



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

TITLE "The Jewish Fraternity as a Jewish Socializing Agency"

Master's [] Prize Essay []

- Note:** The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. yes ~~no~~

Signature of Author Steven J. Wilson

Microfilmed 7/30/76
Date 1/1/77

Melina Steiner
Signature of Library Staff Member

THE JEWISH FRATERNITY
AS
A JEWISH SOCIALIZING AGENCY


STEVEN J. MASON

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

Cincinnati, 1976

Referee: Prof. Norman Mirsky



Acknowledgements

The author would like to acknowledge the following people and organizations for cooperation and assistance in the preparation of this thesis:

Delta, Tau, Omicron Deuteron, Omega Deuteron, Beta Iota, and Alpha Tau Chapters of Alpha Epsilon Pi.

Mu, Pi, and Epsilon Epsilon Chapters of Alpha Epsilon Phi.

Illinois Alpha Kappa Chapter of Pi Lambda Phi.

Omicron, Rho, Sigma Beta, and Mu Psi Chapters of Sigma Alpha Mu.

Gamma, Epsilon, Kappa, Upsilon, Chi, and Alpha Chi Chapters of Sigma Delta Tau.

Psi Chapter of Tau Epsilon Phi.

Nu, Rho, Alpha Gamma, and Beta Gamma Chapters of Zeta Beta Tau.

Dr. Maurice Jacobs of Jewish Publication Society for his helpful correspondence.

Mrs. Fanny Zelker for her assistance at the Hebrew Union College Archives.

Mr. Joel Reynolds of the Interfraternity Research and Advisory Council for his aid in locating key research materials.

Ms. Pat Gordon of the Hebrew Union College Library for her assistance in editing the manuscript.

Ms. Lita Schwartz of Cincinnati for her expert job in typing the final draft.

Lastly, to Dr. Norman Mirsky without whose sponsorship this thesis would not have been possible.

Cincinnati, Ohio
March 15, 1976

Digest

The objectives of this thesis are to examine the American college Jewish fraternity and sorority in terms of its historical context as well as its capacity as a Jewish socializing agency. Since social Jewish fraternities and sororities are a part of a broader spectrum of the college fraternity scene in our American universities, the fraternity world is explored from its inception at William and Mary in 1776 and traced to the contemporary period. Included in this general history of fraternities are the reasons and purposes of their early existences on American college campuses in the nineteenth century, their roles in the early twentieth century collegiate education, and their reactions to a number of ordeals including World War I, the Depression, World War II, Vietnam, and the counter-culture movement of the later 1960's and early 1970's. Only through this context can individual Jewish fraternities and sororities be understood: their histories, the reasons for their founding, their purposes for existence, and the Jewish activities and values found within them.

After thorough exploration of their historical evolution, this thesis attempts to make a sociological investigation of the Jewish fraternity and sorority. By means of interviewing Jewish groups of alumni who attended college between the years 1955-1974 and comparing them to men and women who presently affiliate with predominantly

Jewish fraternities and sororities, two composite profiles emerge, through parameters of Jewish identity. Also discussed in this section are the roles that Jewish fraternities and sororities play in terms of social mobility and ethnic endogamy. By way of investigation, the socializing nature of the Jewish college fraternity and sorority of the future may be speculated.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....	1.
Digest.....	11.
Introduction.....	1.
Origins and Evolution of the College Fraternity....	6.
Origins and Evolution of the Jewish Fraternity....	20.
Origins and Evolution of the Jewish Sorority.....	35.
Jewish Groups - A Closer Look.....	39.
The Counter-Culture and Jewish Fraternities.....	53.
Interview Data - The Alumni.....	59.
Interview Data - The Undergraduates.....	70.
Bibliography.....	104.

Introduction

As our nation enters its bi-centennial year, so does the American college fraternity. Born at the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg, Virginia on December 5, 1776, Phi Beta Kappa became the first "Greek-letter" organization in North America. Since then, fraternities, both men's and women's have been a part of the American college scene.

For more than a century Jewish men and women played little or no part in the Greek organizations that were founded after Phi Beta's Kappa's inception in 1776. However, in 1895 a new fraternity was formed by Jewish students at Yale University. Its name was Pi Lambda Phi which was established in part "as a protest against the formation of college groups which excluded Jewish men, and in part as a protest against the further establishment of exclusively Jewish groups."¹ It was non-sectarian in constitution. Its purpose was to eliminate all prejudice and sectarianism in fraternities at American colleges. Jewish students at other colleges and universities followed suit and formed other societies, some of which were non-sectarian in nature while others were deeply rooted in Jewish heritage if not in Judaism per se.

The American Jewish fraternity and its female counterpart, the Jewish sorority, have undergone radical changes since their inceptions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when young Jews began to attend Eastern universities to acquire educations that their immigrant

parents were deprived of in the ghettos of Eastern Europe. Glancing through recent quarterlies of these organizations, one comes away with the impression that these fraternities and sororities are Jewish organizations: Jewish books are reviewed, individual groups take part in bolstering the local Hillel chapter, Kaddish is said at a memorial service² and many alumni are mentioned as winning awards for Jewish community service throughout the country.

There is a second side to the picture. In "Memoirs of a Fraternity Man" Joseph Epstein writes that rushees who were termed as "too Jewish" were rejected from the fraternity as being unfit for membership.³ Many alumni of Jewish fraternities and sororities report that even though the membership was entirely Jewish, there was not the slightest observance of any Jewish ritual and custom save that which was part of the initiation ritual. The question becomes: Was the Jewish fraternity and sorority of the middle fifties and sixties a Jewish socializing organization or a social organization of Jews?

The question would not be so complex had the nature of fraternities, Jewish fraternities and sororities in particular, not radically altered in the late sixties and early seventies. The Vietnam War and the activism that it spawned wiped out many Jewish houses practically overnight. The "counter" culture and its motto of "Do your own thing" was incompatible with the more group oriented Greek system and many young Jews chose the former sub-culture.⁴ Lastly, those Jewish houses, both fraternity and sorority that did

survive the age of drugs and activism were forced to cope with the problem of religious, racial, and ethnic integration, much of which was championed by Jewish defense organizations. If Jewish groups became heavily innundated with Gentiles, they were no longer attractive to Jewish students. On the other hand, even if the group was heavily-mixed in terms of thenio and religious backgrounds of its members, it was stigmatized as a "Jew house" in which many Gentiles were reluctant to associate. Through lack of clear-cut identity and reason for existence, houses such as these were forced to close.

The goal of this thesis is to examine the present day Jewish college fraternity and sorority in terms of its identity as a Jewish organization over the last two decades. The following questions to be answered are:

1. Why did young Jews join these organizations?
2. What purposes did the organization fulfill?
3. Why Jewish students joined Jewish organizations such as these as opposed to Gentile counterparts which had opened their doors to Jews?
4. What Jewish activities were conducted in and by the house?
5. What differences oan be perceived between Jewish and Gentile groups?
6. What would be a comfortable ethnic ratio in the house?
7. Did Jewishness strengthen in the Greek experience?
8. Did Jewishness have something to do with joining the group originally?

In short, to what extent do these organizations inculcate Jewish values and identity so that these young people become participating members in the American Jewish community after graduation?

The data of this thesis is supplied by personal interviews with contemporary undergraduate men and women in predominantly Jewish groups in the Midwest and Central South. The alumni data comes from interviews with men and women of temple groups in the Cincinnati area who were members of predominantly Jewish fraternities and sororities between the years 1955 to 1974. I will also investigate written material related to fraternities.

Sociological research in the area of the Jewish fraternity has been cursory. Bohrnstedt has found that Jews as a group are more likely to join fraternities than men of other religious groups.⁵ He has further discovered that Jews are more likely to join and use the fraternity for upward social mobility.⁶ Finally, Bohrnstedt believes that Jews who rush and pledge are somewhat more religious than those who do not pledge.⁷ He speculates that Jewish boys who pledge Jewish fraternities may meet and marry a Jewish girl of a Jewish sorority since dating of this nature is encouraged. The fraternity, then, promotes endogamy. According to Segal, Jewish fraternity men protect prestige status by heavily emphasizing the positive worth of Jewish group membership.⁸ Scott believes that Jewish fraternities and sororities maintain an endogamy system where Jewish men of high status may meet a Jewish girl of the same status and vice-versa.⁹ Lastly, Adelson has discovered that Jewish fraternity members are more likely to endorse negative statements about the Jewish people than unaffiliated Jewish students.¹⁰

Footnotes to Introduction

1. John Robson, ed. Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Inc., 1968), p. 333.
2. Phi Epsilon Pi Memorial Service, text undated (Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio: American Jewish Archives).
3. Joseph Epstein, "Memoirs of a Fraternity Man", Commentary 52: (July 1971) 63.
4. The use of drugs on the fraternity premises was usually proscribed by house rules. Secondly, it was felt by many students that living in a fraternity house with the use of illegal drugs on the premises led to confiscation and arrest by campus authorities, more so than if a person lived in an off-campus apartment.
5. George W. Bohrnstedt, "Processes of Seeking Membership in and Recruitment by Voluntary Social Organization", Ph.D. dissertation (University of Wisconsin, 1966) pp. 134-45.
6. George W. Bohrnstedt, "Social Mobility Aspirations and Fraternity Membership", Sociological Quarterly 10: (Winter 1969) 42-52.
7. George W. Bohrnstedt, "Conservatism, Authoritarianism and Religiousity of Fraternity Pledges", Journal of College Student Personnel 10: (Jan. 1969) 36-43.
8. B. E. Segal, "Fraternity Social Distance and anti-Semitism Among Jewish and non-Jewish Undergraduates", Sociology of Education 38: (Spring 1965) 251-264.
9. J. F. Scott, "American College Sorority: Its Role in class and ethnic endogamy", American Sociological Review 30: (August 1965) 514-517.
10. Joseph Adelson, "A Study of Minority Group Authoritarianism", in Marshall Sklare, ed., The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958).

Origins and Evolution of the College Fraternity

As I mentioned before, Phi Beta Kappa was the first Greek-letter society in the United States. It was founded on December 5, 1776 at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia and was much different than the honorary society that bears its name today. The organization possessed all the characteristics of present-day fraternities: the charm and mystery of secrecy, a ritual, oaths of fidelity, a grip, a motto, a badge for external display, a background of high idealism, a strong tie of friendship and comradeship, and an urge for sharing its values through nation-wide expansion. The letters Phi Beta Kappa stood for "Love of wisdom, the guide of life." In its early days the purpose of the organization was social and literary and it held frequent and regular meetings. In December, 1779, the parent branch authorized the establishment of branches at Yale and Harvard.

Phi Beta Kappa came to Union College in 1817 at Schenectady, N. Y. and was still a secret society, social and literary in character. It inspired the founding of three fraternities which are known as the Union Triad consisting of Kappa Alpha Society, 1825, Sigma Phi, and Delta Phi, 1827. All remained relatively small, and most of the chapters were placed in the East.

When Sigma Phi placed a second chapter at Hamilton College in 1831, students at the school found the fraternity idea attractive, so they organized Alpha Delta Phi in 1832. This young fraternity was the first to place a

chapter west of the Alleghenies, at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. This led to the establishment of new societies at that school, Beta Theta Pi in 1839 and Phi Delta Theta in 1848. In 1852 a splinter group withdrew to found a chapter of Delta Kappa Epsilon, which had been born at Yale in 1844. This society was in turn the victim of internal dissention and Sigma Chi was founded in 1855. Beta Theta Pi, Phi Delta Theta, and Sigma Chi are known as the Miami Triad, which expanded rapidly, and these three today are among the largest of the national fraternities.

New fraternities came into being quickly. Phi Gamma Delta, 1848 and Phi Kappa Psi, 1852 were founded at the University of Alabama in 1856. The War Between the States wiped out many existing fraternities and new societies were formed at the conclusion of the conflict. Kappa Sigma (whose traditions date back almost 900 years to the University of Bologna in Italy)¹ was founded in 1869 at the University of Virginia. Pi Kappa Alpha was founded at the same school in 1868. Kappa Alpha Order was formed at what is now Washington and Lee, Alpha Tau Omega at Richmond, Virginia, and Sigma Nu in 1869 at V. M. I.

Although Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Alpha Epsilon, Beta Theta Pi, Pi Kappa Alpha, and Phi Delta Theta have records of initiating women into their societies, the first women's organization was the I. C. Sororsis, founded at Monmouth College in 1867. In 1888 the I. C. adopted its present name of Pi Beta Phi. Most notable in the history of sororities is Gamma Phi Beta which was founded

at Syracuse University in 1874. This society was the first women's organization to call itself a "sorority" and may be credited with the honor of giving the word "sorority" to the English language.

The early social fraternities and sororities had many of the characteristics that their proto-type, Phi Beta Kappa, possessed. The two or three Greek letters of the society represented a motto which was supposed to be unknown to all but the members and which indicated briefly the purposes or aims of the organization.² Greek organizations adopted distinctive badges, passwords, and hand-clasps while retaining the social nature on which Phi Beta Kappa was founded.

Perhaps the most interesting facet of the social fraternity and sorority at this time was that of the altar. In The College Fraternity and Its Modern Role John Robson defines this term, "center of ritual ceremony where a neophyte by the witness of his brothers first expresses the oath and obligation of membership and where he subsequently may repeat the oath and obligation of membership and effect worship".³ Baird's Manual defines it as "the place where the fraternity member in a personal experience looks to his Creator, vows to Him, and asks for strength for himself and also on behalf of his brothers".⁴

It seems apparent that some fraternities started to place an emphasis of Christian values. Early societies followed Phi Beta Kappa's precedent to acknowledge a

Supreme Being or a Creator, but ritual and statements of purpose appeared based on the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. Clyde Johnson remarks that men "like Alpha Tau Omega's leader, Otis A. Glazebrook, were preparing for careers as ministers, and all them found a common bond in their Christian faith".⁵ At that time there were few in our nation's universities who were not professing Christians so their motive could not be interpreted as a desire to exclude anyone because of his religion. Robson writes "The foundations of the prosperous national fraternities of today were built on the rock of Scripture. This principle is repeated in the Sermon on the Mount but it is not unique to Christianity. Rabbi David Jacobson, of San Antonio's Temple Bethel, a member of Sigma Alpha Mu, has stated the same principle in these words: 'Above all is the ideal love of the individual of God ... The love of individual for his neighbor, to be effective, must equal to the love one has for himself'".⁶

In summary, the earliest fraternity, Phi Beta Kappa, incorporated belief in The Deity to substantiate the idealism of its ritual. Later fraternities like Alpha Tau Omega, founded 1869, became Christian-oriented when Christianity could be considered a common bond among its members.

This was no longer true when Jewish students enrolled in college in great numbers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

As I mentioned, the purpose of the early social fraternity was to provide more than just casual relationships in a college environment. The idealism of these societies was often described in religious terms so that "brotherhood" and "fellowship" were often extolled as sacred virtues.

The college fraternity of the early nineteenth century had other purposes. Many organizations continued to follow the pattern that Phi Beta Kappa set in terms of literary and legal interests. Debates were centered on such topics as the place of religion in government, the ethics and economics of slavery, the morality of pre-marital sex, and the relative importance of ancient and modern foreign languages.⁷ Activities such as these satisfied the needs of their members since college curriculums of that day were extremely narrow and young men had to explore meaningful topics through their own devices.

In the same vein, collegians were often uninspired by the chapel services conducted by college officials. The ritual of the fraternity gave the students an opportunity to create their own liturgy, rituals and myths. Since these societies were closed to the college at large, secrecy heightened the sense of participation and involvement.

Lastly, when fraternities began to colonize other colleges a connection to the outside world was often provided to rural campuses. Visitation of one chapter by another became a medium of communication from one campus to another.

College officials often opposed the existence of fraternities. Since the college fraternity was viewed as a secret organization with restricted membership, it was thought to be an elitist society which was inconsistent with the social and cultural milieu of Jacksonian democracy. Secadly, because of the literary activities of the fraternities, college professors often felt that the mere existence of these organizations implied criticism of the curriculum.

