU feel during your college career?

3. Did you experience any problems as a student due to university policies or practices?

4. How did domestic and/or international issues affect your OSU student experience?

5. How did you feel on the day of the Administration Building [Bricker Hall] Student Sit-in?

6. How could your OSU student experience have been better than it was?

7. How would have/did a Black Studies curriculum affect your student life experiences?

8. Which factor(s) influenced your decision to participate, or not to participate, in student protest marches or sit-ins?
9. How were student protest leaders selected? And who were they, as you recall it?

Appendix C: Interview Protocol (II)

1. What is your understanding of Black student activism?

2. You were an African American student at Ohio State University during the 60s-70s; how would you describe or characterize social activism on the part of African American students?

3. An earlier survey I did with some other African American alumni indicates that more than 75% of them had memberships in Black sororities and fraternities; do you have any idea why such a large percentage of students were members of Greek Letter organizations?

4. Less than 33% of a previous survey sample group of 60s-70s OSU alumni had memberships in organizations such as CORE, SNCC, the Urban League & SCLC while they were at OSU. What do you make of that?

5. While at OSU, how did you manage to make your own viewpoints known about social injustices, such as Black professional and trades workers earnings being generally lower than Whites’, or the Vietnam War and the draft, or the fact that Black people couldn’t vote some communities in the U.S.?

6. Tell me, what was your impression of your ability to help correct social injustices for Blacks by working with organizations such as SCLC, NAACP, or the Urban League?

7. Assuming that you were a member of some organization, how were your memberships or affiliations at OSU instrumental in alleviating problems for Black students or the black community?

8. The first group of Black students to formally organize around Black student issues did so in 1968; that group called itself the Black Student Union (BSU). Did you feel the need to be active within this or another organized group of students, if you were not at OSU in 1968? Why would you join, or not join an activist group?

9. How could concerned Black students who were not charismatic leaders or speechmakers be involved in the OSU student movement?

10. In the 40s, Paul Robeson was denied access to speak on the OSU campus; and in the 60’s we had difficulty getting Dick Gregory on campus to speak. How did you feel about the “Speaker’s Rule” and the Free Speech Movement?
11. In my previous sampling of African American alumni, more than about 40% of them reported being members of religious organizations; what was your impression of the importance of spirituality to the Black Student Movement at OSU?


This is a survey of attitudes and behavior of Black/African-descended students who attended The Ohio State University for at least 3 quarters, between 1962 and 1972. If you were NOT enrolled for a minimum of 3 quarters between 1962 & 1972, do NOT complete the survey. And if you are NOT African-descended or do NOT consider yourself a “Black” person, do NOT complete this survey. Thanks for your interest, and please accept our apology; but return this form to the Researcher now.

NAME @ OSU: __________________________________ Current Name, if Different ______________________

GENDER: [circle only one]  Female  Male  Other  OHIO RESIDENT during enrollment: [circle only one]  Yes  No

RECEIVED an OSU degree: [circle only one]  Yes  No  RECEIVED a DEGREE, but not from OSU: [circle only one]  Yes  No

OSU DEGREE CONFERRED: [circle all that apply]: BA, BS, BSN, BSSW, MA, ME, MBA, MS, MSW, JD, MD, PhD, Ed.D, DDS, DVM

PARENT(s) or UNCLE(s) or AUNT(s) or GRANDPARENT(s) Attended or Graduated from College: [circle only one]  Yes  No

PARENT(s) or UNCLE(s) or AUNT(s) or GRANDPARENT(s) were members of NAACP, CORE, Urban League, SCLC  Yes  No

WHILE YOU ATTENDED OSU, did you ever do, or ever experience any of the following:
   a. Reside in official OSU student residence halls or approved off-campus “rooming houses”  YES  NO
   b. Receive official freshman academic counseling by a paid OSU staff or faculty person  YES  NO
   c. Receive a course grade which, you feel, was due to faculty race prejudice or bigotry  YES  NO
   d. Have to “drop out” because you could NOT afford tuition, housing, books, other expenses  YES  NO
   e. Have to “stop out” due to “academic probation,” i.e. grade point average too low  YES  NO
   f. Denied admission to OSU Graduate School or OSU Professional Schools (Med/Dental/Pharmacy)  YES  NO
   g. Feel discriminated against in campus restaurants or OSU social events on campus  YES  NO
   h. Get “drafted” into U.S. Military Service (Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force)  YES  NO
   i. Have social or race conflicts with non-Black classmates or roommates or OSU staff  YES  NO
   j. Attend any protest rallies, or make protest signs or speeches on campus, or near campus  YES  NO
k. Agreed with/Supported the Anti-Vietnam War Movement  
   YES NO
l. Attend any activities with SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) or the Weathermen  
   YES NO
m. Canvass/Sign up citizens to become registered voters for the 1964 and/or 1968 national elections  
   YES NO
n. Join a Greek Letter society: Alpha Kappa Alpha; Delta Sigma Theta; Zeta Phi Beta; Kappa  
   Alpha Psi; Alpha Phi Alpha; Omega Psi Phi; Sigma Gamma Rho  
   YES NO
o. Apply for admission to OSU Graduate School or Professional School (Med, Dent, Vet Med)  
   YES NO
p. Participate in the OSU Administration Building take-over in 1970  
   YES NO
q. Join/ have membership in any of the following: CORE, SNCC, SLCC, Panther Party, Urban League  
   YES NO
r. Sign any petitions to abolish “the Speaker’s Rule”  
   YES NO
s. March on or off campus against the Vietnam War  
   YES NO
t. Play any “varsity sports”, such as football, basketball, wrestling, track & field, swimming  
   YES NO
u. Join a church, temple, mosque, or another spiritual organization  
   YES NO
v. Join ROTC (Reserve Officers Training Corps) at OSU  
   YES NO
w. Approval of John Carlos’ & Tommie Smith’s Black-gloved fists at 1968 Olympics in Mexico City  
   YES NO
x. Receive a Student Judiciary Board Sanction for a non-academic university infraction  
   YES NO

