

# History of Fraternities and Sororities at Franklin and Marshall College, 1854-1987

by David M. Stameshkin, Ph.D.

## I. The Early Development of American Fraternities, 1800-1860

Since the eighteenth century, many students at American colleges and universities have attempted to develop a college life for themselves outside of the classroom and away from the purview of the faculty. According to several historians, the development of that extracurricular life and the growth of fraternities was heavily influenced by a series of tumultuous battles between faculty and students at a number of campuses in the early nineteenth century.<sup>1</sup>

Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, in her superb new book *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, argues that between 1800 and 1830, faculty-student relations (always tenuous at best) reached a new low at a number of institutions.<sup>2</sup> Most American colleges at that time maintained a spartan and highly religious regimen. For those numerous young men--often poorer and older--who came to college to be ministers or missionaries, the atmosphere was conducive to revivals, prayer, and hard work. These pious students modeled their behavior after that of the faculty, who were, for the most part, scholarly ministers themselves.<sup>3</sup> In turn, the faculty rewarded these students with college honors and praise. On the other hand, for those wealthier and more urbane young men who were attending college more as a finishing school, college life left much to be desired. The wealthier students wanted a more genteel atmosphere, increased power over their everyday lives, and more respect from the college authorities. Campus riots and rebellions, led by these students, broke out for a variety of reasons, but in each case, the students lost these (sometimes violent) battles with their college administrations. However, these reversals did not stop those students from searching for new ways to develop their own collegiate life (away from the faculty and the poorer, religious students), and to engage in conviviality, drinking, and other leisure activities which young men of that class wished to enjoy.

In the nineteenth century, the most important institutions in the extracurricular life of many students--wealthy and poor--were the college literary societies which had been founded on many campuses in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.<sup>4</sup> These societies--such as the Goethean and Diagnothian societies of Franklin and Marshall College--were often the center of extracurricular life, and gave students opportunities for developing organizational and oratorical skills, as well as providing good fellowship. They also usually contained society libraries superior in most respects to the college libraries. On campuses with more than one society, the groups would compete seriously with one another for new members, utilizing the same rushing techniques later developed by the fraternities. Although professors occasionally viewed such societies with some skepticism, the societies were not considered a threat to the institution, except, perhaps, on those occasions when the societies would invite a controversial speaker to their society celebrations--Emerson was a favorite in the mid-nineteenth century--who would not echo the dogmatic teachings of the College. Indeed, at Franklin and Marshall College, membership in one of the two literary societies was nearly universal, and, for many years, required by the faculty.<sup>5</sup>

Still, before the Civil War, most of the wealthier and more worldly students on many campuses

found the literary societies and the rest of collegiate life insufficient for their purposes. Instead, they began to organize greek-letter fraternities in the 1820s and 1830s in order to develop a lifestyle away from the faculty, to separate themselves socially from their poorer and more provincial peers, and to enjoy more social activities. Furthermore, as Horowitz points out, the fraternity "perpetuated the mentality of the revolts" and "initiated each incoming group of pledges into a way of thinking and behaving that kept the spirit" of the revolts against the faculty alive.<sup>6</sup>

The fraternities were immensely successful. They developed first at Union and Hamilton in the 1820s and 1830s, and chapters spread rapidly to colleges in the East and the Midwest before the Civil War. Their rituals were modeled after Masonic customs, some of which had been revealed during the anti-Masonic controversies of the 1820s, and, as Frederick Rudolph, a noted educational historian, has claimed, the fraternities appealed enormously to many ante-bellum students:

Greek-letter fraternities were intended to bring together the most urbane young men on campus into small groups that would fill the vacuum left by removal from the family and the home community, but they served a further purpose, too. The fraternities offered an escape from the monotony, dreariness, and unpleasantness of the collegiate regimen which began with prayers before dawn and ended with prayers after dark; escape from the long winters and ingrown college world, from the dormitory with its lack of privacy. Fraternities institutionalized various escapes--drinking, smoking, card playing, singing, and seducing--but they did not introduce these diversions, which long antedated their founding.<sup>7</sup>

At first, college presidents and faculty strongly opposed the existence of fraternities, but they were unable to stop their growth. Non-greeks also opposed the new groups as divisive, secretive, and inimical to the goals of college life. In some places, anti-secret societies were formed. Indeed, from the beginning, the goals of fraternity men differed from non-fraternity students and from the faculty; only in the twentieth century, were some of their goals and methods accepted and slowly integrated into the stated objectives of collegiate education. Before 1860, fraternities were, at best, tolerated by colleges.<sup>8</sup>

## II. The Early Years of Fraternities at F&M, 1854-90

In 1853, Marshall College united with Franklin College to form Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster. Soon thereafter, three greek-letter organizations--Phi Kappa Sigma, Chi Phi and Phi Kappa Psi--were established at the College. Tradition has it that some of the former Marshall College students, homesick and lonely in their new home, had organized several small social groups. One of these groups was contacted by William L. Neff, a member of the Gamma chapter of Phi Kappa Sigma fraternity at Lafayette, who convinced the F&M students they should form their own chapter of Phi Kappa Sigma. They agreed, and on October 13, 1854, they received their charter as the Zeta chapter of Phi Kappa Sigma from the parent chapter at the University of Pennsylvania. Several months later, the Zeta chapter of Chi Phi fraternity was established at the College with eight charter members. Another local fraternity, Phi Beta Tau, was formed in 1858, and this group was organized as the Eta chapter of Phi Kappa Psi in 1860. Finally, the Grand Chapter Tau of the Delta Tau fraternity was chartered in 1874.<sup>9</sup>

The paucity of early records does not allow much analysis of the impact these groups may have

had upon the College in the nineteenth century. Even the fraternity members who kept diaries were--unfortunately for us--very secretive about their secret organizations.<sup>10</sup> We do know, however, that (1) between 40 and 50 per cent of the men usually belonged to fraternities between 1855 and 1890; (2) non-graduates were as likely to belong as those who eventually graduated; (3) men who later became ministers were somewhat less likely to join than non-ministers; (4) that each fraternity chapter usually had between 10 and 20 members; (5) that fraternity members were almost as successful as non-greeks in winning academic awards; and (6) without exception, each of the fraternities drew members in nearly equal numbers from both literary societies.<sup>11</sup>

As the early fraternities increased in number and size, some faculty and students organized a group to oppose them. For example, John Williamson Nevin, president of the College from 1866-76, was particularly adamant in his anti-fraternity views, and he authored a circular in the late 1860s which was published by the "Anti-Fraternity Association" of Lancaster County. "College Fraternities, as they are called, have grown to be an evil in our institutions of learning of the most serious kind," Nevin wrote. "They are a foreign, outside interest in the body of a college, which necessarily preys like a cancer on its proper life....With regard to this, they are, at best, of the nature of an excrescence, a mere fungus, which cannot thrive without eating out more or less the vitality of the college at other points." Nevin was particularly unhappy that the college literary societies were being weakened or destroyed by the fraternities ("the parasitic plant of these outside clubs goes on to fold the college life in its deadly embrace"), and he criticized fraternities as, among other things, immoral organizations (concerned only with frivolity and pretension) which often enticed into membership students who could not afford to belong. "All can see how membership in any of these clubs becomes very soon a temptation, not only to idleness," he preached, "but to vain outside pretension and an improper lavishness of expense in different ways."<sup>12</sup>