In spite of these objections the fraternity system thrived through the 1890's even though it underwent radical changes. With updated curriculum and improved libraries the literary activities of the fraternity vanished. Transportation became easier and the importance of the fraternity as a point of contact with the outside world and as a social center began to diminish. Finally, student bodies found themselves to be more heterogeneous in the social and economic backgrounds and career aspirations of their constituents. Fraternity membership became a source of social status rather than a haven from an irrelevant curriculum.⁸

For practical reasons, however, the fraternity system grew at a phenomenal rate. University funds were earmarked for new classrooms and laboratories, salaries for professors, and volumes for libraries. Educators disclaimed the responsibility for housing students and it was this void that the fraternity system filled. Dormitories were thought to be unsound living quarters by most administrators of the day because students were more likely

to drink, gamble and carouse in the lack of a family atmosphere environment. The fraternity became an attractive solution in as much as it provided housing in small, congenial groups in addition to supplying a status-oriented social life centered around an adventuresome tradition. By the 1920's the housing and feeding of undergraduates had become the primary activities of fraternities.⁹ At this time there were about two thousand chapters of national fraternities and fifteen hundred professional groups at three hundred colleges and universities in the country.¹⁰

The period of prosperity of the fraternity system came to a crashing halt in the 1930's. Because of the serious depression, college enrollments fell off and to many the option of joining a fraternity became financially prohibitive. Many Greek chapters were forced to close while new chapters were not opened. The lull in the fraternity system continued through World War II when enrollments fell off even further and houses were rented to armed forces service groups or to the university for the housing of women.¹¹

The return to normality of the post-war period heralded a new era for the Greek system. Veterans from varied socio-economic backgrounds, religious preferences, and geographical locations were eligible to join fraternities. The Greek system was attractive to these men since it provided the comradeship on the campus that they had known in the service.

To meet the new breed of fraternity man the system had to adjust. Hazing and hell week were seriously questioned, while quotas, especially Catholic, were broken.¹² Although the veteran influx supplied the Greek system with fresh blood, it seemed to be at the expense of the newly-graduated high school student. The veteran was practically-minded in that he entered college for a definite purpose and the fraternity was the focal point for a healthy balance between the educational and social aspects of college life. The high school student of 1952-57 did not have his educational goals as clearly defined as the veteran nor could he utilize the fraternity the same way socially as did the veteran. Alcohol became a problem in as much as the student fresh from high school could not imitate the older veteran in his drinking prowess and found himself in serious social difficulty.

At this time professionally trained student personnel workers were being appointed to key positions on many college campuses. Many of these people had affiliated with Greek letter societies and appreciated the importance of quality programs in the fraternity. Through their graduate training and subsequent placement in these posts, the new professional workers began placing new, and, often, more difficult expectations before the college Greeks.

As enrollments soared in the post-war era, colleges and universities began building residence halls in mass throughout the country. Only in a few places were the Greeks able to keep pace with the university building programs. Not only were the new dormitory buildings large and well-equipped, but they were often supervised by trained counselors. More significant is the fact that these institutions conducted well-planned social, educational, cultural and intramural programs which rivaled and sometimes exceeded the Greeks.

The fraternity system was greatly influenced by the 1954 Supreme Court decision in membership selection criteria. As early as 1946 schools such as Amherst College demanded that the national fraternities on its campus eliminate from their constitutions all membership restrictions based upon race, color, or creed. If they refused to do this they were asked to leave the campus. Three groups, Delta Tau Delta, Phi Kappa Psi and Phi Delta Theta, did leave. Today national sororities have eliminated all racial restrictive clauses from their constitutions and by-laws, and nearly all national fraternities have taken steps to eliminate all racial restrictive clauses.¹³

The launching of Sputnik by Russia in 1957 was a significant blow to the Greek system. Public opinion demanded emphasis of academic excellence and the de-emphasis of the social aspects of college life. The fraternity and sorority systems were forced to re-evaluate their unimpressive

scholarship records in order to keep pace with the rigorous intellectual demands of the university.

The challenges of the fifties seemed to plague the Greeks up through the sixties. Fraternities and sororities lost ground because of their attitude towards scholarship and their discrimination and snobbishness. Also plush dorm complexes lured students away from fraternity houses. In the spirit of President Kennedy's "New Frontier", the relevancy of the fraternity to the college experience was questioned by many collegians. With the options of either dormitory or apartment living available, the Greek letter house could not compete. The apartment became the new status symbol where a student could live, study, and entertain in an atmosphere of privacy in which he was regarded as an individual instead of being stereotyped as a "dormie" or a "frat-rat". As sexual mores changed, the apartment became the focal point for sexual liaison whereas the fraternity and dormitory provided an uncomfortable and awkward setting for activities of this nature because of in loco parentis. As I explained earlier, the apartment was a safer place to use illicit drugs. With competition for admission to professional school higher than ever, many students felt that the Greeks had little to offer academically since their grade averages were often lower than the general campus index.

As the activism movements of the late sixties and early seventies progressed to full force, the Greeks found

themselves in even a more precarious position. At the time they were stereotyped as (a) somewhat conservative in their participation in campus protest, (b) unequivocal supporters of university goals, (c) not intimately involved in university governance or issues, (d) focused upon the exigencies of their social program, and (e) hesitant to act as agents for either society or the university. In a study on a Midwestern campus the results showed that Greeks appeared to be just as individualistic, active, involved, interested in drugs and participating in governance, and as anti-traditional as non-Greeks.¹⁴ Stereotyped as traditional, yet actually anti-traditional, the clear-cut image of the fraternity and sorority of past decades had broken down. The Greeks discarded the traditional elements that represented their identity and advantages to the point that many students asked, "Why be a Greek?". When a satisfactory answer could not be found, many members quit their respective organizations.

Problems such as these came to a head in May 1970 after the Kent State demonstrations which took the lives of four students. Some fraternities became centers for student activism and totally shed their traditional Greek identities. Others closed immediately while many suffered severe membership losses since the college fraternity was still identified with the Establishment which was at its lowest point of credibility in the eyes of many collegians.

By the middle seventies, however, events swung in favor of the fraternity system. As American involvement

in Vietnam ended in 1973, the activism movements that plagued the Greeks began to be phased out. The memories of Kent State grew more vague and the Establishment was looked upon in more favorable light. In some cases students were simply worn out by the demonstrations of the sixties and looked towards "a yearning for enlightened apathy".¹⁵ On other campuses housing shortages were experienced and the fraternity once again fulfilled its traditional role as it supplied room and board for students seeking small compatible places to live. Less hazing was reported while scholarship and community service were stressed. As of 1975 the fraternity appeared to be making a solid comeback. Time Magazine (Jan. 20, 1975) writes: "Parents can relate to the fraternity as part of the traditional college education. Housing in the fraternity is cheaper, community service is up, and there is more pledging."¹⁶

In its pamphlet "College Fraternities: Their Origin and Purpose" the National Interfraternity Council mentions five reasons for the growth of the fraternity system:

1. need for companionship, 2. social outlet, 3. symbolism of ideals, 4. life-long friendship, 5. housing facilities with stress on academic excellence.

It is interesting to note that many of these purposes and values date back to the original motives of early societies of the eighteenth century and have survived two centuries of social, political and economic trial and ordeal. With this taken into account it would seem that the Greek system

has established itself as a permanent institution on
the campuses of our colleges and universities throughout
the nation.

Footnotes to Chapter One

1. Clyde S. Johnson, Fraternities in Our Colleges (New York: National Interfraternity Foundation, 1972), p. 6.
2. Greek letters were chosen because these societies identified their literary activities with ancient classics of Greece and Rome.
3. John Robson, The College Fraternity in Its Modern Role (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Press, 1966), p. 117.
4. Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities, p. 9.
5. Johnson, p. 38.
6. Robson, p. 18.
7. Mark Beach, "Change Through Student Example: the Case of the Fraternity Movement," Journal of College Student Personnel 14: (March 1973), 111-117.
8. Beach, p. 113.
9. Beach, p. 114.
10. Ibid.
11. William Butler, "Forces at Work in the Development of Fraternities," Journal of College Student Personnel 6: (1965), 240.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., p. 242.
14. Packwood, William; Casse, Jr., Robert; Lyerly, Barry; and Moklebust, Joe, "Greek Individualism and Activism: A New Identity?" Journal of College Student Personnel 13: (May 1972), 228.
15. "Frat is Back," Newsweek 82: (Nov. 12, 1973), 109-110.
16. "Frat Redux," Time 105: (Jan. 20, 1975), 54.

Origins and Evolution of the Jewish Fraternity

The proto-type of the Jewish fraternity was Pi Lambda Phi which was founded on March 21, 1895 by Henry Mark Fisher, Louis Samter Levy, and Frederick Manfred Werner. It was their purpose to establish "not a narrow esoteric fraternity, but a fraternity in which all men were brothers, no matter what their religion, a fraternity in which ability, open-mindedness, a far-sightedness, and a progressive, forward-looking attitude would be recognized as the basic attributes."¹

In spite of its non-sectarian nature Pi Lambda Phi had to come to grips with an image of Jewish identity. Even though its alumni corps boast of a diversity of men such as Jewish Tony Martin (vocalist), Rafter Johnson (olympic athlete), Howard Cosell (sportscaster), and Rudy LaRusso (pro player), many of its chapters were predominantly Jewish in membership until recently. There was a general rule of thumb on Pi Lam campuses across the country that the local brotherhood is composed of Jews and even if they may only compose a fraction of the brotherhood at this time, the chapter may maintain a Jewish image.² Ebony Magazine reported that James Evans, a Black, offers a Jewish blessing before dinner. He is president of a Jewish group of Pi Lambda Phi at M. I. T.³ At this time the national office of the fraternity doubts that any of its chapters are entirely Jewish, even though they sometimes carry a stereotype of Jewish tradition on many campuses.

The first truly Jewish fraternity was Zeta Beta Tau which was founded at the Jewish Theological Seminary on Dec. 29, 1898. In 1873 Rabbi Gustav Gottheil was assistant to the aging Rabbi Samuel Adler at Temple Emanu-El in New York City. Challenging the ethical culture theories of Felix Adler, son of Samuel Adler, Gottheil espoused a more traditional theistic Judaism, and was upheld by the congregation. Perhaps it was these traditional leanings that led him and his son, Richard, professor of Semitics at Columbia University into the Zionist movement in which both father and son were active.⁴

In 1898 when Gustav Gottheil was head rabbi of Emanu-El, he and his son became interested in forming a group of young men that would support the Zionist cause. One of the strongholds for Zionism in New York City was the Jewish Theological Seminary. Although the Seminary was only an enclave of dissent against the Reform Movement and had not come into its own as the seat of Conservative Judaism, it nonetheless was sympathetic to Zionism.⁵ Its students were mostly of upper-class German background who were disenchanted with Reform Judaism to that date. These men, while studying at the Seminary, pursued other courses at Columbia University, New York University, and the College of the City of New York. With these men as a nucleus, it was the Gottheils' hope to form a replica of a Vienna society whose purpose was to promote an interest in Zionism and to keep young Jewish men from drifting away from the

customs, ideals and traditions of their fathers. Its rooting in upper class German Jewry gave Zeta Beta Tau a mark of high status for many years on the college campuses.

The organization was originally called ZBT which was taken from Isaiah 1:27 "Tzion B'mishpat T'fadeh - Zion in justice will be redeemed.". The aim was "to inspire the students with a sense of Jewish national pride and patriotism. It intended to interest college men in the Zionist movement. In those days the organization was primarily Jewish. Its name stood for three Hebrew words; its goal was the Jewish nation; its colors were the Jewish national colors, blue and white; and its emblem was the six-pointed star of David. Its officers were called by Hebrew names and at its meetings things of Jewish interest were discussed.".⁶

Although the basic purpose of the organization was Zionist in nature, it was thought that it would be for the best interest of the society not to limit itself to the issue of Zionism since it would shut out Jewish men who had not taken a definite stand on the question. It was resolved, November 1901, that the object of the Fraternity be the promotion of Judaism.⁷

The placement of the first official college unit was enacted in 1902 where a group of Jewish students became the nucleus of Alpha Chapter at the City College of New York whereas up to now the fraternity had no formal chapter organization. In 1906 the fraternity officially adopted

the letters "Zeta Beta Tau" as its name. The aims of the fraternity at this time were:

- "1. To promote a fraternal union among Jewish college men.
2. To study and discuss problems of interest to the Jews of all classes and religious tendencies.
3. To exercise an influence for the good on the Jewish Community."⁸

During this period the fraternity sponsored a series of public lectures on the history of the Jewish people. Some of the topics were "The Period of the Second Temple," "The Talmudic Period," "The Spanish Period," "Israel in Germany and Holland," and "The Modern Period from Mendelssohn."⁹

Expansion of ZBT increased from the years 1902 to 1912. The organization had placed twenty chapters in the East, Midwest and South. By the time of its Silver Jubilee Convention in 1923 it had grown to thirty units across the country. At this time ZBT could be described as ". . . a Jewish organization. Its advent brought Jewish students the material and social advantages of fraternity life - a home, good food, agreeable companionship, and a conscious mission. . . to demonstrate by their every word and deed in public and in private the best of which Jewish manhood is capable and the inherent excellence of the Jewish character."¹⁰

Zeta Beta Tau could be considered the pioneer American and Canadian college social fraternity of Jewish men, although since 1954 the fraternity has been nonsectarian in constitution. Chapter membership in the organization

is non-exclusive with regard to race, religion or creed. Despite this, Zeta Beta Tau continues to draw Jewish students to its ranks and many of its chapters remain predominantly Jewish to this day.

Shortly after Zeta Beta Tau placed its first unit at City College of New York in 1902, Phi Epsilon Pi was founded at the same school by six Jews and one Gentile on November 23, 1904. Its ideals were based "on a mutual undertaking to promote love for higher learning and close friendship, to cultivate a spirit of unselfish fellowship, one unto another, and to exert throughout life an influence tending to more manly character, higher idealism, and tolerance of mind and spirit, all inspired of universal brotherhood." The fraternity was founded as a non-sectarian organization, but the membership was predominantly Jewish. Several of its prominent alumni include Dr. Abram Sachar, President of Brandeis University, Dr. Maurice Jacobs, President of the Jewish Publication Society, and Rabbi Benjamin Frankel, founder of the Hillel Movement.¹¹ Many of its chapters were formed from local fraternities and its group at the University of Georgia was formed from the E. D. S. Society (Eay Daleth Sigma), founded in 1895, the oldest Jewish local fraternity in continuous existence.¹²

During its existence Phi Epsilon Pi used to offer the National Service Award which "betokens the achievement of greatness of the individuals of the American-Jewish community who by their deeds have made vital and exemplary

contributions to the welfare and progress of the Jewish community. Phi Epsilon Pi has maintained that such interest in the well-being of the Jewish community goes hand in hand with loyalty to the country and with the responsibility of good American citizenship in the truest sense."¹³

Recipients of this award include Dr. Stephen S. Wise, President of the American Jewish Congress, Zionist, and founder of the Jewish Institute of Religion and the Free Synagogue; Cyrus Adler, former President of the American Jewish Committee; Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter; Dr. Albert Einstein; and Henrietta Szold, Hadassah founder.

In her acceptance letter to Dr. Sachar, Henrietta Szold wrote, "To be adjudged by three serious-minded, experienced men like yourself (Rabbi Solomon Freehof of Rodeph Shalom of Pittsburgh and Dr. Rubinow, the Executive Secretary of B'nai B'rith) a candidate for the distinction devised by a college fraternity with a tradition behind it for the purpose of honoring public service, cannot but touch deep-lying chords in the heart of the recipient. To be the first thus chosen and to be told the distinction was devised for the purpose of stimulating loyalty toward Jewish values puts a certain responsibility upon the recipient which one of any age cannot but regard with a certain degree of trepidation. I am deeply appreciative of the honor and deeply conscious of the responsibility."¹⁴

In his reception of the National Service Award, Dr. Albert Einstein said in regard to Jewish fraternities

that "banding together socially gives Jewish students 'inner confidence'."¹⁵

Phi Epsilon Pi participated with other Jewish fraternities in aiding German Jewish refugee students from Germany in the middle and late 1930's.¹⁶ In 1970 it merged with Zeta Beta Tau after it sustained heavy financial losses in the late 1960's.

November 1909 witnessed the founding of two groups, Phi Sigma Delta and Sigma Alpha Mu. The former was founded at Columbia University on November 10, 1909 by William Berk, Herbert L. Eisenberg, Maxwell Hyman, Alfred Iason, Joseph Levy, Herbert K. Minsky, Joseph Shalleck, and Robert Shapiro. These men seemed unable to find the proper opportunity for the campus fellowship they were seeking and thus determined to form their own fraternity and thereby perpetuate and nurture their comradeship. Historically interesting is Phi Sigma Delta's efforts in 1934 that arranged refuge for German Jews fleeing Nazi persecution; these efforts continued after the defeat of Hitler on behalf of displaced persons from other countries.¹⁷ In 1969 Phi Sigma Delta merged with Zeta Beta Tau because of heavy financial losses. It was one of the largest mergers in the fraternity world to that date.

