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There are at present (Spring, 1924) at the University of Chicago, thirty-two general undergraduate fraternities. This does not include legal and medical fraternities, nor other professional, departmental, graduate, or honorary fraternities, few of which have houses, and none of which are essentially social in motive. Of these thirty-two fraternities, seven are Jewish and two negro. All are chapters of national organizations. A few local fraternities have existed in recent years, but all which are known to exist at the University have affiliated with some national organization. This report will hereinafter use the term "fraternity" to designate these thirty-two undergraduate social fraternities.

While this number is fairly large, as compared with the number of fraternities at many smaller universities and colleges, it is small in comparison with the number at most of the institutions of the size of this. At the University of Illinois, for example, almost every one of the fifty-three (?) national organizations which are members of the Interfraternity Conference are represented, and a large number of local fraternities. Similar conditions prevail at the University of California, Ohio State University, Cornell University, and in lesser degree at other large universities.

ROSTER OF FRATERNITIES

The fraternities, with date of establishment at this university, the number of active, undergraduate members and pledges
reported for the autumn and winter quarters, 1923-24, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AUTUMN MEMBERS</th>
<th>PLEDGES</th>
<th>WINTER MEMBERS</th>
<th>PLEDGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Delta Kappa Epsilon</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Phi Kappa Psi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Beta Theta Pi</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Alpha Delta Phi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Sigma Chi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Phi Delta Theta</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Psi Upsilon</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Delta Tau Delta</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Chi Psi</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Delta Upsilon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Phi Gamma Delta</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Sigma Alpha Epsilon</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Delta Chi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Sigma Nu</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Kappa Sigma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Alpha Tau Omega</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Phi Kappa Sigma</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Acacia (Masonic)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Alpha Phi Alpha (Negro)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Delta Sigma Phi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Tau Kappa Epsilon</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Kappa Alpha Psi (Negro)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Zeta Beta Tau (Jewish)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Pi Lambda Phi (Jewish)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Alpha Sigma Phi</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Lambda Chi Alpha</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Kappa Nu (Jewish)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Phi Beta Delta (Jewish)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Phi Sigma Delta (Jewish)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Tau Delta Phi (Jewish)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Alpha Epsilon Pi (Jewish)#</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Phi Pi Phi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 469 267 549 140

Average, 32 fraternities, 14.7 8.3 17.2 4.4
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[Note: The table continues with similar entries to the ones shown, indicating a list of items or entries that are not fully visible in the image provided.]
The following chart shows at a glance the tendency of the establishment of fraternities to fall into periods. J indicates a Jewish fraternity; N, a negro fraternity; †, any other.

| 1892 | 94 | 96 | 98 | 1900 | 02 | 04 | 06 | 08 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 22 |
|------|----|----|----|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| ††    | †+ | †+ | †+ | †+   | †+ | †+ | †+ | †+ | N   | †J | N  | †J | †J |     |

**NUMBER OF UNDERGRADUATE MEN IN FRATERNITIES**

During the autumn quarter, 1932 men were enrolled in undergraduate courses on the quadrangles (1478 in A.L. & S., 423 in C. & A., and 31 in College of Education). Of these 1932, 736, or 38%, per cent, were members of or pledged to, fraternities. In the winter quarter the corresponding figures were: Undergraduate men enrolled, 1727; members and pledges, 689, or 40% per cent.

When, however, we consider the character of the undergraduate enrollment in The University of Chicago, with its large number of day students who live in the city and take no part in the activities of the university community save to attend classes, the proportion of men who would normally be fraternity material is seen to be considerably larger than appears at first sight, and the proportion of such men who are actually connected with an undergraduate fraternity is likewise larger than the percentages mentioned would indicate. Indeed, it is entirely possible that only a minor fraction of the undergraduate men
to whom fraternity life would appeal fail to become connected with, or at least invited to join, one or another of the fraternities.

Several facts point toward this conclusion. First, there is the difficulty which non-fraternity social organizations have had in attracting and holding any large numbers of men, in spite of the fact that at least two such organizations have been promoted on the quadrangles in recent years; Second, the absence of local fraternities, such as exist in large numbers in many large state universities where the national fraternities are inadequate to meet the demand; third, the very intense rivalry between fraternities, during the period of rushing and pledging new members, to get not only the more desirable men, but even to get those who give any sort of promise of being "good fraternity material"; and fourth, the assertions which were repeatedly made to me by fraternity officers that their respective chapters are constantly on the lookout for promising men who have been overlooked at the beginning of their freshman year, but that they are rarely able to find such. It seems probable, therefore, that the University is at present served by a sufficiently large number of fraternities so that there is not, as there is in many large state universities, pressing need of encouraging the establishment of more fraternities, if everyone who would like to join is to have a chance to join.
FRATERNITY HOUSES

Of the thirty-two fraternities, all but one report having houses, either owned or rented. Besides housing undergraduate members and pledges, most of the houses accommodate certain others, either graduate or professional students or alumni. In few cases, if any, do all the members reside in the house, although the common practice is for the members who do not sleep in the house to eat one or more meals a day there, even though they may sleep at home. There is constant pressure brought to bear on members to live in the house, up to the capacity of the house, in order to share the financial burden, which is, in almost every fraternity here, if not in all, an important consideration.

In the autumn quarter, 300 undergraduates and 75 others, chiefly professional and graduate students, were reported as living in the thirty-one houses, an average of 12.1 in each. In the winter quarter, 290 undergraduates and 103 others— an average of 12.7 each— were so reported. It will thus be seen that the fraternity houses play a large part in the solution of the housing problem of the student body, and a still larger part in providing meals, since many day students who would otherwise take meals at the commons or at restaurants eat at fraternity houses. Most of the houses, as is well known, are converted residences, and not perfectly fitted for fraternity purposes; although in several cases alterations have been made, such as arranging dormitories or building sleeping porches, which make them better suited to the purpose.
It is difficult to state with accuracy the exact proportion of rented houses and owned houses, without inquiring more deeply into the details of the financial arrangements of each chapter than has thus far been done. Practices vary from one fraternity to another, and under varying types of arrangement several of the houses were built or bought, with a greater or lesser amount of aid (usually greater) on the part of local alumni, functioning either as a chapter, a special corporation, or a group of individuals; in other cases, financial assistance was received from the national organization. In such cases, it is customary to budget a certain amount as "rent"; but the house may be reported either as owned or rented. Hence the difficulty in interpreting their reports. However, the conditions may be stated in a general way. Of the thirty-one houses, ten are reported as rented, evidently in most cases from parties outside the fraternity, but in at least one case (a negro fraternity) from the alumni chapter; twenty-one are reported as "owned". Of the seven youngest fraternities, none own their homes, one of these seven having no house, the others renting.

**Classes of Fraternities**

Fraternities at The University of Chicago are informally classifiable into four groups. These groups, while in no way officially recognized, are fairly distinguishable, except that the status of certain fraternities as between the first two classes described is somewhat doubtful, and in some cases is undergoing a change.
1. The older and stronger fraternities, usually with the advantages of age, national reputation, many illustrious alumni, both here and elsewhere, and campus prestige. They average somewhat larger than the others, the oldest sixteen of the thirty-two (which are also the fraternities which have been established here for a period of twenty years or more) having slightly over sixty percent of the total membership (winter quarter). Not all the older fraternities, however, are among the strongest, at least one of the oldest having given up its charter and disbanded during the war, and not yet having recovered its former standing. Eleven of the sixteen oldest chapters have their houses on University and Woodlawn Avenues between 55th Street and 58th Street, while only four of the younger sixteen have houses in the district described.

2. The younger fraternities (omitting Jewish and negro fraternities). Some of these are chapters of national fraternities which are old and strong, but a number are chapters of national organizations which have been established within the past twenty-five years. They are, of course, ambitious to win the recognition and prestige that is enjoyed by the older fraternities, and miss no opportunity to strengthen their standing in the various phases of undergraduate life.

3. The Jewish fraternities. All of these are recent, both nationally and locally, and the chapters are small, averaging in the winter quarter 9.2 members and 4 pledges. Two of these report owning their houses.

4. The two negro fraternities, which have not, thus far,
had houses in the university community, or been represented on
the interfraternity council, or been thought of, probably, by
the average undergraduate as university fraternities, in spite
of the fact that both have large national organizations, and
a spirit and program that other fraternities might well emulate.

SCHOLARSHIP

Each quarter the scholarship average of the various fra-
ternities is computed in the Recorder's office and published
in the Daily Maroon. Because of the comparatively wide range
of grade points per major which our system provides (from -2
to +6), and the comparatively small number of men per fra-
ternity, an exceptionally good or exceptionally bad performance
by only one or two men may produce wide fluctuations in the
relative standing of a fraternity from one quarter to the next.
Thus, between the autumn and winter quarters of this year, one
small fraternity fell from sixth place to thirty-first, while
another rose from thirtieth to third place. The low degree of
consistency from one quarter to the next may be stated in sta-
tistical terms as follows: The coefficient of correlation
between the scholarship rank of the thirty-two fraternities
in the autumn quarter, 1923, and the winter quarter, 1924, is +.26. 

