

ASSAULT, ROBBERY, MAYHEM: THE CONSEQUENCES OF FRATERNAL CAMPUS  
LOYALTY MOVEMENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS AFTER WORLD WAR I

by

BRITTNEY WILSON

Submitted to the Department of History of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for departmental honors

Approved by:

Nicholas Syrett, Thesis Coordinator

Jonathan Hagel, Committee Member

Howard Graham, Committee Member

Date Defended: May 1st, 202

## Introduction

*The air was brisk, and Jose could feel the dense air against his body as he stood in his temporary garage. It was late Friday, and, albeit otherwise uneventful, he could feel the fatigue in his bones. It was time to sleep. Making his way to the door, he turned around abruptly as a car came to a screeching halt on the road behind him. Four masked men jumped out of each side, silently besetting him. He could feel the panic setting in as they blind-folded him, cut his hair, and dragged him into the car. A series of shrieks escaped his body throughout the journey to the secondary location. He was thrown into the seat in front of him as the car came to a sudden stop, and four pairs of hands threw him onto the ground. A fear-induced paralysis tethered him to the earth as his assailants stole the money from his pants and removed them. He heard them scurry back to their car before driving off, and after the panic had subsided, Jose stood up on the cold, dry grass and began his directionless and pantless quest home in the dead of the night.*

The attack experienced by Jose Cajucom at the University of Kansas in 1918 was well-documented, though not isolated.<sup>1</sup> Punished for not wearing his freshman cap, Cajucom was the victim of one of many acts of violence committed in order to uphold University traditions. Specifically, the freshman cap tradition, widespread and vigorously maintained, required all freshmen to wear a designated cap while on campus. The tradition developed in the latter half of the nineteenth century but was firmly established on K.U.'s campus in the beginning of the twentieth. Even more notable, however, was the punishment endured by those who failed to uphold the tradition. Cajucom's punishment differed from his counterparts' in its method but not its dramatism. Blindfolded, hair clipped, kidnapped, robbed, and stripped, Cajucom's punishment warranted a court case, though many punishments, mostly notably paddling, were regarded as the norm on campus.<sup>2</sup> Paddling involved hitting the dissidents with wooden sticks and was contested throughout the employment of the tradition.

Traditions on campus were especially prevalent during the years following World War I with the establishment of the Loyalty Movement.<sup>3</sup> The Loyalty Movement, initiated by a History

---

<sup>1</sup> "Filipino 'Freshie' Victim of 'Red Vigils' - KU." *Parsons Daily Eclipse*. May 20, 1919.

<sup>2</sup> "Cruel Paddles Will Force Freshman Cap." *University Daily Kansan*. March 27, 1917.

<sup>3</sup> Clifford S. Griffin, *The University of Kansas: A History*. (Lawrence, Kansas: The Regent Press of Kansas, 1980.)

Professor Frank E. Melvin, sought to instill democracy on the University of Kansas' campus, implementing into the college sphere the same ideology that was championed by the United States and its allies during the First World War. In an effort to disseminate power from the Chancellor to the faculty, Melvin gave the student body a call to action, claiming that the success of the Loyalty Movement required the "...efforts of students, alumni, and faculty members to stimulate an intelligent and dynamic loyalty to the University of Kansas that will manifest itself in real college democracy. That means a good understanding and ready cooperation on the part of all members of the University in protecting the good name, and promoting the effective influence of Alma Mater as their paramount concern."<sup>4</sup> Students participated in the Movement through various student groups and activities, including Karnivals, spirit groups, and the building of Memorial Stadium. Melvin also stressed the importance of traditions, and students used violent means to uphold these traditions.<sup>5</sup>

At the same time, a distinct youth culture was developing on college campuses, partly because of the prominence of Greek life.<sup>6</sup> Established in the middle of the nineteenth century, fraternities had already become a contentious subject. Greek life was commonly criticized for its prioritizing of social obligations over academics, and the elitism fostered by the selectiveness and ritual secrecy mirrored the larger national development of discriminatory fraternal orders, such as the Ku Klux Klan and the Masons.<sup>7</sup> In fact, fraternities developed their own vocabulary of verbiage specific to the activities of these organizations, such as hazing, initiation, and pledging.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, in the late nineteenth century it became important to make freshman year a

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 415.

<sup>5</sup> "Prof. Melvin Speaks on 'Alma Mater' ATY.W." *University Daily Kansan*. 2021.

<sup>6</sup>Nicholas L. Syrett, *The Company He Keeps: A History of White College Fraternities* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 45

<sup>7</sup>Allerfeldt, Kristofer. "Jayhawker Fraternities: Masons, Klansmen and Kansas in the 1920s." *Journal of American Studies* 46, no. 4 (2012): 1035–53.

<sup>8</sup> Syrett, *The Company He Keeps*, 121-183.

year-long initiation experience, in which these actions were ritually enacted upon and by newcomers in order to ensure their dedication to their respective fraternities. These hazing and initiation rituals were also often violent and intended to humiliate the fraternity initiates.

In this thesis, I argue that the implementation of the Loyalty Movement on campus prompted a university-wide adoption of fraternal practices and rhetoric in order to enforce a pledge of loyalty to the University through the upholding of traditions, especially among freshmen, and the use of violent hazing to enforce these traditions. Specifically, the Loyalty Movement, because it required an expression of loyalty similar to those in fraternities, placed an emphasis on the importance of traditions and activities like initiation into manhood, pledging loyalty through tradition, and the completion of hazing through the wearing of the cap and the enduring of a violent punishment with the failure to do so. So, correspondingly, the practice of the freshman cap tradition encouraged actions and rhetoric similar to those used by fraternities to justify the hazing of all college freshmen men. In two parts, this paper will first examine the simultaneous development of a youth culture and the growth of fraternal orders on campus alongside the development of the Loyalty Movement following World War I, and the second part will examine the upholding of traditions during the Loyalty Movement as a campus-wide initiation ritual for freshmen men. While there is limited existing scholarship regarding the connection between fraternities, campus Loyalty Movements, and the upholding of traditions, my research has drawn on literature that has individually traced the historical trajectories of these phenomena. Other sources, such as newspapers, court records, and the Chancellor's papers, have provided crucial insight on the local manifestation of these occurrences. More specifically, the story of Jose Cajucom, a Filipino transfer student, provides a special case study on the implementation of violence to uphold traditions and the corresponding negligence of authority

figures. Notably, the exclusionary nature of the campus social sphere cannot be sufficiently examined without a discussion of racism and race-based exclusion on college campuses at the end of the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth century, which will be considered throughout this paper.

### **Part 1: Contextualization of Loyalty Movements and Youth Culture**

*On a Tuesday afternoon a group of skinny boys in extravagant dress talked in hushed voices as a waitress placed four milkshakes on the table in front of them. The commotion of the diner buzzed around them as students ventured out for a late-afternoon snack, and the seriousness of the boys went largely unnoticed among the young crowd. In the heat of their deliberation, one of the boys jumped up from his chair and eagerly grasped the phone sitting on the diner counter. Pulling a wadded up note out of his jacket pocket, he glanced back and forth between the paper and the machine as he carefully dialed a series of numbers. When he heard the friendly voice of the Registrar Office's receptionist, he declared in a low voice "I need to ask about the University class of a student." Satisfied with the answer and more than ready to enact vengeance against a rogue student indifferent to the indispensable and glorious status of the University of Kansas, singularly upheld by its dedicated student body, the group chose to act on the official information they received from the receptionist.<sup>9</sup> "He just got here," they argued. "And he's taking freshman classes." The deliberation didn't take long. They all stared at each other solemnly, each acknowledging the others' gazes as a confirmation of their plan. It was decided. On Monday morning The Daily Kansan would publish a warning note to a student known as Jose Cajucom, and the newly formed secret vigilante group known as the "Red Vigils" would have their first target.*

The development of a youth culture was partly responsible for the student behavior on college campuses in the first part of the twentieth century. In her book titled *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s*, Paula S. Fass determined that school and peer groups became the most influential environments in the development of children's lives as they entered adulthood, replacing the family unit.<sup>10</sup> Fass recounts that the older population were largely traditionalists who feared what they perceived to be the moral depravity of the younger

<sup>9</sup> "Hopfer-Shaw Trial Begins This Morning In District Court." *The University Daily Kansan*. May 9, 1919.