Sigma Alpha Mu was founded on Thanksgiving Eve, November 26, 1909, by eight students at the College of the City of New York. "An adventurous chap, named Lester Cohen better known to his classmates as 'Chief Cohen' had earned the title of class marshal in the sophomore class. 'Chief' selected North Beach, Long Island, as the

place for the class smoker. North Beach was not too heavily populated, and 'Chief' wanted a good hide-out. He discussed the proposal of the meeting with a few of his confidants. The plan included the kidnapping of the officers of the freshman class. All went well, and they met at the appointed place and hour. However, the freshmen were more alert than anticipated, and they escaped the sophomores, leaving them full of chagrin. With the freshmen gone and their plans for capture of their prey fouled, those remaining at North Beach decided to organize the 'Terrible Twelve' for the sole purpose of avenging the clever freshmen who had evaded them. This was on November 6, 1909. According to well-authenticated tradition, as told by 'Chief' Lester Cohen, twelve men, nine of them Jews were invited to meet at Hi Jacobson's house on the fateful eve of November 26, just twenty days later. At last they would really organize, but only eight men arrived at Hiji's home, and they were all Jews. It is purely legendary now, that the absent three were non-Jewish, but for this circumstance, we might have been a nonsectarian fraternity."¹⁸ The eight founders of the fraternity all being of the Jewish faith naturally attracted to their brotherhood men of similar background and faith. They believed in fraternalism among Jewish college men, convinced that without it a large number of Jewish students would be deprived of the pleasant associations and companionships they now find in most colleges.

"Sigma Alpha Mu was therefore a fraternity born of Jewish spirit and American concepts".¹⁹

"Sigma Alpha Mu has always acknowledged with deep appreciation its Jewish heritage and ethical values of Judaism which have enriched its life and the lives of its Chapters and members. With the advent of the mid-twentieth century, expressions of liberalism suggested that constitutional limitations of membership to any particular religious group is not in keeping with the ideal of democracy which has always been part of the Fraternity's creed. Responsive to this thinking, Sigma Alpha Mu at its 1953 Convention amended its constitution, making eligible for membership any student of good moral character who respects the ideals and traditions of the Fraternity."²⁰

Since its inception, Sigma Alpha Mu has been active in Jewish affairs both nationally and internationally. In 1927, when Jewish students in Rumania were subjected to merciless persecution, the Fraternity sent one of its officers to investigate conditions there. His report, subsequently reprinted in newspapers and magazines throughout the country, was instrumental in preventing further assaults in that country.²¹ In 1929, Sigma Alpha Mu was the first college fraternity to award a scholarship to the Hebrew University in Palestine.²² In 1935, Sigma Alpha Mu adopted as a national project the rehabilitation of refugee students. More than a score of outstanding scholars were brought over from central Europe and given

the opportunity to complete their studies and research in American universities.²³ In respect to the State of Israel the Octagonian reads, "We, as Americans, have reason to hold our heads high today. There is a State of Israel, and make no mistake about it. The source of our pride is deeply rooted in part, in Sigma Alpha Mu. We must never be guilty of forsaking our history..."²⁴ Upon glancing through the Octagonian, the quarterly of the fraternity, it is not uncommon to find letters and articles pertaining to Jewish affairs such as a debate between Rabbi Phillip Bernstein of a pro-Zionist camp versus Rabbi Elmer Berger of the American Council for Judaism,²⁵ or a biography of Stephen Wise,²⁶ or Jewish immigration to America.²⁷

1910 saw the founding of two new societies, Tau Delta Phi on June 22, 1910 at the College of the City of New York and Tau Epsilon Phi at Columbia University on Oct. 19, 1910. The former was started as a local fraternity by Maxwell S. Goldman, Alexander B. Siegel, Maximilian A. Coyne, Milton Goodfriend, Max Klaye, Samuel Klaye, Benjamin Gray, Gustave Schreib, and Benjamin Epstein. The group comprising the organization maintained itself as a single unit until 1912 when a division into two chapters became necessary. Although Tau Delta Phi has several predominantly Jewish chapters across the country, it is nonsectarian in membership.

Tau Epsilon Phi was founded by ten young men in Columbia's School of Pharmacy - Robert L. Blume, Julius M.

Breitenbach, Charles M. Driesen, Ephraim Freedman, Leo H. Fried, Harold Goldsmith, Samuel Greenbaum, Julius Klauber, Israel Schwartz, and Julius Slofkin. These men had become imbued with the idea that friendships during collegiate days should be bound together through some means for the remainder of one's life and they found admission to the existing two fraternities barred because of their adherence to the Hebrew faith. They therefore decided, then and there, in light of the latter fact, that their fraternity must never bar anyone by reason of race, color, or creed. The fraternity is nonsectarian.²⁸

Beta Sigma Rho was founded at Cornell University in 1910 primarily as a local organization under the name of Beta Samach, the Greek Beta and the Hebrew Samach suggesting the application of the Greek society idea to the social and cultural life of the Jewish undergraduate. The founders were M. H. Milman, M. M. Milman, Nathaniel E. Koeing, and Lester D. Krohn. Almost immediately the following men joined the group: Saul Blickman, A. B. Pollack, A. M. Fox, M. M. Wyckoff, and then others including I. J. Elkind, Fred Kleinman, H. Z. Harris, and Joy Cohen. Over the years, whatever religious requirements were expressed or implied in the original thinking of the founder disappeared. The legend and ritual were brought up to date, and for some time Beta Sigma Rho has been a nonsectarian fraternity, its doors open to qualified college men without regard to religion or color.

Alpha Epsilon Pi was the last great predominantly Jewish fraternity. It was founded by Charles C. Moskowitz

and eleven other men. As a night student and an excellent basketball player at New York University, Charles Moskowitz was invited to join one of the existing fraternities, but he soon learned that his companions would not be welcome since it was felt that so many night students would be undesirable. Moskowitz and his friends were by and large Jews of Eastern European origin of lower class background. Even though Moskowitz might have been desirable as an individual of exceptional skill as a basketball player, barriers generally existed between Jews of higher class German background and Eastern European Jews of lower class heritage. Recognition of Alpha Epsilon Pi came on November 7, 1913 when Moskowitz and his friends banded together to create a new organization. Taking an example from many other fraternities, they authorized the writing of a ritual to be based upon Jewish ideals and to exemplify Jewish traditions and practices. The ritual has remained essentially unchanged, having been altered only slightly to accommodate modern trends in language formation. Both the exoteric and esoteric exemplifications of Alpha Epsilon Pi remain bound inextricably to expressions of Jewish faith.²⁹

Together with other Jewish fraternities, Alpha Epsilon Pi provided places for escapees from the persecution in Germany. The later focus was on finding accommodations for Israeli students seeking to pursue graduate studies in this country.³⁰ The fraternity bestows the Gitelson Medallion to the brother who demonstrates outstanding leadership in the field of communal Jewish affairs. Its

quarterly, The Lion, is often a forum and a sounding board for topics of Jewish interest. Many of its chapters remain predominantly Jewish today. Quoting The Lion, "Alpha Epsilon Pi was to be a fraternity dedicated to the development of leadership for those students who would eventually play leading roles in the American Jewish community as well as the general community."³¹

Footnotes to Chapter Two

1. Baird's Manual, p. 333.
2. David Whiman, "Response to the Jewish Image," Unpublished paper, p. 1-2.
3. "Fraternity President," Ebony 17: (Nov. 1961), 76-77.
4. Rabbi Gustav Gottheil was the most important American rabbi to publicly support Zionism during the first Zionist Congress of 1897. Richard Gottheil was president of the American Federation of Zionists 1898-1904.
5. The Conservative Movement at that time was a vestige of the Historical School which had for many years been Zionist-oriented.
6. The First Twenty-Five Years. Edited by Dr. Clarence Weil. Published and copyrighted by Zeta Beta Tau. December 23, 1923, p. 15.
7. Ibid, p. 17.
8. Ibid, p. 18.
9. Ibid, p. 21.
10. Ibid, p. 6
11. It is interesting to note that Rabbi Frankel founded Hillel at the University of Illinois in 1923, which was a decade after the founding of the last major Jewish fraternity.
12. Dr. Maurice Jacobs writes that E. D. S. was composed primarily of German Jews from the Atlanta area. An Eastern European Jew was "treif."
13. The award was later changed to the International Service Award for outstanding accomplishments and contributions to the essentials of brotherhood in the later 1950's.
14. Phi Epsilon Pi Quarterly, Feb. 1936, pp. 6-7.
15. Ibid., (April 1941), p. 1.
16. Ibid., (Sept. 1937), p. 20.
17. Johnson, p. 147.
18. Octagonian, 40, No. 4 (Nov. 1952), p. 21.

19. Ibid., p. 25.
20. Pledge Manual of Sigma Alpha Mu, p. 18.
21. Ibid., p. 19.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. Octagonian, 40, No. 4 (Nov. 1952), p. 26.
25. Octagonian, (Summer 1965), p. 8.
26. Octagonian, (Nov. 1963)
27. Octagonian, (Nov. 1954), p. 13.
28. Baird's Manual, p. 364.
29. Alpha Epsilon Pi History and Roster. (St. Paul, Minnesota: Leland Publishers, 1964), p. 13.
30. Johnson, p. 147.
31. Lion and Alpha Epsilon Pi, (Fall 1963), p. 6.

Origins and Evolution of the Jewish Sorority

Iota Alpha Pi was the oldest national sorority founded by Jewish women. It began at Hunter College in New York City in March, 1903. Its founders were Hannah Finkelstein Swick, Olga Edelstein Ecker, Sadie April Glotzer, Rose Posner Bernstein, Rose Delson Hirschman, May Finkelstein Spiegel, and Francis Zellermyer Delson. They originally held their meetings in members' homes and engaged in settlement work in the lower East of New York. One of their cultural tasks was a study of women in the Bible.¹ The sorority has remained relatively small with most of its chapters placed in the East.

The next predominantly Jewish sorority was Alpha Epsilon Phi which was founded at Barnard College on Oct. 24, 1909 by Ida Beck, Lee Ries, Helen Phillips, Rose Salmowitz, Stella Straus, Rose Gerstein and Augustina Hess. These young women had been unable to join any sororities then in existence, and decided to form their own social group or club so they could meet and discuss various common problems and interests. It was their hope that they could create a sorority free from religious prejudice, and because of this idea, Alpha Epsilon Phi has been nonsectarian since its inception.

Despite the nonsectarian orientation, the membership of this sorority has been predominantly Jewish. Philanthropic projects of Alpha Epsilon Phi include scholarships to the Hebrew Union College, donations of technical books to

the agricultural library of Hebrew University in Israel, and fellowships in social service to Brandeis University.²

One of its honorary members is the late Miss Henrietta Szold who organized Hadassah which brought modern medical methods to Palestine, now, Israel. Other alumni, both honorary and initiated, have been officers of such organizations as Council of Jewish Women, Young Women's Hebrew Association, Jewish Women's Congress, and B'nai B'rith.

Phi Sigma Sigma was founded on November 26, 1913 by ten students attending Hunter College. They were motivated by a desire to perpetuate their mutual interest in pursuing a higher education, the advancement of womanhood through a close union of congenial friends of high character and intelligence, and philanthropic service. These young women were of different religious persuasions, and they founded a nonsectarian group. In the course of the sorority's history, however, the young women chosen for membership have been predominantly Jewish. Some of Phi Sigma Sigma's philanthropic projects include the endowment in perpetuity of a bed in the Beth David Hospital in New York, allocation of \$20,000.00 to the Albert Einstein Medical School of Yeshiva University for the establishment of the Phi Sigma Sigma Laboratory of Heart Research, a Psychological Library to Hebrew University, and a women's dormitory at the Hebrew Technion Institute.³

On March 17, 1917 Delta Phi Epsilon was founded by Minna Goldsmith Mahler, Ida Bienstock Landau, Sylvia Stierman Cohen, and Eva Effron Robin at Washington Square

College of New York University. The sorority is nonsectarian by charter, but traditionally, the membership has been predominantly Jewish.

Sigma Delta Tau was the last Jewish-oriented sorority to be founded. It was started at Cornell University, March 25, 1917 by Inez Dane Ross, Amy Apfel Tishman, Regene Freund Cohane, Marian Gerber Greenberg, Dora Bloom Turteltaub, Lenore Blanche Rubinow, and Grace Srenco Grossman. The need for a sorority which girls of the Jewish faith could join was a necessity. In organizing the sorority and in formulating its ideals and ambitions, the founders were aided by Nathan Caleb House. The sorority is nonsectarian, but the membership is predominantly Jewish. The crest of the sorority contains the Torah and the Star of David, while both the pledging and activation ceremonies are religious in that they have tie-ins to the Jewish religion.⁴ Many of its alumni have taken active roles as leaders in Jewish organizations. The Sigma Delta Tau Foundation is a source of scholarship grants and contributions to Brandeis University.

Footnotes to Chapter Three

1. Baird's Manual, p. 438.
2. Ibid., p. 409.
3. Ibid., p. 450.
4. Letter from alumnus of Sigma Delta Tau.

Jewish Groups - A Closer Look

At the turn of the twentieth century when the Jewish population of American colleges was small, Jewish students who were "socially acceptable" were invited to join the existing fraternities. Some accepted and some did not. But shortly afterwards Jews in fairly large numbers started going to college, and the fraternity situation, for them, became acute. There were too many of them to go into the existing groups, and consequently new local and nationals were formed, some all-Jewish and some with one or two non-Jews to make them nonsectarian. These groups came into being because Jewish students were barred from the general fraternities and sororities and secondly, they desired to belong to a group in which they felt at home because of common background.

By World War I all major Jewish fraternities and sororities had been established. Although most groups were able to place new chapters in the war months between April 1917 and November 1918, some of the existing chapters were forced to close during that time. It appears that Zeta Beta Tau was especially hard hit with the ranks of its chapters and national administration decimated. Its service flag bore several gold stars for its members killed in action. When colleges opened in September of 1917, the Student Officers' Training Corps was established and men became members of the U. S. Army. The colleges were put on a war basis and much of the students' time was occupied by military training.

This all but stopped fraternity activities.¹ When Sigma Delta Tau was founded at Cornell in 1917, the campus was almost depleted of its young men by the war; the women busily knitted khaki-colored sweaters and mufflers. There were personal as well as public anxieties of wartime.² Fraternity houses in many instances were abandoned and the men lived in barracks. Later, the War Department issued an order suspending meetings and initiations. By the time it had been circulated and before it could be put in effect, the armistice was signed and peace was at hand.³

With the Armistice of November 1918 normality returned to the college campus. Chapters of fraternities, both Jewish and Gentile, were reorganized and the Greek system started to flourish. Jewish groups once confined to schools on the Eastern seaboard began to colonize in the Midwest, the South, and finally the West coast in the 1920's. Fraternities such as Zeta Beta Tau, Alpha Epsilon Pi, and Sigma Alpha Mu grew rapidly since Jews began to attend college in greater numbers and were still socially unacceptable in many Gentile groups. For this reason as well as for the purpose of housing, Jewish students found the fraternity idea attractive.

By the time of the stock market crash of 1929, Jewish fraternities and sororities were well established throughout the country. Alpha Epsilon Pi had twenty-one chapters in the East, Midwest, and the South; Phi Epsilon Pi had over thirty groups coast to coast; Phi Sigma Delta was established in over thirty colleges across the nation; Sigma Alpha Mu had almost forty chapters coast to coast and in

Canada, while Zeta Beta Tau had thirty units coast to coast and in Canada. Jewish sororities lagged somewhat behind since fewer Jewish women attended college. Despite this, Alpha Epsilon Phi had over twenty chapters coast to coast by 1929.

Because of their well-established nature, particularly their well-established financial nature, Jewish fraternities and sororities were able to withstand the economic depression of the times. The Depression did in fact slow the expansion of the Greek system, and Jewish groups were no exception. They were, however, able to hold their ground by providing loans to needy individuals. The chapter house was still a warm and home-like residence as well as a social outlet for Jewish men and women. Jews were still barred from Gentile groups due to gentlemen's and ladies' agreements because of rising anti-Semitism in Europe and its effects in the depressed U. S. economy. Anti-Semitism was reflected by many of the Gentile fraternities and sororities.

A genuine obstacle to the Greek system arose during the war years of 1941-45. Jewish groups as well as all others were hard hit and attrition rates of fraternities rose when young men dropped out of school to enlist in the Armed Forces. Service flags of all Jewish fraternities soon became covered with gold stars for those brothers killed in action and their obituaries were published in their respective quarterly journals. It followed that due to high

attrition rates some chapters had to close and expansion was at a standstill.

