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**I. Introduction**

On Friday, February 24, 1984, the Trustees of Amherst College met at the Plaza Hotel in New York City to consider a report by an Ad Hoc Committee charged with examining the social life of the College.[[1]](#endnote-2) The Ad Hoc Committee had concluded that the social life of the College had become deficient, and that fraternities, which for generations had been the bedrock of Amherst’s social scene, were to blame.[[2]](#endnote-3) In truth, the Trustees had been considering the “Fraternity Question” for many years. Weighing the evidence provided to them by the Ad Hoc Committee, the College administration, the Alumni Council, the Faculty, the College Council and the Inter-fraternity Council, the Trustees convened at nine in the morning to reach a final verdict on the future of fraternities. Three and a half hours later, they had unanimously passed the Trustee Resolution on Fraternities.[[3]](#endnote-4) The Trustees had concluded that Greek-life organizations had contributed to “the diminution of quality of life” at the College, and that these organizations, “lack the capacity to perform a central and positive role in creating and building a new vision of campus life.”[[4]](#endnote-5) Thus, with one swift stroke, the College ended a relationship with fraternities spanning a century and a half.

How did it come to this? The mission statement of Psi Upsilon, a fraternity pushed off-campus by this decision, states that the purposes of the organization include leadership training, character development, mutual support and broadening horizons for its members.[[5]](#endnote-6) Taking this statement at face value, it seems as though the College might have just as well banished the Boy Scouts of America.

If popular imagination can be trusted, there are few organizations for which the gulf between ideals and practice is greater. Alcoholism, misogyny, and anti-intellectualism are far more likely to be associated with the modern fraternity than “character development” or “leadership training.”

To be sure, this characterization, fair or unfair, informed the debates about fraternities that consumed the campus in the years before the final Trustee Resolution. In truth, this depiction of fraternities remains a reason that college after college has considered following the example of Amherst and eliminating these organizations. The goal of this paper is to revisit the “Fraternity Question” at Amherst. But, this paper should not be regarded as a judgment on the Trustee decision at Amherst. As I explain later in the paper, there existed certain extenuating circumstances that informed the Trustee decision and rendered the case of Amherst unique from that of other colleges. However, through the lens of Amherst’s experience, I hope to offer some conclusions regarding the merits of various arguments, philosophical and tangible, commonly raised against fraternities.

This process proceeds in three parts. First, I consider the history of fraternities, both generally and at Amherst in order to contextualize the organizations that I will evaluate in the subsequent sections. Next, I proceed to consider the claim raised by the Amherst College faculty that there exists an irreconcilable gulf between the ideals of the university and the fraternity. In the final section, I use a variety of empirical models and primary-source evidence to test the tangible claims that fraternities “contributed to the diminution of campus life.”[[6]](#endnote-7) Though, this paper cannot address the full breadth of complaints raised in response to fraternities, I hope that it will provide an assessment of some of the most common issues, and in doing so, encourage a more informed and analytical discourse on the role of fraternities, and more generally, the role of residential and social life in affecting the experience of students at college.

**II. History: Fraternities and the College on the Hill**

The history of the modern college fraternity begins two hundred miles from Amherst at Union College. On November 25, 1825, five students, all of whom had been members of a recently dissolved military company banded together to form Kappa Alpha, a “society for literary and social purposes.”[[7]](#endnote-8) The group met the next day to perform a formal imitation ceremony. By the middle of December they would initiate eight more members. The College fraternity had been born.

In 1831, Sigma Phi, one of two fraternities to be established at Union in the wake of Kappa Alpha, opened a second chapter at Hamilton College. In doing so, Sigma Phi became the first “national fraternity,” that is to say, the first of these societies to open chapters at multiple schools. Soon, other fraternities joined Sigma Phi in expanding. [[8]](#endnote-9) It would not be long until these organizations spread north to Amherst.

The first to arrive at the College, Alpha Delta Phi, evolved from existing secret societies. According to an official history, “[Alpha Delta Phi] was soon joined by others, all dedicated to furthering the intellectual growth of their members.”[[9]](#endnote-10) To understand how and why these secret fraternities spread so quickly, it is necessary to contextualize the colleges that hosted them.

In the 18th Century, the American College remained an institution governed by its original mission of training students for the ministry. The typical college curriculum consisted of Latin, Greek and mathematics with a “cursory view of science and some moral philosophy and belles letters as the capstone.” [[10]](#endnote-11)For students who sought employment outside of the clergy, this curriculum was simply inadequate. This gulf between the needs of students and the curriculum of the university resulted in the formation of literary societies where members could read and discuss modern literature, as well as practice their rhetorical skills. The social benefits of such a society were, at first, incidental.[[11]](#endnote-12)

At the same time, the relationship between students and faculty was tenuous. Students were subjected to a rigid schedule with tight restrictions on when they were to be in bed, and when they were to rise for chapel. The fraternity, though it borrowed the literary and social aspects of the Greek-letter literary societies sanctioned by the faculty (among them, Phi Beta Kappa), offered certain benefits that its predecessors could not—among these: “their [smaller] size, their exclusivity and their secrecy.”[[12]](#endnote-13)