# A coefficient of +1.00 means perfect agreement or consistency
between the two series of measurements; -1.00 means complete
inverse relationship; .00 means that nothing more than chance
relationship prevails between the two sets of rankings or
measurements. A coefficient of +.30 to +.40 is generally re-
garded as indicative of some slight relationship; +.50 to
+.60, a fairly pronounced degree of relationship; +.70 to
+.80 or higher, a marked degree of consistency.
This means that it is impossible to predict, with any degree of assurance, where in the list a fraternity will stand from knowing where it stood the quarter before. Nevertheless, by most fraternities, a "C" average is pretty constantly maintained.

Tendencies in scholarship may be somewhat more precisely appreciated with the aid of the following table, compiled from the last three published scholarship reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Year 1922-23</th>
<th>Autumn 1923</th>
<th>Winter 1924</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of fraternities</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of men</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fraternities aver-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aging 3 grade-points per</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major, or better (i.e., B-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fraternities aver-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aging less than 2 grade-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points per major (C-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest fraternity average</td>
<td>2.369</td>
<td>3.173</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest fraternity average</td>
<td>1.778</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of grade-</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>2.375</td>
<td>2.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points per major, by fra-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ternities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of the scholarship reports reveals the fact that the fraternities which stand highest in scholarship are by no means the older and stronger chapters. Of the sixteen older fraternities, only one appears among the highest ten in the Winter quarter report, and only two in the autumn. It is the
younger and smaller fraternities which make the better showing in scholarship. In the autumn quarter, three of the seven Jewish fraternities stood among the highest ten fraternities in scholarship; and in the winter quarter, five Jewish fraternities and one negro fraternity were among the best ten. In the winter quarter the average scholarship rank of the sixteen older fraternities was 21 (in the list of 32), and that of the sixteen younger fraternities was 12. The coefficient of correlation between the age of the fraternity on the quadrangles and its scholastic rank was -.52, a definite tendency on the part of older fraternities to relax their standing in scholarship.

It has been asserted that the young fraternity, lacking the prestige that will attract to it men of wealth, family prominence, social graces or athletic prowess, tends to seek recognition at first through high scholarship; that probably the next direction in which it turns its attention is toward athletic prominence; and that last of all, if ever, come that established standing and prestige which will attract members of wealth and family position. That there may be considerable truth in this generalization is suggested by the figures cited, as well as by other facts, readily observable, but less susceptible of numerical statement. At any rate, the tendency, as years pass by, seems to be in the direction of relegating scholarly interest to a secondary place; although it should be borne in mind that these generalizations are limited in their reliability by the small numbers in the various fraternities, and by the very slight differences in scholarship standing which obtain between the various fraternities.
It is strange that, so far as I have been able to learn, no attempt has been made heretofore to compare the fraternity averages either with averages of all students or with those of non-fraternity men. Through the kindess of Mr. Scales, who has been making some investigations of records for another purpose, the following figures have been given me, which may be compared with the fraternity averages previously cited, such, for example, as the winter quarter average of 2.458 grade-points per major taken.

1. 304 June 1923 graduates in the Colleges of Arts, Literature and Science averaged 3.3208 grade-points per major taken.

402 June 1923 graduates, including, besides the above, the graduates in Education, Commerce and Administration and Social Service Administration, averaged 3.3593 grade-points per major taken.

A miscellaneous group of 200 graduates, from 1915 to 1919, averaged 3.18 grade-points per major taken.

These averages range from 0.7 to 1.1 grade-point per major above the fraternity average. That this difference is not due alone to the fact that the figures mentioned are those of graduating classes is apparent from further data, here presented.

2. From a list of the marks given by members of the faculty during the winter quarter of 1923, I find that the average grade, expressed in terms of grade-points, for 6871 undergraduate courses completed, was 3.0166, i.e., B-, the same as the averages cited for members of graduating classes.
3. That the responsibility for low marks in the fraternities cannot be thrown entirely on the pledges, whose marks are included in the averages given for the various fraternities, is evident from the following facts. A study was made of the marks received during the autumn and winter quarters by entering freshmen men. A representative sample of 110 men, all native born, who were not pledged to fraternities, but were enrolled both autumn and winter quarters, showed an average of 2.618 grade-points per major in the autumn quarter, and 3.056 grade-points in the winter quarter. The increase of 0.438 grade-point per major was probably due, in the main, to their getting better adjusted to university conditions after the first quarter. In contrast to these figures stand the records of 200 freshmen, enrolled both autumn and winter quarters, and pledged to fraternities during the winter quarter. These men averaged 2.39 grade-points per major during the autumn quarter, and 2.365 grade-points during the winter. These averages are not enough lower than the fraternity average of 2.458 grade points (being, indeed, higher in the autumn quarter by 0.015 grade-point) to mean that the low averages are due to the marks made by the pledges, particularly in view of the fact that the pledges are comparatively few in number. This indicates that those who have been initiated must share the odium of mediocre scholarship with those who have not. The fact that the freshmen pledged to fraternities did not improve their standing during the winter quarter, as the unpledged men did, is due to conditions which will be explained.
Very illuminating as to the conditions affecting scholarship in fraternities are the following figures from the study last mentioned.

126 men who were pledged to fraternities during the autumn quarter and made sufficiently high marks so that they were initiated during the winter quarter, averaged as follows:

Autumn quarter, 3.003 grade-points per major taken
Winter quarter, 2.550 grade-points per major taken

DECREASE, .453 grade-point per major taken.

It is evident from this—a fact which more than one fraternity officer has admitted to me—that the primary object of the close supervision which most fraternities exercise over their pledges is to get them eligible for initiation. When that is accomplished, supervision is promptly relaxed, with disastrous effects to marks the following quarter.

Another bit of evidence to the same effect comes from an examination of the marks of 15 men who were pledged during the autumn quarter and made sufficiently high marks that quarter so that they were eligible for initiation, but for reasons other than low scholarship were not initiated. They averaged as follows:

Autumn quarter, 2.611 grade-points per major taken
Winter quarter, 2.254 grade-points per major taken

DECREASE, .357 grade-point per major taken.

On these men, evidently, close supervision was relaxed when it was found that they had "made the grade".

In striking contrast to these is the record made by 59 men who were pledged during the autumn quarter, but who made
such low marks that they were ineligible for initiation. What their fraternity brothers did to them during the winter is readily inferred from the following averages:

**Autumn quarter, 1.000 grade-points per major taken**

**Winter quarter, 1.999 grade-points per major taken**

_**INCREASE, 0.999 grade-point per major taken.**_

Two facts stand out from these comparisons. First, the fraternity can, very definitely, operate to improve the scholarship of its members. Second, _except_ when necessary, it fails to do so. Although I have not made computations on this particular point, I noticed during the progress of the calculations only one fraternity in which the initiates maintained the standing they had made as pledges.

This showing is certainly not creditable to the fraternities. Nor is it exceptional at this institution, judging from the consensus of opinion of college and university administrative officers the country over, the majority of whom assert that fraternity men average lower in scholarship than do non-fraternity men.

**SCHOLARSHIP AND "ACTIVITIES"**

The explanation of these facts, I am convinced, is not that fraternities and fraternity men are contemptuous of high scholarship. Probably in no institution in the country is scholarship more highly respected than here. The quarterly scholarship reports of fraternities are scanned with interest, and a good average is generally a source of congratulation to a fraternity; at any rate, it means that they are for the
time being at least, "above the danger line". But the mediocre scholarship standing is a corollary of the emphasis almost universally placed among fraternities on "activities". As one fraternity man put it, "After the freshman year" (meaning, probably, more precisely, after initiation is safely accomplished) "we expect to sacrifice about one grade-point per quarter for the sake of activities". The sacrifice, as I pointed out to him, is considerably greater than one grade-point per quarter. The usual argument is that the extra-curricular activities—athletic, journalistic, dramatic, managerial, political, social, and the like—are so important a part of one's college education that it is worth while, if need be, to sacrifice grades to a slight extent.

One of the ideals admitted by every fraternity with whose representative I talked on this subject, is, "Every member in an 'activity'". When I asked whether the appeal most used in getting men to "go out for" activities was profit to the individual in the way of all-around development or personal recognition, or whether it was loyalty to the fraternity and its standing on the campus, the usual reply received was, "Whichever argument will work"; although several asserted that with the freshman, fraternity loyalty seemed to be a more effective type of appeal than with upper-classmen, to whom the value of the personal recognition and training was more apparent. But whatever the motive, it is very clear that "activities" rank higher in the interest and evaluation of many students, and particularly of fraternity men to whom there is a double appeal, than in the opinion of faculty members they should;
and without question the effect of this misplacement of emphasis is deleterious to the highest type of scholarship. There is no reason to assume that fraternity men have less ability than non-fraternity men. Nor are the mere facts of membership in a fraternity, residence in a fraternity house, and participation in the life of the fraternity the fundamental reasons for the lower scholarship of fraternity men; that is, the problem is not fundamentally that of fraternity affiliation or non-affiliation. It is a by-product of the kind of social ideals and habits, praiseworthy in themselves, but easily overstressed, which the intimate and constant associations of fraternity life encourage, and to the frequent exercise of which the machinery of fraternity organization lends itself.