<sup>10</sup> Fass, Paula S. *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920's*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.)

generation. Instead of abiding by a traditionalist set of morals, students seemed to turn to pleasure-seeking after the war exposed them to the horrors of life:

For the traditionalist, the young represented the fruit of social disorder, cultural disintegration, and a personal loss of coherence. They viewed the present from the perspective of what they believed was a formerly stable society which had been shattered, and they taunted themselves with the loss that came with change.<sup>11</sup>

However, to some, the crimes of the youth exceeded the matter of war. Instead, the corruption resulted from a deeper search for truth and a disregard for the past: “For the young, the past was worse than irrelevant, it was pretentious, and they proceeded to strip manners of their gentility, language of its pomposities, and morality of its righteous deceptions.”<sup>12</sup> Regardless, the United States experienced its first development of a youth culture in the 1920s, and the expansion of the school years and the development of school peer groups were pivotal in this formation. Fass credits higher access to education and increased enrollment as the cause for the development of a culture defined by peer groups. In fact, she notes that there was a 650 percent increase in college enrollment between the years 1900 and 1930. Some changes that occurred within the school system itself can be credited for larger societal changes: for example, the students became more confined within their age groups and spent more time at school. Instead of the one room schoolhouse whose attendance was secondary to home chores, students spent all day socializing with peers their own age.

The development of the peer group is a pivotal social phenomenon because it enforced the value of conformity that resulted in a homogeneous and recognizable youth culture. Specifically, Fass writes that the development of peer groups "...helped to homogenize patterns of behavior and attitudes among increasingly diverse elements of the school population. Where

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

once this effect of peer interaction had been limited in its influence, it now operated on a much larger scale.”<sup>13</sup> Thus, the formation of a culture centered around peer influence resulted in the heightened importance of peer relations. Instead of college campuses being predominantly influenced by the administration and coursework, the desire to be included and viewed as “collegiate” exercised considerable power:

Peer groups and the college peer society operated on two distinct levels. First, as primary units of affiliation, they fulfilled individual emotional needs for security and identity. Second, as didactic instruments, they monitored responsible social behavior. That behavior was responsible insofar as it was sanctioned by the society of peers, but it was also socially responsible because peers inducted youths into larger social realities.<sup>14</sup>

On the University of Kansas’ campus, similar to other universities across the country, students interacted with others through extracurricular activities, student events, and on-campus organizations such as Greek life. These activities allowed students to interact in ways that granted them their own agency and ideals, and to accordingly spread and enforce these ideas through close contact with their peers. By the first part of the twentieth century, the University of Kansas had implemented these various programs, clubs, and activities. The University basketball team was founded in 1898, students were occupied by clubs like the glee club and the newspaper, and campus activities such as the yearly Karnival offered a place in which students could gather and converse jovially.<sup>15</sup> A newspaper article from *The Daily Kansan* in 1920 references a Women’s Glee Club, a Texas Club, a Graduate Club, a Cosmopolitan Club, and a Quill Club as active groups for students to join.<sup>16</sup> Thus, Fass notes that it was their peers who often inducted other youths into the social world. Arguably, the enforcement of traditions served

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 24.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 42.

<sup>15</sup> “Basketball in Kansas.” Kansas Historical Society. Accessed April 11, 2023.

<sup>16</sup> “Announcements.” *The Daily Kansan*. May 24, 1920.

to not only induct new students into a collegiate sphere, but to introduce them to a social hierarchy that would remain after their college experience. Specifically, once an individual adhered to the freshman cap tradition, he was a collegiate man whose social standing was marked by his college degree, social circle, and wealth. These ideas were emulated within the fraternity structure, which preceded the existence of a youth culture and likely contributed to its structure.

Specifically, fraternal activities and rhetoric seemed to have influenced larger, campus-wide initiation rituals that helped morph its youth culture. Scheming, secrecy, and subversion have always been critical to the culture of fraternal orders. Focused on forming an explicit “us versus them” mentality, these groups develop strong fraternal bonds by forming an identity that contrasts with, and often directly opposes, those outside of the group. This is especially evident in nation-wide fraternal orders like the Ku Klux Klan, which valued its white Protestant members at the expense of those in minority groups, and the FreeMasons, whose exclusivity is assured through its long history of private rituals, regalia, and knowledge.<sup>17</sup> Fraternities on college campuses exercise a similar hatred for the Other, drawing strict boundaries between their members and nonmembers by awarding exclusive social capital to members. Similarly, the antagonists in Jose Cajucom’s story, though they cannot be directly linked to any University of Kansas fraternities, actively Otherized those who did not participate in KU traditions through their secretive and aggressive hazing methods. Notably, the four boys involved in Jose Cajucom’s case, specifically Otto Shaw and Wallace Hopfer, were allegedly members of a secret vigilante group known as the Red Vigils, whose objective was to enforce the freshman cap tradition by violently persecuting offenders without revealing the identity of the

---

<sup>17</sup> Allerfeldt, “Jayhawker Fraternities:,” pp 1-3.

students involved.<sup>18</sup> Thus, it can be asserted that the Red Vigils appropriated the rhetoric and methods used by campus fraternities in order to punish those who did not uphold KU traditions through the acts of freshman initiation and hazing.

According to Nicholas Syrett in his book *The Company he Keeps: A History of White College Fraternities*, college fraternities originated at Union College in Schenectady, New York in 1825 with the founding of the Kappa Alpha Society.<sup>19</sup> The creation and implementation of college fraternities continued gradually until 1850, by which nearly every college in the north and mid-Atlantic, as well as some in the Midwest and South, welcomed fraternities onto their campuses. The purpose of fraternities was largely to combat the otherwise dreary day-to-day life of the college student. Fraternities provided a close-knit group for students to turn to in the absence of their families, as well as some healthy competition for amusement and help with their studies. From early on these fraternities were characterized by characteristics like class, manliness, and race. Members of the upper class were likely those who were chosen for fraternity membership, while those of the lower class were often not deemed worthy, though their inclusion was often necessary in order to fully satisfy the requirements for a fraternal class. Similarly, notions of manliness were developing along with a burgeoning college culture. A man who exemplified manliness was smart without trying, as well as sturdy and handsome.

By the 1850s, the prominence of Greek life on college campuses was notable. As Syrett observes, fraternity men worked to create a culture exclusive to their fraternities: “Fraternity men of the nineteenth century were eager for a type of imagined community with men they perceived as being similar to themselves.”<sup>20</sup> Accordingly, developments to fraternal life in the 1870s and 1880s and onward cemented into the culture the characteristics responsible for and replicated by

---

<sup>18</sup> “Filipino ‘Freshie’ Victim of ‘Red Vigils’ - KU.” *Parsons Daily Eclipse*.