While at OSU, how did you feel?

1. That professors treated all students fairly, regardless of race or ethnicity  
   (agree) (disagree)
2. Student protests (picketing, rallies, marches, and petition-signing) were justified  
   (agree) (disagree)
3. A Black Studies Program with courses related to being Black/Black cultures was needed  
   (agree) (disagree)
4. I was equally able to participate in any campus activities like the non-Black students  
   (agree) (disagree)
5. Race relations on campus reflected race relations in the off-campus Columbus community  
   (agree) (disagree)
6. Black students had good reasons to be upset with OSU policies and practices in the 60s  
   (agree) (disagree)

APPENDIX E: Authorization to List Your Name in “Study Participant Table”

Date:__________________Name:______________________________________________
This form is an authorization for the researcher, Greer Charlotte Stanford-Randle, to list your name, academic degrees/year of receipt and university where the degree(s) were conferred in a Table of Participants for the research being conducted about African-descended OSU alumni: **The Black Student Movement at The Ohio State University**. Neither complete interview responses nor complete survey responses are being disclosed in the text of the study, although quotes from participants’ responses might be used without identifying the person being quoted by name.

Please circle whether you agree to be listed as a study participant, or whether you decline in the appropriate box, as follows: [agree] [decline]

YOUR SIGNATURE:__________________________________________________________

Print/Type Your Name, as you wish it to appear in the Table of Study Participants.

__________________________________________________________________________

Degree(s)_____________Year Conferred ___________University__________________________

Degree(s)_____________Year Conferred ___________University__________________________

Degree(s)_____________Year Conferred ___________University__________________________

Degree(s)_____________Year Conferred ___________University__________________________

**APPENDIX F: List of Study Participants**

1. **Timothy Ayers**      Bachelor of Science  Ohio State University

2. **Judith L. Baker**    Bachelor of Arts    Wright State University (OH)
3. **Barbara L. Bayless**  
Bachelor Art Education  
Ohio State University (1975)

4. **Karen Banks Bright**  
Bachelor of Science  
Ohio State University (1968)  
Master of Arts  
Xavier University (OH) (1981)  
Doctor of Education  
University of Minnesota (1994)

5. **Harold H. Campbell**  
Bachelor of Arts  
Ohio State University (1973)  
Master Public Admin.  
California State University, Hayward (1989)  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Univ. of California, Berkeley (1999)

6. **Phyllis Dianne Campbell**  
Bachelor Art Education  
Ohio State University (1971)  
J.D. (Doctor of Law)  
Golden Gate University (2005)

7. **Dora A. Carson**  
Bachelor of Science  
Wright State University (OH) (1972)  
Master of Science  
Wright State University (OH) (1978)  
M.S. Educ. Admin.  
Wright State University (OH) (1993)

8. **Beatrice Bridges**  
Bachelor of Science  
Ohio State University (1964)

9. **Andrea Walker Cummings**  
Bachelor of Arts  
Ohio State University (1977)

10. **Herndon R. Cummings**  
Bachelor of Arts  
Ohio State University (1971)

11. **Carmen Daniels**  
Bachelor of Science  
Ohio State University (1987)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree(s)</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Lavonda Fountaine</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Wilberforce University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Business Admin.</td>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Dan Harper</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Ohio State University (1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Ted Harris</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>Ohio State University (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Lois O. Hunter</td>
<td>B.S. Social Welfare</td>
<td>Ohio State University (1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Social Welfare</td>
<td>Ohio State University (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Gwendolyn M. Jones</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>Central State University (1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Arts, Education</td>
<td>University of Michigan (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>LaVerne Mitchell</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Ohio State University (1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Social Work</td>
<td>University of Michigan (1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Jerilyn Nowell</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Wilberforce University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Mary Jane Smith</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>John Carroll University (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Jessica Smith-Evans</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Ohio State University (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td>Ohio State University (1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>Ohio University (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td>Kent State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Will C. Thomas, Jr.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Ohio State University (1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td>Ohio State University (1971)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
    Master of Science  Ohio State University (1973)

25. Leonard Tate  Bachelor of Arts  Central State University (1970)
    Master Public Admin.  Jackson State University (1972)
    J.D. (Doctor of Law)  Cleveland State University (1979)