The opinion may be hazarded that conditions here are not so serious in this respect as they are in many institutions, particularly those where a less desirable attitude toward scholarship prevails than prevails here, and in small institutions where the extra-curricular activities have to be shared by a disproportionately smaller number of students. Members of the faculty, and others as well, will disagree as to the seriousness of the inroads which "activities" make on scholarship. Nevertheless, it seems to the writer that the situation is one which calls for the exercise of attention and effort, in the direction of correcting what is in many instances an erroneous sense of values on the part of students.

The central problem of scholarship in fraternities at the University of Chicago is, it seems to me, twofold. The first part of the problem I think we share with almost every
educational institution, that of reducing the number of failures. That scholarship averages of mediocre quality are partially due, in most fraternities, to the presence of one or more "flunkers" is evident from an inspection of the marks attained by members of the several fraternities. In my opinion, while the present methods of dealing with low-stand men are not wholly satisfactory in effect, what is needed is not so much a change in the general procedure as a more thorough-going use of instrumentalities now in use.

The second part of the problem is, for us, a more perplexing one. It is the problem of bringing about a shift in emphasis, from merely "getting by"—getting and keeping members eligible, for initiation, public appearance, and activities—to raising the entire standard of acceptable scholarship throughout the organization. The fraternities have shown that they can and do function effectively in keeping their members above the danger line. They should have credit for serving as a very valuable adjunct to the official machinery in this respect. But there needs to be injected or developed in them the conviction that creditable standing is just as important a goal as passable standing; and that scholarly distinction is, desirable—more desirable, indeed—than any other kind of distinction. There is no reason to believe that such a change of emphasis would be disastrous to the all-around personal development of any of those who now assiduously cultivate such a development through participation in extra-curricular activities. The impulses which motivate such activities are too deep-seated in most students to be in danger
of suffering seriously if constant insistence is placed on
the fact that the University is primarily an educational
institution.

The scholarship problem is, of course, by no means
peculiar to our local situation. Nor will it ever be solved
by means of a single, simple formula. A number of suggestions
toward methods of improving scholarship in fraternities have
come from various sources. It is my hope to be able to
evaluate these more carefully after further study. Some of
them affect primarily the low-stand students; others aim
rather at the raising of the general level. Some of them
may be mentioned to indicate the possible ways of approach.

1. Limitation of the number of extra-curricular ac-
tivities which a student may undertake has its advocates in
most institutions, including this. If this were done, it
would probably alleviate a few conspicuous cases where par-
ticipation by capable students in a great diversity of time-
consuming enterprises has been disastrous to their scholar-
ship, and probably to their habits of thoroughness and care
in work as well. But it could hardly affect more than a few.

2. Something can be accomplished, probably, by making
it clear to some of the fraternities (some are already well
aware of it) that one or two loafers in a chapter may pull
down the chapter's scholarship rank one-third or one-half,
or even more, the length of the list. In this way, attention
and effort may perhaps be more efficiently focalized.

3. A more constant and effective checking-up with instruc-
tors of each freshman's work under that instructor would prob-
ably be helpful in many instances. The effectiveness of this method as now practiced is limited by at least three conditions: First, that even where the "upper-class sponsor" system (whereby each freshman is under the direct oversight of one upper-classman) has been well worked out, some sponsors fail to give the necessary time to checking up their charges' work; second, that instructors frequently fail to cooperate by replying to inquiries sent them concerning students' standing; third, that ordinarily the plan affects only freshmen, who are far from being the only problem-cases. Possibly a more careful selection of sponsors, and their supervision by the scholarship committee or faculty counselor could be brought about in certain cases. Faculty members should certainly cooperate as far as they can by replying to inquiries about standing of men in their classes; I have suggested to one or two fraternity officers that personal conferences, about mid-quarter, between each sponsor and his charge's instructors, in place of dependence on postal card replies, might not only have more effectiveness in getting information, but might often interest the instructor in watching more closely the work of the student in question, and incidentally increase the range and value of personal acquaintance between upper-classmen and faculty. Whether or not the sponsor system could be extended to men above freshman year, and whether the system of reporting standings of men could be made to cover all fraternity men and not merely freshmen, under-classmen, or low-stand men, I am not prepared to say; but these are possibilities worth inquiring into.
4. Some of the faculty counselors have interpreted their function as primarily to keep up the fraternity's scholarship average, through the medium of talks in chapter meetings, personal conferences with low-stand men, and any other means they could command. There are evidently possibilities for good in the faculty counselor plan that but few of the fraternities and few of the counselors have fully realized. It is to be hoped that the steps taken this spring will help make the faculty counselor system more effective.

5. There are similar possibilities in the encouragement of the plan of alumni advisers or alumni committees, such as prevail in some of the fraternities, but not in all. The effect of this plan on scholarship depends, of course, on the attitude taken toward scholarship by the individual adviser or committee members.

6. Alumni members are often concerned with the mediocre standing of their chapters, and in various ways, by means of prizes, scholarships, honors, and the like, endeavor to encourage higher standing. It is doubtful, however, if even an attractive prize affects many members, since most are likely to leave competition for the prize to a few high-stand men who "go in for that sort of thing".

7. Some fraternities have house rules requiring all members, whether freshmen or not, to observe rigid study hours until they succeed in maintaining a certain scholarship average. While this method is commonly applied to freshmen here, its possible extension to upper-classmen is limited by the fact that so many live outside the fraternity houses.
INFLUENCE ON CHARACTER

The most comprehensive and crucial question concerning fraternity life is its effect on the developing personality of its members, upon their habits, attitudes, and standards of value, in all the many directions in which they may be called into expression, and particularly upon those social attitudes which constitute what we call moral character.

There are as yet no adequate methods for getting quantitative measurements of most of these complex traits. Whether there ever will be depends on the outcome of the efforts now being put forth by many research workers in the field of psychology and of personnel toward this end. At present, however, we must be content to base our conclusions about most of the questions in this field upon the best opinions of careful observers.

Most, if not all, fraternities, it can safely be asserted, embody in their constitutions and express in their rituals, moral (and sometimes religious) ideals which are in every way praiseworthy. The initiation ceremony affords perhaps the principal occasion for impressing these ideals upon the members as well as upon the initiates. How far these ideals remain "paper ideals" and how far they are actually realized in the collective and individual life of the members, depends on actual conditions which vary from fraternity to fraternity and from year to year, with the changing personnel. That it is a wholesome thing to place these ideals on display, periodically, in a dignified and impressive manner, seems quite evident.
"SNOBBISHNESS"

One of the first questions that arises is, "Do fraternities tend to make their members snobbish?" Every sort of answer can be obtained, most of which probably reflect, in some way, the personal experiences and interests of the individuals who give these answers. The charge that they do have this effect is one of the most commonly cited arguments against the fraternity system.

If we bear in mind two or three facts, much of the confusion will, I think, disappear. In the first place, no one can deny that what is sometimes criticised as snobbishness or exclusiveness is merely the obverse of the very natural process of selecting as close friends those with whom one had a community of interests. This is not, of course, a fault peculiar to fraternity men. Unless it be carried to an unreasonable extreme it is not a fault but a necessary and even a valuable human tendency. But its concrete expression is always likely to cause distress to some who, whether they clearly realize it or not, long for the companionship of others who fail to respond. In many cases, undoubtedly, charges of exclusiveness and snobbishness may be characterized as "defense reactions" of disappointed individuals.

Another relevant fact is that every fraternity is critical of those it invites to its fellowship. It wants only those who promise to be congenial. More than this, it wants only those who give promise of proving socially acceptable. Each fraternity realized keenly that it is constantly being judged by outsiders, and that their judgment is based largely upon the impression its
individual members make. Under such circumstances, the other-
wise worthy individual who falls short in appearance, manners,
speech, or any of the social graces, is appraised as a doubtful
asset, even though his real merits may be recognized. It is
not surprising if immature and tactless fraternity men sometimes
give expression to this estimate of those who fail to meet the
fraternity standards, in terms which are ill-chosen and produce
resentment and misunderstanding.

The question of whether fraternities and fraternity men
at the University of Chicago are, as a general rule (for there
are individual exceptions in all fraternities) snobbish in their
attitude toward outsiders may, then, be restated as two ques-
tions: First: Do the fraternities, to an unreasonable degree,
restrict their relationships and interests to their own group,
or to inter-fraternity groups? Second: Do the fraternities
overestimate the value of those personal qualities which consti-
tute "social acceptability", and underestimate others, notably,
high scholarship, ambition, independence of thought, individual
resourcefulness, etc., which not infrequently characterize
non-fraternity men?

One difficulty, of course, in answering the first of these
two questions, is to define "unreasonable degree" in such a way
as would gain general consent. Every observer of our Univer-
sity life knows that non-fraternity men are active and prominent,
side by side with fraternity men, in most student activities.
Not all these nonfraternity men are so because of lack of oppor-
tunity to be fraternity men. Some of the most prominent of the
independent men on the campus are so from choice. The point is,
there is less friction between the two groups in the carrying on of student enterprises than prevails in many colleges. There is a good measure of mutual respect, even in spite of the lines of demarkation. The Reynolds Club is now used freely by both fraternity and non-fraternity men, though probably less continuously by the former, since they have other congenial and convenient gathering places. The term "barb" is rarely heard here, and is objected to by the better fraternity men.