<sup>19</sup> Syrett, *The Company He Keeps*, pp 1.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 106.

those who enforced campus traditions. Admittance into fraternities became much more based on social class, athletic ability superseded academic ability in importance, and members were prone to alcohol driven binges on the weekends. Newspapers across the country criticized fraternities for guiding the priorities of their members away from their studies and instead towards disrupting campus life. In 1885, the University of Kansas distributed a newspaper titled *The University Courier*, which published a series of opinions on fraternity life, saying that “...fraternities, like corporations, seem to have no souls. Brace up and act like men.”<sup>21</sup> Later in the article, a student provides their opinion by presenting a series of fraternity faults, claiming that the lore of Greek life can be deceiving:

One objection that the new student should consider well before identifying himself with a fraternity, is its propagation of narrow-mindedness when judging one’s companions...Another evil that must be laid at the door of the fraternity is the tendency which they foster to elevate incompetent men to positions of honor... I am forced to the conclusion that if Kansas University had never seen one of these organizations it would be fully as well off and possibly better off than it is now.<sup>22</sup>

Thus, a lively debate was occurring through newspaper publications and other public decrees about the corruption of fraternities. In the beginning of the twentieth century, a series of newspapers were published to discuss “the fraternity problem,” though fraternities remained very active on the campus.

Accordingly, it was in the latter part of the nineteenth century that the hazing on college campuses switched largely to the jurisdiction of the fraternities. As noted by Syrett, hazing was prominent in the first part of the twentieth century, though it was primarily the job of the sophomore student to haze the freshman. However, many of the students enrolling after the Civil War employed hazing tactics they learned while being soldiers, and hazing became a way to

---

<sup>21</sup>Stebbins, L. A. “Students' Views.” *The University Courier*. October 9, 1885.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

ensure loyalty and exclusivity within the fraternities themselves. The targets were still freshmen, though the reasoning now focused on the transition from boyhood to manhood. The belief was that college freshman did not appropriately learn how to ‘be a man’ from their caregivers, so it was instead the responsibility of the fraternity to guide them through this transition:

This emphasis upon manhood served two related purposes: by claiming manliness, fraternity men hoped to achieve prestige and distinguish between themselves from what was seen as the antithesis of manhood – boyhood. While standards were changing in the United States – men were increasingly being evaluated with women and femininity as a foil to their masculinity – it was still the case that young men in fraternities, poised between childhood and adulthood, insisted that they were men as a way to emphasize their independence and what they hoped was a greater distance from childhood.<sup>23</sup>

Hence, men entering fraternities were willing to undergo acts of significant mental and physical strain in order to prove their manhood. These tasks were often humiliating and challenging, such as physical beatings and forced alcohol consumption. Death relating to fraternity hazing dates back to the early years after the Civil War with the passing of Moritmer Leggett, who, among other things, suffered through torture by ““electrical horrors.””<sup>24</sup> Thus, for the college man, the freshman traditions had a similar objective: namely, adhering to them marked the transition of the freshman from a boy to a collegiate man. The upperclassman excused the violent treatment of the freshman as something they had to endure in order to prove their masculinity and their desire to be part of the social sphere. Additionally, it is likely that the tradition of violence created a repeating cycle in which men felt they could only ameliorate feelings of inferiority created by their own mistreatment by enacting the same violence on their new inferiors.

Similar to hazing was the act of pledging, which required that young men commit to a fraternity and then undergo certain tasks that secure his membership. Syrett specifically

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 150.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 151.

notes that underclassmen were required to do things like take off their caps out of respect when they encountered an upperclassmen. If a freshman failed to prove his loyalty to the fraternity, his masculinity was challenged and he was denied entry to the fraternity. On a more macrocosmic level, students who failed to adhere to the freshman cap tradition were not denied entrance to the University of Kansas, but were instead frozen out of the peer society within the university walls. The only redeemable course of action, therefore, was to endure the punishment by the upperclassmen and subsequently repent for their sins by loyally wearing the cap thereafter.

By the end of World War I, masculinity on campus had changed from internal characteristics, such as academic success, honor, and general likability, to more physical and outward expressions, such as appearance, athleticism, and oftentimes the willingness to engage in unruly behavior.<sup>25</sup> Notably, despite the seemingly obvious differences between notions of masculinity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, young men often found themselves caught between shifting ideals, and the prevalence of some characteristics did not necessarily result in the disregard of others. Still, Syrett notes that the masculinity of the 1920s is familiar: “During the 1920s, fraternity men in large part completed the transition to standard masculinity that is recognizable to us today.”<sup>26</sup> Men were often subjected to peer pressure in order to prove their athletic and sexual prowess. Significantly, newspaper stories in *The Daily Kansan* suggest that fraternities willingly engaged in the freshman cap tradition and likely even enforced the tradition as part of their own hazing process. An article titled “Retain the custom” notes that “Fraternities...will no doubt require that their freshmen wear the caps,” and another article states that the fraternities were present to cast a vote in the 1920 elections for freshman cap

---

<sup>25</sup> Syrett, *The Company He Keeps*, pp 185.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

punishments to remain permissible.<sup>27</sup> Participating in campus-wide hazing rituals allowed fraternities to firmly establish their newcomers both as members of the University and as fraternity brothers. Because of the prevalence of fraternities on campus, these notions of masculinity were widespread. The desire to perform and prove masculinity resulted in traditions that specifically targeted men, and therefore proved who met the mark and who fell short.

The writings of Eric Hobsbawm and T. O. Ranger in *Invention of Tradition* and Benedict Anderson in *Imagined Communities* are particularly applicable when dissecting the formation of fraternity or campus identity. Specifically, the University of Kansas, in which social membership was determined by a conglomerate of shared characteristics whose requirements mirrored those evident in the exclusionary ideals of American nationalism, appropriated nation-building aspects on a more microcosmic level.<sup>28</sup>

According to Eric Hobsbawm and T. O. Ranger, traditions are often invented for the purpose of establishing legitimacy and a shared identity among a group of people, specifically defining “invented traditions” as “...a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values or norms of behavior by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past.”<sup>29</sup> Within a college campus, traditions like raising a flag or singing a chant represent benign and even banal attempts at instilling a campus-wide identity. Thus, it is the belief of the university that adherence to traditions will establish the current student body within the historical narrative of the institution, of which each student only attends for a small portion of their life, and an even more minute section of the university’s historical timeline. Still, the university must attribute its

---

<sup>27</sup> “Retain the Custom.” *The Daily Kansan*. March 18, 1919.

<sup>28</sup> Trautsch, Jasper M. “The Origins and Nature of American Nationalism.” *National Identities* 18, no. 3 (2016): 289-312.

<sup>29</sup> Hobsbawm, E. J., and Terence Ranger. “Introduction.” Essay. In *The Invention of Tradition*, 1. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.)

existence to the steady flow of people who manage and attend the institution. On an even smaller scale, the more violent traditions upheld by the students represent their inclusion within the university, not as a part of the institution, but as a member of the social circle that operates within it.

Furthermore, theories on nationalism can also be applied to campus-wide attempts to develop a shared identity. Specifically, Benedict Anderson wrote that the imagined communities formed by groups are not necessarily reliant on the close personal connections of the members involved, but instead on the idea that all members share a common group with whom they belong.<sup>30</sup> From its founding in 1866, the student body at the University of Kansas has attempted to fuel the perception that all students are intrinsically and fatefully connected through their enrollment at their Alma Mater. In accordance with Anderson's assertion that newspapers significantly assisted the development of a national identity by connecting individuals across space and time, first its predecessors and presently *The Daily Kansan* attempted to create a shared identity among all students. One of the university's first newspapers, titled *The University Courier*, was actually reestablished after its brisk run in the 1870s to combat the growing influence of fraternities on campus.<sup>31</sup> Despite its objectives, the newspaper still fostered a sense of community pride by allowing students to publish opinions that were distributed to their peers. *The University Daily Kansan*, founded in 1904, took the community building a step further by writing about the ongoings of particular students, under columns such as "University Notices" and "Plain Tales from the Hill," and more student opinions in a column cleverly titled "Campus Opinions."<sup>32</sup> For many, school spirit or devotion to a fraternity may

---

<sup>30</sup> Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. (Verso Books, 2016.)