26. Kenneth Thompson  Bachelor  Welding Engineering  Ohio State University (1972)

27. D. Janine Thompson  Bachelor of Science  Central State University (1966)
    J.D. (Doctor of Law)  John Marshall Law School

28. Linda Little Waddell  Bachelor of Science  Ohio State University (1968)
    M.A. Education  Ohio State University (1995)

29. A. Yvonne Wheeler  Bachelor of Science  Ohio State University (1976)

30. Alvin Whyte  Bachelor of Arts  Ohio State University (1970)
    Master of Arts  Ohio State University (1972)

APPENDIX G

Deceased Alumni/Graduates from 1962-1972 Theoretical Sample
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nelson Adderley²¹⁸</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Phyllis Brown-Strickland</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jacqueline Jannah Callahan</td>
<td>Springfield, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Romero A. Cherry</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Karen Cline</td>
<td>Mansfield, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cornelius (Neal) Colzie²¹⁹</td>
<td>Coral Gables, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yvonne E. Cummings, M.D.</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Robert Cromwell</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fred Davis²²⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Richard (Doc) Goode</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Emerson M. Harewood, M.D.</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eugene Harris</td>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lucy Hines</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Paul Hudson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Edith Huff</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sandra (Penny) Isome</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²¹⁸ OSU Varsity Football Team
²¹⁹ OSU Varsity Football Team
²²⁰ Black Student Union Leader
17. Diane Lewis  Chicago, IL
18. David Mc Farland  Columbus, OH
19. Rufus Mayes\textsuperscript{221}  Memphis, TN
20. Joe Morris
21. Carol Morton  White Plains, NY
22. Ray Von Pryor, M.D. DDS.\textsuperscript{222}  Hamilton, OH
23. Leonard Robinson  Greensboro, NC
24. Harold Ward Strickland\textsuperscript{223}  Dayton, OH
25. Gladys Stull, M.D.  Springfield, OH
26. Theodore J. Waters
27. Gloria J. Webster  Medina, OH

APPENDIX H

PETITION: IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, FRANKLIN COUNTY OHIO 240650

\textsuperscript{221} OSU Varsity Football Team
\textsuperscript{222} OSU Varsity Football Team
\textsuperscript{223} Black Student Union Leader
In the Common Pleas Court of Franklin County, Ohio, Case #240650 was filed by eleven (11) non-university personnel including parents of students and students on behalf of The Ohio State University on May 28, 1970. Nine (9) individual defendants, along with three organizations, are listed. Among the nine individuals, the following four (4) Black students were included as defendants: Paul Cook, Michael White, William T. Kilgore, and Roger Barriteau. Edmund William Boston, another Black man not believed to be an OSU student according to the petition, was also named as were David Kettler, Loraine Iris Cohen and Phillip H. Greenberg, all OSU professors at the time. The petition reads, as follows:

Plaintiffs, for their cause of action against defendants, state:

1. The Ohio State University, hereinafter referred to as “OSU” is a tax-supported institution of higher education in the State of Ohio which is engaged in educational, academic, research, and administrative functions. There are approximately 40,000 students enrolled at said university, and it provides services to said students and members of the general public.

2. OSU is, pursuant to law, governed by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University. The Principal office of the Board of Trustees is at 190 North Oval Drive, Columbus, Ohio. The Board of Trustees is charged, according to law, with the responsibility of regulating the use of its grounds, building, equipment, and facilities and the conduct of the students, staff, faculty, and visitors to the campus so that law and order are maintained and the University may pursue its educational objectives and programs in an orderly manner. The Board of Trustees is required by Ohio law to adopt regulations for the conduct of the students, faculty, visitors, and staff and may provide for the ejection of a person from college or university property, suspension or expulsion of a person who violates such regulations.

3. The Third World Solidarity Committee, the Student Mobilization, and the Ad Hoc Committee for Student Rights are recognized student organizations with activities upon the OSU campus, and some of the individual officers, directors, and members of such organizations are students or persons purporting to be students attending OSU. Leaders of these organizations have incited much of the hereinafter described violence that has occurred at OSU.

4. All of the plaintiffs with the exception of Aldean S. Coppeler and Erna M. Coppeler are enrolled as students at OSU and by reason of their payment of tuition and fees are entitled to attend OSU and to receive instruction and other educational service provided
by OSU. Defendants, as hereinafter alleged, have prevented students at OSU from receiving instructional and other educational services to which they are entitled. Defendants have also placed the safety of OSU students in jeopardy. Said student plaintiffs are also taxpayers of the State of Ohio, and have individually required to expend their monies in payment of sales and other taxes in the State of Ohio, and reasonably expect to make further tax payments to the State of Ohio.

5. Aldean S. Coppeler and Erna M. Coppeler are the parents of a student enrolled at OSU, have paid tuition and other fees for enrollment of their said son at OSU. Said parent plaintiffs bring this action because of their concern over the extent to which the actions of defendants have jeopardized the safety of their son while attending OSU, because the actions of defendants have disrupted their son’s college education, and because of the misapplication of taxpayer funds.

6. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves, on behalf of the State of Ohio, and on behalf of all taxpayers, students, and parents of students similarly situated. The unnamed members of said class are very numerous, and it would be impracticable to bring them all before this Court. The questions raised in this litigation are of general and common interest to such unnamed members of the class.

7. Defendant David Kettler is a teaching professor at OSU and is being paid with taxpayers’ funds to provide instructional and educational services to students at OSU. While being paid by taxpayers’ funds, said Professor Kettler has engaged in the hereinafter described activities which have caused the material disruption of class work and substantial disorder at OSU and has uttered public inflammatory statements indicating disrespect for the governing officials at OSU and the city and state law enforcement officials charged with the responsibility of maintaining order on the campus. Defendant Lorraine Iris Cohen and P.H. Greenberg are employed as teaching assistants by OSU and are being paid with taxpayers’ funds to provide instructional and educational services to students at OSU. While being paid with public taxpayers’ funds, said defendants have engaged in the following described activities which have caused a material disruption of class work and substantial disorder at OSU and have uttered public inflammatory statements indicating contempt and disrespect for the governing officials at OSU.

8. The remaining individual defendants with the exception of Edmund William Boston are enrolled or claim to be enrolled as students at OSU.

9. Defendant Edmund William Boston is an organizational leader of an organization known as Afro-Am Organization and has engaged in the following described disruptive activities at the OSU campus. All the individual defendants named herein with the exception of David Kettler are members of either the three student organizational defendants or Afro-Am.
10. On or about April 24, 1970, the Ad Hoc Committee for Student Rights under the leadership of Lorraine Iris Cohen and others organized and held a Rally attended by approximately 300 persons on the Oval at the OSU campus. Said Committee called for a student strike on Wednesday, April 29, 1970. Professor David Kettler addressed the demonstrators at that meeting, criticized the University’s existing disruption rules, and classified them as a continuation of the University’s repressive pseudo-parental code.

11. Prior to April 29, 1970, representatives of the three student groups named as defendants herein submitted a total of forty or more demands to the Administration of OSU and threatened to close the University down if their demands were not adhered to. Picketing of various buildings at the OSU campus began on the morning of April 29, 1970. Many of the students were carrying picket signs with the words “Shut It Down.” On or about noon, April 29, 1970, approximately 2,000 students gathered at the Oval at OSU. Various students addressed the group with defendant Lorraine Iris Cohn stating words to the effect that it was time for apathetic students to get together and show their power on the campus. Defendants Joel Ann Todd and Phillip Greenberg also addressed the group and, after the speeches were over, Edmund Boston outlayed plans and strategy for a student strike.

12. At or about 2:45 p.m. on April 29, 1970, the demonstrators who gathered under the leadership of Todd, Greenberg, Boston and Cohen and who had been incited by said defendants, blocked the entrance to the campus at 15th Avenue and High Street and erected barricades preventing all inbound traffic. Other demonstrators blocked the entrance to the campus at Neil and 11th Avenues by closing the gates and sitting in the streets. This was the beginning of an incident which escalated the demonstration to a state of violence.

13. At approximately 3:30 p.m. on April 29, 1970, a small number of highway patrolmen were dispatched to the 11th and Neil Avenue gate to open access to the campus. On several occasions, the patrolmen requested the demonstrators to clear the entrance. The demonstrators refused, insulted the patrolmen and threw bricks, rocks, bottles, and other missiles at the patrolmen. Thereafter, the patrolmen again attempted to open access to the campus, whereupon they were swarmed and assaulted by the demonstrators. Additional highway patrolmen had to be dispatched to the scene. Arrests were made of students and tear gas was used to disperse the crowd.

14. After the crowd of student demonstrators were dispersed at 11th and Neil Avenue, said demonstrators went to the Administration Building and proceeded to throw rocks, bricks, and other missiles through the windows. Other campus buildings were stoned and furniture from Derby and Denney Halls were torn apart and used for missiles. The City of Columbus police and members of the Highway Patrol were required to clear the area around the Administration Building and to again use tear gas.
15. Throughout the remainder of the day and evening of April 29, 1970, violence and property damage on and about the OSU campus continued. There was a time when University officials were unable to leave the Administration Building because of the violence outside. Public streets were blocked by students. Windows on the campus and on business buildings bordering the campus were broken. The City of Columbus police were fired upon by snipers. Twenty-eight police, eighteen students, and nine non-students were injured and sent to University Hospital. These injuries included five gunshot wounds, three inflicted upon students and non-students. Twelve persons, including four police and eight others, were required to be treated at Grant Hospital, two from gunshot wounds. Seven persons were required to be treated at Riverside Hospital. Approximately forty arrests had to be made by the police. At or about midnight, the Ohio National Guard began moving onto the OSU campus.

16. During the period from April 29, 1970, until this date, much of the same kind of property damage, violence, disruption, and disorder has continued at and about the OSU campus. Extreme tension has existed upon said campus at all times since April 29, 1970, to date, there have been innumerable bomb scares, bomb threats, false fire alarms, and incidents of arson on OSU. Defendants before making their speeches to demonstrators and mass gatherings were aware of said tension and knew or should have known that their speeches would inflame an already explosive situation.