The formation of the present non-fraternity organization, "The Romans", is a case in point. It met with no active opposition from the fraternities, although a good many fraternity men, remembering previous attempts, expressed doubt about its ultimate success. In fact, fraternity men served on the committee which set this enterprise in motion. It is generally understood that one or more of the earlier non-fraternity organizations disintegrated not because of active opposition, but because of internal conditions. One cause was that some of the leaders joined fraternities when their activity and leadership brought them to recognition by the fraternities. This can hardly be described as systematic antagonism and I think was not generally so regarded.

On the other hand, it is not to be wondered at that fraternities do organize their efforts in support of their own members, or that interfraternity support of certain candidates is an occasional phenomenon of campus politics. This is one of several lines of demarkation of interest naturally to be expected. I may be mistaken, but I doubt if this constitutes so serious an evil here as to demand immediate action. In fact, the cultivation of a better spirit of cooperation between the fraternities, and
the putting of more authority and influence into the hands of the Interfraternity Council are conditions whose realization is being urged by the Dean of the Colleges, who is in close touch with them. There is probably more interfraternity rivalry and less interfraternity unity than there appears to be to the outsider. On the whole, I am doubtful if the fraternities at the University of Chicago can justly be charged with the intentional cultivation in their members of a supercilious attitude toward non-fraternity men as such.

Whether or not the fraternities place a correct estimate on the personal qualities of those they choose and those they do not choose is quite a different question. It is undoubtedly true that a good many members of a good many fraternities do have a somewhat distorted sense of personal values. Too high an estimate is placed upon superficialities, on good clothes and good looks, on pleasing accomplishments and social graces, on a not-too-serious attitude toward study and toward life, on a "good line of talk", and on prominent family and social connections, and not enough on qualities of character, intellect, and leadership. This distortion is not exclusively a fraternity fault, of course. Nor is it so conspicuous here as in many Eastern universities and colleges. But, as has been pointed out, it is likely to be more characteristic of the older and better established organizations than of the younger fraternities. It is also quite certain that every year some men of marked ability and initiative are never invited to become fraternity members because of some personal peculiarity or other. Of course this is by no means the only reason. As previously noted, many who live
in the city restrict their campus life to classroom, laboratory and library, and do not become known as potential fraternity material. Others give the impression of being colorless rather than eccentric in personality, and hence fail to attract attention or are not appraised as "potential assets to the chapter". Still others, for one reason or another, remain outside the fraternities from choice. But the failure of fraternities to be attracted to and to attract certain men who deviate markedly from the accepted "type" does lead to the criticism that the fraternities do not want non-conformists, individualists, geniuses, grinds, or radicals in their ranks, but only those who will let themselves be molded into the fraternity pattern.

I doubt if this represents so serious a distortion of values as is sometimes charged. It is not that the fraternities fail to recognize real merit, so much as that they are cautious about taking on any more "social liabilities" than can be helped. Every fraternity, sooner or later, pledges some men it wishes it were rid of, and which, often, it does get rid of before initiation. Considering the haste of the rushing and pledging season, it is rather remarkable that this does not happen oftener than it does. That it does not is due to the several months of investigation of prospects, preceding the opening of the autumn quarter, which all the fraternities endeavor to utilize, and upon which some of the older and stronger chapters place their main reliance. The consequence of this exercise of caution is that they are so repelled by superficial defects that they frequently let themselves have no opportunity to discover such underlying worth as there may be in the individual. Cer-
tainly, the valuable traits mentioned—scholarliness, independence, leadership, ambition, resourcefulness, and the rest—when combined with social acceptability, make their possessor all the more desirable fraternity material. Under the surface "conformity" of fraternity men there is probably as large or larger a proportion of ability, originality, and initiative, as in the student body as a whole.

While, as has been previously pointed out, there is too low a value placed on scholarship among many fraternity men, that low valuation is relative, and hardly constitutes an actual, general disrespect for scholarship. But other things being equal, all fraternities would be willing to stand high in scholarship.

As to the "snobbishness of wealth" complained of as a fraternity fault in many colleges, there is comparatively little evidence of it here. Self-support, whole or partial, is so common here, even among fraternity men, that no stigma attaches to it.

I believe that something could be done by the fraternities to lessen what ground does exist for the charge of exclusiveness, and at the same time to strengthen their own positions. This is by continuing, more systematically, the search for desirable material among men who were missed in the mad scramble of the autumn freshman rushing season, or those who have entered with advanced standing from schools having no fraternities. Many men of real "fraternity caliber" are thus missed in every institution. At Amherst, one of the strongholds of college fraternities, Calvin Coolidge was "overlooked" until his senior year. Fraternity officers with whom I have talked all assert that they do constantly look out for good fraternity material
among upperclassmen. But this search is much less systematic and ineffective than it might be. I believe that (assuming for the moment that fraternity life is commendable), rather than adding new fraternities in order to give a chance to every man who would like to enjoy the privileges of fraternity life, it would be better for all concerned if the fraternities now on the ground would work the field more intensively. This would, of course, leave even less justification for charges of exclusiveness.

LIQUOR AND SEX IMMORALITY

With respect to those more fundamental aspects of personality to which we apply the term "character", it is still more difficult to generalize. On the whole, I believe that the University of Chicago has had less ground to complain of fraternities as immoral influences than have many other institutions; and conditions at present seem no worse, and in some ways better, than in previous student generations. In fact, considering the very slight degree of official control exercised in the past, I believe that the University of Chicago has reason to congratulate itself on the moral fiber of its student body.

This is not to say that the fraternities and their members are free from faults, or even from vices. They do reveal at times grave derelictions, even in some of the best and most substantial organizations. These derelictions, moreover, are not always such as can be excused when they do occur. Every effort and constant effort should be put forth to correct them and to correct the conditions that contribute to them.
One of the most constant and troublesome evils is the use of intoxicants. Probably every one of the fraternity houses has stringent house-rules against bringing liquor into the house. In most, if not all, the fraternities, this rule has the backing of official support and of the public opinion of most members. Nevertheless, its violation by individuals has been too frequent. While no cases have come to my attention where violation of such rules was clearly the act of the fraternity as a whole, or even of a considerable body of its members collectively, officers and members undoubtedly are frequently at fault for failure to enforce the rule with sufficient persistence and severity.

An especially troublesome factor, and one which I suspect operates in a considerable proportion of the cases, is where liquor is brought in by former students or alumni. This is a traditional source of trouble in most institutions, particularly at Commencement and on the occasion of football victories and other festivities. The solicitations of the bootlegger constitute another troublesome influence, although he operates as a rule through individual members or alumni. Especially since the advent of prohibition the introduction of liquor into the houses has been done in such a way as to make it difficult to locate the responsibility, even where the fact is indubitable. The motive seems to be much less frequently a genuine desire for the liquor than it is a wish to appear clever or sophisticated.

The consumption of liquor outside the house is another serious problem, the more so because the places where it is consumed, the quality of the liquor, and the attendant circumstances are likely to afford additional dangers. In a city of the size
and character of this it is practically impossible wholly to prevent such consumption. I have heard it stated by fraternity representatives that in their opinion most students probably drink at one time or another, although with the majority once or twice suffices. This probably occurs more often during the sophomore year than earlier, when freshmen are under closer supervision, or later, when, as one representative put it, "they have acquired a little more sense".

I do not wish to overstate the prevalence of this evil--nor to understate it. Certainly it is in no sense peculiar to fraternity life, although such life does provide both incentive and opportunity to those who are susceptible to it. It has not attained the proportions of a public scandal; it is probably less serious here than in many institutions. Nevertheless, it calls for unceasing vigilance. This vigilance should not, I believe, be confined to discipline for offences, but should extend to the exercise of every possible influence toward maintaining a wholesome public sentiment among fraternity men, in order that both officially and unofficially, offenders may be made to feel the disapproval of their fellows.

I believe the University may well consider whether the cultivation of an atmosphere favorable in this respect might not be effected by encouraging (and perhaps later requiring) the residence in every house of a responsible older person, either a faculty man or a so-called "house-mother" or chaperone. On this point more will be said later.

Of the extent of sex immorality it is even more difficult
to speak with confidence. Certainly it is even more strongly disapproved by the fraternities than is liquor. I have found no one who believes that it is practiced in any fraternity house, at least with the knowledge of any considerable number of members. Even more than with liquor, the extent to which it occurs outside the house can only be a matter of conjecture, since it is less frequently the subject of conversation or boast than is drinking.

One annoying form which this problem takes is calls at the door or by telephone by women or girls of doubtful, or at least of irresponsible character. To a considerable extent this is believed to be organized solicitation by residents of disreputable houses, some probably in Hyde Park. To what extent this solicitation proves effective I cannot say. I believe it constitutes a source of danger, particularly for the unsuspecting student who may be led into difficulties without realizing just how it came about, perhaps by a woman professing to be a sister or mother of some fraternity brother. It calls, I think, for firm insistence on observance of the rule about women visitors to fraternity houses. However, it should be mentioned that this practice is regarded in many of the houses as a nuisance, rather than as a positive moral menace.