<sup>31</sup> McCool, John H. "Our Weekly Reader." Our Weekly Reader | KU Memorial Union. University of Kansas. Accessed April 11, 2023.

<sup>32</sup> McCool, John H. "The First Kansan." The First Kansan | KU Memorial Union. The University of Kansas. (Accessed April 11, 2023.)

have been akin to a religious experience, with devotion to the Alma Mater and its peer society perhaps even replacing the religion one grew up with in their family homes.

Still, attempts to develop a shared identity, both within K.U. fraternities and on campus, were directed towards students who fit the desired demographic. Thus, this "us vs. them" rhetoric enforced by fraternities was evident campus-wide in the longstanding history of racism.<sup>33</sup> Nationally, sentiments regarding race were still antagonistic in the early twentieth century. Jim Crow laws continued to be enforced in the South, national fraternities like the Ku Klux Klan encouraged the prejudiced and violent thinking towards non-white non-protestant groups, and pseudosciences like eugenics were being spread to the masses, seeming to affirm the supremacy of the white race. The University of Kansas was also guilty of promoting these bigoted beliefs. The school began admitting African American students in 1876, but remained segregated until the 1950s.<sup>34</sup> In the early twentieth century, a black cadaver was stolen and hanged on campus, and newspaper articles published after the First World War confirm that racial prejudice was still eminently present.<sup>35</sup> Specifically, a newspaper article detailing the events at a 1920 student Karnival advertised games with racist and ableist titles, such as "collection of freaks," "hit the \*\*\*\*\* babies," and "African dip."<sup>36</sup> At the same time, people of non-white races also faced a tremendous amount of racism, situated between the passing of various anti-immigration acts and a fear perpetuated by the onslaught of immigrants arriving after the First World War. Chancellor Strong's correspondence papers reveal that he was communicating with professors and Committee of State Affairs members from Winfield,

---

<sup>33</sup> Reagan-Kendrick, Amber. "Ninety Years of Struggle and Success: African American History at the University of Kansas, 1870-1960." (Dissertation, 2004.)

<sup>34</sup> "Fully Integrated." KU History, June 15, 2018.

<sup>35</sup> Campney, Brent M. S. "'HOLD THE LINE': The Defense of Jim Crow in Lawrence, Kansas, 1945-1961." *Kansas History* 33, no. 1 (2010): 22-41.

<sup>36</sup> "Plans for Karnival Nearing Perfection ." *The Daily Kansan* . March 10, 1920.

including St. John's College, about the creation of a Board of Americanization.<sup>37</sup> Over the course of their conversation, Strong revealed that he believed "...strongly that no language except English ought to be used as a medium for instruction in our schools...I also thoroughly believe in adequate measures for Americanization."<sup>38</sup> Though the formation of the Board did not come to fruition, Strong's correspondents wrote to him urgently after "The measure of absolute prohibition of immigration failed of passage in the Congress now adjourned,"<sup>39</sup> noting that it was their obligation to organize Americanization efforts in Kansas: "It will be necessary to organize the foreign speaking element of our population, to get among these people, let them see the advantages of our form of government, etc."<sup>40</sup> Significantly, Fass notes that, while students in the 1920s were often more willing to listen to minority groups than their predecessors, a significant amount of bigotry was still prevalent among the youth:

...editors and students usually urged strict immigration restrictions and welcomed the choking off of Oriental immigration. The usual rationale for these actions was the difficulty of assimilating so many people at one time. At the same time, racial incidents flared on the campuses throughout the decade, and surveys of youth revealed that college students were prejudiced against a whole range of ethnic, racial, and religious groups.<sup>41</sup>

Hence, as a youth culture developed, the youth became slightly more occupied with social issues, especially questions surrounding race, economics, and government policy. However, students still very much dispensed the hatred inherited from their parents and reinforced by their peers. Accordingly, it would be an overstatement to argue that racism was vehemently opposed by any college in the 1920s, and especially those with geographic ties to the Civil War. Thus, in addition

---

<sup>37</sup> Strong, Frank. Letter to Hon. J. A. McDermott. "This Is in Answer to Your Favor of January 25th." (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas, January 27, 1919.)

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> Gulick, Sidney L. Letter to Chancellor Frank Strong. "National Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation." (New York, New York, March 12, 1919.)

<sup>40</sup> Graebner, Martin. Letter to Frank Strong. "Hon. J. A. McDermott Tells Me That You Are the Chairman..." (Winfield, Kansas, January 25, 1919.)

<sup>41</sup> Fass, *The Damned and the Beautiful*, 50.

to creating new cultural ideas, the development of a youth culture also created closely bound spaces where older traditions of bigotry could not only flourish, but find companionship in its hatred.

Contemporaneously, the University of Kansas was undergoing significant changes in its leadership structure.<sup>42</sup> Clifford S. Griffin records the events that took place following World War I on K.U.'s campus in his book *The University of Kansas: A History*, in which he claims that the end of the war shifted the focus on university campuses to the importance of democracy, and faculty, especially K.U.'s History Professor Frank E. Hodder, sought to implement democratic values on their own campuses:

In a letter to the *Graduate Magazine* he pointed out that at the end of a war in which thousands of men had died to preserve democracy, a curious paradox existed in the University government. In Europe, he said, nations with the most autocratic governments had universities whose government was the liberal and democratic. But in the United States, founded on democratic principles, a purely autocratic type of university structure was prevalent. That paradox had to be broken.<sup>43</sup>

Thus, the criticism of the administration arose from the fact that the dominant ideology and political system of the war, democracy, was not present within the collegiate institutions of the nation. The University of Kansas was particularly at a crossroads regarding its Chancellor position and the power of the faculty. Specifically, the faculty wanted a committee who contributed to the administration of the campus. Frank Strong was opposed to the dissemination of power and instead opted for the creation of smaller committees with limited power. After his resignation, Ernest H. Lindley was hired between 1920-1921. It was during the year 1919, however, that Griffin placed the beginning of the campus Loyalty Movement. The Movement spread across campus so that there were ““...efforts of students, alumni, and faculty members to

---

<sup>42</sup> Griffin, *The University of Kansas*, pp 395.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

stimulate an intelligent and dynamic loyalty to the University of Kansas that will manifest itself in real college democracy. That means a good understanding and ready cooperation on the part of all members of the university in protecting the good name, and promoting the effective influence of Alma Mater as their paramount concern.”<sup>44</sup> Griffin notes that the Loyalty Movement, in the words of Frank E. Melvin, included informing the “...people of the University’s history, traditions, and ideals, sponsor rallies and ceremonies to encourage greater love for the school, and support ‘various undertakings which are of special value to the University or of special interest to the students.’”<sup>45</sup> It is the Loyalty Movement and the enforcement of these traditions that likely led to the increase in violent hazing across campus. Fass also notes the importance of loyalty in the formation of the youth culture, noticing a link between the enforcement of conformity and loyalty to the group that one is conforming to:

Conformity was valued in theory as well as in action by the young. The term loyalty described the ideal of group allegiance and community cohesion. Loyalty to the institution was basic to the peer system. According to the Cornell Sun, the two most important benefits to the undergraduate of college life were ‘loyalty and lasting love for his Alma Mater, and a self-confidence that will enable him to go forth and perform in the world.’ The conjunction of loyalty and success was revealing. One led to the other.<sup>46</sup>

Thus, students had a different conception of the Loyalty Movement than the members of the administration and faculty. While the older generation connected democracy to loyalty as a larger political truth, students viewed loyalty as necessary for fitting in with their college peers. This is demonstrated by Melvin himself, who recognized the importance of traditions but denied that they were the most significant by-product of school loyalty, saying that the Alma Mater “...has stood for culture - the promotion of music, art, and literature... Traditions play a large part in this

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 415.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> Fass, *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920's*.

individuality. They are symbols of ideas, and should be of ideals. They are ideas dominating the life of a group, but they do not always reflect the spirit of the University of which they are a part.”<sup>47</sup> While traditions were one avenue for ensuring the loyalty that will result in campus democracy, for Melvin, the practice of enforcing traditions was not its end goal, and especially not its primary objective. And, while the students often appeared to be violently enforcing traditions for the sake of the University, the monolith of “Alma Mater” functioned as a vessel that contained the microcosmic peer society that one desired to appeal to. Hence, the story of the Loyalty Movement is nuanced in that the goals of the faculty differed from the students, though the historical record often indicates that they were united in their stance. Instead, an individual’s concept of loyalty was contingent on one’s social, political, and cultural background, and was often tied to generational differences. Thus, these generational differences provide two different but entangled accounts of the purpose and effect of the Loyalty Movement on the University of Kansas’ campus in the years after World War I, as outlined in primary source accounts such as newspapers, the Chancellor’s papers, and court records.