Even with this organized opposition, the greeks did not disappear, and all four of the fraternities maintained their chapters into the 1890s (Delta Tau Delta finally disbanded in 1897). The chapters met at first in the basements of the literary societies or in rented rooms in town, and they often set up eating clubs to dine together as well. It was not until the 1890s that fraternities began to rent or own their own houses. At the same time, the College offered little in the way of organized student life, aside from the literary societies. Harbaugh Hall, which opened in 1871 as a residence hall (for forty students) and refectory (for one hundred), briefly became a center of student life during the 1870s and 1880s; however, students soon grew unhappy with the food, and they found cheaper living accommodations in town. In 1900, Harbaugh Hall was demolished, and the College went out of the residence life business for over two decades, while fraternities continued to serve the needs of many students.<sup>13</sup>

### III. Eating Clubs and Fraternities, 1890-1928

During the 1890s, upperclass students shunned Harbaugh Hall, and continued to organize eating cooperatives and clubs with colorful names such as "Mixed Pickles," "College Ralstons," "Paradise Club," "Franklin Club," "Marshall Club," "Nevonian Club" and "Harbaugh Club." In the early twentieth century, most of the clubs slowly evolved into local fraternities with constitutions, secret rituals, banquets, and ongoing recruiting efforts. Finally, between 1903 and 1931, most of them linked up with a national fraternity.<sup>14</sup>

The first to do so was the Nevonian Club, which was organized in December of 1896 and established as the Pi chapter of Phi Sigma Kappa in 1903. The Mixed Pickles eating club, founded in 1893, split into two groups during the 1890s--the Franklin Club (1897-1917) and the Harbaugh Club (1900-17). The Harbaugh Club, which developed close ties with the Lambda Chi Alpha chapter at Colgate, established the Alpha Zeta chapter of Lambda Chi Alpha at Franklin and Marshall in 1917, while the Franklin Club members organized the Nu chapter of Sigma Pi in 1918. Phi Kappa Tau also has its roots in the eating clubs of that era. In 1909, the College Ralstons was transformed in to the Marshall Club, and, in 1921, Paul B. Bordner helped convince his fellow members to establish the Xi chapter of Phi Kappa Tau at F&M. The Paradise Club, founded on April 1, 1896 by Professor C. N. Heller and W. Stuart Cramer, was the first club to have a house --at James and Pines Streets--in which members both ate and lived together. After thirty-two years as a club, the group agreed to establish the Delta Rho chapter of Kappa Sigma fraternity in 1928. The Torch Club, established in 1927, affiliated with Sigma Delta Rho fraternity in 1929 as the Eta chapter.<sup>15</sup> Apparently the Upsilon Chapter of Delta Sigma Phi, which was officially founded in 1915, was the only fraternity organized during the period 1903-1928 which was not first an eating club. The Deltas had a tough time at the start: in 1917, the Student Senate refused to allow Delta to seat a representative, and for some reason, they are not mentioned in the Oriflamme with the other fraternities until 1921.<sup>16</sup>

The older fraternities and the fraternities which developed out of the eating clubs all sought housing during the early twentieth century, and most were successful. In 1910 and again in 1926, the College offered fraternities an opportunity to build on College property, but only Chi Phi was interested. In 1896, Chi Phi had opened one of the first chapter houses at 612 North Duke Street. Later, they moved to 415 W. James, before they accepted the College's offer in 1928 and built "Dubbsheim" at 603 Race Avenue . Others found housing near the College, but not on campus property. For example, Phi Kappa Sigma, after living in a variety of houses, settled into 644 Race Avenue in 1930, and later bought the house at 415 West James, which it still owns. Phi Kappa Psi claims to have been the first F&M fraternity to rent an entire house (556 West James in 1896); in 1907, the chapter moved to 540 West James, and later to 560 West James. Phi Sigma Kappa established their house at 437 West James in 1910, and Lambda Chi Alpha was housed at 524 West James before building a beautiful brick home at 637 College Avenue in 1929. Sigma Pi eventually moved into 552 West James, Delta Sigma Phi found a home at 423 West James (and, in 1937, was apparently the first fraternity to pay off their mortgage), Kappa Sigma located its chapter at 550 West James, and Phi Kappa Tau took over 365 College Avenue before settling in at 605 College Avenue.<sup>17</sup>

The College's decision to offer fraternities land to build on campus was symbolic of the sea-change in College opinion regarding fraternities between 1890 and 1930: President Nevin's virulently negative views on greek organizations no longer represented the majority opinion of the College community. As early as 1903, for example, Professor Joseph Dubbs, in his history of Franklin and Marshall College, could write in almost neutral tones about the fraternities and clubs at the College.

Fraternities have been greatly opposed, and there can be no doubt that some fraternities have deserved all that could be said against them. The fact seems

to be that they are exactly what their members make them. When they are properly conducted, they claim to advance the culture and protect the morals of their members, when they are controlled by evil influences, the result may easily be foreseen. At present, the fraternities dwell in

beautiful houses, and are careful to preserve their good reputation. As they may soon celebrate their semi-centennial it may perhaps be taken for granted that they have come to stay.<sup>18</sup>

Indeed, faculty and trustees, many of whom were alumni and had been members of fraternities or eating clubs, were increasingly supportive of fraternities, as were other students and alumni. For example, by 1917, twelve of the College's seventeen faculty members had been members of fraternities in college, and eleven of them--including President Henry Harbaugh Apple (1909-1934)-- had belonged to fraternities with chapters at F&M.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, in his 1931-32 President's Report to the Board of Trustees, President Apple praised the College's fraternities:

Seven hundred post-adolescent boys living under the influence of a liberal ~~arts~~ curriculum and the supervision of a faculty of trained and experienced leaders is a great opportunity of training for special service. The fraternity houses, especially, ~~are~~ useful for this purpose. At least 50 students are managing dining rooms, keeping the house in order, handling budgets of thousands of dollars and supervising the social ~~and~~ ~~study~~ experiences of more than 300 boys. It requires very little imagination to picture the vast opportunity that this experience presents in training for leadership after college days.<sup>20</sup>

In general, by the 1920s, fraternities had become increasingly respectable (and highly visible) partners in the American educational enterprise, and many students came to college fully expecting to join one.<sup>21</sup>

Those aspects of fraternities in the early twentieth century that might particularly concern us today--hazing, discrimination, and elitism--were not perceived as major problems at that time by the society or by the College. Hazing of freshmen by sophomores, for example, was allowed by the College, and, indeed, was the basis of most of the College's traditions in the first seven decades of the twentieth century.<sup>22</sup> Fraternity hazing apparently was also accepted by the College and by American culture until quite recently. While there were a few men, such as Shober Barr (Class of 1924), who thought hazing was not helpful for the brotherhood, they were in a minority.<sup>23</sup> In addition, discrimination against Jews, Catholics, and Blacks was practiced throughout society; to select out fraternities, therefore, and attack them for discriminatory behavior and rituals does not provide a particularly helpful analysis.