17. On or about May 4, 1970, the Army ROTC was holding its annual division review to honor selected candidates. Demonstrators at OSU taunted the ROTC students mercilessly with obscenities, vulgarisms, and mockeries. One of the aforesaid forty demands previously issued to the OSU administration was that the ROTC program be eliminated from the campus at OSU.

18. Shortly prior to 5:30 p.m. on May 7, 1970, the violence disorder, disruption, property damage, and danger to students at OSU had accelerated to the point that it was necessary for the president of the University to announce its closing. OSU was closed on that date. All students were ordered to leave campus before noon on Thursday, May 7, 1970. All University activities and assemblies were canceled until further notice of the president. The University was not reopened until May 19, 1970, and while plaintiffs and the class they represent. Additionally, during other periods since April 29, 1970, while the University has been open for attendance by students, many plaintiffs and the class they represent were prevented from attending classes by reason of violent and disruptive activities by demonstrators under the leadership of or motivated and induced by defendants.

19. During the period from April 29, 1970, until date, individual defendants made oral presentations to demonstrators and mass crowds at OSU. At the time of and immediately prior to such speeches, defendants were aware of the tension and dangerous conditions
prevailing at The Ohio State University. However, with full knowledge of such tension and
dangerous conditions and the natural results of the kinds of inflammatory speeches they
were making to demonstrators and crowds, they proceeded to assume positions of leadership
over the mass crowds and to make statements and distribute leaflets designed or likely to
cause the students at OSU and non students in the crowds to: (1) strike, picket, boycott
classes, and (2) to disrupt normal instructional educational services and other activities
conducted or scheduled to be conducted at the OSU campus, (3) to cause mass gatherings
and mass demonstrations, (4) to promote unrest by students and others on the campus at
OSU, (5) to materially and substantially interfere with the requirements of appropriate
discipline in the operation of OSU, (6) to cause illegal blocking of access to buildings on the
OSU campus and public highways, and (7) to cause ridicule of and disrespect for law
enforcement officers and OSU governing officials. Defendants knew or should have known
at the time they made their speeches that such speeches would inflame the crowd and lead to
further disorder, disturbance, and violence.

20. Because of the violence of demonstrators and mass crowds on or about the OSU campus
under the leadership of or motivated by the various individual defendants, it has been
necessary for the City of Columbus and the Board of Trustees to establish various curfew
hours. A curfew remains in effect at the OSU campus; however, defendant Professor Kettler
and others have recently promoted a twenty-four hour per day free class program to be
conducted on the campus. The conduct of such free class during curfew hours would violate
the lawfully imposed curfew. Said free class program promoted by Professor Kettler is in
conflict with regularly scheduled educational activities at OSU.

21. Plaintiffs believe and therefore allege that unless enjoined by this Court, individual
defendants will continue to make speeches which will motivate demonstrators and mass
crowds on about the OSU campus to further violence which will threaten the safety of
students, which will interfere with students’ rights to pursue their academic endeavors at the
OSU campus, and which will cause further personal injury and damage to private and State
of Ohio property. In view of the tense and dangerous conditions at the OSU campus,
individual defendants do not have constitutionally protected freedom to make speeches
likely to lead to further disruption of academic affairs at OSU. There is a clear and present
danger that if individual defendants are permitted to continue to make inflammatory
speeches to demonstrators and mass crowds on the OSU campus, such will lead to further
disruption of academic affairs, violence, property damage, personal injury, and general
disorder.

22. Although the Board of Trustees of OSU is required to adopt regulations governing the
conduct of students, faculty, and visitors at the University and to take appropriate
disciplinary action against persons violating such regulations, the Board of Trustees does not
currently have any such regulations in effect and has not initiated action to cancel the
contracts of individual defendants who are on the OSU payroll, to suspend or expel
individual defendants who are students, or to eject individual defendants who are
nonstudents.
23. Plaintiffs herein seek a declaration of this Court as to the rights of students at The Ohio State University, parents of students enrolled at The Ohio State University, and taxpayers of the State of Ohio to obtain judicial relief against actions and utterances by students and teachers at OSU, which jeopardize the safety of students, which interfere with the rights of OSU students to obtain instructional and educational services at OSU, and which lead to the destruction of OSU property.

APPENDIX I

Ohio Revised Code; » Title [33] XXXIII EDUCATION - LIBRARIES
Chapter 3345: STATE UNIVERSITIES - GENERAL POWERS

3345.011 State university definitions.

State university’’ means a public institution of higher education which is a body politic and corporate. Each of the following institutions of higher education shall be recognized as a state university: university of Akron, Bowling Green state university, Central state university, university of Cincinnati, Cleveland state university, Kent state university, Miami university, Ohio university, Ohio state university, Shawnee state university, university of Toledo, Wright state university, and Youngstown state university.

State institution of higher education’’ means any state university or college as defined in division (A)(1) of section 3345.12 of the Revised Code, community college, state community college, university branch established under Chapter 3355. of the Revised Code, or technical college.