Too, the sororities participated in the war effort. Sigma Delta Tau answered the call to arms by donating an ambulance to the American Red Cross and through the sale of U. S. War Bonds by active chapter and alumnae leagues, two Flying Fortresses were purchased - Torch of Sigma Delta Tau and Spirit of S. D. T. Twenty-seven SDTs enlisted in the Armed Forces.⁴

The fraternity system boomed in the years of the late forties. Colleges and universities experienced an upsurge in enrollment due to the G. I. Bill and Jews, like their Gentile counterparts, returned to the classroom. Jewish fraternities grew with the mainstream of the Greek system since Jewish men wanted the close comradeship in college that they had known in the service. Some chapters that were forced to close in the war years were reactivated and expansion was heavy, but difficulties were encountered with administrations when Jewish organizations tried to colonize a rural institution.⁵ They did not want Jewish institutions on campus and as an excuse said that they did not want sectarian organizations.

Perhaps the most significant ramification stemming from World War II and the Korean Conflict that affected the Greek system was in the area of segregation by religion. Social barriers started to crumble between Jew and Gentile since Jews fought side by side with Gentiles in two wars. Many veterans began to question the policies

of gentlemen's agreements when they returned to campus in the late forties and fifties. Until 1954 segregation was still the rule on most campuses with few Jewish students being able to affiliate with Gentile societies, while Jewish fraternities and sororities were almost exclusively Jewish in membership.

As late as 1956 the situation was such that "the pattern of segregation is fixed by the so-called white Caucasian fraternities. We simply have to fit in. If we are not permitted to join other fraternities, we must form a fraternity of our own. Nobody really likes to live in a ghetto, but sometimes you have to."⁶ Even the Jewish groups founded on nonsectarian principles were thought to be Jewish in nature.⁷

The Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954 banning discrimination caused a major upheaval in the Greek fraternities. The ban affected Jewish groups in a particularly radical way. Since the Jewish fraternity and sorority was basically composed of individuals of a single ethnic group, the stimulus to integrate presented a unique challenge and perhaps a threat to its established identity.

Jewish civic groups such as The Anti-Defamation League immediately supported integration. The ADL policy on fraternities was: "ADL policy, however, is opposed to the practice of racial or religious discrimination by college fraternities. It believes that the purposes of university education are defeated when fraternities introduce social discrimination on the campus. Such discrimination, ADL

believes, (1) introduces students into the practice of racial and religious bias which they then carry into later life, (2) denies the full use of college facilities to the students discriminated against because fraternities frequently control the social activities and housing facilities on campus. Finally, (3) it limits that kind of free and uninhibited association among students which is an important part of the basic educational process."⁸

The Jewish community was divided on the issue of integration and for that matter still is to this day. The problem has two sides - Jewish youth could enter a Gentile group and Gentiles could now be accepted into Jewish groups. It was recognized that some Jewish students would join Gentile groups. The real crux of the issue is whether or not Jewish groups would accept Gentiles and in what manner and numbers.

Writing in the Jewish Digest, Irwin E. Schlussel says:

"I would ask Mrs. Wolff to inspire her child for the opportunity awaiting him at college - a rare chance to enjoy and promote the true universality of man's fraternal spirit...I would explain to her that the attempt to picture religious observance as a normal or proper part of fraternity life erroneously begs the question. Practice of one's religion is, and should remain, a personal thing...Students who desire to participate in religious programs do so through special denominational clubs - the Hillel Foundations provide admirable facilities and activities in this respect... If they (fraternities) do not integrate, they will and should be abolished. Since this will be good for society, it will be good for the Jews...Any segregation by itself implies a difference which in turn invites discrimination. Let us not attempt to build a golden ghetto around our children. Rather, let us teach them to share their rich heritage with all their fellow men."⁹

Jewish civic groups such as the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Committee sided with men like Irwin Schlusel and promoted the integration of Jewish groups. Not all Jewish leaders agreed, however. Dr. Maurice Jacobs felt that integrated fraternity membership would not work and cited four cases where integration had failed. Furthermore, Dr. Jacobs believed that those houses that pledged non-Jews would attract the lowest caliber of Gentile man, thus making it more difficult to attract desirable Jewish members. Secondly, he thought that integrated fraternities and sororities would complicate the serious problem of intermarriage. Lastly, Dr. Jacobs felt that integrated fraternities and sororities would be a serious blow to Jewish leadership on college campuses in that members of mixed groups are more likely to hide their Jewishness than to express pride in it. "In my judgement", Dr. Jacobs writes, "we are planning to destroy a good force on the campus without providing an adequate substitute. Integration of fraternities and sororities must inevitably mean the end of Jewish fraternities and sororities...I feel it is my right to belong to an all-Jewish fraternity if I wish to...It took 60 years to build the strength of the Jewish fraternities and sororities into a decent force and into a positive factor for Jewish life on the campus. Let's not give these up so easily."¹⁰

Other leaders supported Dr. Jacobs. Dr. Frank Rosenthal, Hillel Director, University of Washington

believed that all-Jewish fraternities could contribute to the revitalization of American Jewry by their Jewish identity and participation in Hillel affairs.¹¹ Arnold Hoffman, Past Supreme Master of Alpha Epsilon Pi, had similar ideas in mind when he wrote, "We must and are developing a positive program whereby our Jewish youth will be kept aware of its heritage and responsibility to the Jewish community at large. The methods by which this is to be implemented into our individual chapters are now being studied and devised in many of our Jewish fraternities by committees composed of both lay and rabbinical members. The program decided upon within each fraternity may have a slightly different approach, but I am certain the end result and purposes will be the same - The retention of our Jewish college youth in our Jewish way of life."¹²

Despite these objections, Jewish fraternities and sororities on many campuses did integrate as the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Committee encouraged. Ethnic barriers dropped by the wayside as many of the traditionally Jewish fraternities at the University of Texas began to rush Gentiles to keep their chapters full.¹³ Jewish sororities at Syracuse University have been making concerted drives to pledge attractive Gentile girls and vice versa.¹⁴ At this time there are only a handful of totally Jewish fraternities and sororities in the country with most having some proportion of Gentiles in their ranks. To this day the question of integration still poses identity problems for some chapters.¹⁵ For

instance, some Jewish fraternities and sororities which were once totally Jewish have become so integrated to the extent that prospective Jewish members no longer see it as a Jewish organization, while Gentiles view it as a "Jew house."¹⁶

In June of 1967 when Jewish ethnicity arose on college campuses after Israel's stunning victory over Arab forces the effects were nil on most Jewish fraternities and sororities. The chief reason for this is probably that from the years 1954 to 1967 Jewish groups had become nonsectarianized and their ranks included many Gentiles.¹⁷ The Jewish ethnicity movements could not re-vitalize Jewish fraternities and sororities since through the process of integration, most had disenfranchised their identities as Jewish groups. Only those Jewish houses that remained Jewish in membership were able to capitalize on the movement.

The seventies brought new challenges and problems to Jewish fraternities and sororities. At this time the counter-culture gave the university a universal, secularist, life-style which diametrically opposed a Jewish life-style. The latter was seen as ethnic tribalism which was seen as atavistic and as logically unjustifiable in the universalist atmosphere. Polarities were set up in the consciousness of the Jewish student. Judaism was identified with the group and ethnocentrism; secularism, with the universal concerns. Jewish society's tone was warm and lush; the academic style was cool and spare.

The Jewish society was bourgeois; the academic, swinging. The Jewish community was the culture of organizations; the college society was the scene of privatism and self-expression. Not surprisingly, the student tended to opt for the secular alternative.¹⁸ By choosing this option, the Jewish student was disenfranchising his Jewish identity. Because of this, he or she was not likely to affiliate with a predominantly Jewish group, Greek or otherwise. The universal atmosphere of the college even permitted a Jewish student to join a basically Gentile fraternity or sorority. Gary Anderson of Alpha Epsilon Pi stated, "Freshmen are smarter. He won't be impressed by a Jewish house...He'll like an atmosphere in which he will be happy. If it's ATO, that's where he'll go."¹⁹

Along with universalism there is the tendency to alienation. In The Uncommitted Kenneth Kenniston defines alienation as a response of individuals especially sensitized to reject culture in their early development, a development which in part reflects their family's efforts to solve dilemmas built into American life.²⁰ The classic illustration of Jewish alienation is that of a youngster telling his parents that the rabbi said it was wrong to eat pork, while his mother slips bacon slices on his plate saying, "We didn't send you to religious school to learn that!". The child senses the double-think and hypocrisy of his parents' thinly-veiled will to assimilate into American culture and rejects his religion entirely. The alienated outlook is directly opposed to the outlook pro-

vided by the Jewish fraternity, or for that matter, any other. Whereas the fraternity promotes a healthy outlook on human nature, closeness, team-work, possibility of mutual understanding and tolerance, it has been found that some people who are from their ethnic background have a low view of human nature, repudiation of intimacy, rejection of group activities, impossibility of true communication, and intolerance. Secondly, the alienated Jewish student will be "turned-off" by the cultural aspects of the Jewish fraternity since it purveys that culture which the alienated student originally rejects - Yiddishkeit and Jewishness. The most vivid example is that of a leading Big Ten University where only 500 students of a Jewish population of 5,000 had any association with Jewish organizations, which included Hillel, Chabad, Jewish fraternities and sororities and a kosher commune. Somewhere among the 4,500 unaffiliated students, alienation took its toll and the Jewish fraternities and sororities along with the other Jewish organizations were affected.²¹

Finally, a new phenomenon has appeared on the college campus - Jewish radicalism. Jewish students who were once turned off by Jewish fraternities and sororities have banded together to form haveroth and kosher communes and co-ops. These organizations in turn attract a student who is more interested and committed in his Judaism than exhibiting a Jewish identity. The haverah provides kashruth, Shabat, holidays, and a Jewish life-style, more than any fraternity or sorority can offer. Ten or fifteen

years ago the Jewish fraternity and sorority was the only form of Jewish communal living which was marginally Jewish in life-style. With the havera (which incidentally offers co-ed living in many cases) on the college scene, the Jewish fraternity and sorority no longer have monopolies on Jewish life-styles and must compete with the havera in certain instances for membership.²²

Footnotes to Chapter Four

1. First Twenty-Five Years of Zeta Beta Tau, p. 49.
2. Pledge Manual of Sigma Delta Tau, p. 3.
3. First Twenty-Five Years of Zeta Beta Tau, p. 49.
4. Pledge Manual of Sigma Delta Tau, p. 4.
5. Commentary 21: (May 1956), 451.
6. Commentary 21: (Feb. 1956), 118-125.
7. David Whiman, Response to the Jewish Image. Unpublished term paper, William and Mary, 1971.
8. "Fraternity Integration, Ideal or Foolhardy?" National Jewish Monthly, (Nov. 1961), p. 12.
9. Irwin E. Schlusel, "Integrated Fraternities Are Good for the Jews," The Jewish Digest, (June 1961), p. 51-53.
10. Dr. Maurice Jacobs, "Let's Look at Four Case Histories," The Jewish Digest, (Sept. 1960), p. 5-7.
11. Dr. Frank Rosenthal, "Greek and Jew: The Challenge of Chanukah," The Lion, (Winter 1956), p. 7.
12. Arnold B. Hoffman, "Fraternities - the New Look," The Lion, (Winter 1956), p. 12.
13. Ben Gallob, "Ethnic Barriers Slip as Fraternities Vie for Members," Jewish Telegraphic Agency. Reprinted from "The Voice," (Jan. 1, 1971).
14. "Sororities: Do They Swing?" Seventeen 25: (Aug. 1966)
15. Notwithstanding is the problem of racial integration. An alumnus of SDT at the University of Toledo states that when her chapter took two black girls in preference to two Jewish girls, the sorority lost the support and recognition of the Jewish alumnae of the Toledo community.
16. Dr. Maurice Jacobs, "Let's Look at Four Case Histories," Jewish Digest, Sept. 1960, p. 5.
17. It is interesting to note that after 1954 the quarterly journals of Jewish groups adopted a nonsectarian tenor. Most journals hardly mentioned the Six-Day War and by 1967 few articles of Jewish interest (as opposed to pre-1954) were being published in them.

18. Irving Greenberg, "Jewish Survival on the College Campus," Judaism, 17: (1968), p. 260.
19. Anderson, tape recorded interview, Sept. 27, 1975, Cincinnati, Ohio.
20. Kenneth Kenniston, The Uncommitted (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965).
21. The fact that there is now only one Jewish fraternity and two Jewish sororities bears witness to the alienation of Jewish students at this university. In 1968 there were seven Jewish fraternities and four Jewish sororities. Efforts to reorganize inactive groups have been nil.
22. Mention must be made at this point of Omega Deuteron Chapter of Alpha Epsilon Pi at the University of Michigan. The group was inactive from 1970-72. It was reactivated in 1972 as a kosher and co-ed fraternity. The house operates a kosher kitchen, observes Shabbat to the point that the lights are taped to the "on" position, builds a succah, and is 100% Jewish in membership. It is the only active Jewish fraternity operating at Michigan's campus at this time. Its radical departure from the fraternity image is probably the reason for its existence and success at a liberal campus such as U. M.

The Counter-Culture and Jewish Fraternities

Although integration and Jewish ethnicity played an important role in shaping the destiny of many Jewish sororities and fraternities in the late fifties and sixties, the youth culture also had great effect upon their developments. The counter-culture could be defined as that movement which stood for anti-Establishment values and personal freedom that expressed itself through such modes as activism, the use of proscribed drugs, autonomy in life style, and non-conformity in regard to dress and hair styles.

In the late sixties and early seventies the quarterly journals of Jewish groups published articles which portrayed facets of the youth culture as a direct threat to and antithesis of the Greek system. The Octagonian states, "Through the years college fraternities have aspired to be accepted as an integral and respected part of the academic establishment. Now that this objective has been achieved 'establishment' has become a nasty word. The in-thing to be is anti-establishment. Tradition is shrugged aside; hence the college fraternity - deeply rooted in American heritage - is suspect, the relevancy of its ideals questioned."¹ In describing an Alpha Epsilon Pi convention, George Todt stereotypes the men as "a conclave of young businessmen, absent of long hairs and beatniks."² If this were so, we need to ask why were Jewish groups so heavily influenced by the counter-culture and its affects?

One of the chief reasons that Jews were so involved in counter-culture activities was because of idealistic beliefs. One theory, the "continuity hypothesis," suggests that radicals share, rather than repudiate, the basic value commitments of their liberal parents. Many Jewish parents are highly educated, urbanized, and cosmopolitan professionals, service workers (teachers and social workers, for example), or intellectuals. In rearing their children they stressed sensitivity to injustice and discrimination, distrust of irrational and bureaucratic authority, and urged their offspring to question, to make their own decisions, and to challenge the status quo.³ The doctrine of Jewish activism could well be stated by Hillel the Elder's maxim, "If I am not for myself, who will be for me? And if I am only for myself, what am I? And if not now, when?"

Dave Maibaum and John Chessler, Alpha Epsilon Pi undergraduates at Miami of Ohio, perhaps give the most candid observation to the effect of activism on the Jewish fraternity. "In 1970 Alpha Epsilon Pi at Miami had a 75-man house with 22 pledges. The Kent State Incident wrecked the house...Miami was hit hard by riots...Kids were sent home with credit...Alpha Epsilon Pi went from 70 to 22 men overnight...Guys just left...All houses were hit... Alpha Epsilon Pi was never built up yet...At that time the house was 75% Jewish, but the Jews took off because of Jewish values of social justice and objections to a

wrong war...Jewish cradle of life and waste of life... Didn't want to live in a system that was wrong. Establishment was at its lowest point. Nobody wanted to be part of a group...Be independent - be yourself...way of life...radicals in any walk of life, Jewish included... Established organization out...House believed it and men quit...High mortgage on the house...We took anybody, Jew or Gentile."⁴ These undergraduates would probably agree with Keith Karnofsky's statement, "Activism is a Jewish thing."⁵

Activism was often a vicious circle which spelled the end of Jewish fraternities and sororities. If members became interested in Students for Democratic Society, anti-war protesting, etc., they often lost interest in the fraternity. If the house as a unit became active in the movement, it often lost its identity as a social group and closed down as Alpha Epsilon Pi did at Miami of Ohio. Lastly, if the chapter was not involved in activism, it was stigmatized as irrelevant and thus found difficulty in attracting new members. Looking back, Gary Anderson, a Regional Governor of Alpha Epsilon Pi says, "With S. D. S., the hippie movement or whatever, fighting the Establishment was in. One does not have to be rebellious to be active today. Then, in the late sixties and early seventies, they did. (Activism) need not overthrow fraternities now. One can be a good fraternity man and an activist."⁶

In the late sixties and early seventies the second factor that influenced many young Jews to become interested in the counter-culture movement was Jewish affluence. It was perhaps this factor that caused Jews to be one of the highest percentage groups on college campuses to use drugs. Ed Gold, Regional Governor of Alpha Epsilon Pi states baldly, "Jewish kids want to be in the forefront of the change even if they don't understand what change is all about, but they want to be in the forefront. They want to be the first to smoke pot, play around with drugs because it was the in-thing and they had the money so they could afford to do it and they did it. We lost many chapters because of drugs than the non-Jewish groups lost... Our kids are the big experilementers."⁷

Using drugs, like activism, often created a vicious cycle in fraternity and sorority houses. Since they could not be used on the premisis, individuals who wanted to use them had to quit or be expelled from the organization. If the group condoned their use in the chapter house, it found itself in trouble with the legal authorities, the college administration, and the nation organization.