On the positive side, it was argued (as it had been in the nineteenth century) that fraternities helped young men learn manners and how to make the transition to the adult world, as well as providing them with opportunities for friendship, support, and good times.<sup>24</sup> The fraternities also were useful because they offered (at reasonable cost) housing and dining for students--something the College was unable to do. Even after Franklin-Meyran and Dietz-Santee residence halls were constructed on campus in the mid-1920s, only one-third of the incoming freshmen could be accommodated in the 1930s and 1940s. Moreover, aside from the handful of men--about 25--who lived and ate at the Seminary, all students had to fend for themselves for food.<sup>25</sup> The popularity of fraternities--just over one-half of Franklin and Marshall men belonged in the years 1910-1940--was due, in part, therefore, to their availability as residences and dining units.<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, even though the College renovated the old gymnasium into a student center--the Campus House--in 1926, the fraternities continued to be the major centers of social life at the College.<sup>27</sup>

#### IV. Discrimination in Fraternities at F&M, 1900-1961

Jewish students and Black students were refused admittance to most fraternities in the United States until after World War II, and, in some cases, until the 1960s. Several national Jewish fraternities, including Zeta Beta Tau, were organized across the country in reaction to this practice. In the late 1920s, Jewish students at Franklin and Marshall formed The Towers eating club, which, in 1931, became the Alpha Tau chapter of Zeta Beta Tau fraternity. After World War II, a number of students, primarily Jewish, organized a local fraternity which, in 1947, became the Pennsylvania Tau Omega chapter of Pi Lambda Phi fraternity, a non-sectarian national fraternity. There was some concern among alumni regarding the establishment of another fraternity that would admit Jews on campus. For example, a prominent alumnus wrote to President Theodore Distler (1943-1954): "By allowing the nationalization of this local group you are promising, inferentially, that you will admit sufficient Jewish students so that both of the purely Jewish fraternities will have an ample supply of men available for the maintenance of their respective groups." This alumnus, a successful attorney, also was concerned that the College was "inferentially" promising to place all of these Jewish students after graduation, which would be impossible, according to him, "because graduate schools will not take them and neither will industry," even though Jewish students "will maintain a high scholastic rating." He urged Distler, instead, to place a quota on Jewish students--"this is not racial discrimination, but common sense"--since the College could not find places for its Jewish graduates. Furthermore, the alumnus maintained, Jewish students, "because of their racial instincts and training...take more out of your faculty."<sup>28</sup> Distler disagreed with these theories about Jews, but did mention that fewer Jews had been enrolled since he had taken over as President.<sup>29</sup> Perhaps this eased the concerns of this alumnus. In any case, Pi Lambda Phi was allowed to establish the chapter, and it was predominantly Jewish during the 1940s and 1950s. Furthermore, unlike most fraternities, its ritual did not exclude Blacks, and any Blacks who joined fraternities at Franklin and Marshall before 1961 were probably members of Pi Lambda Phi.<sup>30</sup>

The issue of discrimination in fraternal organizations had briefly flared after World War II as idealistic veterans, who had fought a war against fascism and discrimination, attended colleges and began to dominate fraternity chapters. At Amherst, Middlebury, and several other Northern colleges, for example, chapters of national fraternities had attempted to initiate Jewish and/or Black members only to be told by their national organizations that they could not do so. Even when the local chapters took their case against discrimination to the national conventions, their resolutions to end discrimination were usually defeated by the delegates (many of whom represented Southern chapters). Finally, in some cases, the local chapters disaffiliated from the nationals so they could have Jewish and/or Black members.<sup>31</sup> The issue died down a bit in the early and mid- 1950s as the veterans were replaced by the generally more complacent students of the McCarthy Era. In the late 1950s and 1960s, however, the push for an end to discrimination among greek organizations reached its peak. At Franklin and Marshall, the faculty (after three years of discussion) and the student government recommended to the Board of Trustees that the College act to help end discrimination in fraternities.<sup>32</sup> Finally, on June 3, 1960, the Board of Trustees issued the following statement.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees instruct the President of the College to inform the presidents of all chapters of national fraternities at Franklin and Marshall College that the Board of Trustees is opposed to charters requiring discrimination in the selection of fraternity members which is based on race or creed. The president of any fraternity chapter practicing

such discrimination prescribed by its charter together with the Dean of Students shall inform the national officers of the fraternity of the stated position of the Board of Trustees of Franklin and Marshall College.<sup>33</sup>

Over the past twenty-five years, the greek organizations at F&M and across the country have slowly eliminated racial and religious discrimination. In this regard, fraternities have probably kept pace with the rest of society in their attitudes towards Blacks and Jews. Today, those Jews and Blacks who join fraternities and sororities at F&M are spread fairly evenly among the chapters. However, most Black students do not choose to affiliate.

## V. The Heyday of Fraternities at F&M, 1948-1963

An average of 57.3 percent of Franklin and Marshall students belonged to fraternities each year between 1948-1963, and that figure never dropped lower than 53.4 per cent during that period.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, once students returned from World War II and reactivated the various chapters, the individual fraternities had relatively few problems in obtaining suitable housing and maintaining it properly, keeping membership at required levels, and dealing amicably with the community, the College, and their national fraternal offices. Indeed, as late as 1955, the Board of Trustees viewed favorably the idea of fraternities building or moving on to campus.<sup>35</sup> The fraternities also dominated the College's social life in this era, and, even while the College rapidly began to provide residential housing and dining services for an increasing number of students, fraternities continued to be important living alternatives as well as social groups. For example, Kappa Sigma and Pi Lambda Phi both moved into large and spacious quarters around 1960 (249 North Charlotte and 201 College Avenue, respectively) after spending several years searching for a good location.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, the chapters demonstrated admirable pride in their houses and kept them in good shape. Parties and other social events at the houses were primarily for brothers and their dates, and there were few if any noise complaints or destruction of fraternity property.

One of the reasons for the success of the fraternities in this period was the support of many faculty and alumni. In the 1947 Interfraternity Council (IFC) rush book, for example, each chapter proudly listed the Franklin and Marshall faculty who were members of their fraternity, a total of thirty-seven in all!<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, in the 1961-62 IFC booklet, Professor P. P. Martin wrote a lengthy and extremely positive statement about fraternities, including the following words of praise.

The eleven national fraternities on the campus of Franklin and Marshall College have as their principal purpose: to support and to further the educational process which is available to each student here. Everything else is subordinate to this cause.... In addition to this primary goal, fraternities have much more to offer the student. Living in close relationship with a small group of men, assuming the common responsibility of maintaining a small financial enterprise, cooperating in extracurricular activities, and sharing leisure hours together: all these things tend to produce a well-rounded citizen of the college community.<sup>38</sup>

Any freshman reading Professor Martin's words in 1961 could only think that the faculty supported the greek system.