Naturally, the very things that made the early fraternities attractive to new members were the things that most worried the faculty. President Francis Wayland of Brown University complained that the fraternities met outside of the watchful eye of the faculty, “I would incomparably rather resign my place,” he wrote, “than allow young men the right to meet in secret when they choose without the knowledge of the faculty.”[[13]](#endnote-14)

President Matt Hopkins of Williams, meanwhile, was concerned by the effect that these societies had on individual students, “The social, moral and religious influences have been modified with the state of feeling at different times, but on the whole my opinion is that they have been evil […].” Furthermore, Hopkins was concerned with the divisive nature of the groups, “They create class and factions, and put men socially in regard to each other into an artificial and false position. Their tendency is to lead men to associate only with a small number with whom they may have been thrown by accident and to narrow their intellect and their feelings.” [[14]](#endnote-15)

President Hitchcock of Amherst had similar concerns to those of his peers. But, despite his efforts, the fraternity system grew entwined with the very roots of the College. By 1860, 42 of 48 graduating seniors were fraternity brothers.[[15]](#endnote-16) The spectacular growth of fraternities necessitated new spaces for their meetings. In 1875, Alpha Delta Phi led the way, purchasing the first fraternity house. With this move, a new era had begun for fraternities—the Fraternity House was born.[[16]](#endnote-17)

Between 1828 and 1912, Amherst had built only one new residence hall. At the same time, eleven fraternities followed the example of Alpha Delta Phi by acquiring houses. [[17]](#endnote-18) As a matter of necessity, and because they were more attractive than the few existing college dorms, fraternities gradually took a greater and greater role in providing housing to students. In doing so, they rendered themselves essential to the function of the College.

By World War II, however, the fraternity system was perceived to be in crisis. When the war came, so many students were under military orders that the fraternities were unable to attract a large enough membership to stay open. [[18]](#endnote-19) The Office of Fraternity Business Management, established by Amherst President Stanley King in 1936, was forced to rent out the houses as barracks and dormitories.[[19]](#endnote-20) When the war came to a close, many segments of the campus community believed that the fraternities should remain shuttered. The moment, they argued, offered an unprecedented, and potentially unrepeatable, opportunity to break with the past.

A faculty committee concerned with proposing long-range post-war policy recommended that they not be permitted to reopen. A five-man alumni committee concurred, and wrote, “The majority finds little in the recent fraternity tradition or character calculated to give assurance that fraternities at Amherst can be made important supports and leaders toward intellectual interests and attainments.”[[20]](#endnote-21) The Fraternity Business Management office, however, succeeded in convincing the Trustees that the system, which had proven so valuable to the Amherst of old, could be revitalized and reclaimed.[[21]](#endnote-22) Between 1945 and 1946, the Trustees issued two statements calling for radical reform. Under the new system, the Trustees abolished freshmen rush (though it was reinstated in 1948), ended dining within fraternity houses, required the reduction of dues to make fraternity membership less social-class-dependent and placed the discipline of fraternities under the control of a newly established House Management Committee. Notably, they also voted to require that each fraternity end any prohibitions against race, color or creed.[[22]](#endnote-23)

These reforms created a period of relative calm between the administration and the fraternities. So much so, that in 1957, an Ad Hoc Committee for the Board of Trustees concluded that the fraternities had responded positively to the challenges of the previous decade and that they should, “be continued as the basic social and living arrangement for the three upper classes.”[[23]](#endnote-24)

In 1961, the College offered the Fraternities the option of selling their houses to the College, and leasing them back. This proposal offered many tax advantages to the fraternities, as well as the promise of college maintenance for the buildings.[[24]](#endnote-25) Yet, as each fraternity elected to accept the College’s offer, the relationship between the College and the fraternities was subtly, but fundamentally, altered. For the first time, the fraternities were officially under the control of the College—and, as a result, radical reform was possible. This set the stage for a confrontation between the pro-fraternity House Management Committee and the anti-Fraternity Faculty Sub-Committee on Student Life. [[25]](#endnote-26)

The Trustees met in June of 1966 to consider the competing claims and decided on a middle ground. They concluded that some fraternities were, “like the men who comprise them, diverse.” And, at their best, brought “together persons of varied background and interests in a comradely relationship that enriches all who share it. Without diminishing individuality, it can provide training in achieving harmony.”[[26]](#endnote-27) But, they also noted that too often, this was not the case: “A fraternity can dull as well as sharpen […] community of interest may prove in actuality to be no more than a low common denominator,” and that, “fraternity members can debase the College by their gross disrespect toward others.”[[27]](#endnote-28) Noting this wide gulf in the behavior of fraternities, the Trustees concluded that no overwhelming case had been established to either laud or abolish the fraternity system. They were, however, confident that continued reform might lead to a more ideal system.

**III. Clash of Values? Fraternities and the Ideals of Liberal Education**

If their later actions can be taken as any indication, they would be bitterly disappointed. Less than twenty years after re-affirming the Amherst fraternity system, the Trustees unanimously concluded that fraternities were no longer a tenable system, and should therefore be abolished.[[28]](#endnote-29) This action marked the culmination of an unprecedented debate about the future of the College. It is, perhaps, surprising, that the Trustees were extremely vague in their condemnation of the fraternity system.[[29]](#endnote-30) Nevertheless, by delving into the discussions among students, faculty and alumni, it is possible to understand and evaluate the various debates which informed the Trustee decision.