## **Part 2: Traditions and Movements on Campus**

*Jose sat anxiously on the courtroom bench, waiting for his perpetrators to arrive at the scene. It was an otherwise beautiful spring morning, but the sky felt more mocking than welcoming. He scanned the courtroom before glancing at the crowd behind him; some were familiar and friendly, but most were not. Several of them would be taking the stand as witnesses, and many others were simply there for support. Not his support, however. Instead, they supported the violent vigilantes whose crimes were committed in the name of their beloved institution: The University of Kansas. He knew that many of the students had betrayed his pain by signing a petition to let his abusers off without punishment, and they were offered school lawyers in order to clear the case. In fact, many of the students agreed with the harsh measures taken by the young college men. He fiddled his thumbs in his lap and stared ahead as the courtroom doors swung open. The judge took his seat at the front of the room, followed by the defendants who sat*

---

<sup>47</sup> “Prof. Melvin Speaks On ‘Alma Mater’ ATY.W.” *The University Daily Kansan*.

*to his right, neither looking at Jose. The judge scanned the room silently before making his dreadful announcement: court was now in session.*

The story of Jose Cajucom presents a detailed account of the violent and bigoted nature of many hazing attacks. His case was outlined thoroughly in *The Daily Kansan*, which recounted the specifics of this court session.<sup>48</sup> Cajucom took the stand first, claiming that Hopfer and Shaw had grabbed him from his garage before taking him to the Oak Hill Cemetery, where they stole his pants and clipped his hair before leaving him to return to town on his own. He also noted that he recognized Hopfer from the swing in his walk, and, while the men wore masks, he recognized Shaw because of his “rather feminine voice.”<sup>49</sup> Allegedly, Hopfer had warned him that he was being punished for not wearing his cap after he was informed to do so by university upperclassmen. Also notable, Cajucom provides the reason for his refusal to wear the cap as technical: according to Cajucom, he was not technically a freshman because he had credits from the University of Manila, and wearing the cap was not compatible with his religious beliefs and practices.<sup>50</sup>

Other witnesses were later called to the stand, though many of the student testimonies did not support Cajucom’s case.<sup>51</sup> Ester Agie claimed that she was canoeing with Hopfer until 11 o’clock on the night that the crime was committed. Ruth McDonald then testified that Hopfer had stopped by her house from 11 o’clock to 12 o’clock. Two other students, Lucile Edgar and Jimmie Telsley, were present as well. The witness claimed that Telsley left with Hopfer at midnight, and the two headed north with canoe paddles. Telsley claimed that he walked with Hopfer to Ninth and Louisiana Street before Hopfer veered off towards his own place of residence. Finally, Mrs. Nelson’s daughter noted that she heard a man enter their home around

---

<sup>48</sup> “Hopfer-Shaw Trial Begins This Morning In District Court.” *The University Daily Kansan*.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

ten to fifteen after midnight, and she could hear that he was carrying canoe paddles. A bit later, she heard a different man go into the room of Hopfer and Shaw, and from what she could recall, no one else left the house after that.

Other accounts suggest that Shaw and Hopfer were implicated in the crime in some way. Editor-in-chief of *The Daily Kansan* Harold R. Hall testified that two articles that had been published in *The Daily Kansan* were incriminating to Hopfer: one warning article had been signed by Hopfer and another that other bore his initials.<sup>52</sup> Cajucom's landlord E. P. Gallagher noted that he had witnessed Hopfer walking from his home after talking to Cajucom around one week before the crime took place. Finally, Francis Ostrum claimed to have heard Hopfer talking on the phone to the registrar in Dan's Cafe, where he learned that he was statistically a freshman.

Newspaper sources from *The Daily Kansan* provide a comprehensive account of both sides of the trial. The testimony of the students suggests that much of the student body was in favor of the vigilante actions of Shaw and Hopfer. Moreover, the efforts of the perpetrators to disguise themselves suggests that they understood that their actions would have legal repercussions, and chose to use violence in order to enforce K.U. traditions regardless. Particularly incriminating, however, is Otto Hopfer's own history of disobeying his freshman cap obligations. A story from *The Daily Kansan*, published in 1918, a year before the crime against Cajucom, states that Hopfer was a victim of hazing from some upperclassmen:

Otto Hopfer, c '21, wouldn't wear his cap, this morning, no, not him. And the Laws saw Otto. And they saw he had no cap... Otto was surrounded by a mass of Law students. After a while he appeared, resplendent and glorified. He was adorned with a bright pink dress, taffeta silk, the latest creation. Where his cap ought to have been was a woman's hat. One leg was daintily white silk-stockinged.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> "Plain Tales from the Hill." *The Daily Kansan*. April 4, 1918.

The newspaper continues to detail how Hopfer was subsequently chased around campus between classes for all students to observe, until he had his clothes removed later that day so they could be stored away for the next freshman. Thus, Hopfer's own run-in with freshman cap vigilantes during his freshman year would have likely influenced his desire to participate in the enforcement of the tradition his sophomore year. His own humiliation could only be rectified and his social standing reinstated with his willingness to play a part in the enforcement of punishments for his inferior's failure to comply with the cap tradition. It is also plausible that Hopfer's lingering embarrassment contributed to the especially violent nature of Cajucom's punishment.

Cajucom's case occurred only months before the official implementation of the Loyalty Movement, though student participation in the case undeniably inspired the Movement and bolstered student morale, as well as increased the focus on traditions immediately before and after its implementation. The alleged targeting of Cajucom may have also been the result of his racial and immigration status. A newspaper article in *The Daily Kansan* notes that Cajucom was the first target of the newly formed Red Vigils, who had also threatened other students in the paper. Despite the seemingly large pool of disobedient freshman, their first target was a Filipino transfer student, and their methods were nontraditional in relation to normal degrees of paddling. Moreover, several newspaper articles suggest that students were aware that Cajucom was targeted because of his race. The article titled "Jayhawker Ku Klux Klan Stalked Forth at Night After Forgetful Frosh," described the vigilante group as a "modern Ku Klux Klan," and threatened other offenders if they continued to disregard the freshman cap tradition.<sup>54</sup> Another article expresses the opinion of an anonymous student, who wrote that, "The recent activities of a band of students assuming the name of 'Red Vigils' is punishing a foreign student who is a

---

<sup>54</sup> "Jayhawker Ku Klux Klan Stalked Forth at Night After Forgetful Frosh." *University Daily Kansan*. May 9, 1918.