This is not to say that members of the faculty and administration did not have their problems with the fraternities during this period. In addition to criticizing fraternity discrimination (see above), many faculty and administrators opposed hazing and the illegal use of alcohol, both of which were significant parts of fraternity life. For example, some faculty condemned the quasi-sadistic "Hell Week" activities which most fraternities utilized to bring their pledges into line just before initiation. In response, some of the fraternities had changed the name of their pre-initiation activities to "Construction Week" during the early 1950s, and, rather than spending time branding or paddling their pledges, they began to utilize them more in fixing up their chapter houses. Yet, stories of virulent hazing continued to circulate.<sup>39</sup> Alcohol was a constant problem, too. After World War II, although the College had called for prohibition of alcohol in the chapter houses, the fraternities continued to allow alcoholic beverages in the houses, and everybody knew it. In 1948-50, the College attempted a two-year experiment in which the IFC and the individual chapters were allowed to regulate alcohol in their own houses. The College determined that his policy was also not satisfactory, and, in 1950, prohibition was again in effect.<sup>40</sup> The fraternities stated reluctantly they would go along with the College; yet, fraternity alumni of that era are quick to point out that there was alcohol in the fraternities throughout the 1950s and 1960s.<sup>41</sup> Apparently the College closed its eyes to the problem, and the "decibel and decorum" rule was in effect (and still is), i.e., if activities involving the consumption of alcoholic beverages do not get loud or unruly, and if the outside world does not know what is happening, nobody will interfere with the activity.

Aside from these concerns with hazing and alcohol, the faculty, particularly during the administration of President Frederick deWolfe Bolman (1956-62), had become increasingly concerned about the academic life of the College and what many considered the over-emphasis on extracurricular activities, particularly athletics. The decisions in the late 1950s and early 1960s to no longer grant athletic scholarships and to introduce stiffer curricular and academic requirements were indications of the faculty's mood.<sup>42</sup> There were also signs that some fraternity activities were increasingly viewed in a negative light, because they were not, in the minds of many, supportive of the serious academic mission of the College. For example, the editorial in *The Student Weekly* of April 19, 1961 concluded:

F&M is in the process of a revolutionary transition. At one time the school was a ~~game~~ institution where studies were subordinate to fun. All that is changing now....This means that if athletics are to be strong on the F&M campus, then athletes must be good students. If fraternities are to operate, then fraternity men must emphasize academics.

This is the way we feel it should be.<sup>43</sup>

In April, 1961, a large number of students angrily voiced their displeasure about the College's decisions to apparently de-emphasize athletics and place fraternities under closer scrutiny. They demonstrated in front of the President's house, and later tossed eggs and tomatoes in Hensel Hall and built a bonfire on College Avenue.<sup>44</sup> It was a momentary reminder of the desire many students have to determine the character of their lives outside the classroom, and their willingness to demonstrate to maintain its importance.

## VI. The Decline of Fraternities at F&M, 1963-1979

Shortly after he was inaugurated as president, Keith Spalding (1963-83) asked that a committee



investigate student life at the College. The Klein Commission, as the group was called (after its chair, Professor Fred Klein), is remembered primarily for its recommendation that the College admit women.<sup>45</sup> However, the Commission also carefully examined the fraternity system (among other things), and made a number of important recommendations concerning greek organizations at Franklin and Marshall: (1) fraternities should modify their bidding system so that any student who wished to join a fraternity could do so and would not be excluded "because of his rejection as an individual"; (2) the "master/slave" relationship developed in some pledge programs and the "black-ball" system should both be eliminated; (3) fraternities should not be housed on campus; (4) the number of national fraternities should not be increased for the next five years; (5) chapters should consider the possibility of becoming locals; and (6) another study of student life and fraternities should be conducted in 1970-71 "to determine whether the place of fraternities in the life of the college community has changed, or should be altered."<sup>46</sup> It is very unlikely that such recommendations would have been considered ten or fifteen years earlier, and the reasons for the obvious change in the College's attitude towards fraternities between 1955 and 1965 was probably two-fold: (1) the faculty, as we have seen, was becoming increasingly serious about academic excellence and the over-emphasis on extracurricular activities; and (2) the College was becoming much less dependent on the fraternities to provide room and board for students due to the construction of College residence and dining halls in the 1950s and 1960s.

Five years later, the system was not re-evaluated. It is likely that the College did not care to undertake such a controversial assignment in 1970-71 at the same time that the institution was facing student disruptions, financial difficulties, and internal dissent.<sup>47</sup> On the other hand, it would have been quite revealing to have conducted such a study. Between 1965 and 1971, fraternity membership dropped precipitously on campus from 672 (45.5%) to 362 (24.5%).<sup>48</sup> Indeed, the fraternities never really recovered in the 1970s (some would argue that they still have not recovered) from the decline in interest among students and alumni during the period 1966-1979. Student attitudes changed markedly in this period, and fraternities did not have the same appeal to that generation of students as they had had previously. Students, particularly in the late 1960s and early 1970s, were egalitarian in their outlook, liberal in their politics, serious in their philosophy, and individualistic and anti-institutional in their lifestyles. Fraternities, on the other hand, appeared to stand for ritual, tradition, conservatism, conformity, elitism, "the establishment," and irrelevant frivolity. For many students, the past was corrupt, and traditions were tied to that past. Furthermore, the present was too important and serious to be wasted in such things as silly hazing rituals--who had time for paddling when the world was to be saved?<sup>49</sup>

The result, in short, was fewer fraternity members, less revenue, and deteriorating houses. Most important, there were not enough interested students to keep all of the houses going, and Sigma Pi, Phi Kappa Psi, Pi Lambda Phi, Phi Kappa Sigma, and Zeta Beta Tau all were forced to endure periods of inactivity or reorganization during the 1970s.<sup>50</sup> In each case, alumni relations were damaged. Furthermore, students of the 1960s and 1970s were rapidly developing a youth culture which emphasized drug use, sexual freedom, long hair, and bohemian dress, all of which was heartily disliked and repudiated by alumni, many faculty, and members of the community. This further separated the fraternities from their alumni. When some alumni returned to campus, they were dismayed at the condition of many of the houses. John Hicks (Class of 1934), for example, recently wrote: "The last time I visited the Sigma Pi house I was appalled by and ashamed of its condition, and came away broken-hearted. During my time at F&M (in the depth of the depression) we were forced to keep things up ourselves, and we kept the place spotless."<sup>51</sup> Phi Kappa Psi, for example, was in dismal shape in the fall of 1972 according to one of its

members: "As fraternal spirit declined, so did the physical structure. Phi Psi's boiler has only 10 per cent efficiency, there are grease fires in the stove, and the lights don't work right. The roof leaks considerably. When snow accumulates on the roof, or when it rains hard, so much water seeps through that fungus forms on the third floor. Take the rats, for example..."<sup>52</sup>

Aside from assisting Zeta Beta Tau in 1975-78 in securing use of the College's house at 611 College Avenue, and allowing the first sorority--Sigma Sigma Sigma--to organize in 1977-78, the College did very little to help greek organizations arrest the decline of the fraternity system in the 1970s.<sup>53</sup> In the mid-1970s, for example, President Keith Spalding wrote Dean Bradley Dewey that "at their distance, and with our too-casual attention to them, I agree, they don't represent what we admire."<sup>54</sup> Indeed, it was not until the late 1970s that President Spalding and the College, spurred on perhaps by the increasingly uncivilized behavior of several of the chapters, the legal liability of the College which might arise from hazing cases or other fraternity misconduct, and the growing interest in sororities, seriously began to address the problem of the greek organizations at Franklin and Marshall.<sup>55</sup>