Just as affluence was one factor in the reason that many Jews used drugs, it was the chief reason that Jewish college students could afford to live in off-campus apartments. With national organizations building houses that needed to accommodate fifty to sixty members, local chapters had great difficulties in filling their houses in order to operate in solvency. This was the chief reason

that Phi Sigma Delta and Phi Epsilon Pi merged with Zeta Beta Tau since the former groups incurred heavy financial losses in the late sixties. An Alpha Epsilon Pi who was at Ohio State University from 1961-63 mentions, "Apartments kept girls from sororities...it killed the Greeks.". With Jewish students living off campus because of affluent status, extra pressures were put on Jewish fraternities and sororities. National organizations had simply invested too much money for housing their chapters and when they could not court men and women away from apartments, the local chapters often had to close, usually at financial loss to the national. In addition to being a status symbol in its own right, the apartment provided a better and safer place for the use of drugs as well as sexual liason. At this time fraternities were plagued by in loco parentis policies of the university.

In the middle seventies the effects of the counter-culture either became incorporated into the Establishment or disappeared. Drugs such as marijuana became deoriminalized to the point that arrest for simple possession meant only a small fine thus making it compatible with fraternity life. The end to U. S. involvement in Viet Nam deflated the activism movements of the sixties giving a more mellow, less radical tenor to the university campus. Lastly, inflation has driven the price of apartment living beyond the means of even the most affluent students. For this reason, fraternities and sororities, with few exceptions, have been able to make recoveries.

Footnotes to Chapter Five

1. Octagonian of Sigma Alpha Mu, (Spring 1970), p. 2.
2. Lion of Alpha Epsilon Pi, (Winter 1966), p. 18.
3. Jack Porter and Peter Dreier, Jewish Radicalism, (New York: Grove Press, 1973), xxi.
4. Interview with David Maibaum and John Chessler, Alpha Epsilon Pi Fraternity, Miami University of Ohio. Oct. 19, 1975.
5. "Prophets: True or False," Time 92: (Sept. 20, 1968), p. 66.
6. Interview with Gary Anderson, Alpha Epsilon Pi Regional Governor in Cincinnati, Ohio. Sept. 27, 1975.
7. Interview with Edward Gold, Alpha Epsilon Pi Regional Governor. Miami Beach, Florida. Aug. 20, 1975.

Interview Data - The Alumni

Question #1. Why did you join a fraternity (sorority)?

For the alumni graduating between 1955 and 1973 the primary reasons for joining a Jewish college fraternity or sorority were social factors. Falling under this category were responses such as "liked the people," "knew the people in it," (most admitted that their friends were Jewish) "status," "social contacts," "wanted to be part of a group," and general social reasons such as feeling comfortable with a group, the desire for closer friendships, and the activities of the fraternity or sorority. In several instances men and women reported that they were students at a commuter campus where the fraternity or sorority provided a social outlet.

Running a weak second to social factors was that of Jewish identity. An Alpha Epsilon Phi at the University of Pittsburgh said, "Pitt was a commuter school...As an out-of-towner I wanted to make an identity and associate with a group of Jewish women...Hillel was not active." A Pi Lam from the West Virginia University reported that "the fraternity life (Jewish fraternity life) was the sole existence of Jewish life. Hillel was inadequate then." From these statements it could be surmised that Jewish groups such as these provided an association with other Jewish students when Hillel was inactive. It was also stated by an Alpha Epsilon Phi at Ohio State (who is a rabbi's daughter) that Hillel was too Orthodox and that the sorority provided greater access to Jewish friends.

The third major factor in this question was that several men and women perceived that associating with a college fraternity was in vogue and at the time "the thing to do". A Zeta Beta Tau from Ohio State frankly states, "It was part of a way of life in college - there was a need to join."

Other responses to this question were the possibility of future job opportunities, the chance to build a new group, physical structure (national fraternities and sororities had started to build comfortable houses for many of their chapters at this time), rejection of dorm life, legacies, academic standing of the chapter (to be discussed later), parental suggestion ("My parents expected me to do something like that. We did it without challenging it."), association with a high school fraternity and finally one fraternity man was induced to join upon receipt of free room and board in exchange for kitchen duties.

Question #2. What purpose was the fraternity (sorority)?

The leading response to the above question were social reasons which included friendship, house activities, social contacts, group living, group identity, and brotherhood. This correlates closely with the first question as to why men and women join these organizations, that is, they originally affiliate for social reasons, and in retrospect feel that the purpose of their fraternity life was basically for social factors. As one Alpha Epsilon Pi alumni states, "The fraternity is not a religious Jewish

organization. The founders of our fraternity weren't founding a shul but a social organization where they could have a good time."

Following social factors were those of living conditions and Jewish identity. A Sigma Delta Tau from Indiana felt that her house provided "lovely living conditions, good food, and stability." (It must be mentioned that the houses at Indiana University are among the most modern and highly mortgaged in the country.).

Jewish identity seemed to be a purpose in its own right. Responses along these lines included "be with Jewish kids," "greater access to Jewish friends," "place to be with guys of my own religion," and "continued association with Jewish people." The most eloquent answer of this category was verbalized by a Sigma Delta Tau of the University of Toledo. "The campus didn't permit Jewish girls joining other houses...I thought there would be more Jewish girls in the sorority and I would meet Jewish fraternity guys."¹ Several of the men and women who answered Jewish identity to Question #1 were the ones who responded in a similar manner to Question #2.

Following living conditions and Jewish identity were the factors of campus activities, academics, help in future job contacts in response to the purpose of associating. This seems to bear out Bohrnstedt's finding that Jews are more likely to use the fraternity for upward social mobility. On many campuses the academic standing of Jewish houses is quite high which in turn attracts men and women

interested in post-graduate and professional training. It is perceived that academic achievement is the key to acceptance into post-graduate programs, and with their emphasis on the academic, Jewish fraternities and sororities aid in this area. It was also felt that by merely associating with an organization such as this, one's chances for future employment or acceptance into graduate or professional school would be improved since the image of Greek life was that of a man or woman involved with campus affairs.

Question #3. Why did you join a Jewish group?

Of the men and women surveyed, the single primary reason for pledging a Jewish group was simply that many Jewish men and women never considered associating with a Gentile group. An Alpha Epsilon Phi who attended the University of Pittsburgh responded, "Why not (join a Jewish house)? The barriers were up...no opportunity to pledge a Gentile house...ladies' agreements."

Running second to the above question was a conglomeration of Jewish-centered answers. These replies included comfort and compatibility, friends were Jewish, and Jewish identity. An Alpha Epsilon Pi at New York University frankly states, "I was Jewish...there was more compatibility than with another house." In responding to this question an Alpha Epsilon Pi alumni from the University of Kentucky simply answered, "There was no particular reason for a Jewish house. My friends from

high school were there...They happened to be Jewish." Lastly, a Pi Lam from West Virginia University plainly replied, "Jewish house for association with Jews."

Other responses to this question were "to meet Jewish guys," "rushed by a Jewish house" (suggests a mutual relationship between organization and individual in terms of identity), "legacy," "Jewish house was inexpensive," and "parental objection to pledging a Gentile group." An Alpha Epsilon Phi from Indiana University admits, "I almost pledged a Gentile house... My folks wouldn't understand anything but a Jewish sorority because it was expected of me."

To summarize, it could be said that Jewish men and women pledged Jewish fraternities and sororities in response to the segregation patterns of their day. These patterns extended to the high school level such that one's high school friends were Jewish and that the likelihood was that these high school associations would be continued in the environment of the college fraternity.

Question #4. What Jewish activities were there in your group?

The overwhelming response to the above was that there were few if any Jewish activities in Jewish fraternities and sororities. There was also little activity by the alumni groups. A sorority member from Indiana admits, "There was no Jewish fund-raising and little identity of being a Jewish house. We were supposed to be Jewish nationally...There was a prayer before dinner...Being active in Hillel was looked down upon...It was something that Jewish

fraternity and sorority kids didn't do...That was for independents." A Cincinnati sorority girl confided that as her chapter took more Gentiles, a Hannukah party was changed to a non-sectarian "Good Seasons Party."

For those alumni that reported Jewish content in their Greek experiences, leading responses were mezzuzah on door, symbols, identity, and initiations of Jewish content, Shabbas candles, Passover matzah, Ha-Motzi, and High Holiday hospitality. A sorority alumna from Cincinnati mentioned that they were compelled to belong to Hillel and attend worship services at the Hebrew Union College.

Question #5. What differences did you notice between Jewish and Gentile houses?

Most of the alumni felt that there were no differences between Jewish and Gentile houses. An Alpha Epsilon Phi from Pittsburgh responded, "It was before the time of social activism...Girls went to have a good time...No women's lib."

Many, however, had mixed feelings. The chief reason for this was perhaps because they had not been rushed by Gentile groups and, therefore, could not check out any differences. On this account it was a difficult question to answer.

However, for those who reported differences, those mentioned were: "no feeling of belonging in Gentile house," "fewer social activities in a Jewish house," "identity difference between Jewish and Gentile groups," "better

food and rooms in a Jewish house," "Gentiles drank more," "Gentiles were closer" (response given by a Jewish sorority girl whose chapter was becoming increasingly innundated with Gentiles and losing Jewish cohesiveness), and "Gentiles are athletic."

Question #6. Should a Jewish fraternity or sorority stay Jewish in terms of the religious preference of its members?

In response to this question the majority of the alumni believed that the organizations should stay all Jewish or predominantly Jewish. One sorority woman responded, "We had a strong Jewish identity...Jewish kids stuck together...felt comfortable." An Alpha Epsilon Pi from Wayne State University said, "Find as many Jewish members. I'd tell my son to join a predominantly Jewish house...Not necessary to be 100% Jewish...Don't want kid to be a minority and treated like one in a college fraternity...Want predominantly Jewish chapters...Danger of chapters to go more Gentile when you have reasonably higher numbers of non-Jewish members in it. They tend to look after themselves."

A strong second was the response that the groups should be increasingly mixed. An Alpha Epsilon Pi alumni from Drake University stated, "The fraternity house should be mixed. The man needs to get away from home which is a structured environment...So is an all Jewish house... He'll never learn to live with the outside man." A Sigma Alpha Mu from Michigan responded, "Now I'm not

sheltered...Frat living was a cultural and religious vacuum...reason for its demise." Finally, an Alpha Epsilon Phi from Indiana replied succinctly, "It shouldn't... Gentile houses shouldn't remain all Gentile."

Other answers to this question were "depends on the individual campus," "mixed feelings (Like Jewish identity but don't like to live in a ghetto)," and "don't know."

Question #7. Did your Jewishness strengthen while being in the fraternity or sorority?

The response to this question was overwhelmingly negative. An Alpha Epsilon Phi from Ohio State reported, "It (sorority) weakened it...Jewish girls dated Gentile boys - I didn't like it...Purpose of sorority was to meet Jewish guys." A Pi Lam from Cincinnati mentioned that "Frat meant good-bye to religion...We had guys going to HUC, but they didn't express Judaism at the house." An Alpha Epsilon Phi from Indiana replied, "Definitely not...I was married to a Jew, but now I'm married to a non-Jew." A Sigma Delta Tau who was a minority among Gentiles in her chapter stated, "No...Lessened through experience...Jew against Gentiles...I needed to forgo Friday night services...out-numbered in suggesting Jewish activities for house." On a less castigating note a Sigma Alpha Mu from Cincinnati admits, "No, it didn't strengthen...I had a good background from home...It (Jewishness) didn't weaken."

There were several positive responses. A Sigma Delta Tau from Cincinnati conceded that "Sorority experience

helped me to become more observant now...We're (my husband and I) active in the temple...We head a young married group... Had I not joined SDT, it could have gone either way." An Alpha Epsilon Phi from Ohio State reported, "I got group identity...Went to Hillel together...Went to Jewish fraternity parties...Medium for meeting Jewish guys." A Sigma Delta Tau from Indiana responded with this feeling, "My Jewish identity strengthened...Decided to marry a Jewish man...Realized that I wanted to be involved in the Jewish community...Enjoyed being Jewish." Lastly, a Zeta Beta Tau from Indiana admitted, "Being a Reform Jew, I met different Jews and learned from them...Also met Jewish girls...Should be a function."

Question #8. Did being Jewish have any influence in pledging a Jewish fraternity or sorority?

In response to this question the return was a lopsided positive-being Jewish did affect one's joining a Jewish group. Comments, however, varied from individual to individual. An Alpha Epsilon Phi from Ohio State answered, "Yes...Never considered joining anything else.", while a sorority sister of hers at Indiana replied, "Yes... Being Jewish would be uncomfortable in a Gentile sorority... Maybe feel comfortable now in a mixed group." A SAM at Cincinnati baldly states, "I wouldn't have pledged unless I was Jewish...I was Jewish."

There were several dissenting opinions. An Alpha Epsilon Phi from Ohio State replied, "No...Maybe my friends

were Jewish...College kids now are thoughtful...Its hard to remember reasons for doing things...There was little Jewish orientation." A Cincinnati Pi Lam admits, "I might have pledged a Gentile house if I had the money."

Some of the alumni had mixed emotions. An Alpha Epsilon Phi at Indiana responded, "I didn't do anything because it was Jewish...I came from a small town where being Jewish was no hassle. It became a hassle in college... There was separatism I never felt before...Sorority made a wider gap...Everybody was friends in a small town... Sororities created a gap I never knew...Maybe that was the reason that I considered a Gentile house...But my parents wouldn't accept it."

To conclude, it may be said that Jewish men and women joined Jewish fraternities and sororities for social reasons since they were barred from Gentile groups and as a result high school friendships were continued in the college fraternity environment. Factors of Jewish identity, although present to an extent, were secondary reasons. Most alumni reported few, if any, Jewish activities in their respective houses, while the majority of them did not perceive any differences between Jewish and Gentile groups. Although the men and women responded negatively to the question of whether or not the organization strengthens one's Jewishness, they nevertheless felt that the groups should be predominantly or completely Jewish in membership. This fact perhaps indicates a mild reinforcing effect on an individual's Jewish identity

much in the same way that living in a predominantly Jewish neighborhood serves as identification with the local Jewish community. Most alumni thought that being Jewish had influence in pledging a Jewish fraternity or sorority, indicating an expectation that their Greek experiences would have some Jewish orientation even if it were only slight. One must surmise that Jewish fraternities and sororities were at the most marginally Jewish as Jewish socializing agencies.

Interview Data - The Undergraduates

Question #1. Why did you join a fraternity (sorority)?

The chief reason that undergraduates chose to pledge a fraternity or sorority were social factors which included "wanting to meet people," "liking the people," "friends were here," and lastly, the "communter syndrome" where a student at a university such as Northeastern University at Boston, Mass. affiliates to supplement his home-to-school-and-return routine. Statements reflecting this factor were verbalized by the following students:

Zeta Beta Tau at Vanderbilt University - "Frat is an important thing in college. There was brotherhood and I liked it. I felt this before school. The frat offers something outside of school where education is living with others and the frat helps. Frat can't hurt a person in any way." Sigma Delta Tau at Miami University of Ohio - "Without the sorority I would have dropped out of school. I needed something to do." Zeta Beta Tau at the University of Illinois - "Liked the idea of being part of something." Alpha Epsilon Pi at the University of Illinois - "My friends from USY (United Synagogue Youth) were all here." Lastly, an Alpha Epsilon Pi from Northeastern University remarked - "School was 80% commuter and I wanted something more. I wanted to be involved with people and the university."

Placing a strong second was the response that the fraternity or sorority represented an alternate place to live. A Sigma Delta Tau at Michigan admitted the reason that she joined the sorority was that "I was kicked out of

the dorm by the lottery."¹ The University of Michigan as well as many other schools are undergoing severe housing shortages, and the fraternities and sororities are aiding the university in quartering students. A SAM at Miami of Ohio admitted, "The fraternity is off-campus. We're not subject to university rules." At the University of Illinois an Alpha Epsilon Phi mentions, "U. I. is big. It's easy to get lost in a crowd. There's a house atmosphere here which kills alienation." A sorority sister of hers replied, "I never had brothers or sisters. The dorm is cold and informal. The sorority would broaden my experience." Lastly, an Alpha Epsilon Phi at Illinois reported, "I got admitted to school late. I pledged because of housing opportunities."