proven junior for not wearing his freshman cap seems to be a high example of misdirected activity.”<sup>55</sup> Thus, students were not only cognizant of the fact that Cajucom’s race was a relevant factor in determining his violent punishment, but they assumed that the misbehavior of the foreign student was the motivating force behind the formation of the vigilante group. It should be noted, however, that whiteness and affluence did not spare other students from receiving similar punishments. While Cajucom’s identity did likely contribute to his experience, he was a catalyst for later and more frequent incidents. Paddling was the most common punishment enacted upon misbehaving freshmen, and accounts of paddling incidents are well-documented in the newspapers. The newspaper archives suggest that there was an increased focus on traditions, and especially the freshman cap tradition, following the implementation of the Loyalty Movement. According to the online newspaper database newspapers.com, between the years 1912 and 1918, *The University Daily Kansan* published an average of 28 articles a year regarding the Freshman Cap tradition. In the year 1919, the year of Cajucom’s trial and the implementation of Loyalty Movement, around 55 articles were published by *The Daily Kansan* about the tradition, and around 78 articles were published between all major Lawrence newspapers. One account recalls the story of a student who hid in the forests on the periphery of campus for several days in order to avoid paddling from the upperclassmen.<sup>56</sup> Another newspaper recounts the shenanigans of a group of upperclassmen who found amusement in running up and down the streets chasing freshman with paddles.<sup>57</sup> While the administration often tried to control the violent hazing on campus prior to Cajucom’s case, the targeting of those who refused to wear or spoke against the tradition likely dissuaded other students from speaking in opposition.

---

<sup>55</sup> “Campus Opinion.” *The Daily Kansan*. April 21, 1919.

<sup>56</sup> “Hid Himself in the Woods to Avoid K. U. Hazers.” *The Daily Kansan*. October 9, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

<sup>57</sup> “Retain the Custom.” *The Daily Kansan*. March 18, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

Specifically, however, the story of Raymond Henze corroborates the severity of the hazing problem after the implementation of the Loyalty Movement. In the fall of 1919, as an incoming freshman and chemistry student, Henze sent an article to *The Daily Kansan* condemning the tradition.<sup>58</sup> Just days prior, the Men's Student Council had voted to solidify the rules of the freshman cap, which determined, among other stipulations, that "All men enrolled in the University of Kansas for the first time with less than 24 hours credit, must wear the freshman cap, unless they have been on the Hill one year."<sup>59</sup> Consequently, Henze's article was published on October 6, 1919 and argued that the symbolism of the freshman cap only reinforced the elitism and classism present on campus:

I have always admired a strong school spirit and have always done all I could do to further that spirit. Nevertheless, I know and you know that behind the whole purpose of the symbol is nothing but autocracy of the richer students, egotism of the upperclassmen, ignorance of what constitutes school spirit, disregard for the natural right of a freeman, idolatry of a spurious tradition, and graft.<sup>60</sup>

Henze's criticism is particularly valuable because he posits that the richer students were largely responsible for the hazing on campus. This demographic, the richer students, would also have been involved in campus fraternities, therefore suggesting that those who were involved in fraternities played a significant role in enforcing campus traditions. He went on to say that the freshman cap, intended to rid the freshman of the arrogance from their childhoods, only succeeded in publicly humiliating them:

The cap custom was brought here in 1912 but it was wrought from the evil scum of misconception, and to this the degenerate snob class of students added

---

<sup>58</sup> "Raymond P. Henze Leaves University." *The Daily Kansan*. October 14, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

<sup>59</sup> "Freshman Cap Rule In Effect This Year ." *The Daily Kansan*. September 25, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

<sup>60</sup> "Freshman Hurls Defi At K.U. Cap Tradition." *The Daily Kansan*. October 6, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

insult, injury and dishonor. If the intentions were to help the freshman become acquainted, the method of distinction was ill-conceived and the acephalous freshman had to accept it for barter value in exchange of honor for graft... You realize that the cap brings ridicule, mockery and raillery to the wearer and yet you who are supposed to have the welfare of each student at heart, bolster the cause of the bully. In your vanity you claim that the purpose of the cap is to rid the freshmen of that which you possess the greater portion, namely, conceit.<sup>61</sup>

Henze's story does not end with a victory; instead, he became the victim to another bout of violent hazing. After the publication of his article, a group of upperclassmen students chased him onto the top of one of the metal ventilators on the roof of Fraser Hall.<sup>62</sup> Superintendent of buildings and grounds John Shea required the pursuers to leave the roof before making Henze follow them down. Henze was promptly thrown into Potter Lake by the upperclassmen. One last display of power, the upperclassmen painted their class numbers on the standpipe, leaving them to be cleaned by the freshmen in the morning. Another article recounted that Henze was taken to the Chancellor's office for protection after being removed from the top of Fraser Hall, and his assailants offered to eradicate the paddling tradition if Henze were to jump into the lake.<sup>63</sup> Chancellor Strong had urged him to not accept the deal, but Henze was allegedly happy to comply. After swimming back to shore, Henze was rewarded with calls of "Keep him in! Keep him in!" though he made it back to shore unharmed.<sup>64</sup>

After receiving his punishment, Henze was even more eager to disband the freshman cap tradition. Regardless of his actions, however, the student body did not uphold their promise to voluntarily end the tradition. Henze retaliated by making an appeal to the Governor of Kansas, and the Board of Administration purportedly opened an investigation.<sup>65</sup> An article on October

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> "Hid Himself In The Woods To Avoid K.U. Hazers." *The Daily Kansan*.

<sup>63</sup> "Raymond P. Henze Leaves University." *The Daily Kansan*.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> "Henze Case To Board After Plea To State." *The Daily Kansan*. October 10, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

10th, 1919 notes that the Board of Investigation was planning a trip to Lawrence in order to further investigate the case, though an article published on October 14th of the same year recounted that Chancellor Strong said he heard no news of a formal investigation being opened, despite several visits to the school by the State Board.<sup>66</sup> Henze left the University of Kansas to study law at the University of Michigan shortly after this event. Notably, Henze's story reflects the fraternal nature of the cap tradition, in that his failure to comply with the tradition resulted in an immediate physical and humiliating punishment, namely being thrown into Potter Lake with subsequent threats of a forceful drowning.

Despite his short time at the University of Kansas, Henze's legacy lingered long after he left the institution. An article published by *The Daily Kansan* on March 10, 1920 announced that the Senate would be voting on a constitution that would create a self-led student government:

'I hope the students will adopt the constitution,' Chancellor Strong said today. I believe it is what the students really want and the faculty is really in sympathy with their desire for self-government which the new constitution gives.' Chancellor Strong pointed out the gradual evolution of sentiment which finally resulted in the new constitution. The movement began last fall when the disturbance caused by Raymond Henze was brought up before the University Senate.<sup>67</sup>

The new self-led government would differ from their predecessor, the Men's Student Senate, in that the Men's Student Senate did not have the power to enforce their rulings, whereas the self-led government would.<sup>68</sup> The article goes on to list some of the responsibilities of the new student government, including:

To foster University traditions for the men students of the University. To have control of all student parades and rallies, to make proper plans for such parades and rallies and carry them out. . . To act as a Board of Arbitration and to make all needful regulations in case of trouble or disagreement between men students of the

---

<sup>66</sup> "Raymond Henze To Leave University." *Lawrence Daily Journal-World*. October 14, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

<sup>67</sup> "K.U. Head Endorses Men's Constitution." *The Daily Kansan*. March 10, 1920. (accessed December 11, 2022).