Before addressing more tangible concerns, it is necessary to assess whether or not a fraternity system—even an ideal one free from abuses—has any place in elite institutions of higher education. In this section, I will examine claims of inconsistencies between the mission of fraternities and the mission of universities that were raised in the debate at Amherst. A close analysis proves that the objectives of the two organizations are not mutually exclusive, but instead, can, in fact, be complementary.

The philosophical challenge to fraternities consists primarily of the proposition that fraternities are inherently opposed to the values of open inquiry ideally fostered in the College. This proposition relies on three claims articulated in the “Report of the Administration to the Committee on Campus Life,” “Members of the Faculty and the Administration […] have observed for four decades contradictions between the emphasis on openness, rigorous inquiry and accountability in the classroom and the apparent secrecy, unquestioning acceptance and lack of personal responsibility professed and practiced by many fraternity members and fraternal organizations.” [[30]](#endnote-31) The philosophical problem with fraternities, they argue, is a consequence of the “secrecy, unquestioning acceptance and lack of personal responsibility” which is considered inseparable from these organizations. We will, therefore, examine each of these claims in turn.

First, the Faculty and the Administration of the College correctly identify secrecy as an essential element of the fraternity system. But, secrecy, in-and-of-itself needs not be opposed to the mission of the College. To this end, it is instructive to consider what type of secrecy fraternities actually employ, and the function of this secrecy.

Fraternity secrecy has two dimensions: nominal and actual. Nominal secrecy concerns the rituals and secrets of the society, but as Nicholas Syrett explains, “the ‘‘secrets’’ possessed by one group [are] remarkably similar to those possessed by their arch-rivals (usually something about loyalty and honor and the mysticism that surrounded [their] mottoes).” [[31]](#endnote-32)This nominal secrecy, however, has a function in laying the foundation for actual secrecy concerning the activities of brothers. Syrrett, summarizing the writings of Georg Simmel, argues that this nominal secrecy builds loyalty and “lays the foundation for the ability to keep further secrets that may arise around the actions and behaviors of various members or groups of members.”[[32]](#endnote-33)

Actual secrecy, however, is more important in the day-to-day operations of a fraternity. Before addressing criticisms of secrecy, it may be instructive to consider the reason fraternities foster it among members. As the Lambda Chi Fraternity discusses in its pledge-essay, “Why Secrecy?,” secrecy is inherent to any number of benign social institutions. Because fraternities are fond of using the name “brother” to describe members, the most obvious parallel can be drawn to a family. “A family’s income, children’s problems at school, the intimate relationship between a man and a woman, the contents of one’s last will— all these things we naturally choose to keep within the bosom of the family and would not care to have them made public.”[[33]](#endnote-34) Secrecy, in this respect, is tantamount to a less-insidious word: trust. And, in this way, the fraternity may actually be constructive for its members. By cloaking their actions and thoughts in a fraternal secrecy, members often feel comfortable discussing problems within the fraternity that they might only discuss with the closest of friends or family. This institutionalization of trust cannot be understood as an inherent evil, and it should not be viewed as necessarily more destructive to the College’s mission than families or other close relationships.

Nevertheless, critics maintain that fraternal secrecy can be destructive. According to the minutes of the faculty debate over fraternities, Professor O’Connell, noted that several of, “his advisees came to him last year with stories of a scandalous nature of the frats but could not discuss them openly because they were ‘terrified of retaliation.’”[[34]](#endnote-35) These negative consequences of secrecy can be reduced to the second criticism of the fraternity system—that it encourages a lack of personal responsibility.

The mission of a fraternity, of course, is not to instruct its members in the abdication of personal responsibility. Instead, the fraternity seeks to foster a sense of collective responsibility, and encourages members to take responsibility not only for their actions but also for the actions of all members. Collective and individual responsibility are not mutually exclusive. Nevertheless, assured of secrecy, and perhaps, convinced that the fraternity will assume responsibility for any individual wrong-doing, fraternity members may be inclined to commit acts they otherwise never would.

If, as occurred at Amherst, fraternity members were involved in gross misconduct, the College then faced the question of whether to discipline the organization in addition to the students. Despite extolling the virtues of collective responsibility, many brothers complained whenever the administration sought to sanction the fraternity. This response, however, represents a failure on the part of fraternity members to internalize the values of their organization. As President Armour Craig noted during a Faculty debate at Amherst, “It’s not a fraternity if you can’t be your brothers’ or sisters’ keepers.”[[35]](#endnote-36) This situation, in-and-of-itself, does not prove that fraternities cannot foster both individual and collective responsibility. It does, however, suggest that the administration of the College must work with the fraternities to establish a clear policy on how organizations will be sanctioned for the actions of their members. If structured properly, these policies will not only re-enforce individual responsibility, but also re-enforce the values that fraternities claim to espouse.