## VII. The System in Crisis: Fraternities at F&M, 1979-84

At the September 12, 1979 Meeting of Overseers, President Spalding alerted the Board to a "series of social, managerial and legal problems" involving the fraternities:

In the last year, the fraternities have become the site of increasingly raucous and inappropriate behaviors. In addition, the fraternities have been subjected to increasing scrutiny from City Fire, Safety and Health inspectors due to the deteriorating condition of their properties. Finally, several of the fraternities have attracted the antipathy of the neighborhood in which their houses are located. The President stated that it was the policy of the College to counsel with the members of the houses in a variety of ways to attempt to effect improvements in conduct and other house policies. If such improvements are not forthcoming, it can be expected that College recognition of the offending fraternities will be withdrawn and the houses closed.<sup>56</sup>

In order to assist in this process of counseling chapters, effecting improvements, and withdrawing recognition when necessary, Spalding formed a standing committee--The Fraternity-Sorority Review Board. On November 8, 1979, Spalding wrote to each fraternity chapter reminding the members that the College was continually concerned "for the maintenance and enhancement" of the College's "learning environment" and that recognition of each chapter was "neither automatic or final." "Only those organizations," he wrote, "which demonstrably share and support the College's educational mission and regulations can expect recognition, and the continuation of the relationship must be subject to on-going evaluation according to clearly stated criteria and procedures." In general, those would include: "(1) [t]he extent to which the fraternity has demonstrated in positive ways its understanding and support of the College's educational mission; (2) [t]he extent to which the fraternity has assumed responsibility for the intellectual and social maturation of its individual members; and (3) [t]he extent to which the fraternity has exemplified the professed goals of brotherhood and responsibility to the community." The evaluation would be annually conducted by a Fraternity-Sorority Review Board (FSRB) which would make recommendations concerning recognition to the President. Each chapter was strongly encouraged to conduct a self-study, which the FSRB could use (along with a visit to the chapter house and information from the Administration) to help determine its recommendation.<sup>57</sup>

At first, the fraternities (and other students) were suspicious about the purposes of the FSRB; however, it soon became apparent that the FSRB was in place primarily to help greek organizations meet the expectations of the College, rather than recommend the elimination of chapters one by one.<sup>58</sup> For example, in 1980, the FSRB recommended against withdrawing College recognition of Lambda Chi Alpha, even though the Committee on Student Conduct, which had "cited a record of offenses over four semesters without constructive response," had urged such an action.<sup>59</sup> Indeed, as early as 1974 Lambda Chi Alpha's frequently outrageous behavior had been discussed by the Board of Trustees; the national and alumni organizations had intervened at that time to re-organize the chapter and throw out some of the worst offenders.<sup>60</sup> Apparently, things had not improved much, and although the FSRB recommended giving the chapter one more chance in 1980, the national organization placed the chapter on inactive status in the summer of 1980. The College followed this action by withdrawing recognition of the chapter, and implied that it would not consider offering recognition again until the Class of 1983 had graduated.<sup>61</sup> Members of the fraternity's alumni council, which owned the chapter house, sold the building to the

College in 1981 for \$90,000 (apparently out-bidding a group of young alumni who wanted to keep the group going). The College, in turn, renovated the building, re-named it the Wohlsen House, and moved the Admissions Office into the new facility in June, 1982.<sup>62</sup>

The FSRB, through its review process, continued to encourage improvement by the greek organizations in the early 1980s. In addition, the work of Assistant Dean Paul Leavenworth should be noted. Leavenworth tried valiantly (and with some success) to direct the fraternities toward reform, and, primarily due to his influence, the fraternities discussed curfews, ending open parties, curbing alcohol abuse, eliminating hazing, and increasing community awareness during the period 1980-83. Leavenworth conducted leadership workshops, attended an intensive training week for fraternity advisers, and lavished time and attention on the greek leaders. Yet, even with Leavenworth's direction and the help of the FSRB, most greeks were not eager to change their ways significantly. This was particularly true in regard to alcohol, as Leavenworth explained in December, 1981:

The current fraternity system is a very competitive system that has turned to alcohol-centered programming and open parties to attract prospective pledges. This type of programming has resulted in noise complaints, property damage, fights, and alcohol abuse....Because so much of rush is based on alcohol-centered programming and open parties, competition for bigger, wilder, and more frequent parties is on the rise. Many houses are now moving toward mid-week parties to help attract prospective pledges....As a result of this type of programming, many pledges have been attracted to specific houses because of their parties and not for more legitimate community service, and social responsibility.<sup>63</sup>

Moreover, the large, open, alcohol-centered parties (which had become increasingly common in the 1970s) were the cause of significant physical damage to the houses and an increasing number of complaints from neighbors in the early 1980s. In January, 1983, for instance, Phi Kappa Tau brothers closed down one of their parties after midnight when they discovered that "guests" had destroyed a toilet, ripped a thermostat out of the wall, punched a hole in the same wall, broken a window, and caused other damage. There were also fights with inebriated people who tried to enter the party, and, according to the College Reporter, damage of this kind was not uncommon at fraternity parties. Although several fraternity leaders were apparently somewhat chastened by these events, a straw vote at the IFC meeting several weeks later on the question of banning open parties resulted only in a 5-5 tie. Large, alcohol-centered, open parties continued officially until March, 1987, when the IFC voted to ban open parties (although the "closed" parties remain large).<sup>64</sup>

While the College was taking a much more critical look at fraternities, students were finding them increasingly to their liking. In the early 1970s, fraternity leaders could only entice 25-35 per cent of the men to join their organizations; by the late 1970s and early 1980s, membership was burgeoning to 50 per cent and more of the males.<sup>65</sup> The increased student interest in fraternities in the late 1970s and early 1980s should have provided great assistance to the greek system at the College, and, in some cases, it did. Zeta Beta Tau returned and became a strong chapter in the late 1970s. Phi Kappa Sigma was revived, and thrived until the mid-1980s. Pi Lambda Phi also found new life in the early 1980s when the chapter became the new home for men (football players, in particular) who would previously have joined Lambda Chi Alpha. Even Phi Kappa Psi, which remained small, had renewed hopes. On the other hand, some of the fraternities could not take advantage of the increased student interest in greek organizations during the

early 1980s. Sigma Pi, for instance, slowly fell apart in the early 1980s and could not keep its house from deteriorating.<sup>66</sup> When a small fire broke out at Sigma Pi on August 1, 1983, the fire department and health department entered the house and, shocked at the filth they discovered, quickly closed the house as "unfit for human habitation."<sup>67</sup> The chapter had squandered its money, and the national asked the College to buy the chapter house to ease the chapter's financial difficulties. After a good deal of discussion, the College agreed, and renovated the structure into cooperative coeducational housing for 22 students.<sup>68</sup> Although the College did not withdraw its recognition of Sigma Pi, the local chapter went inactive until it was revived by Laurence Robinson '85 in the spring of 1985; it currently operates as an unhooded fraternity with 25 members.