“University system of Ohio” means the collective group of all of the state institutions of higher education.

“Member of the university system of Ohio” means any individual state institution of higher education.

Amended by 128th General Assembly File No. 9, HB 1, § 101.01, eff. 10/16/2009.

3345.021 Control of use of college facilities for speaking purposes.

The board of trustees of any college or university, which receives any state funds in support thereof, shall have full power and authority on all matters relative to the administration of such college or university. Such power shall include but not be limited to the authority to withhold use of the facilities of any such college or university for meetings or speaking purposes from persons who are members of the communist party, persons who advocate or persons who hold membership in or support organizations which advocate the overthrow of the government of the United States and its free institutions by force or violence or whose presence is not conducive to high ethical and moral standards or the primary educational purposes and orderly conduct of the functions of the institution. The board of trustees of any such college or university may delegate any administrative authority mentioned in this section, including but not limited to, the enforcement of rules or regulations with respect to the use of university or college facilities for speaking purposes, to the president of any such college or university, or to such other administrative personnel as may be designated or appointed therefore by the board of trustees.

Effective Date: 10-14-1963

3345.022 Group legal services insurance plan - prepaid legal services plan.
The board of trustees of any college or university supported in part or in whole by state funds, or two or more such boards, may enter into a contract, upon such terms as shall be determined to be in the best interests of students, for the provision of legal services to students through a group legal services insurance plan approved by the superintendent of insurance or through a prepaid legal services plan established by attorneys admitted to the practice of law in this state. The fees or charges to students who participate in the plan shall be established by the board or boards and shall be sufficient to defray the college’s or university’s cost of administering the plan. No student shall be required to pay any such fee or charge unless he elects to participate in the plan, and no revenue from any other student fees or charges shall be used to finance any portion of the cost of any plan or the college’s or university’s cost of administering the plan. Legal representation under the plan shall be limited to services determined by the board to be reasonably related to student welfare, to the advancement or successful completion of student education, or to serve a public purpose within the powers of the college or university. A plan shall not provide or pay for the cost of representation of a student in an action against a state officer or agency arising out of the performance of the duties of the officer or agency, against a law enforcement officer arising out of the performance of the duties of the officer, against a college or university participating in the plan, against a student of such a college or university, or against a member of the board of regents or of the board of trustees, faculty, or staff of such a college or university, if the cause of action arises out of the performance of the duties of the office of the member or in the course of the member’s employment by the college or university. As used in this section, “law enforcement officer” means a sheriff, deputy sheriff, constable, marshal, deputy marshal, municipal police officer, state highway patrol trooper, or state university law enforcement officer appointed under section 3345.04 of the Revised Code.

Effective Date: 08-08-1991

3345.122 Immunity of trustees from civil action.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member of a board of trustees of an institution of higher education, as defined in section 3345.12 of the Revised Code, is not liable in damages in a civil action for injury, death, or loss to person or property that allegedly is caused by an expenditure made or a contract entered into by the institution of higher education unless the trustee acted with malicious purpose, in bad faith, or in a wanton or reckless manner with respect to the expenditure or contract.

Effective Date: 09-16-1998

3345.15 Attorney general to be attorney and legal advisor.

The attorney general shall be the attorney for each state college and university and shall provide legal advice in all matters relating to its powers and duties.

Effective Date: 07-01-1983

3345.202 Board of trustees may provide liability insurance coverage.
(A) As used in this section, “state university or college” has the same meaning as in division (A)(1) of section 3345.12 of the Revised Code.

(B) The board of trustees of a state university or college may provide insurance coverages, in any amount authorized by the board, protecting the state university or college, the members of the board, the officers and employees of the state university or college, or other persons authorized by the board, or any one or more of them, against loss or liability that arises or is claimed to have arisen from acts or omissions while acting within the scope of their employment or official responsibilities or while engaged in activities at the request or direction, or for the benefit, of the state university or college. Such coverage may be provided in any one or more of the following ways:

(1) The purchase of a policy or policies of liability insurance from an insurer or insurers licensed to do business in this state;

(2) Establishment or participation in a program of self-insurance, by trust or in any other manner the board considers prudent. Any self-insurance program shall file annually, with the superintendent of insurance, a report certified by a competent property and casualty actuary. The superintendent of insurance shall review such report. If such a self-insurance program has more than a single college or university participant, all participants shall be provided with the annual actuarial reports of the program.

(3) Establishment of or participation in a captive insurance company that is licensed to do business in this state, another state, or a foreign country.

(C) Insurance coverages under division (B)(1), (2), or (3) of this section may include coverage for the defense or costs of defense or settlement, including attorney’s fees, of any covered person or entity and be paid for from any funds under the control of the state university or college.

(D) Provision of any insurance coverage under divisions (B)(1) to (3) of this section is not a waiver of any immunity or defense available to the state university or college or to any covered person or entity.