There is undoubtedly an element of truth in the common charge that other undesirable practices, such as betting, profanity, and the telling of vulgar or indecent stories are favored by the conditions of life in fraternity houses. Equally undoubtedly, however, popular generalizations by outsiders misrepresent the facts. In every organization there are to be found members, few or many, who silently or openly disapprove these practices as strongly as do their critics. Such things occur, of course, in most places
where men live together and particularly where they congregate for recreation.

While I have not made much special inquiry about betting and gambling, what has come to my notice has been, in general, for small amounts and is not usually taken as a serious matter by the participants. Most profanity and improper language are likewise the result of careless habits and the influence of mob-mind, rather than any general taste for deliberately vicious practices. Nevertheless, these habits, like the more serious vices, are injurious to the development of the type of character for which the University stands. The efforts which are being exerted by fraternity officers of the better sort, to correct and prevent these practices in their houses should have the support of the University authorities in every practicable way. While the University can, and on occasions must, exercise disciplinary measures, the most effective weapons against all these demoralizing influences are strong public sentiment, especially inside the fraternities, and provision of conditions such as will discourage their expression. Here again, I am certain that the presence of the right sort of a chaperone in the house would here, as it has elsewhere, usually prove a major influence toward the maintenance of a favorable atmosphere. In general, public sentiment in our student body is wholesome. In the greater intimacy of the fraternity house its quality varies. It must always depend mainly on the attitude of the more influential members. Certainly, the University cannot afford to have it said that it has done anything less than its utmost to cooperate in providing conditions favorable to the maintenance of a morally wholesome atmosphere.
A criticism often heard from those who have official dealings with fraternities is that they are frequently irresponsible about meeting their obligations, official, financial, and community. Such criticisms have reference to a variety of conditions, among which may be mentioned failure to pay debts and maintain sound credit, to schedule social events in advance, to meet classroom obligations on time, to care for property and maintain quiet and order in the house in such a way as not to constitute an annoyance to the neighborhood.

Certainly, there is plenty of ground for such criticisms. Not all these, however, can be justly charged against all fraternities or all members. Equally certainly, irresponsibility is not a fault peculiar to fraternities and fraternity men, although the collective social obligations which organized group life and the possession of real property incurred afford a greater number of opportunities for failure to be noticed and to be especially annoying. In large measure, irresponsibility is a correlate of youth and inexperience. Conversely, to identify it as a leading fault in others implies the viewpoint of a person of maturity and responsibility.

This fact was brought home to me by the fact that every fraternity representative to whom I broached the subject either did not consider undergraduate irresponsibility a major problem, or seemed at a loss to understand what I was talking about. This was in spite of the fact that several were officers who had undoubtedly been inconvenienced, at one time or another, by the irresponsibility of their fraternity fellows.

The fact is, that a sound sense of responsibility comes
only with years, experience, and training, and such training is and should be one of the primary aims of a college education. The instructor who does not insist upon obligations being promptly met, or who is himself negligent or unpunctual, must bear a large portion of blame. The management of a fraternity, either as an officer or as a voting member, affords a good many opportunities, and creates a necessity for its development, such as do not come to the individual without such relationships. From one point of view this opportunity for training in social responsibility is one of the strongest arguments in favor of fraternity life. But it is an equally strong argument for more effectual training.

As it now is, the burden of responsibility for the proper conduct of affairs falls on the men who are seniors and, to a little less degree, on the juniors. Characteristically, they hold the responsible offices in the chapter, exercise considerable authority, are looked to by the underclassmen to set the keynote for the fraternity. Often each qualified upperclassman has the individual responsibility for one or more freshmen and has to see to it that his freshman not only observes house-rules, performs the duties that are assigned to him, keeps study-hours, and maintains a high enough grade so that he will not fail of initiation or bring the fraternity average down, but also that he eliminates whatever social crudities he may have, and become socially "fit". After the freshman year, this surveillance is relaxed, and it is the common testimony that it is the sophomore members who cause most of the worry to these in control. How well this system of responsibility for underclassmen operates depends largely on the individual upperclassman counsellor or
sponsor, but also on how tightly the chapter president or other responsible officer holds the rein on fraternity affairs. It must not be forgotten, however, that the officers are, after all, undergraduates, and that for them to steer a skillful course between laxity on the one hand and an overbearing and dictatorial attitude on the other requires a degree of judgment that is rare, even among experienced executives.

I believe that in most cases the experience of responsibility, either as officer or as sponsor or counsellor, is a very valuable thing for the upperclassman in cultivating this desirable sense of obligation. The problems are, however, to get this sense of obligation to function in situations the importance of which is frequently not realized, and to develop it in those in whom it is wanting.

As an example of the first may be cited the frequent complaint from neighbors about the appearance of fraternity property, particularly the back yards. With a membership completely changing every four years, and a personal responsibility which by division becomes so attenuated as to be inoperative, it is not surprising that the first experience of fraternity men in building and managing property fails to develop that community-sense and property-pride which should and do characterize most house-owners in this community. It is likely to be a perpetual problem. Something doubtless can be done through an appeal to alumni living in the house. Possibly some public recognition, such as a cup, medal, banner, or honorable mention, awarded annually to the house or houses maintaining the best-kept property or showing the strongest community spirit in this and other ways as well, might have some effect.
The problem of financial responsibility of the fraternities is less serious now than it has been in previous years, particularly during the war years. I am informed that no fraternities were reported to the University office this past year as failing to pay their debts, whereas during the war years it was a frequent occurrence. The fraternities are in stronger financial condition now than for some time past. As a rule, the fraternities seem to endeavor seriously to maintain good credit standing, and when they do not, it is due more to unskilful management than to disregard of their obligations. Some of the fraternities which are fortunate in having unusually competent business management, pride themselves on not only paying their bills promptly, but on making payments on their homes or accumulating a surplus.

INFLUENCE ON RELIGIOUS LIFE

It is a common charge that fraternity life operates to weaken or destroy the religious life of men who would otherwise be active in religious organizations and regular attendants at religious services. It is asserted that men who have been active in church and young people's religious organizations at home often drop all such activity when they come to the University and are pledged to fraternities.

That this does happen in a good many cases there can be no doubt. But the situation can easily be misjudged. A good many fraternity men do continue to be active in religious affairs, in the Y.M.C.A. or other organizations, and to attend religious exercises frequently on Sundays. These men are often equally prominent in other campus or fraternity activities. In fact, an
office or cabinet position in the Y.M.C.A. is, equally with athletic, journalistic, dramatic or other recognition, viewed by many men and many fraternities as a coveted honor, an "activity to go out for". Perhaps this attitude may be objected to as unseemly, but it certainly does not betoken general indifference or contempt.

But even in those cases where a boy, previously active in religious enterprises, drops out of active participation on entering college, it is fair to raise the question whether his new environment is wholly, or even chiefly, to blame. Probably more often than is generally suspected, the sudden change in outward conduct had its origins, either as definite experiences or as a vaguely felt dissatisfaction, in some failure or failures of the home church or home religious training to meet adequately the intellectual and social needs of the developing youth. The analysis made last year of the freshman English papers on the topic of religion affords strong evidence to this effect. Whether the feeling of insufficiency be vague and scarcely realized, or whether it be a vivid and strong as to amount almost to revolt, the freshman's sudden change of mode of life, coinciding with the relaxation of direct parental influence, is very likely to disrupt those habits which have already ceased to be felt as vital. The associations and sense of freedom afforded by the fraternity house often tend to emphasize this break, so that it may be more evident among fraternity men than among non-fraternity men who have less incentive to seek human companionship in religious assemblages.

This does not, of course, absolve the fraternity from its
share of whatever blame may be due. But it is evidently not a sole, and perhaps not even a major cause. Ceasing to participate in religious activities, moreover, does not always—or even often, I am convinced—betoken a cessation of interest in the fundamental values which religion seeks to foster. It is a reaction rather against the externals and incidentals of religion, and certainly against its inconsistencies. One man, prominent in fraternity and athletics, in talking about the Y.M.C.A. discussion groups remarked, in effect, "It's all right to discuss social and life problems; it's fine, and I'm for it; but the minute you call it 'religion' or 'Bible study' the fellows won't stand for it." I was told later by the Secretary of the University Y.M.C.A. that he had never been able to arrange for a discussion group in that particular house (as in some other houses as well), chiefly, he believed, because of the objection of Catholic members to anything savoring of Bible study.