The third major factor that Jewish students joined Jewish fraternities and sororities were for reasons of Jewish affiliation. A svelte Alpha Epsilon Phi at the University of Michigan admitted, "In my first two years at the dorms there was quite a bit of anti-Semitism. The people were very prejudiced and I wanted to live with Jewish people. You can't run away from anti-Semitism, but you can fight it by living in a Jewish house." An Alpha Epsilon Phi from Sioux City, Iowa responded, "I come from a small town. I wasn't exposed to many Jews. It's good to get near other Jewish people." A Zeta Beta Tau at Vanderbilt answered, "I wanted a Jewish group. I was concerned with going to temple and I could get a ride from one of the brothers." (Hillel is weak at Vanderbilt and the Nashville temples and

synagogues are out of walking distance). Lastly, a Delta Phi Epsilon from Ohio State mentioned, "I wanted to retain my Jewishness. I wanted to meet Jewish fraternity guys and Jewish girls."

Following these primary factors were a host of secondary ones. Perhaps the most interesting one was food. Several Alpha Epsilon Pi's at the University of Michigan pledged because the fraternity operated a kosher kitchen. Even though Alpha Epsilon Pi does not keep kosher at Illinois, one member reported that the fraternity gives a rebate so any individuals who might want to eat kosher food outside the house would not have to incur any extra expense.

Other responses included "please parents," "sports," "academics," "high school fraternity experience," "build a new group," and "the house was mellow (used drugs)." The last response indicates the point that various phases of the counter-culture became incorporated into fraternity living whereas five years ago, the use of drugs was diametrically opposed to fraternity life.

Question #2. What was the purpose of the fraternity (sorority)?

The overwhelming response to this question was that the purposes of these organizations were social in nature. A Sigma Delta Tau at Michigan states succinctly, "There's a family feeling where you can get close to girls. Socially, there's somebody to do something with." A Tau Epsilon Phi at the University of Illinois responded, "The purpose for me was to know I could cooperate with people, yet keep my

individuality." Friendship was often verbalized as a purpose of fraternity life. An Alpha Epsilon Phi at

Indiana reported, "Friendship with a variety of girl friends," while an Alpha Epsilon Pi at Cincinnati responded, "Social activities and better relationships with people." Expectations of friendships were often expressed in hope of life-time duration.

Running a weak second to the social aspects of fraternity and sorority life was that of academics. A Zeta Beta Tau from Illinois responded, "We're #1 academically here. It has something to do with being Jewish. The guys are driven by their parents in the notion that Jews should be smarter and the leaders." The academic standing of most Jewish houses is usually quite high. This seems to bear out what Bohrnstedt has found in terms that Jews use fraternities for social mobility and because they think membership insures high marks, which are necessary for entrance into professional schools. A Sigma Delta Tau at Indiana whose chapter had become increasingly innundated with Gentile members laments, "Our academics were high. Not now. There's too much emphasis on social events. Could be because of the Gentiles." Even though top academic standing is prestigious to the chapter and beneficial to its members, some Jewish fraternity people were critical of this stereotype. A SAM at Illinois retorted, "SAM wasn't supposed to be good athletically. When we started kicking the shit out of these big jock fraternities with their sorority girls watching them, we got respect by Gentiles. Just because I'm

Jewish doesn't necessarily mean I'm a studier. I like to have my fun too."

Following academics was the desire to associate with other Jews as a purpose in itself. Illustrating this trend were statements such as "kashrut and place to live with Jewish kids" (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Illinois), "belonging to a Jewish community" (Zeta Beta Tau - Vanderbilt), and "I wanted to live with other Jewish girls" (Sigma Delta Tau - Indiana). Desire for association with Jews seems to occupy the same relative position.

Other responses to this question included "richer life style," "desire to meet Jews of the opposite sex," "a place to live," "sports," "leadership," and "grad school." The latter two are perhaps clear expectations that the fraternity and sorority are direct vehicles of social mobility.

Question #3. Why did you pledge a Jewish fraternity (sorority)?

The leading response to this question was that many undergraduates pledged Jewish houses because individuals felt more comfortable with Jews in a living arrangement than in a Gentile environment. Statements reflecting this idea were: "Birds of a feather - I'm comfortable with Jews" (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Northeastern), "I was raised with Jews" (Sigma Delta Tau - Indiana), "Warmer than others...girls closer...typical of being Jewish" (Sigma Delta Tau - Cincinnati), "More comfortable psychologically" (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Cincinnati), "Grew up with Jewish kids ...

I would feel out of place at a Gentile house...Comfortable here...Common things with Jews" (Sigma Delta Tau - Illinois), and "More comfortable...Knew friction between Jews and Gentiles in high school...Wanted to get away from it" (Pi Lam - Illinois).

An interesting difference between the alumni and the undergraduates is that most alumni never had the chance to even consider joining a Gentile group, whereas the undergraduates often had the opportunity to pledge Gentile organizations, but elected to affiliate with Jewish chapters because of ethnic acceptance and mutual congeniality. It should be noted, however, that all Jewish undergraduates did not share this view point. To be sure, some Jewish students did consider affiliating with a Gentile group. An Alpha Epsilon Phi at Indiana University relates, "I considered XXX. I was happy at both AEW and XXX. XXX was a challenge. They don't take Jews. It was challenging since I'm from Highland Park, Ill. (a predominantly Jewish suburb of North Shore Chicago). My majority of social life was Jewish and I thought I could break away. It wasn't easy since there was a quota for Jews at XXX. I went AEW by default."

Discrimination was not the rule in every case and in many universities it was possible for Jewish men and women to pledge Gentile organizations. Despite this, a fair majority of Jewish students only considered Jewish houses. A Sigma Delta Tau at Illinois admits, "I couldn't live in a Gentile house being orthodox. I make kosher meals here which are sent from home. I don't go out on Friday

night. I would get problems from Gentiles." Not all responses along this line were as religiously oriented. An Alpha Epsilon Pi at Memphis State replied, "I'm Jewish and Jews need to be with Jews. I'm not assimilationist." In the same vein an Alpha Epsilon Phi at Illinois responded, "I'm culturally very Jewish. I was bothered by the cultural difference between my ex-boyfriend (Catholic) and myself. I wanted a Jewish atmosphere." A Sigma Delta Tau at Ohio simply stated, "Keep Jewish identity."

An interesting response that several men and women gave was that it was important to meet other Jews. Jewish students coming from small towns often attached a feeling of importance to meeting other Jews since they were not exposed to their co-religionists at home. A Sigma Delta Tau at Michigan expressed a desire to associate with Jewish kids because "establishment of Jewish contacts will be invaluable for the rest of your life." Although most students did not share this expectation, a SAM at Miami stated, "The house can be a good place to meet Jewish girls which is important to me." Lastly, an Alpha Epsilon Phi from Indiana admitted, "My parents stressed being Jewish. I didn't want to be a token in a Gentile house."

Two common responses which the undergraduates share with the alumni is pledging because of association of high school Jewish friends and the parents' desire for their son or daughter to affiliate with a Jewish house. The former is illustrated by many Jewish students of the North

Side of Chicago belonging to exclusively Jewish high school fraternities as well as temple and synagogue youth groups. The latter is described by statements such as: "My parents wanted me to be in a Jewish sorority. They have a right" (Sigma Delta Tau - Michigan), "I was brought up with Gentiles. My parents and I wanted a Jewish house" (Sigma Delta Tau - Indiana), "I wanted to pledge a Gentile house...My parents forced me to pledge a Jewish house" (Zeta Beta Tau - Ohio State), and "Dad wouldn't pay for a Gentile house" (Alpha Epsilon Phi - Illinois). It appears from this trend that even though Jewish parents might not have raised their children in a optimum Jewish environment in the home or given them a sufficient Jewish education through the synagogue or Jewish camp, they are willing to make a last-ditch effort to impose some type of Jewish identification on their children by prohibiting them from affiliating with Gentile societies.

Lastly, several students with weak Jewish identities pledged Jewish groups for no apparent Jewish reason and one student pledged a Jewish house with a high proportion of Gentiles. An Alpha Epsilon Phi at Michigan reported that she met several of the members and joined without considering the ethnic background of the sorority. More interesting is the fact that men and women of these organizations who have some problem in accepting their Jewishness will respond in this manner. An Alpha Epsilon Phi at Indiana retorted, "We're not a Jewish hosue...My boy-friend picked it out for me." A Zeta Beta Tau at Ohio State responded similarly in saying, "We're not

a Jewish house. I like it since there are Gentiles. I wanted to break out of the ghetto and learn and live with Gentiles." A Tau Epsilon Phi at Illinois stated, "TEΦ is a Jewish house, but I don't think of it as a Jewish house. It was the only house I was familiar with. Didn't pledge since it was a Jewish house." It should be noted that these chapters have a number of Gentile members to the extent that one must question the Jewish identity of the house. It appears that students wanting to keep only the slightest hint of Jewish identity will pledge a house of this ethnic composition and reply to the question "Why did you choose a Jewish house?", "No reason."

In summary we are able to say that whereas the alumni had few choices in opportunities to pledge Gentile organizations because of discrimination barriers, contemporary undergraduates were often able to affiliate with these groups but often declined to do so because of factors such as mutual congeniality with Jews, past Jewish associations and friendships, importance of being with other Jews, and Jewish consciousness and identity. Some Jews attempted to cross the ethnic barriers but were thwarted and affiliated with Jewish groups by default. Others were forced by their parents to identify with Jewish houses, while a small minority pledged a mixed group of their own accord to identify on a low-grade Jewish level. In short, we may conclude that Jewish students attending college fifteen to twenty years ago

pledged Jewish fraternities or sororities because of segregation patterns. However, it appears that the chief reason today is that there seems to be a genuine desire to affiliate with Jewish organizations by contemporary Jewish men and women.

Question #4. What Jewish activities are there in your group?

Most students reported some Jewish activity in their fraternity or sorority. The amount of activity and customs observed appeared to be directly proportional to the percentage of Jewish membership of the chapter. That is to say, a group comprised of 95% Jews usually had a greater amount of Jewish activity than a group of 50% Jews.

The organization par excellence of Jewish activity is Omega Deuteron Chapter of Alpha Epsilon Pi. Since its refounding in 1972, a religious atmosphere has prevailed in its house. The chapter operates a kosher kitchen (replete with cholent for Shabbat), a succah for Succoth, a prohibition of work on Shabbat, encouragement to attend services, Shabbat dinner with z'mirot and Birchat Ha-Mazone, Oneg Shabbat, Torah session, and a general adherence to Halacha in deciding chapter policies.

Despite the prevalence of Jewish customs and activities, not all members felt that halacha was at an optimum. One younger man reported, "There should be more... I want more people to be religious...The house is hardly religious at all...I'm upset by non-religious kids' insensi-

tivity." On the other hand a senior member complained, "I'm upset with halacha - it's unreal, unworldly trivia." At any rate, most agree to the right of the observant to influence the house.

Many undergraduates reported that the rituals and symbols of their respective organizations were of Jewish nature. An Alpha Epsilon Pi at Pittsburgh mentioned, "When you see the cofa, ritual and symbols, you think of Judaism." A SAM at Cincinnati reported that the charter and ritual were based on Judaism. Symbols seem to elicit Jewish identity that might have been somewhat unconscious previously. Not all symbols, however, served positive functions. An Alpha Epsilon Phi at Indiana who did not think of her sorority as a Jewish house mentioned that the two menorahs usually displayed were hidden during rush to identify the house as non-sectarian.

Sabbath observances seemed to be mentioned as chief Jewish activities. A Sigma Delta Tau from Indiana reported that there were candles, prayers, and a special meal on Friday night. One special feature of the Shabbat dinner was that milk was not served with meat at this meal. Perhaps more interesting is the fact that this chapter of Sigma Delta Tau as of date is only 50% Jewish in membership. Next door at the Alpha Epsilon Pi house two pledges took the initiative to recite Kiddush in which the entire chapter participated in spontaneous enthusiasm. The Ha-Motzi usually accompanied the Shabbat celebrations in many houses, as well as during week-day meals.

In many organizations, however, it was felt that Shabbat ceremonies could not be performed because of infringement on the religious feelings of Gentiles. It was believed in one sorority that because of a Gentile president, Shabbat candles could not be lit. An Ohio State girl mentioned that because of one Gentile member no customs or activities were observed.

Resistance to observances often come from within the ranks of the Jewish membership. A Sigma Delta Tau at Illinois relates, "I'm disappointed that there isn't more. We are religious in a sense. Should get together more. The girls are getting to have more respect for Shabbat. They used to come in platzed from Friday afternoon drinking which offended other kids. I'd like to see z'mirot, dress up, and spend more time together. The girls who are Reform aren't religious. It would be hard to change, but possible. The girls put religion aside."

In several all-Jewish houses, however, religious ceremonies were not limited to the Shabbat. At Zeta Beta Tau at Indiana brothers reported that a minyan was held daily in the chapter house of behalf of a member whose father had recently died. At the Alpha Epsilon Pi house across the street Hannukah candles were lit during the holiday. It was mentioned that the ceremony also provided the opportunity for the brothers to meet Jewish girls because the event was informally publicized.

Celebration of the High Holidays was also mentioned by several men and women. Members of both Jewish fraternities and sororities at Illinois reported that there was a mass exodus (no pun intended) to Chicago at this time where members attended synagogue together. In those schools where students remained on campus, the members stated that they attended Hillel services together and conducted a break-fast after Yom Kippur.

Pesach provided an occasion for Jewish identification in several groups. Alpha Epsilon Pi's at Florida State and Delaware reported holding a traditional seder at the chapter house or members' apartments. Sigma Delta Tau's at Indiana mentioned serving kosher food (complete with matzoh ball soup) for the holiday, while next door at Alpha Epsilon Pi chumatz was cleared from the house.

Other Jewish activities worth noting were philanthropic projects for Jewish causes (Alpha Epsilon Phi donating money for Jewish hospitals in the United States and in Israel), United Jewish Appeal work (led by a Zeta Beta Tau at Indiana University), joint projects with Hillel Foundations (Zeta Beta Tau at Vanderbilt and SAM at Ohio State), Yiddish expressions in the house (often used with discretion in the presence of Gentile members), the mezzuzah on the door, exchanges with other Jewish fraternities and sororities, and Alpha Epsilon Pi's at Pittsburgh donated blood to a Jewish man.

Lastly, many men and women stated that there was a feeling of Jewishness in their respective houses. A

Zeta Beta Tau at Vanderbilt responded, "We can talk about our beliefs and joke around," whereas an Alpha Epsilon Pi at Indiana replied, "We're not questioned on Jewish identity. We can go to Hillel or observe what we want and not get hassled." It is important to recognize that even though most Jewish customs are not observed, many students feel that they do live in a Jewish environment because of the religious composition of the members of the chapter.

Several different reasons were given by students reporting little or no Jewish activity. An Alpha Epsilon Phi at Indiana remarked, "Not many are into religion. The college atmosphere is not a Jewish atmosphere...Could be mutually exclusive...Being Jewish is not a big deal...Go on major holidays...Some girls are Jewish...There is a Jewish upbringing." A SAM at Miami of Ohio stated, "We're a liberal house and got away from tradition...Jewishness is not carried out in the house...Religion does not play a part, but it could unite us." A Sigma Delta Tau from Ohio State responded with this statement, "We had a Christmas tree-Hannukah bush. I didn't like it, and it won't happen again...The Gentiles just did it...The house is liberal in terms of everything...Cuts down on organized activities...Hard to pull ourselves together...Hard to do Jewish activities with Gentiles in the house." A Delta Phi Epsilon from Ohio State had similar feelings in mentioning, "We want to light candles, but we'll have

to do it in somebody's room. We don't want to offend Gentiles." It appears from these remarks that the liberal atmosphere prevailing at the university in general and the Jewish groups in particular seem to eliminate Jewish observance in two ways. The first is due to a breakdown of regimentation which to an extent is necessary for Jewish activity. Both Jewish fraternities and sororities have dropped certain house rules governing the conduct of the individual members thus giving them a relaxed and liberal atmosphere. What the individual gains in personal freedom seems to be at the expense of group cohesiveness. The second factor is that Gentiles appear to be inhibiting the observance of Jewish ceremonies since the Jewish members are sensitive not to alienate their Gentile brothers and sisters in group activities. If Gentile members understand why Jewish customs are observed and Jewish members are equally secure in their Jewish identity, then a situation such as Sigma Delta Tau at Indiana may exist where the house is approximately 50-50 in Jewish-Gentile percentage, yet Jewish customs are observed. On the other hand, if Jewish members feel uncomfortable with their Jewishness and Gentiles exacerbate the situation by setting up Christmas trees, etc., then Jewish activities are not likely to be performed.