The final of the three criticisms argues that fraternities are liable to foster unquestioning acceptance. Yet, the faculty of Amherst offer very little to substantiate this claim for the College. It might be argued that any group, and especially those with a pretension to developing the morals or characters of its members might be liable to push a group character on to the individual, but if such activity is a universal consequence of social groups, than it is difficult to condemn a fraternity anymore than one might condemn any other group. What warrants consideration, then, is whether the group is instilling moral values that can be described as acceptable to the host institution or if the actions of its members suggest otherwise.

Thus, none of the three claims of the faculty stands up to strict scrutiny. Fraternities are secret, but this secrecy does not necessarily need to be destructive, and in fostering close bonds of trust, may in fact be useful to the development of students. Fraternities do emphasize collective responsibility, but this value, if actually upheld, can be a strong complement to the value of individual responsibility taught in the College. And, finally, the claim that fraternities foster unquestioning acceptance is simply unsupported by any evidence that could not also be offered to condemn any social or extracurricular group. As a result, we can conclude that fraternities are not philosophically incongruent with the liberal arts college.

**IV: Fraternities in Fact: Tangible Effects of the Fraternity System at Amherst**

A compatibility of ideals is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for proving that a fraternity system can be a successful method of organizing social and residential life in institutions of higher education. On a tangible level, there exist several concerns about the fraternity system. In this section, I will endeavor to explore some perceived shortcomings and abuses of the Amherst College fraternity system. Specifically, I will assess claims that the fraternities at Amherst were anti-intellectual, that they were divisive and re-enforced cliques, that they engaged in a uniquely cruel form of hazing and, finally, that fraternities treated their College-owned houses with contempt—resulting in a disproportionate amount of property damage within these fraternity houses.

As colleges are primarily academic institutions, the criticism that fraternities are anti-intellectual is particularly important, and thus should be dealt with first. To begin with, it bears mentioning that there has always, and continues to exist a manifest tension in the academic and social lives of students in college. In ideal, the university is a place of academia, but in popular imagination, it is also a place of beer, sex and parties. The elimination of fraternities at Amherst has in no way eliminated the tension between these extremes. There remains a considerable divide in how a students acts in the classroom and how he acts at the beer-pong table. Nevertheless, because fraternities played such a large role in the extracurricular lives of students, and because institutions are easier to police than individuals, it is worth asking how fraternities figured into the academic life of the College.

In the decades before the Trustee decision, fraternities were a powerful academic force. A 1965 report prepared by the House Management Committee for the Trustees accuses critics of being misinformed, ““The charge of being anti-intellectual is usually broadened, when fraternities are being castigated, into lack of worth while activities; the fraternities are held up as organizations of a playboy nature, a relic of the past when a gentleman’s “C” average was the aim of most members and serious purpose was practically unheard of.”[[36]](#endnote-37) The report goes on to enumerate the contributions made by the various fraternities in recent years. One fraternity planned two trips to New York-- the first of these to see a controversial play, and the second, for a trip to the New York Philharmonic.. And, all of them, the report notes, provided each member with two daily newspapers—the New York Times Another fraternity regularly held faculty seminars, while yet another sponsored a classic film series. Three others hosted charity programs for underprivileged children in the community. The fraternities, they argue, also stimulated interaction between students and faculty. Every guest speaker, the HMC points out, was entertained at a fraternity after their lecture and, as a result, made available to speak with students and faculty. Two fraternities held annual cook-outs open to students and faculty. Yet, another was responsible for publishing Scrutiny, the course evaluation magazineand a local publication, as well as an average of five magazines ranging from Playboy to the Saturday Review of Literature.[[37]](#endnote-38) Indeed, the fraternities of the 1960s were, at least officially, surprisingly intellectual institutions.

But, the system had deteriorated by the 1980s. Even the Inter-Fraternity Council report, clearly the most pro-fraternity report presented to the Trustees, could not claim the laundry list of academic contributions that the House Management Committee was able to offer twenty years earlier. The IFC claimed that the fraternities hosted faculty sponsored lectures in the 1982-1983 academic year. Yet, President Armour Craig, in the notes submitted with this report to the Trustees, is quick to point out that only one house, Phi Gamma Chi, sponsored one lecture, and that alcohol education lectures (which the IFC takes credit for) were actually part of a sanction against Delta Kappa Sigma.[[38]](#endnote-39) As a result, by the time of the Trustee decision, no claim could be made that Amherst’s fraternities furthered the intellectual interests of their members in any organized way.

Nevertheless, had the Administration clearly articulated the ways in which it believed that fraternities should supplement the classroom education of their members, the parties might have been able to reach an agreement. It remains eminently possible that many fraternities would have still failed to live up to their end of such a bargain. Still, such an accord would have at least provided a mutually acceptable criterion by which to judge Amherst’s Greek-lettered organizations.

Fraternities, critics also maintained, were responsible for fostering the partying culture at Amherst. While this was certainly a function of fraternities, it seems questionable to hold them responsible for a social scene that endures to the present day. Blaming the fraternities for hosting parties is tantamount to blaming social dormitory residents for the College’s present partying. Unfortunately, any attempt to evaluate whether the fraternities truly fostered a more bacchanalian culture than its eventual replacement is impossible. To begin with, the challenge in comparing attitudes about drinking and sex over a time horizon as expansive as three decades is formidable. The effort is further complicated by the fact that Massachusetts increased the legal drinking age from 18 to 20 in 1979, and 20 to 21 in the same year that the College abolished fraternities.[[39]](#endnote-40) Changes in the party culture would just as likely have resulted from this change in the availability of alcohol as from the transformation in the school’s social structure.