There are plenty of evidences of a wholesome student interest here at the University of Chicago in the more serious problems of life, those which are the direct concern of a vital religion. There is also general respect for organized religious enterprises. The avowed atheists and agnostics are so few as to be practically negligible. In many of the fraternity houses it is easy to find evidences of religious interest, or at least of religious conformity. Many of the initiation rituals are semi-religious in character. In several houses (including the Y.M.C.A. one mentioned as opposing discussion groups) it is customary to say or sing grace at meals. One fraternity representative said that on the occasion of a prominent preacher's presence at Mandel
Hall it is usual for from half to two-thirds of his fraternity to attend; and the same is doubtless true in several other houses, although at other times only a few attend. Another fraternity provides many of the ushers. Last year thirteen of the twenty-three white, non-Jewish fraternities held Y.M.C.A. discussion groups, and in the opinion of the Y.M.C.A. secretary more would have been organized had leaders been available. In most cases, he believed, the series proved a success. Those cases where it did not were due to the leader's monopolizing the discussion. In his opinion, the crux of the problem is the difficulty in finding faculty members who will consent to lead these discussion groups, although the previously mentioned disinclination to "Bible study" is a factor.

The one formal religious exercise of the week which is designed for the entire University, the Sunday morning Mandel Hall service, does not, as we all recognize, have the appearance so much of a University function as a Hyde Park community function. A visitor looking over the typical Sunday morning audience would not inevitably recognize it as a student-body. While not many fraternity men attend there regularly, it is doubtful if a much larger proportion of undergraduate, non-fraternity men can be found there, either. In my opinion this is in some degree due to the fact just mentioned, that it is not thought of as a service primarily for the students. I believe it should be so thought of, although how to make it so is a question not easily answered.

I believe that a plan worth considering is to reserve, until 11 O'clock, the front part of the central section, that
is to say, the choicest seats, for students. This would offer a special inducement to attend and to be prompt; for it is certainly true that before 11 o'clock most of the seats which offer the best view and hearing of the speaker are filled by people who are not students. It would make the students feel that the University had provided the service particularly for them. It would make a much more definite showing of student strength, and give a more favorable impression upon speaker, audience, and students themselves. On the occasion of visits of men like Dr. Fosdick and Professor VanDyke, and perhaps on other Sundays as well, arrangement for reserving definite sections or rows for various fraternity groups might be arranged. Particularly, I think, would this be a fitting thing for a fraternity to plan for when the speaker of the day is a member of their national organization. Experimentation with such a plan for a quarter, supplemented by occasional general or special invitations sent out by the President's office would probably give some indication of whether the plan should be further tried, modified, extended, or discontinued.

The suggestion has been made that greater interest might be created by the organization of a University church, somewhat like the Church of Christ in Yale University. While it would undoubtedly attract the interest of several, I am doubtful if local conditions are such as to make the plan a solution of our problem. Opportunities to hear good preaching are fewer in New Haven than in Chicago. More students here live at home or go home for week ends. Several denominations are making special efforts to bring their students into touch with neighborhood
churches. This is very desirable, but would interfere more seriously with a formally organized University Church than it would with Sunday services arranged and carried out by the University.

I believe that a systematic and persistent attempt, through as many channels as seem suitable, to present the Mandel Hall service to the undergraduates as a rare opportunity to hear some of the finest thinkers and most eloquent speakers the country can offer, might profitably be undertaken.

On the whole, I believe fraternity men here cannot be charged either with antagonism to or general indifference to the fundamental social and personal values which are the particular concern of ethics and religion. There are plenty of exceptions, real or apparent. But a sympathetic and straightforward approach finds most fraternity men, as I have known them, genuinely appreciative of the value of these ideals, responsive to appeals, and glad to cooperate in realizing these values. They are willing to go half-way, or more. To develop a sense of social values in men and women who have not had extensive experience is one of the primary obligations of the University; and I believe that we have raw material which, while by no means perfect, is more pliant, responsive, and promising than we have sometimes credited it with being.
FRATERNITY CONTROL

It is impossible to make any sound, sweeping generalizations about the degree and kind of control exercised over fraternity life and fraternity members, either by their national organizations, their alumni, their faculty counsellors, or their local officers. Conditions and practices vary widely from one fraternity to another, from one chapter to another within the same national fraternity, and even within the same chapter over a period of a student generation or even less.

As an illustration of the last mentioned point may be mentioned the fact that several fraternity officers have commented to me upon the change of character apparent within their own houses during the past year, due to the passing, by graduation, of the ex-service-man element from most of the chapters, which has been, since the war, a conspicuous and often a controlling factor. These men were older than the present student generation, and doubtless in some cases more sophisticated and, as the students put it, more "hard-boiled". Some of the fraternity officers feel that this change has been beneficial to the spirit and morals of their houses. At the same time, it has thrown the burden of control on younger men. Undoubtedly this fact has had some influence. Similar changes, over a student generation or two, in the tone of a chapter are familiar to all observers of campus life. Generalizations about this, that, or the other fraternity are, therefore, always subject to qualifications.

INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

In general, the national organizations have seriously
endeavored, in policy and usually in administration, to encourage higher standards of scholarship and a desirable type of social life. They have not always succeeded, sometimes because of a "good fellow" type of traveling secretary, but more often because of distance from the local chapters. I have in mind the case of a young national fraternity whose officers live in Chicago and are in frequent touch with the local chapter, and leave a positive and valuable impress upon that chapter. With larger organizations, whose national officers live at a distance, this is of course impossible to accomplish.

The spirit of the National Interfraternity Conference, as personally observed in the 1923 meeting, and as reflected in all its printed minutes, has been throughout one of the most cordial and sincere cooperation with university and college administrators in the maintenance of higher standards of scholarship and character. Deviations from this high standard, therefore, must be charged to conditions more or less local and limited in their scope, and not primarily to the national fraternity movement. Committees of the Conference, some temporary, some permanent, have been active for the past fourteen years, assembling and summarizing facts and making recommendations concerning many aspects of fraternity life, the majority of which, probably, are directly in line with the interests of the college and university administrative officers. Past minutes of Interfraternity Conference are full of reports of committees and individual addresses which reflect this wholly salutary spirit of constructive cooperation. The following topics, taken from half a dozen of these minutes, indicate the direction of the
Conference's interests, and afford a suggestive picture, not only of actual conditions, but of the ideals of the men who determine national fraternity policies.

Relations between colleges and fraternities
Obligations of graduate fraternity men toward their undergraduate fellows
Standard form of report on scholarship (to national offices)
Chapter organization
Public opinion
Fraternity scholarship
Organizations antagonistic to fraternity ideals
What proportion of college fraternity men fail to graduate and reasons therefor
Food values and steward's department
High-school fraternities and their relation to college fraternities
Cooperation between colleges and Interfraternity Conference
Alumni advisers
Business training within fraternities
Social hygiene
Health and hygiene
Student activities
Fraternities and parents
Alumni relations

In spite of this wholesome attitude, it must be admitted that the ideals of the national organization often prove to be influences weaker than those which are more direct, present and personal. It is to these latter that we must look, in general, to secure and maintain desirable conditions.

ALUMNI INFLUENCE

Of alumni influence, not so much can be said. Only a few of the national fraternities (according to an Interfraternity Conference committee report in 1919) have adopted the Alumni Adviser plan, initiated among national fraternities sixty years ago. Certainly, this plan plays little part in fraternity life here at the University of Chicago. So far as I have been able to learn, not more than two or three fraternities here does
systematic alumni control of fraternity life (outside of financial and property matters) seem to play any large role. Alumni influence of an unofficial and personal sort is, of course, a prominent factor in the life of every chapter. But the most active alumni are, for the most part, recent graduates who have not yet severed the ties that bind them to the house. This is not altogether surprising. A few years after graduation, new interests, new friendships, and new responsibilities supplant the old. Unless a man is actively and constantly in touch with the local chapter, by virtue of continued residence in or official connection with the collegiate community, or because of business or family relationships with the chapter or some of its members, he is likely to confine his visits to the chapter house to the Commencement or other reunion seasons. The alumnus who is not thus directly connected with the fraternity or college, but who, nevertheless, continues, after his college mates have departed, to make the fraternity house his frequent rendezvous, may be popular with the student members, and be regarded as a "fine chap", to "have the right spirit", and so on. But his fellows of his own age are likely to wonder, "Why should So-and-so prefer the companionship of immature boys to that of men of his own age? Will he ever really grow up?". Whether alumni influence of this type is wholly of the sort the University desires and the students need is at least open to question.

That more direct control by responsible alumni is desirable, goes without saying. In a few cases (the Phi Kappa Psi Educational Association, for example) the matter has received serious, prolonged consideration, leading to definite organiza-
tion toward that end. Individual alumni in several chapters have often proved of invaluable assistance to the University officers in dealing with fraternity problems, and it is to be hoped this agency may continue to be of growing usefulness. But it is a type of control the initiative for which has to come mainly from other directions than faculty and administrative officers, and it does not seem that primary dependence can at present be placed on this type of agency.

FACULTY COUNSELORS

More can be expected of the faculty counselor system, and already some steps have been taken in that direction. A "Better-Yet" committee held several meetings last year and made inquiries of faculty counselors and student representatives about current practices, estimates of the value of the system, and suggestions for its improvement. Twenty of the twenty-five counselors, and nine of the thirty-two student representatives addressed, replied. Marked differences in practice were reported, as well as some disagreement about the proper functions of such officer. Some advocate and practice as close personal relationships with individual members as possible, while others believe there is greater respect for counsel if a somewhat more official attitude is maintained. Some conceive the proper function to be that of adviser to the fraternity as an organization, while others endeavor to be of assistance to individual members. There were none, however, either students or faculty members, who did not express themselves as believing that the system has great possibilities for good in it, and that
efforts should be made to realize these possibilities.