<sup>68</sup> "Organizations Back Men's Constitution ." *The Daily Kansan* . March 11, 1920. (accessed December 11, 2022).

different schools, classes or organizations, and to make recommendations in such cases to proper University authorities.<sup>69</sup>

The constitution was voted in on March 18, 1920.<sup>70</sup> Despite the very vocal group who found the traditions to be demeaning, many students on campus also outwardly expressed their support, often arguing that the freshman cap was critical for earning social capital. Thus, the constitution provided students with the opportunity to closely relegate the University of Kansas's social sphere, deciding on a bureaucratic level the rewards and punishments for their fellow students. Notably, those who were strong proponents of the traditions were published in conjunction with the criticisms of the Freshman cap tradition. *The Daily Kansan* records many different student opinions. In a section of the newspaper titled "Campus Opinion," one student who signed their entry "X.Y.Z." sarcastically congratulated the freshman students for now having the same status as their upper-classmen counterparts, writing that discipline is an important part of the freshman experience.<sup>71</sup> They ask the question in the first sentence, "Why is freshman discipline not just as important as the academic side of his life?"<sup>72</sup> Another "Campus Opinion" also enforced the tradition by providing a grim image of a future without it, saying that "...things and conditions are different. The cap has degenerated in importance, even in the eyes of the high school graduate. He no longer guards it as he would his own life. When he is tired of wearing it he thoughtlessly tosses it aside, secure in the knowledge that he is safe."<sup>73</sup> Another writer in an article, titled "Keep the old tradition," warns freshmen that wearing the cap is essential for succeeding socially: "The wearing of the freshman cap will enable the freshman to distinguish their classmates from the upperclassmen, and help them to make friends. The big majority of

---

<sup>69</sup> "K.U. Head Endorses Men's Constitution." *The Daily Kansan*.

<sup>70</sup> "Men's Constitution Wins-Vote Predicts ." *The Daily Kansan* . March 18, 1920. (accessed December 11, 2022).

<sup>71</sup> X.Y.Z. "Campus Opinion." *The Daily Kansan*. November 3, 1920.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

<sup>73</sup> X.Y.Z. "Campus Opinion." *The Daily Kansan*. November 3, 1920..

freshmen who wear the cap will think less of those who do not, and no upperclassmen is going to look down on the first year student because he abides by one of the rules laid down by the student council.”<sup>74</sup> Thus, to many students, the freshman cap tradition was a foolproof method of affirming masculine status and effectively relegating the social sphere. The fraternal nature of the traditions was once again reaffirmed shortly after the passing of the constitution, in which the Men’s Student Council instilled K.U.’s Ku Ku Klan, whose name was taken from the second Ku Klux Klan that had just entered Kansas, with the power to enforce freshman tradition. A newspaper article from *The Daily Kansan* titled “Ku Ku’s to wield paddle on frosh cap violators,” reading that “The Ku Ku Klan, dressed in its uniform will patrol the campus Wednesday for violators of the freshman cap tradition. The Klan will be responsible for the enforcement of the tradition for the remainder of the season.”<sup>75</sup> Entrusting the tradition to a group based on a nation-wide fraternal order further emphasizes the connection between fraternity rhetoric and actions and the transition from boyhood to manhood within the college sphere.

Thus, the cause-and-effect sequence of the Henze hazing to the implementation of a Men’s Constitution reveals a connection between the Loyalty movement and the upholding of traditions through violent hazing methods. Specifically, the case of Jose Cajucom led to the redefining and solidifying of previously established campus rules on paddling and the freshman cap tradition. The re-establishment of these traditions prompted Henze to publish his own criticisms of the tradition. After failing to control Henze’s outlash, Chancellor Strong finally noted the need for self-government by the student body in the midst of the Loyalty Movement, which provided an avenue for Strong to shift the burden of responsibility regarding traditions onto the student body. This also reveals Strong's hesitation to provide a meaningful distribution

---

<sup>74</sup> “Keep the Old Tradition .” *The Daily Kansan*. October 2, 1919.

<sup>75</sup> “Ku Ku’s to Wield Paddle on Frosh Cap Violators.” *The Daily Kansan*. November 16, 1920..

of power. In the wake of an onslaught of bureaucratic issues, students only had a voice in the social ongoings of campus life. Moreover, Strong's lack of communication about the Loyalty Movement within his correspondence letters suggests that he may not have been interested in its cause. Additionally, this sequence of events emphasizes the dual nature of the Loyalty Movement: where the administration found solutions to their structural problems through a change in legislature and the dissemination of power to the student body, the student body continued to measure inclusion within their social sphere by each member's willingness to comply with University traditions. This is evident in the continued discussion and social exile of Cajucom, as well as Raymond Henze's physical departure from the University. Moreover, an article from *The Daily Kansan* affirms that the student body was primarily interested in the legislation because it permitted complete authority to the student body over issues surrounding the University traditions, stating that "... the constitution is the outgrowth of the many events last fall when there seemed to be an inability on the part of both faculty and students to stop the various violations..."<sup>76</sup> Thus, to the students, the ratification of the new student constitution was less remarkable for its display of democracy than its permittance of students to now formally include and exclude individuals from the University social sphere.

### **Conclusion**

*Jose stared ahead anxiously as the final witness took their seat. It was time for the jury to deliberate, and besides his personal certainty about the guilt of his perpetrators, he had to hope that the witness statements would be convincing enough. He rose out of his seat and made his way to the courtroom doors, trusting that it would be the last time he left as a victim.*

The case of Jose Cajucom resulted in the hung jury after its first session, which reconvened later in November but was dismissed after Cajucom failed to appear in court.<sup>77</sup> Still,

---

<sup>76</sup> "Responsibility." *The Daily Kansan*. February 6, 1920.

<sup>77</sup> "Hung Jury Prospect in the Cajucom Case." *Lawrence Daily Journal-World*. May 10, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

the case demonstrates the complexity of the relationship between the violent hazing traditions and the Loyalty Movement. The goals of the administration and faculty differed from those of the students, who viewed the Movement as a trial for their admittance to the social world of the University of Kansas. While the nature of the hazing was violent, a notable amount of the student body supported the actions of the vigilantes because of their beliefs in the power of student traditions for the manifestation of campus pride. Similarly, the large number of attendees at the trial suggests that much of the campus was implicated in the Movement and believed in its mission. Nevertheless, the victims of hazing often opposed the methods used against them, and those who outwardly expressed disapproval were often the targets of more violent and elevated hazing attempts.

Still, the Loyalty Movement did not disappear into the historical record with no lingering legacy. In fact, the Movement was pivotal in the building of the Memorial Stadium, the Memorial Union, and the Uncle Jimmy Green statue in the middle of the 1920s. Within his Correspondence Letters, Chancellor Strong responded to Mr. George F. Hurley on February 24, 1920, who, writing from the University of Michigan, inquired about the potential construction of a Kansas Union.<sup>78</sup> Strong responded to his question saying that “Your letter of January 14th was handed to the persons here in a new Loyalty Movement which may result in a Kansas Union... There is at present no Kansas Union and it will necessarily be some time before there is one, it all depending, I think, upon the result of the Loyalty Movement just referred.” In a 1920 article published by *The Daily Kansan* titled “Greetings sent by N. Y. Alumni to K.U.,” an alumni reunion in New York wrote a series of resolutions addressed to Chancellor Strong. Beyond congratulating him for his retirement, the resolution expressed its support of the Loyalty

---

<sup>78</sup> Strong, Frank. Letter to George F. Hurley. “This Is in Answer to Your Favor of February 18th.” (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas, February 24, 1920.)

Movement: “We heartily endorse the Loyalty Movement...will exert a stimulating influence on matters of general student welfare as embodied in plans for a Student Union and Commons and for the development of a spirit of unity and cooperation among students, faculty and alumni.”<sup>79</sup>

An article published by *The University Daily Kansan* in 1925 titled “Actual construction of Union marks last step in progress of Memorial Drive Movement,” recorded the beginning of the construction on the Union: “The memorial drive was started in the fall of 1920 as the result of an effort made to place upon the campus a lasting memorial to the 126 Kansas men and women who had given their lives for their country in the World War.”<sup>80</sup> Hence, while the student body and alumni had different interpretations and manifestations of the Loyalty Movement, all parties were in favor of the superiority and development of the college. Class competitions were utilized to raise money, in which their contributions were published in the University paper. Even with the betterment of the University in mind, students found ways to compete among themselves for social capital.