Yet, the fraternities may have had a secondary academic utility. As Austin Sarat wrote for the College Council in his 1983 Report to the Trustees, “We can accept,” he wrote, “neither the proposition that fraternities should duplicate the life or work of the classroom nor the idea that ‘intellectual interests and attainments’ adequately express the College’s goals.”[[40]](#endnote-41) The Inter-Fraternity Council expanded on this point in their report to the Trustees, “Fraternities provide a social atmosphere that increases each member’s circle of friends. In doing so, they do not, in any way, diminish the intellectual life of their members.”[[41]](#endnote-42)

Fraternities are often criticized for fostering or re-enforcing divisive cliques that split an otherwise inclusive campus community into artificial segments. Yet, a second countervailing thought argues that the fraternity may create artificial communities, but if structured properly, it brings together students from different interests and backgrounds. Like a micro-version of the College itself, it thus provides an opportunity for students to meet and become friendly with peers decidedly different from themselves. In this way, the fraternity social group may be preferable to those created from a single shared interest or through random factors like dorm proximity. At least one alumni, DKE ‘78E, recalled that “the diversity of DKE was a great plus for me.”[[42]](#endnote-43)

In order to assess this claim, I studied a document prepared for potential rushing students in 1963 that describes the extracurricular involvement of each fraternity.[[43]](#endnote-44),[[44]](#footnote-2) While extracurricular involvement does not necessarily equate to social groups, each of the former Amherst fraternity members interviewed stated that their friends from outside the fraternity came from shared academic or extracurricular interests. Therefore, we can infer that shared extracurricular involvement strongly correlates with social groups. If a fraternity’s members all participated in similar extra-curricular activities, we could conclude that the fraternity re-enforces existing cliques. However, if the evidence suggests that a fraternity has a representative cross sample of a wide variety of extra-curricular involvement in its membership, then this would imply that fraternities cut across existing cliques in order to foster a social group with relatively diverse intellectual interests—a desirable outcome.

My analysis began by finding the percentage of each fraternity’s extra-curricular involvement in each of five classes of activities: sports; publications; theater and music; outdoor activities; and pre-law, debate and student government.

Analyzing the data in this way revealed two seemingly contradictory trends. First, nine out of the thirteen fraternities had significant over-representation in one class of activity (defined as approximately twice the average percentage of participation in all fraternities). This evidence suggests that most fraternities would have had a strong presence within one of these domains and thus, it is likely that each of these fraternities would have had a reputation as either a “Sports House,” an “Arts House,” or something similar. Indeed, as the same alumni, DKE ’71, noted, each fraternity had a well-established personality: “Delta Upsilon was viewed as a place for athletes; Phi Delta as a place for the studious; Chi Psi for people who liked to party; Theta Delta for ‘preppies.[[45]](#endnote-45)’”

But, at the same time, it appears that generally, these personalities and over-representations did not significantly limit the diversity of interests within a given fraternity. Only five fraternities had over fifty-percent of its extracurricular involvement within a single type of activity—each of these in athletics. And, even within these more athletic fraternities, no single sport was responsible for greater than fifty-percent of athletic involvement. We can, therefore, conclude that while each fraternity certainly had a distinct character based on its campus involvement, each brotherhood was actually heterogeneous in the interests and campus involvement of their members. This implies that fraternities cut across existing cliques. It is not surprising then that former Dean of Students, Ben Lieber, who took over at Amherst for Dean Kathleen Deignan in the fall of 1984, declared the issue of clique-formation a “red-herring.”[[46]](#endnote-46)

The process of pledging, however, was certainly a concern for the administration of the College. A 1983 Memo from the Dean of Students Office chronicles a laundry list of abuses believed to have occurred on Amherst’s campus, including, but not limited to: “mudsliding, wild automobile rides, the use of hoods, fire, branding irons, paddles, coercion and peer pressure to consume alcohol and drugs, the swallowing of goldfish and other substances that one would normally not ingest, the stripping of clothes and nudity, scavenger hunts, taunting and derogatory name-calling.” [[47]](#endnote-47)

The issue I wish to examine with respect to hazing is not so much whether hazing occurred in Amherst fraternities—it did, though to varying extents in each—but whether this hazing constituted something unique to the fraternity system. To analyze this question, I turned to interviews with members of Amherst fraternities in the 1970s, and compared their experiences with hazing to those of modern Amherst athletes and other students.

Today, at Amherst, sports teams and other extracurricular activities perform many of the vital functions that the fraternity system once did. A team or club can give a sense of shared identity and create friendships that bridge individual classes. But, surprisingly, my research concluded that these organizations often rely on some of the less-savory initiation tactics of their Greek-lettered counterparts.