As one result of this committee's work, a procedure neglected by most fraternities, and even unknown to several, has been revived, namely, that of having the fraternities nominate and the President of the University appoint the counsellors. The committee recommended (1) annual nomination and appointment of counsellors (preferably during the spring quarter); (2) careful selection of counsellors; (3) recognition of both general and individual advisory functions; (4) quarterly meetings of counsellors; (5) that in handling cases involving scholarship and discipline the Dean avail himself of the good offices of the counsellor; and (6) quarterly reports to be submitted by counsellors to the Board of Student Organizations, Committee on Fraternities.

These recommendations are in process of being carried out. A general meeting recently held (the first, I am told, in five years) was very well attended, revealed general interest, and resulted in initiating action on several matters. Better understanding by the counsellors, both as individuals and as a selected, experienced group, of problems common to all and mutual assistance in solving them will undoubtedly help to make the fraternities feel that University and faculty are making constructive efforts to help them, a condition which has not prevailed to the extent it should.

UNIVERSITY POLICY

There are doubtless many connected with the University who believe that the University should continue what is commonly regarded as having always been its definite policy, that of
the least practicable control. The arguments for such a policy are familiar to all. On the other hand, the University has, by word and act, frequently expressed its genuine concern for the development of undergraduate as well as graduate and professional instruction and life, especially this past year. Its interest in advanced study does not, therefore, relieve it of proper responsibility in matters that are common to every undergraduate college, even though there may be differences of opinion as to the precise extent and character of that responsibility.

The limited experience and authority of fraternity officers and members, even those of the best intentions, highest ideals, and strongest sense of responsibility, and the limited assistance of a systematic, organized character that can be relied on from the alumni members, taken in conjunction with the foregoing recital of conditions in the fraternities seem, in my opinion, to raise directly the question of the need of more active oversight by the University of fraternity life.

I believe that the University might, at this time, properly and profitably consider this. In the past the specific relationships and contacts have arisen chiefly out of the pressure of circumstances, often under emergency conditions. Without awaiting such crucial occasions, the University might, I believe, wisely initiate a policy of more positive and constructive cooperation with the fraternities in the solution of the many problems which are of concern to both parties. This can and should be done as not to lay the University open to the charge of undue interference, and without the assumption of a domineering or patronizing attitude. That conditions are favorable for effecting this larger measure of cooperation, I am confident.
METHODS OF ACHIEVING CLOSER RELATIONSHIPS

The methods which the University can utilize to this end must be, to a considerable extent, the outcome of experiment. Unless conditions actually demand that they be officially enforced, they should not take the form of rules but of suggestions and recommendations. In my interviews with fraternity men I found invariably a most gratifying response to my suggestion that the University administration was less concerned with inquiring into and regulating their private affairs, than in finding ways in which the University and the fraternities could be of greater mutual assistance to each other, and come to a better understanding. Invariably I heard expressions of appreciation of this attitude, and of willingness to cooperate. I do not believe, therefore, that tactful approaches on the part of University officials will be taken by the more thoughtful students as in any sense a limitation upon their self-determination. Rather, I think, many students regard such steps as welcome manifestations of an interest, the lack of which they have deplored. A truer understanding by fraternity members of many facts about faculty and administrative attitudes toward student problems would in my opinion clear the way for an effective and friendly type of cooperation. I see no insurmountable obstacles to such relationships.

This cooperation might well take, at times, the form of more frequent conferences, formal or informal, between officers of administration and representatives of the fraternities, either individually, in small groups, or the interfraternity council. Dean Wilkins has taken steps in this direction during the past year with promising results. Such conferences should,
I believe, endeavor to anticipate problems and to work out jointly a solution for them.

Another method which it is desirable to develop is the previously mentioned cooperation between faculty counselors of different fraternities. Mutual interchange, several times a year, of experiences, opinions, and recommendations, between these men who are usually in closer touch with student life and fraternity conditions than most other faculty members, would be welcomed by at least some of them, and should prove a valuable agency in helping to formulate wise, constructive policies with reference to various problems, and in securing the cooperation of the fraternities in carrying them into effect. One serious difficulty is that the counselors are busy men and can ill afford the time for such conferences unless they are so planned as to make effective use of the time. If definite problems are made the order of business at each meeting, preferably initiated with a preliminary report by a special subcommittee to serve as a basis for discussion, I believe the time could be so profitably utilized that the conferences would be well attended and effective.

It has seemed to me also that periodical (perhaps monthly) letters of a friendly and informal sort, designed to keep the fraternities in close touch with the views of the administration and faculty on questions of mutual interest, and to be read at chapter meetings, would help to cultivate the better common understanding previously referred to, as well as to put directly before the fraternities any matters needing attention. These always—need not—and probably should not—be critical or admonitory in character. Nevertheless, on some matters, often overlooked or underrated by the fraternities, a friendly word of counsel
would not be taken amiss. Such matters might, in this way, be presented as, the primary emphasis on scholarly attitudes, caring for fraternity property, both inside and outside the house, as a property owner in a respectable neighborhood is expected to do, the importance of maintaining sound financial credit, the significance of and privileges afforded by the religious services at Mandel Hall and the Y.M.C.A. discussion groups in fraternity houses, and many others which are constantly suggesting themselves.

A plan which commends itself to me more and more is that of having, as resident in each fraternity house, a mature and responsible man or woman who can, in a way, assume the function exercised by the resident head of each University residence hall. Whereas such supervision is provided in all residence halls managed by the University, it seems strange that in the fraternity houses, where the need is if anything even greater, no such oversight is provided for. In most of the houses, of course, there reside alumni, who are either studying in some one of the graduate or professional schools, or are employed in the city. In many cases their influence is salutary and constructive. But their relations are personal and limited, and usually not official or authoritative in any way. It is entirely possible that in cases their influence is not so much in line with the University's interests as is desired. It seems to me that the University might well urge, and perhaps at some future date require, that every fraternity house shall have some approved resident, man or woman, who shall, in some degree, represent the University. Such resident head might be either an unmarried faculty man, or a so-called house-mother. Several fraternity representatives
have expressed their desire that they might have a faculty member residing in the house. Some to whom I have mentioned the house-mother plan have expressed themselves as provisionally in favor of such a plan, one or two even remarking that in the past they had sought to introduce such a plan, but were not permitted to do so. One or two were dubious about its practical feasibility. But I have heard no one express himself as opposed to having some mature, cultured man or woman residing in the house. The prevailing opinion, so far as my observation goes, would be favorable, and in cases enthusiastic.

THE HOUSE-MOTHER PLAN

While there are certain obvious advantages in having an unmarried faculty-man who is a member of the fraternity residing in the house (if the right man can be found), there are, I believe, valuable possibilities in the house-mother plan which is being fostered in several Universities and is being encouraged as a national policy by at least one national fraternity. I have letters from a few individuals who have had experience with the plan, and their attitude is in every case favorable. I take the liberty of quoting at length from some of these letters passages which summarize the advantages as well as the difficulties of such a plan.

From the Dean of Men, Kansas University:

.... I am glad to write expressing, in general, a favorable opinion of it.

The boys themselves choose their house mothers and pay them from a minimum of room and board to a maximum of probably $75.00 per month and room and board. In some cases this does prove to be a financial burden and there is more sentiment this year toward giving it up than there has been heretofore. However, only one or two of the fraternities are
now without house mothers.

It is impossible to generalize as to the right type of woman but it is safe to say that she must be a woman who can win and maintain the confidence of the boys. Beyond that she should have the ability to stand consistently for high ideals of conduct and win at least gradually more and more support for them without antagonizing the boys.

The effect on the general tone of the houses and upon their social life is generally good although as you can see any statement here would be intimately related to the statement made in the preceding paragraph.

The plan appeals to me and I hope it will continue at K.U.

From a faculty member at University of Missouri:

We have had the "House Mother" system in operation for many years. However, all that the University has required is that each house must have a chaperon. The matter is handled differently in the different houses. In a few cases the "Mother" has no specific duties except of a general social character. On the other hand, in some cases she plans the meals, does most of the buying, superintends the servants, etc. In other words the duties vary throughout a wide range. The compensation also varies, in a few cases the chaperon receives her board and room and seventy-five dollars per month. In some cases it may be only a little more than board and room.

In a number of cases the chapters feel that it is economy to have a chaperon, that she saves the chapter money through her more careful methods of management.

The position is a very desirable one for a widow, or a woman who is compelled to earn a little. It has become pretty well known that these positions exist, with the result that many applications are filed each year with our Dean of Women (who helps the sororities and fraternities in finding suitable chaperons). Once in a while a chapter will employ an undesirable one. If so, they soon get another. There is a marked tendency for the successful ones to stay year after year. Some of them have been in the same house for many years.

At first I think that there was trouble in finding suitable women, but that difficulty has largely disappeared. Our chaperons are always women who can maintain a certain social standing, and usually they are women who take a great deal of motherly pride in their boys. The boys, as a rule, feel that they could not get along without their house mother. They do not feel that she is something thrust upon them by
the University; they have her in their house because they want her. You can easily see that these women have a wonderful opportunity to do a great deal of good - and most of them realize it fully.