Notably, women were mostly left out of this narrative. Their femininity, diametrically opposed to new notions of masculinity, would have been threatened by violent punishment or verbal harassment. *The Daily Kansan* and the Chancellor’s Correspondent Records suggest that a Women’s Council did exist at the time, though it exercised considerably less power than the men’s self-led government.<sup>81</sup> Accordingly, while women likely had traditions that they were expected to maintain, their loyalty was much less consequential. Even in the wake of the passing of the nineteenth amendment, physical displays of loyalty were largely the responsibility of the male students. Their performances were rewarded by increased control over university

---

<sup>79</sup> “Greetings Sent by N.Y. Alumni to K.U.” *The Daily Kansan*. April 27, 1920.

<sup>80</sup> “Actual Construction of Union Marks Last Step in Progress of Memorial Drive Movement.” *The Daily Kansan*. November 22, 1925.

<sup>81</sup> “Assembly Outlined at Men's Convocation.” *The Daily Kansan*. November 6, 1920.

government, and, consequently, the student body. Further research on the role of women in the Loyalty Movement can reveal more information about the development of peer societies and the manifestation of the Movement on campus.

By understanding the historical setting in which the Loyalty Movement derived, namely through a development of youth culture and burgeoning notions of masculinity, this paper attempted to understand the conditions that led to the enforcement of campus traditions and its reception by the administration and student body. Hence, this research provides a brief glimpse into the socio-cultural components that shaped a violent and masculine campus culture following War World I and into the 1920s. The character of masculinity is always shifting due to historical changes, and its trajectory, combined with its social manifestations, can reveal how men were affected and reacted to these changes. Thus, a culmination of time and space bound historical studies could reveal how we have arrived at our current state of masculinity, and, potentially, what to do about it on college campuses and beyond.

## Bibliography

### Secondary Sources

Allerfeldt, Kristofer. "Jayhawker Fraternities: Masons, Klansmen and Kansas in the 1920s."

*Journal of American Studies* 46, no. 4 (2012): 1035–53.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. Verso Books, 2016.

"Basketball in Kansas." Kansas Historical Society. Accessed April 11, 2023.

<https://www.kshs.org/kansapedia/basketball-in-kansas/12229>

Campney, Brent M. S. "'HOLD THE LINE': The Defense of Jim Crow in Lawrence, Kansas,

1945–1961." *Kansas History* 33, no. 1 (2010): 22–41.

Fass, Paula S. *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920's*. (Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 1979.)

"Fully Integrated." KU History, June 15, 2018. <https://kuhistory.ku.edu/articles/fully-integrated>.

Clifford S. Griffin, *The University of Kansas: A History*. (Lawrence, Kansas: The Regent Press of Kansas, 1980.)

Hobsbawm, E. J., and T. O. Ranger. *The Invention of Tradition*. (Cambridge England: Cambridge

University Press, 2019.)

Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the*

*Eighteenth Century to the Present*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.)

McCool, John H. "Our Weekly Reader." Our Weekly Reader | KU Memorial Union. (University of Kansas. Accessed April 11, 2023.)

McCool, John H. "The First Kansan." The First Kansan | KU Memorial Union. (The University of Kansas. Accessed April 11, 2023.)

Reagan-Kendrick, Amber. "Ninety Years of Struggle and Success: African American History at the University of Kansas, 1870-1960." Dissertation, Proquest , 2004.

Syrett, Nicholas L. *The Company He Keeps a History of White College Fraternities*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.)

Trautsch, Jasper M. "The Origins and Nature of American Nationalism." *National Identities* 18, no. 3 (2016): 289-312.

### **Primary Sources**

"Actual Construction of Union Marks Last Step in Progress of Memorial Drive Movement ." *The Daily Kansan*. November 22, 1925.

"Almost Two Score Years, Professors on Mount Oread." *The Daily Kansan*. April 28, 1920

"Assembly Outlined at Men's Convocation." *The Daily Kansan*. November 6, 1920.

"Cajucum Files Complaint Against Three K.U. Men ." *University Daily Kansan*. April 24, 1919.

“Campus Opinion.” *The Daily Kansan*. April 21, 1919.

“Cruel Paddles Will Force Freshman Cap.” *University Daily Kansan*. March 27, 1917.

“Filipino ‘Freshie’ Victim of ‘Red Vigils’ - KU.” *Parsons Daily Eclipse*. May 20, 1919.

“Freshman Cap Rule In Effect This Year.” *The Daily Kansan*. September 25, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

“Freshman Hurls Defi At K.U. Cap Tradition.” *The Daily Kansan*. October 6, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

Graebner, Martin. Letter to Frank Strong. “Hon. J. A. McDermott Tells Me That You Are the Chairman...” Winfield, Kansas, January 25, 1919.

“Greetings Sent by N.Y. Alumni to K.U.” *The Daily Kansan*. April 27, 1920.

Gulick, Sidney L. Letter to Chancellor Frank Strong. “National Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation.” New York, New York, March 12, 1919.

“Henze Case To Board After Plea To State.” *The Daily Kansan*. October 10, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

“Hide Himself in the Woods to Avoid K. U. Hazers.” *The Daily Kansan*. October 9, 1919.  
(accessed December 11, 2022).

“Hopfer-Shaw Trial Begins This Morning In District Court.” *The University Daily Kansan*. May  
9, 1919.

“Hung Jury Prospect in the Cajucom Case.” *Lawrence Daily Journal-World*. May 10, 1919.  
(accessed December 11, 2022).

“Jayhawker Ku Klux Klan Stalked Forth at Night After Forgetful Frosh.” *University Daily  
Kansan*. May 9, 1918.

“Keep the Old Tradition .” *The Daily Kansan*. October 2, 1919.

“K.U. Head Endorses Men's Constitution.” *The Daily Kansan*. March 10, 1920. (accessed  
December 11, 2022).

“Ku Ku’s to Wield Paddle on Frosh Cap Violators.” *The Daily Kansan*. November 16, 1920.

“Men's Constitution Wins-Vote Predicts .” *The Daily Kansan* . March 18, 1920. (accessed  
December 11, 2022).

“Organizations Back Men's Constitution .” *The Daily Kansan* . March 11, 1920. (accessed  
December 11, 2022).

“Plans for Karnival Nearing Perfection .” *The Daily Kansan* . March 10, 1920.

<https://www.newspapers.com/image/427847471/?terms=%22collection%20of%20freaks%22%20&match=1>.

“Prof. Melvin Speaks on ‘Alma Mater’ ATY.W.” *University Daily Kansan*. 2021.

“Raymond P. Henze Leaves University .” *The Daily Kansan*. October 14, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

“Red Vigils Got Him.” *Lawrence Daily Journal-World*. April 21, 1919.

“Responsibility .” *The Daily Kansan*. February 6, 1920.

“Retain the Custom.” *The Daily Kansan*. March 18, 1919. (accessed December 11, 2022).

Stebbins, L. A. “Students' Views.” *The University Courier*. October 9, 1885.

Strong, Frank. Letter to George F. Hurley. “This Is in Answer to Your Favor of February 18th.”  
Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas, February 24, 1920.

Strong, Frank. Letter to Hon. J. A. McDermott. “This Is in Answer to Your Favor of January  
25th.” Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas, January 27, 1919.

X.Y.Z. “Campus Opinion.” *The Daily Kansan*. November 3, 1920.

X.Y.Z. "Campus Opinion." *The Daily Kansan*. November 3, 1920.