Effective Date: 10-20-1987

3345.21 Board of trustees to maintain law and order on campus - administration and enforcement of rules.

The board of trustees of any college or university which receives any state funds in support thereof, shall regulate the use of the grounds, buildings, equipment, and facilities of such college or university and the conduct of the students, staff, faculty, and visitors to the campus so that law and order are maintained and the college or university may pursue its educational objectives and programs in an orderly manner. The board of trustees of each such college or university shall adopt rules for the conduct of the students, faculty, visitors, and staff, and may provide for the ejection from college or university property, suspension or expulsion of a person who violates such regulations. All such rules shall be published in a manner reasonably designed to come to the attention of, and be available to, all faculty, staff, visitors, and
students. The board of trustees shall provide for the administration and enforcement of its rules and may authorize the use of state university law enforcement officers provided for in section 3345.04 of the Revised Code to assist in enforcing the rules and the law on the campus of the college or university. The board of trustees, or appropriate officials of such college or university when the authority to do so has been delegated by the board of trustees, may seek the assistance of other appropriate law enforcement officers to enforce the rules and to enforce laws for the preservation of good order on the campus, and to prevent the disruption of the educational functions of the college or university. The rules of the board of trustees shall not restrict freedom of speech nor the right of persons on the campus to assemble peacefully.

Effective Date: 06-19-1978

3345.22 Hearing for suspension of arrested student, faculty or staff member, or employee - responsibilities of referee.

(A) A student, faculty or staff member, or employee of a college or university that receives any state funds in support thereof, arrested for any offense covered by division (D) of section 3345.23 of the Revised Code shall be afforded a hearing, as provided in this section, to determine whether the person shall be immediately suspended from the college or university. The hearing shall be held within not more than five days after the person’s arrest, subject to reasonable continuances for good cause shown, which continuances shall not exceed a total of ten days.

(B) The arresting authority shall immediately notify the president of the college or university of the arrest of a student, faculty or staff member, or employee of the college or university for any offense covered by division (D) of section 3345.23 of the Revised Code. The hearing to determine whether the person shall be immediately suspended shall be held in the county where the college or university is located, before a referee appointed by the president. The referee shall be an attorney admitted to the practice of law in Ohio, but the referee shall not be attorney for, or a faculty or staff member or employee of, any college or university. Immediate notice of the time and place of the hearing shall be given or sent to the person.

(C) The referee may administer oaths, issue subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence, and enforce the subpoenas, as well as preserve the order and decorum of the proceedings over which the referee presides, by means of contempt proceedings in the court of common pleas as provided by law.

(D) The hearing shall be adversary in nature and shall be conducted fairly and impartially, but the formalities of the criminal process are not required. A person whose suspension is being considered has the right to be represented by counsel but counsel need not be furnished for the person. The person also has the right to cross-examine witnesses against the person, to testify, and to present the testimony of witnesses and other evidence in the person’s behalf. In the absence of a waiver of the right against compulsory self-incrimination, the testimony of a person whose suspension is being considered, given at the hearing, shall not subsequently be used in any criminal proceeding against the person. The referee may require the separation of witnesses and may bar from the proceedings any person whose presence is
not essential to the proceedings, except that members of the news media shall not be barred from the proceedings.

(E) Upon hearing, if the referee finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the person whose suspension is being considered committed any offense covered by division (D) of section 3345.23 of the Revised Code, the referee shall order the person suspended, except that when the good order and discipline of a college or university will not be prejudiced or compromised thereby, the referee may permit the person to return to the college or university on terms of strict disciplinary probation. Subsequent violation of the terms of the probation automatically effects a suspension. A person suspended under this section may be readmitted pursuant to division (A) of section 3345.23 of the Revised Code. A suspension under this section is in effect until the person is acquitted or convicted of the crime for which the person was arrested. If convicted, the person is dismissed pursuant to section 3345.23 of the Revised Code.

(F) Upon acquittal, or upon any final judicial determination not resulting in conviction, of the charges for which a person is suspended pursuant to this section, the suspension automatically terminates, and the person suspended shall be reinstated and the record of the suspension expunged from the person’s college or university record.

(G) An order of a referee pursuant to this section may be appealed on questions of law and fact to the court of common pleas of the county in which the college or university is located, within twenty days after the date of the order. If the court to which an appeal is taken determines that the good order and discipline of a college or university will not be prejudiced thereby, it may permit the person suspended to return to the college or university on terms of strict disciplinary probation.

(H) A person afforded a hearing pursuant to this section who does not appear at the hearing shall be declared suspended by the hearing officer.