Several other statements are worth mentioning. An Alpha Epsilon Pi at Cincinnati felt that it would be

unfair to Gentiles to introduce Jewish customs since it is bringing something in that is not normally found in a fraternity. A Zeta Beta Tau at Illinois stated, "We don't like being stereotyped...We're open-minded Jews...Want to get away from being Jewish...We're like anyone else." A brother of the above had a most interesting comment, "Hard to be religious in college... individuals it's easy...hard for a house...part of Judaism is helping others...We sponsor dance marathons for non-Jewish causes...Service to others is epitome of Judaism...Doesn't have to be Jewish-oriented... Importance is guys doing it...That's my Jewish background."

To summarize this point we may say that the amount of Jewish activity is directly proportional to the percentage of Jewish members in the chapter rolls with activities ranging from Halacha-based house operation to Jewish fund-raising. For those groups reporting little or no Jewish activity, it was usually found that Gentiles had innundated their ranks while the Jewish members showed weak allegiance to Judaism and mixed emotions regarding Jewish identity. The synthesis of these trends produced a liberal, non-sectarian atmosphere which precluded most Jewish activities. The majority of contemporary undergraduates reported some form of Jewish activity as opposed to the alumni who reported little Jewish activity thus indicating the increased Jewish ethnicity on the college campus. It must be mentioned, however,

that the feeling of Jewish ethnicity was experienced largely in chapters of all-Jewish or predominantly Jewish houses.

Question #5. What difference did you notice between Jewish and Gentile houses?

As opposed to the alumni, most contemporary undergraduates did report differences. The leading characteristic that sets Jewish fraternities and sororities apart from their Gentile counterparts is that of scholarship. An Alpha Epsilon Phi at Michigan boasted, "SDT and AEQ win scholarship awards...It's the Jewish idea of getting ahead...We have a collection of people who believe in this." A SAM at Illinois responded, "Jewish houses have a higher grade point average...It's related to being Jewish." As stated previously, Jewish men and women are likely to use the fraternity as a vehicle for social mobility with the academic factor providing the nexus for acceptance into professional school. A SAM at Ohio State was extremely impressed with the fact that all seniors of last year's graduating class had been accepted to professional schools of their choice. The most interesting fact connected with this facet is that the Jewish undergraduates perceived that high achievement is part of being Jewish. In Fraternities in Our Colleges Johnsons mentions, "Jews have traditionally placed a very high value upon education and intellectual attainment...In addition to home and family values...Jewish students have stronger need for

professional and career success, and more of them have the advantage of preparing for university demands in the superior secondary schools of large cities."

Several undergraduates living in all-Jewish chapters reported a kind of Jewish living experience that seems to pervade the Jewish house. A SAM at Ohio State replied, "They're goyim! There's no closeness...Here, there's an extra bond of brotherhood because of our Jewishness." A Sigma Delta Tau at Illinois merely responded, "Everything is different." An Alpha Epsilon Phi replied, "We care for each other here." It appears that these men and women corroborate Segal in their emphasis of Jewish group membership and feel very much at home in the acceptance of their Jewish identities.

Not all individuals felt this way. Those men and women who felt uncomfortable with their Jewishness often felt that they were stigmatized by a stereotype. In this vein a SAM at Miami responded, "We are known as the Jewish house...Want to get away from it...We want more Gentiles since they work harder...Bad to be known as Jewish house...We want a social fraternity...Religion categorizing is bad." (SAM at Miami has many Gentiles members. Similarly, a Zeta Beta Tau at Ohio State replied, "We carry on relations with Jewish sororities, but Gentiles have a wider spectrum to work...We are stereotyped as being Jewish, but we'll accept anyone."

Other differences noted were: "Gentiles are anti-Semitic - relationship between Jewish and Gentile house

isn't good. There's friction and anti-Semitism...Makes Jewish guys identify with religion...Rock throwing and name calling...Turns guys off to Gentile houses," (Pi Lam - Illinois). "Gentiles beat their pledges," "Gentiles snobby," "Gentiles unrefined," "Gentiles are stupid...Don't have class...are immature," (Tau Epsilon Phi - Illinois). "Gentiles are more social minded - Gentile houses have quotas and things like Christmas dance that Jewish houses don't have," (Sigma Delta Tau - Indiana). "Gentiles are athletic," "Gentiles are colder," "Gentile houses are bigger in membership," "Gentiles drink more," and "Gentiles have bigger parties." Most of these comments seem to indicate a residual amount of ill feeling or at least animosity on many college campuses. As stated previously, Jewish students band together to form Jewish fraternities and sororities to resist anti-Semitism and the above statements seem to bear this out.

Several differences worth noting are "Gentiles are more diversified - there's a kind of Jewish geography down here...Everybody knows everybody else from the North Side suburbs," (Sigma Delta Tau - Illinois), "Jewish houses are more liberal - no mandatory meetings, a liberal visitation policy, and fewer rules," (Alpha Epsilon Phi - Michigan), and "Girls here aren't out to get married," (Alpha Epsilon Phi - Illinois).

Some men and women felt that there were differences, but couldn't verbalize them. An Alpha Epsilon Pi at Vanderbilt stated, "There are differences, but it's hard

to say...Gentiles have variant identities...We're supposed to have a Jewish identity, but there's no identity in this house...But I didn't join because AEII was a Jewish house." For a minority of students reporting no differences statements such as "Girls are girls," (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Indiana) and "Same purposes for Jewish and Gentile sororities. They're secular organizations," (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Cincinnati) seemed indicative. Undergraduates such as these seemed to have a hazy Jewish identity or perhaps a negative one.

In reviewing the data we may conclude that differences stemmed from two sources: 1. Pride in Jewish ethnicity which exhibited itself in high chapter scholarship, a feeling of closeness and common values, and mutual nurturance and 2. from residual ill feeling which caused Jewish undergraduates to conceptualize Gentile groups through a maze of stigmas. Pride in ethnicity was only seen in all-Jewish or or very predominantly Jewish groups. Heavily mixed chapters often viewed themselves as being stereotyped Jewish by Gentile groups, and sought to break away from this image by wanting to associate more with Gentile sororities and to pledge more Gentile members. Generally, heavily-mixed Jewish groups viewed differences between themselves and Gentile groups through a lack of Jewish identity, i. e. being stereotyped by Gentiles rather than through pride in Jewish identity.

Question #6. Should a Jewish fraternity or sorority stay Jewish in terms of the religious preference of its members?

In agreement with the alumni, the majority of undergraduates felt the fraternity or sorority should remain either all-Jewish or predominantly Jewish. For those who thought the organizations should stay all-Jewish, the following statements were indicative of their feelings: "Jews have to stick together, assimilationism leads to intermarriage," (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Memphis State), "Like the house to be Jewish since I didn't have it at home...Need solidarity," (Alpha Epsilon Phi - Michigan), "Definitely...ZBT was founded by Jewish people...Add extra heritage by being Jewish," (Zeta Beta Tau - Indiana), "Hard to be religious of any kind if 50-50...My brother was an AEII...in his fourth year it was 50-50 and few Jewish values," (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Indiana), and "Yes...Jews are better students...Keeps ZBT #1 academically," (Zeta Beta Tau - Illinois).

Those men and women desiring a predominantly Jewish group responded in a similar way: "We can't demand 100% Jewish because of the university...Gentiles will go Gentile because of old patterns...Yet, Jews stay with themselves...too many Jews alienate Gentiles in fraternity, but we want more Jews," (Zeta Beta Tau - Vanderbilt), "We want more Jews...House would be better if there were more Jewish guys...We would rush against only one fraternity...Can't fight against twenty others," (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Miami), "Predominantly, but a non-Jew might fit in... Other frats will stereotype us as Jewish," (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Cincinnati), "Realism is that Gentiles won't want to go into a Jewish house since they won't be com-

fortable...House will stay Jewish by natural selection," (Zeta Beta Tau - Illinois), and "Predominantly, since it's better to identify as Jewish...Good to have some Gentiles since some Jewish kids never knew or had close friends who weren't Jewish," (Tau Epsilon Phi - Illinois).

For those undergraduates reporting a desire to keep the organization less than predominantly Jewish, the following statements were reported: "Half and half is the answer...Can learn from each other," (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Pittsburgh), "SAM is a Jewish house and I like many of the Jewish guys...I don't want all-Jewish...People would think this fraternity is just a lot of Jews," (SAM - Miami of Ohio), "If we kept Jewish membership at a minimum (40-60), we would fit in with the Miami way of life...Assimilation would give us a stronger group...non-Jewish girls ignore us...We're mostly Jewish since the girls wanted it that way," (Sigma Delata Tau - Miami of Ohio), "I like 50-50...Jewish thing to show sisterhood to a person of another religion...Makes me feel more Jewish...Sorority means more than religion...Can live in a 50-50 house and not lose Jewishness...Sometimes hard to express themselves," (Sigma Delta Tau - Cincinnati).

Fourthly, there was a group that stated that the organization did not need to rush new members by religious preference. Responding in this manner we hear: "Religion isn't important...I don't want to see J. A. P.'s (Jewish American Princesses)," (Sigma Delta Tau - Michigan), "Against believing the house to be a Jewish fraternity," (SAM - Miami of Ohio), "Sisters love each other...

That's what counts," (Sigma Delta Tau - Cincinnati), "House should pledge guys they want...Religion shouldn't play a part...I don't believe in organized religion," (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Illinois), and lastly, "I don't want to live in a house of 100% kikes...Some people want it," (Tau Epsilon Phi - Illinois).

Finally, several undergraduates reported mixed feelings on the question. A Sigma Delta Tau from Ohio State replied, "Don't know...there are advantages and disadvantages...All eliminates animosity along religious lines...Little Yiddish innuendoes hurt the Gentiles...Have to keep a Jewish majority by national ruling." An Alpha Epsilon Pi at Cincinnati frankly admits, "It's the era of integration...Don't know if we can stay 100%."

A pattern seems to take shape from the response. Those individuals desiring an all-Jewish group had the strongest Jewish identities and expressed the reasons for keeping the chapter all-Jewish in terms of positive Jewish factors, i. e., anti-assimilationism, Jewish solidarity, academics, and possibilities for Jewish activities. If these opinions prevailed, the house was usually all-Jewish in membership or at least predominantly Jewish.

Those undergraduates preferring a predominantly Jewish group did so by verbalizing a lower-grade Jewish identity than those preferring an all-Jewish group. Factors given for this opinion were generally pragmatic rather than out of affinity for Jewish association. Examples were seen in that Jewish fraternities would always

be stereotyped as Jewish, rushing against Jewish houses is easier than rushing against Gentile houses, and that Gentiles are not likely to fit in.

For the students desiring a 50-50 mixture, assimilation tendencies and of lower grade Jewish identity were noted. Sometimes their opinions prevailed and the group contained many Gentiles, other times, it was the opinion of merely one member. In several cases the individuals favoring this view did have strong Jewish identities, but for the well-being of the organization, felt it was best to pledge Gentiles. Most interesting is the appearance of the "minority phenomenon" where a Jewish member feels more Jewish in a largely Gentile group. Although he or she might be more aware of his Jewishness in a Gentile group, statements such as this tend to indicate an alienation from Judaism and Jewish identity.

Negative Jewish identity was expressed by the fourth group which believed that the organization did not need to rush new members according to religious preference. Jewish members often used anti-Semitic statements such as "J. A. P." and "kike" in verbalizing their disgust or by using thinly-veiled denunciations such as "sisters love each other" or "religion shouldn't play a part." In the above categories, opinions of individuals such as these sometimes influenced the chapter as a whole, but sometimes (depending on the feelings and identities of other group members) had little effect.

It appears from this data that the desire to retain an all-Jewish group is dependent on the strength of the Jewish identities of its members. The weaker the Jewish identities of the group members, the less likely that the group will retain an all-Jewish membership or collective Jewish identity. Assimilationist statements or even anti-Semitic statements reflected a desire by the individual to include Gentiles in the organization in greater proportions. In most cases the desire of the individual could affect the entire chapter if an individual's opinion was shared by the rest of the organization. At other times it had little or no effect if that individual was in a distinct minority.

Question #7. Did your Jewishness strengthen while being in the fraternity or sorority?

As opposed to the alumni, the solid majority felt that the fraternity or sorority experience strengthened or at least reinforced the Jewishness of the individual in several different ways. Zeta Beta Tau's at Indiana respond, "I'm not religious, but I feel very Jewish here... I've never realized what being Jewish was like. It's a whole different life-style...I was raised in Christian schools and was never around Jews. ZBT gave me experiences of being with Jews. I got a lot of Jewish tradition with the minyan in the house and one of the brothers teaching me Jewish history. I hope to get Bar Mitzvah this year." Alpha Epsilon Pi pledges at the same campus mention, "AEII as a Jewish fraternity helps you to think you are a group

of Jews. It's very important now and after school when you'll live with all types of Jews." Next door at Sigma Delta Tau one of the sisters remarked, "We light candles in my parents' home now. We used to do this all the time, but we stopped. I think my sorority experience motivated me to get them to do it again." A Zeta Beta Tau at Vanderbilt replied, "I won't pick up Gentile ways. I was bothered by that. The house will keep me from losing my Jewish identity." Lastly, a Zeta Beta Tau at Illinois admits, "ZBT makes me feel more secure about being Jewish than if I were independent. I can fight and resist anti-Semitism."

Those reporting that the fraternity or sorority strengthened one's Jewishness seemed to resist classification as far as Jewish affiliation, geographic location, or even religious composition of the house. The Jewishness of the individual was likely to strengthen in an all-Jewish house, but exceptions to this were seen in groups such as Sigma Delta Tau at Indiana which is only 50-50 Jewish in membership. We may only conclude that Jewish ethnicity seemed to have permeated most Jewish groups in the later sixties and early seventies with all-Jewish groups exerting the most Jewish influence on their members.

The Jewish identities of men and women seem to be aggravated in certain cases. A pre-rabbinic student in Alpha Epsilon Pi at Indiana mentions, "Few of the guys knock Judaism, but I defend it. They're afraid to admit

they like it since they don't understand it." A Sigma Delta Tau at Illinois responded, "I'm tested in the house. I have to ask girls to do things for me. I was raised Orthodox and believe in it. I'll stick to it no matter what." This situation is most eloquently verbalized by an Alpha Epsilon Pi at Illinois, "I keep my Jewishness to show the Jewish kids that I can take my Jewishness seriously. I try to show the kids how to be Jewish and collegiate without sacrificing social life. Some kids get into this and we influence the house back to Judaism either by house identification or through individuals doing it on their own." It appears that although these men and women are sometimes aggravated in their expression of Judaism in the house, it is often through their efforts that the group retains a Jewish identity. That is to say, a small minority of dedicated Jewish students can build an image of a Jewish group for the entire organization through persistent efforts to conduct Jewish activities in the chapter house, influence on peers in the immediate living environment, and campus activities, e. g. Hillel.

For those that mentioned that their Jewishness did not strengthen comments such as these were indicative: "Anything I did was on my own...I was influenced from home," (Zeta Beta Tau - Vanderbilt), "No...I don't like services...Judaism is close to me in family ties... Developed Jewish identity at home," (Sigma Delta Tau - Ohio State), and "Hard to express yourself with one Gentile girl in the house...Makes me feel uncomfortable..."

For this reason the sorority doesn't strengthen my Jewishness," (Delta Phi Epsilon - Ohio State). Lastly, "Judaism weakened since I was away from home...Was active in youth group...It's like taking four years off from Judaism."

To summarize we can say that the Jewishness of an individual strengthens because of one or both of two factors: 1. the Jewish oriented expectations and identity of the individual entering the group and 2. the influence of the group on the individual. By the same token Jewishness of an individual may not strengthen because of one or both of two factors: 1. low Jewish oriented expectations which may include a strong Jewish identity from the home and 2. influence of the group on the individual with the implication that Gentiles weaken the Jewish identity of the group in most instances. The post June 1967 ethnicity movement seems to be active in either the all-Jewish or predominantly (90-95%) Jewish groups as opposed to its weakening in heavily mixed groups (80% Jewish or below). The role of the minority group dynamics cannot be overstressed. It was clearly seen that several men and women with strong dedication to Judaism could influence the organization such that a Jewish image of the group could emerge. On the other hand, inclusion of a minority of Gentiles could inhibit Jewish activity if the Jewish consciousness and identities of the Jewish members were sufficiently weak.

It is interesting to note that Jewish affiliation, that is to say, if one has been raised Orthodox, Conservative, Reconstructionist or Reform has little influence in the above process. Although Orthodox men and women usually had strong Jewish identities (but not in all cases), it was seen that Reform, Conservative and Reconstructionist produced equal numbers of students with strong and weak Jewish identities. For instance, a fraternity man from Memphis who has been raised in a dedicated Reform atmosphere might want to see more Jewish activities, more Jewish members, and perceive more differences between Jews and Gentile groups than a Conservative counterpart raised in a marginal or even assimilationist environment in the suburbs of Chicago.