Interviews with three alumni from three different houses (referred to hereafter by their house-name and graduation year) provide insight into the pledging processes common to campus in the 1970s. These alumni reported a wide variety in both the intensity and type of hazing. Phi Gamma ’78, for example, reports that, “We did not have any hazing.   There was a trivia quiz for pledges called, as I remember, ‘True-Hoods of the Gamm,’ which involved learning some history of the fraternity and learning about some recent events, and some trivia.” Other fraternities, he explains, were not so fortunate. “I seem to recall an evening where someone was skiing around on the carpet of Frost Library for a while, and this was part of pledging at some frat or other.  Also I heard that someone broke the copier glass at Frost with their ass, trying to take a photocopy of that piece of anatomy as part of some kind of fraternity initiation.”[[48]](#endnote-48)

Chi Psi ’71 recalls, “I remember some of the pledges were ambushed, tied up with tape, brought somewhere and left without any money -- they had to find their way back to campus.  Was pretty much viewed as fun.”[[49]](#endnote-49) More disquieting, however, was DKE ‘71’s recollection of the use of alcohol. There was, he says, “pressure to drink to excess as harassment. As far as I know this was typical for most frat houses.”[[50]](#endnote-50)

This report of hazing is disquietingly similar to the experience of Amherst athletes today, though these incidents seem to occur less frequently. Alcohol remains a central component to modern-day hazing. I surveyed five members of four different sports’ teams and each reported that alcohol was prominent in hazing activities. Basketball players have their “New Player’s Night” (renamed at the request of my interviewee) where freshman are required to drink to excess, while those players who do not drink for personal reasons are given an array of unsavory eating options—among them SPAM or cottage cheese with maple syrup.[[51]](#endnote-51)

The baseball team holds one hazing event each semester. One of these transpired such that, “new members were locked in a room and not allowed to leave until a certain amount of alcohol was consumed, given time constraints.”[[52]](#endnote-52) The swimming and diving teams, for their part, have “Pearl Harbor Day” where new members wear nothing but parkas and drink excessively early in the morning. The soccer team, however, may have had the most disturbing hazing events.

As one player recalls, “Hazing rituals tend to revolve around drinking, but it is a mistake to think this the focus.  More than that, it has in my experience been targeted at freshman with stronger personalities and most pointedly revolved around humiliation and control.  For example, the soccer team puts certain freshman that have, for example, talked back to a senior, lost to a girl at beer pong, or even played very well in their first game to answer to the team for their actions.”[[53]](#endnote-53)  His teammate disagreed with this assessment, but in his response, reveals a similarly disquieting attitude, “It’s like, if you score two goals, who do you think you are? For scoring those two goals, you’re going to chug two beers […] If you come in, and you think you’re the star, and you might be really good, but there’s no point in acting like you’re a star. They manage to take that all down, so you’re not a jerk, you’re just a good guy. And then you’re cool and you don’t act superior to everyone else.”[[54]](#endnote-54) This attitude of group pressure to conform is beyond any that alumni recalled from their fraternity days.

Yet, it is important to note that athletes have recourse that the fraternity brothers did not—the option to complain to a Coach about hazing. This reality, many players note, prevented hazing from becoming excessive.[[55]](#endnote-55) While Amherst fraternities did, at one point, have faculty advisors, it is uncertain if pledges—who have the primary objective of seeking the approval of the group—would be willing to risk their social standing in the group by complaining, even anonymously. Nevertheless, there is little to suggest that hazing, when it does occur, is a more pleasant experience for athletes today, than it was for fraternity brothers in decades past. Hazing, unfortunately, seems to be a reality for groups that bring together students from more than one class. Even a Resident Counselor reported that the initiation of new RC’s was similar, in many ways, to the hazing he had undergone as a pledge of an off-campus fraternity.[[56]](#endnote-56) Hazing, then, is not just a problem for fraternities. While it should be addressed in each of these organizations, it can no more be used as a reason to abolish fraternities than it would be to abolish sports’ teams.

Finally, College administrators had become displeased with the excessive property damage occurring in fraternity houses. They believed that fraternities were abusing their relatively greater autonomy. Fraternities, for their part, maintained that the excessive property damage was a consequence of their role in providing a majority of campus parties. In order to examine these competing claims, I performed two types of analysis comparing dorm damage data from the years before fraternity abolition to the present day (unfortunately, no data was available from the immediate post-abolition era).

First, I endeavored to examine how abolition had affected property damage in the fraternity buildings. Adjusting for inflation to 2008 values using a Consumer Price Index calculator, I compared the average property damage reported for the fraternities by the College administration in the 1980-81, 1981-82,1982-83 academic years[[57]](#endnote-57) to the same property damage accumulated in these buildings in the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10[[58]](#endnote-58). The buildings accumulated an annual average of $1,900.85 of property damage between 1980 and 1983. Comparatively, these same eight buildings accumulated an average of $3,426.75 in damage over the last three years. [[59]](#footnote-3)

At first glance, this seems to confirm the administration’s suspicion that fraternity brothers were treating college property with greater disrespect than their peers in dormitories. But, this assessment is incomplete. To begin with, college social life has shifted away from the exclusive use of these fraternity houses. Today, the social dorms are much more likely to host a party than a former fraternity house such as Newport. Next, many of these fraternity houses were either rented out to Hampshire College or closed for various reasons over the last three years. Finally, recent renovations to the Mayo-Smith, Hitchcock and Seelye dorms may inflate the value of property damage as old property has been replaced with relatively more expensive furnishings. As a result, it may be more instructive to pursue another form of analysis.