While Sigma Pi failed because of a lack of leadership, Phi Sigma Kappa was forced to leave campus because of a series of behavioral problems culminating in an alleged gang rape. In 1981-82 and 1982-83, the FSRB had warned Phi Sigma Kappa to improve its behavior, and had recommended that the chapter be recognized only conditionally.<sup>69</sup> The fraternity continued to claim that things were improving, while their behavior was problematic.<sup>70</sup> Finally, on April 17, 1983, an inebriated female student from Albright College apparently went to the chapter house and asked for sexual favors. The brothers obliged in "servicing her" as one alumnus has callously put it.<sup>71</sup> On May 10, 1983, President Spalding informed the chapter of his decision to withdraw recognition indefinitely.<sup>72</sup> Later, the College stated that the fraternity could ask for recognition again in the fall of 1986, after all the brothers had graduated. Although some of the fraternity's alumni were furious at Spalding's decision to withdraw recognition, apparently most alumni supported the College.<sup>73</sup> Unfortunately, several fires, which broke out in the chapter house in the fall of 1983, caused extensive damage (estimated at over \$100,000) to the inside of the house.<sup>74</sup>

College-fraternity relations, which had never been very good in the 1970s, were further strained in the 1980s by the demise of Lambda Chi Alpha, Sigma Pi, and Phi Sigma Kappa. Fraternities viewed the administration with increasing suspicion, and there was a feeling that the College was allowing (helping?) the fraternities to die off one by one. An issue which exacerbated poor College-fraternity relations between 1977 and 1982 was the question of board rebates for fraternity brothers who lived in residence halls but dined at the chapter houses. The College wanted all campus residents to eat all of their meals in the dining halls, while the fraternities desired that members and pledges eat in the houses. After a series of confrontations and compromises, it was determined that fraternity members who resided on campus would be allowed to eat all weekday meals in the houses, pledges could have weekday lunches there as well, and rebates would be granted by the College to the individuals.<sup>75</sup>

The greek system which President James Powell inherited on his arrival in the summer of 1983 was, therefore, characterized by large, open, alcohol-centered parties, internal decay, weak chapters, poor fraternity-College relations, neighborhood complaints, and serious behavioral problems.<sup>76</sup> He was informed that three of the College's eleven fraternities had disappeared since 1980, and that others were not in good shape. (Indeed, in the next two years, two fraternities were re-organized, one was unable to buy the house they had been leasing, and one was suspended for hazing.)<sup>77</sup> Interviews with Leavenworth, Dean Peter Balczunas, and others close to the fraternity scene convinced Powell that action must be taken.<sup>78</sup> Indeed, Richard Charles, the chair of the FSRB from its inception, argued that "the fraternity system could, with appropriate institutional support, become again a positive influence on student life at Franklin and Marshall, with most if not all houses performing in the upper range." He posited that the

"College now has no policy toward fraternities," and he believed the College would be "advantaged" if it eliminated open parties, ended hazing, demanded and helped encourage a strong advisory structure, developed clear guidelines for fraternity-College relations, and established expectations for behavior by the chapters.<sup>79</sup>

Powell was determined, based upon the evidence available, to treat the future of the greek system seriously. Indeed, he was concerned with the general character of student life at the College, and he decided to form a Commission on the Quality of Student Life (CQSL) to investigate all aspects of student life at Franklin and Marshall and make recommendations for improving it.<sup>80</sup> The CQSL was carefully chosen so that members represented all important College constituencies: faculty, staff, administrators, students (greek and non-greek), alumni, and trustees. The CQSL began to meet in the fall of 1983 and set up subcommittees, including one on fraternities and sororities. This subcommittee, chaired by Professor Richard Fluck, received letters and statements from alumni and other members of the College community, and held hearings on campus in February and March of 1984. While subcommittee members heard a number of faculty and students strongly condemn the College's greek organizations, they also received letters from alumni, and heard testimony from students, faculty, staff, and administrators urging them to retain the system.<sup>81</sup> The "polarization of the community" on this issue was noted by the CQSL.<sup>82</sup> Indeed, during the winter and spring of 1983-84, Dean Bradley Dewey and Professor Leon Galis wrote anti-fraternity tracts, and pro-greek students angrily attempted to refute arguments presented in favor of abolition.<sup>83</sup>

Finally, four of the six subcommittee members supported a report that recommended continued recognition of the fraternities and sororities, but that the system "undergo wide-ranging and specific reforms." One subcommittee member--Daniel Capristo '85, who, later that year, would win the Williamson Medal--wrote a minority report urging abolition of the system, and another member--Reverend Barbara Brummett--wrote a minority report favoring drastic reforms (tantamount to abolition in the eyes of some observers).<sup>84</sup> The full CQSL debated the three reports long into the night of Thursday, April 19, 1984. For a while, it appeared to some of the thirty or so members of the audience who witnessed the public debate in the Board Room on the second floor of Old Main that Capristo's eloquence might carry the day. However, at about 2:30 a.m., the CQSL cast seven votes for the majority report, four for Capristo's abolition report, and two for the Brummett option.<sup>85</sup>

The recommendations in the majority report of the fraternity and sorority subcommittee included a wide range of reforms: an end to open parties, a deferred dry rush, an improved advisory structure, an end to hazing and the abolition of "Hell Week" activities, improved leadership training, a strengthened IFC (which would include sorority leaders), greater alumni participation with the establishment by each chapter of a five-member alumni board, more emphasis on cultural and educational activities, an end to alcohol abuse, specific regulations to cover the greek system, and specific mechanisms to measure compliance with those regulations. The report also recommended that within five years the College buy all of the fraternities and that all fraternities should be on or adjacent to campus.<sup>86</sup>

In the spring of 1984, the Board of Trustees established an Ad Hoc Committee on Student Life, chaired by William Seachrist, which was asked to review the CQSL report and to present its own findings and recommendations to the Board of Trustees. The Committee established as its first priority "a thorough analysis of the fraternities and sororities," and interviewed key trustees from other selective liberal arts

colleges on important student life issues. The Committee agreed with the general tone of the CQSL Report, and it stated that "the status quo of fraternities at Franklin and Marshall College is not acceptable and must be changed, either by reforming substantially or replacing the fraternities."<sup>87</sup>

President Powell had carefully reviewed the CQSL recommendations, and he wanted to move quickly to inform greek leaders of the College's decisions regarding the CQSL Report. He shared the opinion stated initially by President Emeritus Spalding that fraternities and sororities must demonstrably support the College's educational and social missions and abide by its regulations (see page 10 above). Additionally, Powell believed that strict adherence to many of the major reforms proposed by the CQSL might produce such a result. In any case, he thought the fraternities and sororities should have a reasonable chance to meet the CQSL requirements and reform themselves. Once Powell knew that the Ad Hoc Trustee Committee and other key members of the Board also favored implementing many of the CQSL reforms, he wrote to each greek organization president on July 1, 1984 informing them of the new rules that would be in effect in the fall of 1984. Although the Trustee Ad Hoc Committee on Student Life would continue to meet and might make additional requirements of the greek organizations (or modify some expectations), it was important, Powell thought, to begin the reform process.<sup>88</sup>