Effective Date: 09-28-1999

3345.23 Dismissal of convicted student, faculty or staff member, or employee - reinstatement.

(A) The conviction of a student, faculty or staff member, or employee of a college or university which receives any state funds in support thereof, of any offense covered by division (D) of this section, automatically effects the student’s, faculty or staff member’s, or employee’s dismissal from such college or university, except as provided in division (E) of this section. A student dismissed pursuant to this section may be readmitted or admitted to any other college or university which receives state funds in support thereof, in the discretion of the board of trustees, but only upon the lapse of one calendar year following the student’s dismissal, and only upon terms of strict disciplinary probation. The contract, if any, of a faculty or staff member or employee dismissed pursuant to this section is terminated thereby. A faculty or staff member or employee dismissed pursuant to this section may be re-employed by any such college or university, in the discretion of the board of trustees, but only upon the lapse of one calendar year following the faculty or staff member’s or employee’s dismissal.
(B) Upon conviction of a student, faculty or staff member, or employee of a college or university which receives any state funds in support thereof, of any offense covered by division (D) of this section, the court shall immediately notify the college or university of such conviction. The president, or other administrative official designated by the board of trustees, shall immediately notify such person of the person’s dismissal. The notice shall be in writing and shall be mailed by certified mail to the person’s address as shown in both the court and the university records. If such person has been suspended pursuant to section 3345.22 of the Revised Code, and not permitted to return to the college or university, the period of the person’s dismissal shall run from the date of such suspension.

(C) No degrees or honors shall be conferred upon, no instructional credit or grades shall be given to, and no student assistance, scholarship funds, salaries, or wages shall be paid or credited to any student, faculty or staff member, or employee, in respect of the period such person is properly under dismissal pursuant to this section or under suspension pursuant to section 3345.22 of the Revised Code.

(D) Without limiting the grounds for dismissal, suspension, or other disciplinary action against a student, faculty or staff member, or employee of a college or university which receives any state funds in support thereof, the commission of an offense of violence as defined in division (A)(9)(a) of section 2901.01 of the Revised Code or a substantially equivalent offense under a municipal ordinance, which offense is committed on or affects persons or property on such college or university, or which offense is committed in the immediate vicinity of a college or university with respect to which an emergency has been declared and is in effect pursuant to section 3345.26 of the Revised Code, is cause for dismissal pursuant to this section or for suspension pursuant to section 3345.22 of the Revised Code. Criminal cases resulting from arrests for offenses covered by division (D) of this section shall take precedence over all civil matters and proceedings and over all other criminal cases.

(E) If a final judicial determination results in an acquittal, or if the conviction is reversed on appeal, the student, faculty or staff member, or employee shall be reinstated and the college or university shall expunge the record of the student’s, faculty or staff member’s, or employee’s dismissal from the student’s, faculty or staff member’s, or employee’s college or university records, and the dismissal shall be deemed never to have occurred.

Effective Date: 09-06-1996

3345.24 Duty and authority of college administrators.

(A) Sections 3345.22 and 3345.23 of the Revised Code shall be applied and followed, notwithstanding any rule, regulation, or procedure of the college or university, but such sections shall not be construed to limit any duty or authority of the board of trustees, administrative officials, or faculty of such college or university to take appropriate disciplinary action, through such procedures as may be provided by rule, regulation, or custom of such college or university, against students, faculty or staff members, or employees, nor shall such sections be construed to modify, limit, or rescind any rule or regulation of the college or university not inconsistent therewith.
(B) Sections 3345.22 and 3345.23 of the Revised Code shall not be construed as modifying or limiting the duty or authority of the board of trustees or president of a college or university to summarily suspend a student, faculty or staff member, or employee, when necessary to preserve the good order and discipline of such college or university, provided that the person suspended is given notice of suspension and the reasons therefor, and is afforded a fair and impartial hearing within a reasonable time thereafter, under regular procedures of the college or university. The duty and authority of the board of trustees or president of a college or university to impose summary suspension shall not be abrogated or limited in any way by any rule or regulation.

(C) To the extent that sections 3345.22 and 3345.23 of the Revised Code conflict with civil service requirements and procedures, persons otherwise subject to disciplinary action pursuant to such sections, but who are employees in the classified civil service, shall be disciplined according to civil service requirements and procedures.

Effective Date: 09-16-1970

3345.25 Dismissed or suspended person not to enter college premises.

No student, faculty or staff member, or employee under dismissal or suspension from a college or university pursuant to section 3345.22 or 3345.23 of the Revised Code, shall enter or remain upon the land or premises of the college or university from which he was suspended or dismissed, without the express permission of the board of trustees or the president.

Effective Date: 09-16-1970

3345.26 Board of trustees or president may declare state of emergency.

(A) The board of trustees or president of a college or university which receives any state funds in support thereof, may declare a state of emergency when there is a clear and present danger of disruption of the orderly conduct of lawful activities at such college or university through riot, mob action, or other substantial disorder, and may do any one or more of the following, as are necessary to preserve order and discipline at such college or university during such emergency:

(1) Limit access to university property and facilities by any person or persons;

(2) Impose a curfew;

(3) Restrict the right of assembly by groups of five or more persons;

(4) Provide reasonable measures to enforce limitations on access, a curfew, and restrictions on the right of assembly imposed pursuant to this section.

(B) Notice of action taken pursuant to division (A) of this section shall be posted or published in such manner as is reasonably calculated to reach all persons affected.
(C) Division (A)(1) and (A)(2) of this section shall not be construed to limit the authority of the board of trustees, president, or other proper official of a college or university to impose reasonable restrictions on use of and access to, and the hours of use of and access to university property and facilities, for purposes of regulating the proper operation of such university, and regardless whether any emergency exists.

Effective Date: 09-16-1970