For my second examination, I wanted to specifically assess the Inter-Fraternity Council claim that the role of these houses in providing a majority of campus social life led to greater property damage.[[60]](#endnote-59) To accomplish this, I first found the ratio of property damage accumulated in fraternities to other dorms in the 1980s. Next, I compared this ratio to a similar one accounting for the relative damage between today’s “party-intensive” dorms (what Residential Life terms “TAP Dorms”) and the rest of the dormitories. By this examination, the average across three years for the fraternity-dorm comparison was $2.44 in fraternity damage for every $1 in damage to other dorms. In comparison, the TAP Dorms incurred $3.40 in damage for every $1 in damage to other dormitories. Unfortunately, the data available does not allow us to separate out the social dormitories that may have played a role in providing some partying-space during the 1980s and include them with the fraternities. Nevertheless, this data does suggest that the fraternity’s assertion that property damage was a function of their special role in campus social life has, at least, some merit.

**V. Conclusion**

In 1984, Amherst College eliminated fraternities. In doing so, they took a step that many faculty and the Trustees believed rectified a philosophical incongruity between the social and academic lives of students. On a more practical level, they also sought to eliminate what they perceived to be the negative elements of fraternity life—an anti-intellectual atmosphere, a divisive clique culture, hazing and excessive property damage concentrated in the fraternities. The results of these experiments were, at best, mixed. As we established in the first section of this paper, there is not a necessary contradiction between the values of the College and the values of the fraternity. In the second half of the paper, we examined these four claims of abuses in the fraternity system. Though, the fraternities of the 1980s were failing to strongly contribute to academic life in the way they had in decades past, the argument that they perpetuated an anti-academic social life mistook correlation for causation, and perhaps, over-estimated the role that residential and social life can re-enforce classroom learning in the College. The fraternities, it also seems, might have provided a social group that successfully cut across academic and extracurricular interests, and in doing so, positively contributed to each individual’s experience of a diverse learning community. Hazing, while it certainly occurred in the fraternity system, endures to the present day, and as such, should not be treated as anymore endemic to fraternities than it is to any other activity. And, finally, the excessive property damage incurred in fraternities is not out of line from the dorm damage occurring in present-day dormitories that now serve the same social function as the old houses.

This paper has sought to address some specific claims against fraternities at Amherst, and in doing so, provide a lens for assessing these claims at other Colleges. But, it would be a mistake to conclude based on this evidence that Amherst College made a mistake in eliminating fraternities. As Professor O’Connell said during the Faculty debate over fraternities, “To vote fraternities out is not to vote in virtue or paradise, but we can vote in a new beginning.[[61]](#endnote-60)” The evidence provided verifies his claim.

There were, at least, two reasons not addressed in this paper that the abolition of fraternities was probably appropriate for Amherst in 1984. The first of these was an on-going transition to a co-ed college. Though, the fraternities, under pressure from the Administration, were all admitting women by the time of abolition, they remained entrenched with a sense of misogyny. This is not to say that women had an unequivocally bad experience with fraternities. Indeed, ten female students who were fraternity members joined together to write a pro-fraternity editorial about their experience in November of 1983.[[62]](#endnote-61) But, fraternities were designed as masculine institutions. Dean Ben Lieber, for example, recalled that when DKE was converted to the Plimpton dormitory, female students and their families were horrified to find a horribly explicit and sexist mural in the basement of the house.[[63]](#endnote-62) While it is certainly possible that the admission of women to fraternities would have eventually tempered the chauvinistic character of these institutions, their abolition almost certainly expedited the elimination of sexist sentiment on campus.

The second reason for their abolition concerns the nature of the relationship of the fraternity to the campus. Because fraternities had sold their houses to the campus, but continued to exclusively operate them, the College was forced to restrict students from College-owned housing based on their social selection by a group of students. Indeed, even members selected by the fraternity might be denied access to living in their house, if they were granted the lower-status of “social”, but not “residential member.” This forced the College into the uncomfortable position of sanctioning housing discrimination within its own buildings. And, this, even taken by itself, was perhaps a strong enough reason to end the fraternity housing system on campus.

My analysis, then, suggests that fraternities were no longer defensible at Amherst, but that the fraternity system is not the unequivocal negative that popular perception might suggest. If the brothers and the college administration can work together to realize the potential benefits of creating small diverse communities and teaching collective responsibility for one’s friends, then fraternities can, in fact, be positive institutions. But, such a beneficial arrangement can only result if all members of the campus community take a constructive role in the residential and social life of students.