In his letter to the greek presidents, Powell told them he took "very seriously indeed" the recommendations of the CQSL, and reminded them that every member of the CQSL had voted against maintaining the status quo regarding fraternities. Powell announced that some of the CQSL recommendations were readily acceptable and would go into effect immediately. These were: rush would be deferred to the spring and would be dry; hazing and "hell week" activities would be prohibited; parties would be closed, registered a week in advance, and have adequate supplies of non-alcoholic beverages and food available; and each house would include cultural, educational, and community events on its calendar. He concluded by reminding the fraternity leaders that "the College Community--not the Administration alone but the College Community--is speaking loudly and clearly to the fraternities. If Franklin and Marshall College is to continue to have fraternities, the only way it can happen is for the fraternities to become fully part of the college, and like all other parts, to conform to the principles, rules, and educational goals of the institution. There can be no other way."<sup>89</sup>

#### VIII. Has Reform Worked?: Fraternities and Sororities, 1984-87

During the summer of 1984, two new student life staff members, Vice President for Student Life Rita Byrne and Associate Dean of Students David Stameshkin, worked on a set of interim rules to guide the greek organizations through the deferred rush system in the 1984-85 academic year. These were sent to greek organization presidents in August.<sup>90</sup> The FSRB was reconstituted (it did not meet officially during the 1983-84 year), and, in the fall of 1984, assisted in the process of developing specific rules and interpretations of the reform requirements.<sup>91</sup> In the spring of 1985, after the Trustee Ad Hoc Committee had further discussed the CQSL recommendations, the Committee presented its report to the full Board of Trustees, and, on April 10, 1985, the Board accepted the report and the requirements for reform developed by the Committee.<sup>92</sup> The Committee's expectations included most of those stated in President Powell's July 1, 1984 letter, as well as a number of the other CQSL recommendations: each chapter would be required to eliminate alcohol and drug abuse, develop an adequate advisory structure (including a five-person alumni advisory board, faculty associate adviser, and chapter adviser), ensure that all building

and health codes would be met, and maintain an effective leadership training program, among other things.<sup>93</sup> In the fall of 1985, a list of these expectations was distributed widely to all Greek Council members, other greek leaders on campus, advisers, and national organizations.<sup>94</sup>

The reforms were greeted with anger, disdain, disbelief, and reluctant cooperation on the part of most fraternity leaders during the 1984-85 year (the sororities were much more cooperative and flexible, as usual). Many fraternity officers and members complained bitterly that the new deferred rush, dry rush, and shortened pledging periods were unworkable and/or would ruin the system. There was a good deal of illegal fraternity rushing in the fall, sometimes in the fraternity houses, but most often in apartment houses off-campus in which fraternity men lived. Dry rush was dry only in the fraternity houses; in those same apartments, the liquor flowed. Indeed, there was no significant attempt by the greek leaders to move on any of the reforms. For example, open parties continued, and alcohol abuse was commonplace. The original plan called for freshmen to stay out of fraternities entirely in the fall semester; however, in a compromise worked out by the FSRB, freshmen were allowed into chapter houses for two weekends in November. Each of the the fraternities was allowed to throw one party during that period, and they went to great lengths to impress the freshmen; the parties were incredibly crowded, and many underage students left the houses inebriated.<sup>95</sup>

Only one infraction of the rules was reported all year by the IFC Judicial Board. In January, 1985, Chi Phi had about thirty freshmen in their house for a party before rush had begun. The IFC Vice-President (a Kappa Sigma brother), who was at the party, called Dean Stameshkin at 1:15 a.m. and begged him to come down and identify the students so that the Vice-President would not have to be the one to bring charges against Chi Phi. Chi Phi was tipped off, however, and the freshmen escaped just before the dean arrived. The Vice-President was, therefore, forced to bring charges against Chi Phi, himself, if he wanted to make a case against them. After much thought, he decided to go ahead. Chi Phi was found guilty, and lost some of their rush privileges. The Vice-President, on the other hand, was ostracized by most of the greeks (and physically jostled on campus), and he lost any chance of becoming IFC president for the next year. In short, the fraternities were not eager to take responsibility for policing themselves.<sup>96</sup>

In the spring of 1985, President Powell asked the National Interfraternity Conference to send in several fraternity national executives to "review our system and the reforms and changes that we propose."<sup>97</sup> A three-man team arrived later that spring, spent two days at the College, and met with a variety of greeks and administrators. Unfortunately, one of the men, due to personal problems, was unable to complete his assignment, and the report was never completed.<sup>98</sup> While they were at the College, however, they were able to advise President Powell as he tried to determine how he should respond to the most serious violation of the reform guidelines he had yet encountered. On the night of April 5, 1985, several Pi Lambda Phi brothers "kidnapped" one of their pledges, took him to a birthday party in an off-campus apartment, forced him to drink an undetermined amount of alcohol (eight shots and some beer, perhaps), drove him out into the country, and left him in a darkened corn field (next to a dangerous road with no shoulders) with his hands tied loosely. The student was apprehended by police after he tried to obtain help at a highly-secured facility in Manheim Township. While being transported to the College, he revealed the whole story to a police officer.<sup>99</sup> The College community was outraged by such conduct, and College officials seriously considered withdrawing recognition permanently from the chapter. The College finally accepted the proposals of the Pi Lambda Phi national office, and the chapter was



suspended for one semester. However, in a strongly worded letter of May 9, 1985, President Powell warned all fraternity leaders that the next hazing incident would most likely result in immediate and permanent withdrawal of recognition.<sup>100</sup>

During the 1985-86 year, there was some progress made by the greek organizations in conforming to the College's expectations. Most of the chapters worked with John Overdurf, the College's drug and alcohol consultant, in developing programs to combat drug and alcohol abuse among their members. Yet, the parties remained open and alcohol-centered, for the most part, and little was done to limit risk. Several chapters made concerted efforts to obtain a better advisory structure, fix up their houses, and/or begin educational and cultural programming. The Alumni Board, which had set up a Special Committee on Student Life in 1985, was particularly helpful in assisting the fraternity chapters in identifying potential alumni board members and chapter advisers. With the assistance of the Alumni Office, the Special Committee sent letters to all greek alumni asking if they would be willing to help the local chapters. The responses were forwarded to each local chapter for their use.<sup>101</sup> Yet, as late as the spring of 1987, many chapters still did not have a five-member alumni advisory board in place.

Indeed, from the fall of 1985 to the spring of 1987, most greek leaders (and nearly all their members) apparently did not believe the College would abolish fraternities and sororities. Moreover, they did not take seriously the reform proposals, and, for the most part, only did what they absolutely had to do (shorten pledging programs, stop rushing openly, hold a couple of educational programs, and write some "paper policies" on stopping drug and alcohol abuse) so that things would "look" like they were changing. On the other hand, deferred rush meant shortened pledge programs, and that, in itself, was a major change in the system. Still, illegal rushing was common, and in the fall of 1986, at the request of a fraternity president who was trying to keep his brothers from rushing, Dean Stameshkin visited a party at an off-campus apartment at 10:50 p.m. When the door was opened, the dean saw about 30 freshmen and 30 Zeta Beta Tau brothers enjoying some beer (apparently purchased by ZBT) and Monday Night Football. Other reports of freshmen dining and partying in off-campus apartments leased by fraternity men were common. Although Dean Stameshkin constantly warned the fraternities about these activities, the fraternity leaders responded that they were unable to control their brothers, and, since everybody else was doing it, they had to do such things, too!<sup>102</sup> On another matter, continual faculty complaints about mid-week fraternity parties and their adverse affects upon student performance and attendance in classes reached a new high in the spring and fall of 1986, and some faculty pressed the College to ban mid-week parties. The fraternity mid-week parties had no curfews, and some people stayed until 2:30 a.m. or later. A compromise was reached in which the parties would have to end at 1:00 a.m. and no alcohol would be served after 12:30 a.m. Unfortunately, Chi Phi was apparently not willing to accept the compromise, and, after their parties consistently went past the curfew, they were punished by the IFC Judicial Board. In addition, the IFC agreed to ban drinking games at fraternity parties.<sup>103</sup>