I do not know how the presence of these women affects study and scholarship. I know that in individual cases boys have been helped by talks with their house mothers. The greatest change one notices in these houses is in the general tone of things - the absence of carelessness in dress, in speech, and often in morality. There is no doubt that the system does greatly improve moral and social standards. It makes the place more of a home. I am sure that the faculty or the alumni, or the active men would not want to have these women taken out of our houses. If put to a vote it would be practically unanimous.

From a student at Ohio Wesleyan University:

We have used the "House Mother" plan for some years, ten or twelve, I imagine; at least some time before I entered college. We have found it eminently satisfactory. There was one woman with the chapter for eight or ten years and this is the fourth year our present "House Mother" has been with us and she expects to return next year. During the interval between the time these two women were at the house, according to my brother who was in the house at that time, they didn't see how they got along and were glad when the few months was up and the present "House Mother" came to Delaware.

I think the present "House Mother" was secured through some of the alumni of recent graduation. I think they were very fortunate in securing her for she is a woman of considerable education, is quite well read, is a church member, and always exerts the best influence possible. There would never be any question of her honesty and she is always interested in seeing that the various parties and alumni entertainments go off in fine style. She takes a decided personal interest in the appearance of the house and I hate to think of the house without her there. She adds all the difference between the house being a club house and a home.............

......Naturally the idea is some expense, but not as much as an outsider might expect. I don't see why it should be kept a secret, so I might say that we now pay the "House Mother" $50 per month. She has a room on the first floor and of course eats all her meals with us. If we did not have her it would be necessary to employ some woman to come in and clean daily and so the expense isn't very great.......This spring we voted to increase her salary to $70 per month. She was astounding and almost didn't want to accept the increase because she said she didn't want to cost the fellows any more than she absolutely had to........

......While she never interferes with any activity of the chapter she is a silent influence. You very seldom hear any profane language on the first floor and comparatively
little upstairs. During the school year, while I have been in Delaware, I have never seen a case of a fellow being drunk in the house. During vacations there has been just a little, but that was when she was not in the house. I would say she has a decided influence in raising the moral standard of the fellows in the house.

Probably her influence on study could not be very great, yet the fact remains that during the past four years there has been but one semester that the chapter has not been at the top of the eleven national fraternities on the campus in scholarship. It is very likely that her presence is partly responsible for what we consider a good record.

......So you can see that we consider the plan very successful. However, naturally it all depends on securing the right woman for the position. We have been very fortunate in this respect. We have an unmarried woman of about 45, I should say, and she certainly takes an interest in all our affairs. She goes to all the parties. She supervises the cleaning, looks after preparation for dinner parties, looks after the woman guests, etc. All the girls in school are very fond of her and she frequently goes to the girls' hall for meals.

In addition to the points specifically mentioned in these letters, it seems to me that the influence of a house mother would be very salutary with respect to such problems, previously referred to, as the elimination of calls, in person or by telephone, by women and girls of questionable character; the lack of care for furniture and furnishings apparent in some of the houses; the rather untidy habits with respect to care of rooms and person frequently observed; and others which will readily suggest themselves.

It would probably be neither desirable nor feasible to force the adoption of such a system all at once, even if it seemed the best system to adopt. I believe, however, that through various channels, including many of the alumni who are genuinely concerned with conditions in their chapter houses, the fraternities could be urged to consider its adoption. The results quoted above as following the adoption of the plan are so direct-
ly the sort of results we want accomplished here, that the plan commends itself to me as very desirable.

The method of introducing the plan, of course, should have careful consideration. Even as this report is being drafted, information has come that one of the oldest and most influential fraternities (with one of whose officers I talked about this plan last spring) is of its own initiative considering its adoption. It would, of course, be exceedingly desirable to have the movement start in this way. Its success in such a place would do more to encourage its adoption in other fraternities than would any amount of official urging. It seems probable, therefore, that the wise course is to defer for the time being any overt action or recommendation, pending the outcome of this fraternity's action. This is favored by Dean Wilkins, who is much interested in the house-mother plan. It may be mentioned also that Meadville House, though not a fraternity house, has somewhat similar problems; and its experiences with the house-mother plan are, I am told, highly satisfactory. One faculty counsellor reports that the presence in his fraternity house this fall of a housekeeper and her daughter who are women of a high type of character has already effected a marked change in the tone of the house, comparable to the cases previously cited. The time, therefore, seems favorable for the gradual initiation of the house-mother plan.

SHALL FRATERNITIES BE RETAINED?

The principal argument for the fraternity is that it provides a home and close friends. Upon the fundamental importance of these values it is unnecessary to dwell. Both are absolutely necessary for normal human development. The student who does
not have them is unfortunate. The alumnus who looks back on his undergraduate self with amused tolerance and minimizes the value of his fraternity and other associations, has forgotten how vital and significant a part of his life these associations were at the time, and what his present self owes to them. The question is: Does the fraternity provide the best—or at least a wholesome and desirable—type of home and friendships? Can the same values or better be obtained by any other device? Are the defects attendant upon fraternity life so serious as to call for the provision of a substitute?

This study has pointed out several facts having a bearing on these questions, as they have been secured from a variety of sources, although it does not pretend even to have touched upon every relevant consideration. It has been pointed out that the fraternity houses make a very large contribution to the solution of the University's housing problem. It has been shown that many of the ills commonly attributed to fraternities are not exclusively, or even primarily, peculiar to fraternity life as such, but are common to youth, and especially to youth living together. No attempt has been made to consider the question of whether fraternities should ever have been permitted to gain a foothold in the University. They are here. Until they have proved conclusively that their evils outweigh their benefits, or until some adequate substitute has been worked out, any move toward their elimination would arouse opposition too severe to justify the attempt.

In my opinion, neither of these two conditions has yet been realized. That fraternities have their defects cannot be denied; but their values, at least here in the University of
Chicago, seem to me to be equally demonstrable. A satisfactory substitute, at least in part, may possibly be provided at some time in the future, perhaps as a system of residence halls in connection with the proposed colleges, which will provide for all men of present junior college level, the benefits which the fraternities now offer to some, and at perhaps less cost and under more competent oversight. But that is a problem for the future, near or remote.

What the attitude of the fraternities would be toward the plans proposed last year by the Commission on the Future of the Colleges, it is impossible to say, since I found no undergraduate (and not all the faculty) who were familiar with the proposals or had formed an opinion about them. That such a plan as the one proposed would have a profound effect on the fraternities is clear. Three alternatives seem possible:

1. The present system might be continued, and freshmen and sophomores (or whatever they might be called in the new organization) permitted to live either in residence halls or in fraternity houses, perhaps with some such supervision by a head-resident or faculty counsellor or proctor as was suggested for the Colleges. Such a plan would, of course, interfere with the full realization of the proposed plan for the Colleges, at least so far as the residence-hall feature is concerned.

2. The fraternities might become "Senior college" organizations, open only to men who have completed the work of the (Junior) Colleges, and have left the residential halls. This plan would be objected to on several grounds; that it would alter if not destroy the essential character of the fraternities; that
it is the freshmen and sophomores who need the fraternity more than do the upperclassmen; that because of lack of enough residents to fill the house, the consequent financial losses and the additional cost to the members would be prohibitive; that it would mean the elimination of approximately one-half the fraternities now on the campus (and these probably the younger and less influential fraternities) unless the University increased so greatly in size as to provide enough upperclassmen to use the various houses to their full capacity. The problem of the financial support of the houses, if freshmen and sophomores were removed, would be, I believe, the crux of the difficulty.

3. The fraternity might be permitted to pledge and initiate men residing in the college halls, but not to permit them to live in the fraternity house until they have completed the work of the (junior) colleges. This again would be met by the objection just cited--the financial one.

Until the proposed plan for the Colleges is more definitely in prospect of adoption, and until opinions based on a knowledge of the plan are available, I am not prepared to make any recommendation as to action affecting fraternities. I am, therefore, making such recommendations as I have made on the assumption that at least approximately the present form of organization of the Colleges will be continued for a few years. Any plan that would so vitally affect the fraternities should have full preliminary consideration by a joint committee representing the interests of all parties concerned.
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The principal conclusions that have forced themselves upon me as I have studied the fraternities are twofold, and may be summarized as follows:

First: The University owes it to its constituency, its students, and itself to undertake a more direct and positive oversight of fraternities and fraternity life. This the present administration has already begun to do, and will doubtless continue to do. Particularly is this needed in the form of more constant and direct counsel and supervision of the life in the houses by mature, responsible men or women.

Second: This oversight should manifest itself, not by lessening in any degree the freedom and self-direction which we all as members of the University so prize, but by taking the lead in a program of sympathetic, cooperative consideration, together with the fraternities, of problems which are of mutual concern. There should be firm insistence— with penalties, if necessary— on respect for the values for which the University stands— scholarship, social reputability, personal character. But the primary aim should be to anticipate difficulties and to provide salutary conditions, rather than merely to punish for violations of rules.