In the final faculty debate, Professor DeMott rose to address his peers. He told them that he was afraid that the faculty and administration were just telling the students “you’re wrong, you don’t now as much as we do. We know how to live out our lives.” This, he told them, was “misguided paternalism.”[[64]](#endnote-63) Professor DeMott may have been correct. As this paper has shown, many of the complaints offered by critics can be empirically assessed. But, for an academy obsessed with rigorous inquiry, there was precious little objective analysis of the residential and social life of students at Amherst College. In its place, as DeMott noted, there was only conjecture and stereotyping. In truth, a rigorous empirical analysis might have reached the same conclusion to abolish fraternities. But, on an issue as vital to the College as the residential and social experience of its students, the students and the College deserved better.
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    **Appendix A: Extra-curricular Involvement by Fraternity**

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    | **Fraternity** | **AD** | **ATX** | **BETA** | **Chi Phi** | **Chi Psi** | **DKE** | **DU** | **KT** | **Phi Psi** | **Phi Del** | **Phi Ga** | **Psi U** | **TD** | **Avg.** |
    | By Person | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Sports | 44 | 4 | 32 | 6 | 30 | 8 | 22 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 18 | 13 | 49 | 19.15 |
    | Music, Theatre | 17 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 17 | 22 | 10 | 17 | 7 | 2 | 10.77 |
    | Publications | 7 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 9 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 6.85 |
    | Outdoors | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 4.77 |
    | Debate, Law, Gov | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2.92 |
    | Total | 76 | 31 | 45 | 27 | 51 | 44 | 49 | 31 | 46 | 37 | 53 | 34 | 54 | 44.46 |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | By percent | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | Sports | 58 | 13 | 71 | 22 | 59 | 18 | 45 | 13 | 11 | 38 | 34 | 38.2 | 91 | 39.31 |
    | Music, Theatre | 22 | 29 | 13 | 37 | 17.5 | 18 | 12 | 55 | 48 | 27 | 32 | 20.5 | 3.7 | 25.77 |
    | Publications | 9 | 32 | 2 | 11 | 12 | 41 | 18 | 19 | 26 | 16 | 9.4 | 14.7 | 1.9 | 16.31 |
    | Outdoors | 4 | 19 | 7 | 22 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 6.5 | 8.7 | 8 | 13.2 | 14.7 | 0 | 11.62 |
    | Debate, Law, Gov | 7 | 6.5 | 7 | 7.5 | 0 | 4.5 | 6 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 11 | 11.3 | 11.7 | 3.7 | 6.83 |

    **Appendix B: Property Damage**

    **Table 1: Comparison of Damage in Fraternities to Modern Dorm**

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    | **Dorms** |  | **2007-2008** | **2008-2009** | **2009-10** | **Average** |
    | Hamilton | HAMD | $3,601.00 | $12,363.23 | $1,415.46 |  |
    | Hitchcock | HITC | $5,606.11 |  | $18,404.98 |  |
    | Mayo-Smith | MAYD |  | $5,940.13 | $1,034.14 |  |
    | Plimpton | PLIM | $1,416.88 | $1,416.88 | $200.00 |  |
    | Newport | NEWP | $306.00 | $603.04 | $363.99 |  |
    | Marsh | MARS | $451.00 | $923.00 | $103.87 |  |
    | Seelye | SEEL | $6,494.11 |  |  |  |
    | Seligman | SELI | $52.00 |  |  |  |
    | Average |  | $2,561.01 | $4,249.26 | $3,587.07 | $3,465.78 |
    | Inflation Adjusted to 2008 | | $2,412.44 | $4,266.33 | $3,601.48 | $3,426.75 |
    |  | |  |  |  |  |
    | **Fraternities** |  | **1980-1981** | **1981-1982** | **1982-1983** |  |
    | Averages\* |  | $604.52 | $1,074.00 | $900.74 | $859.75 |
    | Inflation Adjusted to 2008 | | $1,414.18 | $2,365.78 | $1,922.60 | $1,900.85 |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  | | |  | Inf. Adj Difference: | $1,525.90 |

    Notes: 1. Cells left blank denote that the house was closed for the year. 2. For 2010, inflation for 2009 was used. Inflation figures were not available for this year.  
     3. To calculate inflation, I used <http://www.westegg.com/inflation/>

    **Appendix B: Property Damage**

    **Table 2: TAP Dorms and Fraternity Houses Compared**

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Dorms** |  |  | **Fraternities** | |  | **Ratio** |
    | Year | Total Dam. ($) | # of Dorms | Avg ($) | Total Dam. ($) | # of Frats | Avg ($) |  |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 1980-81 | 8623.1 | 21.0 | 410.6 | 4836.2 | 8.0 | 604.5 | 1.5 |
    | 1981-82 | 8286.6 | 21.0 | 394.6 | 8592.0 | 8.0 | 1074.0 | 2.7 |
    | 1982-83 | 6025.3 | 21.0 | 286.9 | 7205.9 | 8.0 | 900.7 | 3.1 |
    | Average | 7645.0 | 21.0 | 364.0 | 6878.0 | 8 | 859.8 | 2.4 |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  | **General Dorms** | |  | **TAP Dorms** | |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | 2007-08 | 35424.0 | 30.0 | 1180.8 |  | 8.0 | 4442.9 | 3.8 |
    | 2008-09 | 69549.8 | 29.0 | 2398.3 |  | 7.0 | 7260.5 | 3.0 |
    | 2009-10 | 40715.1 | 28.0 | 1454.1 |  | 8.0 | 4979.7 | 3.4 |
    | Average | 48563.0 | 29.0 | 1677.7 |  | 7.7 | 5561.0 | 3.4 |

    [↑](#endnote-ref-62)
64. [↑](#endnote-ref-63)