Finally, in the spring semester of 1987, for the first time, it appeared that the greeks were taking the reform process seriously. The annual Franklin and Marshall Greek Leadership Conference in January was well attended, ten greek leaders attended the Northeast Interfraternity/Panhellenic Conferences in Philadelphia in March, and two of them were elected regional officers of these organizations.<sup>104</sup> Moreover, David Coyne '87, IFC president, went out of his way to push every chapter toward compliance with each of the reforms mandated by the Trustees. (Indeed, Coyne requested that the Trustees conduct their review in the spring of 1987.) In addition, the new fraternity presidents elected in

the winter and spring of 1987 were all members of the Classes of 1988 or 1989, all of whom were in high school when the CQSL met. Since they do not remember the old system, they tend to be less angry and confrontational about the reform process. That is not to say they are not upset about the possibility of abolition, only that they tend to accept reform more readily. For example, in February and March of 1987, the IFC, after much debate, finally voted to end open parties, and most chapters began to tighten up their security systems and party management procedures.

Just when many people began to believe the fraternities were moving toward real reform, the superficial nature of much of the progress was revealed by an incident at Pi Lambda Phi. At 4:00 a.m., Sunday, February 22, 1987, a fight broke out in the basement of Pi Lambda Phi fraternity after an inebriated freshman pledge, who was tending bar, threw a beer in the face of a guest. The fight started again outside, and when the guest and his friends verbally and physically assaulted several friends of the Pi Lam brothers, the fraternity members poured out onto College Avenue, across from St. Joseph's Hospital, and a brawl ensued. Seven people were arrested, and the guest was beaten up pretty badly.<sup>105</sup> The IFC Chief Justice found the fraternity blameless; the FSRB, however, conducted a thorough investigation, and recommended heavy sanctions against the chapter.<sup>106</sup> The FSRB concluded that "an incident such as this jeopardizes the existence of the fraternity, and, indeed, the entire fraternity system."<sup>107</sup> Furthermore, the FSRB and many people in the College community were discouraged at the lack of progress demonstrated by Pi Lambda Phi in meeting the reform requirements, and many recalled the Pi Lambda Phi hazing incident which had occurred just two years before. Finally, on May 19, 1987, President Powell, after consultation with various College officials, announced that the College had withdrawn its recognition from the Pennsylvania Tau Omega chapter of Pi Lambda Phi fraternity. He informed the local chapter that they could apply for recognition in one year, and that if they wished to regain such recognition they (1) must not use the chapter house and property to support the operation of a "shadow" Pi Lambda Phi chapter, or in any other way operate as a fraternity in the interim; and (2) must prepare a statement of how they would conduct themselves differently in the future.<sup>108</sup> The national Pi Lambda Phi organization was infuriated that the College had withdrawn recognition from the Pennsylvania Tau Omega chapter and had rejected the national's proposal to reorganize the chapter. They wrote Powell that they would not pull the chapter's charter, and, in the fall of 1987, when the local chapter decided by a 55-0 vote to flout the authority of the College and to operate as an unrecognized fraternity in 1987-88, the national supported them.<sup>109</sup>

The sororities, meanwhile, have, for the most part, met the expectations of the College and, particularly during the past two years, become a strong force apart from the fraternities. Indeed, one of the most important developments in student life in the past ten years has been the increased interest in sororities among our female students. In the mid-1970s, Amy Morris '78 and Shevaun Keough '78 and a number of other women worked for nearly three years to establish the first sorority, Sigma Sigma Sigma, which received its national charter on April 11, 1978.<sup>110</sup> The sorority usually attracted about thirty women, and, after a few years, there was some interest in bringing a second national sorority onto campus. After an embarrassing misunderstanding with Alpha Sigma Alpha in 1979-80, the College permitted a group of women-- the Omega Society--to affiliate with Alpha Phi in the spring of 1981.<sup>111</sup> After Alpha Phi was granted its official charter in April, 1982, the competition between the two groups helped further interest in sororities. Still, combined membership did not rise above 70, and Sigma Sigma Sigma had begun the process of finding a house in which they could live and operate the organization. They were hopeful that such an addition would also increase the popularity of the sorority. In the fall of 1981, they

attempted to secure the house at 548 West James (now the College's French House), but were denied because they could not meet the parking requirements.<sup>112</sup> In 1983-84, they were granted guaranteed housing for their sisters on a residence hall floor, but they continued to hope for better accommodations.<sup>113</sup>

By the fall of 1984, however, Sigma Sigma Sigma's membership had dwindled to only nine, and their leadership feared the sorority would soon cease to exist. At the same time, a group of fifteen sophomore women (Class of 1987) petitioned to start a new sorority. The College convinced the women to resuscitate Sigma Sigma Sigma, instead. They agreed (reluctantly at first, due to the dwindling size of the group), and within three years, had built membership up to 90, secured a leased house at 442 West James, and had won the prestigious award for best Sigma Sigma Sigma chapter in the nation (awarded every three years). At the same time, Alpha Phi also was thriving, and, in the fall of 1985, two local groups also formed with the hope of affiliating with national sororities. The College decided they would allow one of the groups, The Third Edition, to affiliate first since most of its members were sophomores, while the other group was primarily freshmen. In the spring of 1986, after a year-long process, The Third Edition and the College chose Chi Omega as the national sorority with which the Third Edition would affiliate. In 1986-87, Chi Omega initiated nearly one hundred members, and by the spring of 1987, when Chi Omega received its charter, all three sororities were nearing that size. A Panhellenic Council was formally constituted in the fall of 1986, and sororities were suddenly a major force on campus.<sup>114</sup> Furthermore, the sororities have caused few problems and seem to be operating in an efficient and careful manner. They are concerned that the fraternities, which they perceive to be disorganized and prone to behavioral problems, will bring the sororities down with them, and they are constantly frustrated in their attempts to convince the men to mend their ways.

In the fall of 1987, several fraternities, influenced by recent legal cases and faculty concerns over College liability for fraternity parties, have seriously considered not serving minors, stamping hands at the door, and implementing other ways of complying with Pennsylvania State Law. The combination of increased liability, continuing pressure from faculty and administrators, and the simple fact that the Trustees' decision on the future of greek organizations is no longer three years away have all had their impact on the fraternities. There is no question that, generally speaking, greek organizations have changed somewhat for the better in the past three years; the question is whether enough chapters have changed sufficiently to assure the rest of the College community that fraternities and sororities have been restored "to a position of positive influence on the campus" and should be a part of the College's future.<sup>115</sup>