Question #8. Did being Jewish have any influence in pledging a Jewish fraternity or sorority?

In agreement with the alumni, the undergraduates reported that pledging a Jewish group had been influenced by their Jewishness. Responses such as the following were indicative: "When I decided on a fraternity, it would be a Jewish one since I've always associated with Jews," (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Indiana), "I wanted to be with Jewish girls, high-class with enthusiasm," (Alpha Epsilon Phi - Indiana), "Didn't want to be a token Jew," (Sigma Delta Tau - Indiana), "Yes, in a way. They came for me and it was mutual acceptance," (SAM - Ohio State), and "Attracted to ZBT being Jewish since there's growing anti-Semitism on the campus. Gentiles feel threatened

by Jews. We try to avoid it by not acting hostile toward Gentiles," (Zeta Beta Tau - Illinois).

For those responding negatively to this question, the following statements were given: "Might have pledged a Gentile house if my parents would have allowed it," (Alpha Epsilon Pi - Illinois) and "Person who rushed me wasn't Jewish," (Tau Epsilon Phi - Illinois).

An interesting corollary to this question is the expectation of Jewish undergraduates to meet members of the opposite sex by way of Jewish fraternity-Jewish sorority inter-dating. As opposed to the alumni, it seems in many instances that this pattern of finding one's mate through Greek life is extinct. A Sigma Delta Tau at Miami stated, "My parents felt disappointed when I got a Gentile boyfriend. They thought it defeated the purpose of the sorority which is to meet Jewish guys." A different view-point is stated by a Sigma Delta Tau at Illinois, "Jewish fraternities are snotty to Jewish sororities. We have worse relations with Jewish houses than Gentile. Jewish guys feel that they'll marry Jewish girls and don't bother with them here. Anyway, they're like brothers and won't necessarily go out with Jewish girls. I won't meet a Jewish guy on this campus. It's hard to have a boyfriend-girlfriend relationship. They're known too well." In a similar vein a Zeta Beta Tau from Ohio State replied, "We like to see some new Gentile girls here. We need new blood."

The factors causing the breakdown of this pattern are varied. As opposed to the alumni inter-faith dating

has been accepted on the college campus for over a decade and Jewish men and women feel that it is no stigma to date Gentiles. Secondly, on many campuses Jewish groups are accepted by Gentile houses such that it is not uncommon for a Gentile fraternity and a Jewish sorority and vice-versa to collaborate on school projects such as homecoming or Greek Week. Lastly, the postponed age of marriage among Jewish singles literally eliminates the undergraduate fraternity-sorority scene in terms of a meeting ground for that purpose.

Several points can be made in conclusion to this study. As viewed by both the alumni and the contemporary undergraduates, the reason for existence and purpose of college fraternities and sororities were social in nature. Although both the alumni and the undergraduates felt that the Jewish college fraternity and sorority should remain Jewish in membership several glaring differences were noted. Alumni pledged Jewish groups because Gentiles refused them admission in their organizations. Jewish students on the other hand had the opportunity to pledge Gentile houses since discrimination barriers had for the most part fallen, but elected to join Jewish groups usually out of the desire to affiliate as Jewish. This desire was caused by the Jewish ethnicity movement post 1967 when Jewish American collegians identified with Israel's stunning victory in the Six Day War. However, preceding the desire to affiliate was the will to assimilate. Most Jewish fraternities and sororities had become non-sectarianized by that time so that only those

groups that had not taken Gentiles and had remained almost 100% Jewish were able to derive any impetus from the ethnicity movement. It was in these groups that significant Jewish activities were reported by their members, more so than in alumni groups of high Jewish proportion. It was perhaps the integration drives of the national organizations that transformed these Jewish social organizations into non-sectarian groups. Opposition from the counter-culture and activist movements played secondary roles in the process.

In closing, one more point should be made. The college fraternity or sorority is an organization composed of the personalities of individuals. In the case of Jewish groups, the Jewish identity that an individual brings to the group may have more influence on the group than the group influencing the individual. Group Jewish identity is therefor only the top ten percent of the iceberg with 90% being the individual identities of the members. It is clear that much of Jewish identity is formed in the home environment. In one highly mixed group that was visited, several members bitterly expressed their rejection and alienation from Judaism through unmeaningful childhood experiences. Although the Jewish fraternity may serve as a socializing agency in the college years, it can seldom compensate for twenty odd years of defective Jewish socialization in the home, camp, or synagogue. If, however, new and meaningful modes of Jewish education and socialization can be developed in the home

environment and provided that Jewish college fraternities and sororities may remain almost all-Jewish in membership, then the latter might provide a vehicle for the retention of one's Jewish allegiance for life.

Footnote

1. Dormitory space at the University of Michigan is limited such that freshmen alone are guaranteed a room in university housing. Lotteries are held in the spring of a student's freshman year to establish priority for those upper-classmen desiring to remain in the dormitories. Those who are not successful must seek off-campus housing through their own efforts.

Bibliography

ABC's of Pledgeship: Alpha Epsilon Phi Pledge Manual.
Revised Sept. 1968.

Adelson, Joseph. "A Study of Minority Group Authoritarianism." The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group.
Ed. Marshall Sklare. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958.

"Amherst Fraternities," Scholastic and Social. 94: (Dec. 10, 1966), p.446.

"Amherst Support of Fraternities," Scholastic and Social, 91: (Feb. 23, 1963), p. 81.

"Are Fraternities Necessary?" Holiday 24: (Oct. 1958), pp. 50-51.

Paird's Manual of American College Fraternities. Eighteenth Edition, Ed. John Robson. Menasha, Wisconsin: The College Press - George Banta Company, Inc., 1968.

"Be Peppy Y'all." Life 51: (Oct. 13, 1961), pp. 102-103.

Beach, Mark. "Change Through Student Example: The Case of the Fraternity Movement," Journal of College Student Personnel, 14: (March 1973), pp. 111-117.

Bennis, Warren and Slater, Phillip. The Temporary Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Bohrnstedt, George W. "Conservatism, Authoritarianism, and Religiosity of Fraternity Pledges," Journal of College Student Personnel, (Jan. 1969), pp. 36-49.

Bohrnstedt, George W. "Social Mobility Aspirations and Fraternity Membership," Sociological Quarterly, (Winter 1969), pp.42-52.

"Boosting the Brothers." Newsweek 52: (Oct. 20, 1958), pp. 111-112.

Butler, William R. "Forces at Work in the Development of Fraternities." The Journal of College Student Personnel 10: (June 1965), pp. 118-122.

"Changing Attitudes." Personnel and Guidance 37: (April 1959), pp. 542-550.

"Clarification at College Park." Christian Centennial 81: (April 15, 1964), pp. 500-502.

"Colorado University Ends Fraternity Bias." Christian Centennial 73: (April 18, 1956), p. 494.

"College Frat: Brotherhood and Ballyhoo," Scholastic and Social, (Nov. 1969).

- "Death to the Greeks." Newsweek 60: (Oct. 22, 1962), pp.84-85.
- "Discrimination." Scholastic and Social 80: (Oct. 16, 1954), pp. 122-123.
- "Down with Fraternities." Time 80: (July 13, 1962), p. 43.
- Elton, Charles and Smart, John. "Many are Rushed, But Who Will Pledge?" Journal of College Student Personnel 12: (May 1971), pp. 204-207.
- Epstein, Joseph. "Memoirs of a Fraternity Man." Commentary 52: (July 1971), pp. 59-64.
- "Facts of Fraternities." Scholastic and Social 91: (Feb. 23, 1963), p. 80.
- The First Twenty-Five Years. Ed. Dr. Clarence Weil. New York: Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity, 1923.
- "Fraternities." Esquire 56: (Oct. 1961) pp. 116-119.
- "Fraternity Advisor." Personnel and Guidance 36: (Nov. 1957), pp. 203-206.
- "Fraternity and College Purposes." Scholastic and Social 90: (Nov. 17, 1962), p. 393.
- "Fraternities and Sororities - New Academic Image." Intellect (Jan. 1973).
- "Fraternities Breed Racism." Christian Centennial 79: (Nov. 21, 1962) p. 1408.
- "Fraternities: Evil Force." Saturday Review 38: (Sept. 10, 1955), p. 28.
- "Fraternities Get the Grip." Time 85: (June 25, 1965), p. 53.
- "Frat's in Fire." Time 87: (April 8, 1966) p. 54.
- "Fraternity Integration: Ideal or Foolhardy." National Jewish Monthly (Nov. 1961).
- "Frat is Back." Newsweek 82: (Nov. 12, 1973), pp. 109-110.
- "Fraternities Losing Out." Jewish Post and Opinion (Oct. 9, 1970).
- "Fraternities of the University of Rochester." Scholastic and Social 93: (Feb. 6, 1965), p. 77.

"Fraternity President." Ebony 17: (Nov. 1961), pp.76-77.

"Frat Redux." Time 105: (Jan. 20, 1975), p. 54.

"Frat Rejoins World." Christian Centennial 75: (Mar. 26, 1958), p. 367.

"Fraternity Rushing" Life 41: (Sept. 24, 1956), pp. 141-149.

"Fraternity Without Brotherhood." New Republic 134: (Jan. 23, 1956), pp. 18-19.

"Friction on Frat Row." Senior Scholastic 85: (Jan. 7, 1965), pp. 15-15.

Gollub, Ben. "Ethnic Barriers Slip as Fraternities Vie for Members." The Voice (Jan. 1, 1971).

Gladd, Sandy. Personal letter. Nov. 11, 1975.

Gordon, S. E. "An Instrument to Measure Attitudes Toward Selected Fraternity Activities." Journal of College Student Personnel 13: (May 1972), pp. 229-232.

"Greek Letter Discrimination." Commentary 21: (Feb. 1956), pp. 118-125.

Greenberg, Irving. "Jewish Survival and the College Campus." Judaism 17: (Summer 1968), pp. 259-281.

A Guide to Alpha Epsilon Pi. Fulton, Missouri: The Ovid Bell Press, Inc., 1966.

"Hazing and Maturity." Scholastic and Social 83: (Mar. 31, 1956), pp. 119-120.

The History and Roster of Alpha Epsilon Pi Fraternity. St. Paul, Ieland Publishers, Inc., The Fraternity Press, 1964.

Hoffman, Arnold B. "Fraternities, the New Look." The Lion of Alpha Epsilon Pi (Spring 1956), p. 9.

Hointras, Peter and Pederson, Lawrence. "Self-Concept of Fraternity Members and Independents." Journal of College Student Personnel 11: (Jan. 1970), pp. 46-49.

"Integration." U. S. News 41: (Nov. 9, 1956), pp. 90-92.

"Intellectual Work in Fraternities." Scholastic and Social 95: (Summer 1967), p. 282.

Jacobs, Dr. Maurice. Personal letter. Jan. 18, 1975.

Jansen, P. A. "Fraternity." Saturday Review 55: (Dec. 9, 1972), p. 34.

Jacobs, Dr. Maurice. "Let's Look at Four Case Histories." Jewish Digest, (Sept. 1960), pp. 3-7.

Jewish Radicalism: A Selected Anthology. Ed. Jack Nusan Porter and Peter Dreier. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1973.

"Jewish Role in Activism." Fortune 79: (Jan. 1969), pp. 112-113.

"Jewish Students Today." Trans-Action 8: (Oct. 1971), pp. 45-48.

Johnson, Clyde Sanfred. Fraternities in Our Colleges. New York: National Interfraternity Foundation, 1972.

Johnson, Edward. "Sophomore Fraternity Members Compared with Independents on the Biographical Scales of the CSQ" Journal of College Student Personnel 12: (May 1971), pp. 208-213.

Kenniston, Kenneth. The Uncommitted. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1965.

Lee, Alfred M. Fraternity Without Brotherhood: A Study of Prejudice on the American Campus. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1955.

Letchworth, George. "Fraternities: Now and in the Future." Journal of College Student Personnel 10: (1969), pp. 118-122.

"Letter from a Far Frat." Atlantic 223: (May 1969), pp. 85-87.

The Lion of Alpha Epsilon Pi. St. Paul: Leland Publishers, 1962-68.

Longino, Charles F. and Kart, Cary. "The College Fraternity: An assessment of Theory and Research." Journal of College Student Personnel. 14: (Mar. 1973), pp. 118-125.

Mead, Margaret. Culture and Commitment. New York: Natural History Press, Doubleday and Company, 1970.

Miller, Leonard D. "Distinctive Characteristics of Fraternity Members." Journal of College Student Personnel 12: (May 1971), pp. 204-207.

"My Crusade Against Fraternities." Nation 189: (Sept 26, 1959), pp. 169-172.

National Interfraternity Conference, Inc. College Fraternities: Their Origin, Purpose and Value. Indianapolis: NIC, Inc., 1967.

"No More Hell Rides." Scholastic and Social, 83: (Apr. 14, 1956), p. 136.

Octagonian of Sigma Alpha Mu. New York, 1953-73.

"Out of Fashion." Time 80: (Nov. 23, 1962), p. 32.

Packwood, William; Casse, Jr., Robert; Lyerly, Barry; and Moglebust, Joe. "Greek Individualism and Activism: A New Identity?" Journal of College Student Personnel 13: (May 1972), pp. 224-228.

"Perils of Big Brotherhood." Look 27: (Mar. 12, 1963), pp. 53-56.

Phi Epsilon Pi Quarterly. Philadelphia, 1933-68.

Pledge Manual of Sigma Alpha Mu.

The Plume of Tau Epsilon Phi. St. Paul: Leland Publishers, 1960-62 and 1966-70.

Prichard, Keith W. and Burton, Thomas H. "The Social Fraternity System: Its Increasing Problems." Journal of College Student Personnel, (May 1972), pp. 218-223.

"Prophets: True or False?" Time 92: (Sept. 20, 1968), p. 66.

"Report on Amherst Fraternities." Scholastic and Social 86: (Jan. 18, 1958), pp. 44-45.

Robson, John. The College Fraternity and its Modern Role. Menasha, Wisconsin: The Collegiate Press - George Banta Co., Inc., 1966.

Roe, Betty Boyd and Wood, James R. "Security in Sorority Breeds Adaptive Innovation." Journal of College Student Personnel. (Mar. 1973), pp. 130-134.

Rose, Harriet and Elton, Charles. "Sorority Dropout." Journal of College Student Personnel 12: (Nov. 1971), pp. 460-463.

Rosenthal, Dr. Frank. "Greek and Jew: The Challenge of Chanukah." The Lion of Alpha Epsilon Pi (Winter 1956), pp. 7-11.

Schussel, Irwin E. "Integrated Fraternities Are Good for the Jews!" The Jewish Digest (June 1961), pp. 51-53.

Schmidt, Marlin R. "Relationship Between Sorority Membership and Changes in Selected Personality Variables and Attitude." Journal of College Student Personnel 12: (May 1971), pp. 208-213.

"Scholastics and Fraternities." Personnel and Guidance. 38: (Oct. 1959), pp. 134-141.

Scott, J. F. "The American College Sorority: Its Role in Class and Ethnic Endogamy." American Sociological Review 30: (Aug. 1965), pp. 514-527.

Segal, B. E. "Fraternities, Social Distance, and anti-Semitism Among Jewish and non-Jewish Undergraduates." Sociology of Education 38: (Spring 1965), pp. 251-264.

"Showdown on Frat Row." New York Times Magazine (Nov. 11, 1962), pp. 32-33.

Sigma Delta Tau Pledge Manual.

Sklare, Marshall. Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement. New York: Schocken, 1955.

Slater, Phillip. The Pursuit of Lonliness. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.

"Social Not Civil." Commonweal 67: (Dec. 13, 1957), p. 277.

"Sororities: Do They Swing?" Seventeen 25: (Aug. 1966), pp. 296-297.

Torch of Sigma Delta Tau Evanston, Ill., 1962-66.

"Upgrading Fraternity Scholarship." Scholastic and Social (Dec. 17, 1960).

"What's Your Verdict?" Personnel and Guidance 34: (Dec. 1955), p. 239.

"When Pranks Turn Lethal." Nation 189: (Oct. 24, 1959), p. 243.

Whyte, Jr., William H. The Organization Man. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

Wolf, Millie. "What's the Answer?" Jewish Digest (Sept. 1960), pp. 1-3.

"Work Week, Not Hell Week." Scholastic and Social 83: (June 9, 1956), p. 208.

"ZBKaput". Newsweek 57: (Mar. 27, 1961), pp. 82-82.

Zeta Beta Tau Quarterly. New York, 1962-67.

982056

W 5887