



TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

Fraternity & Sorority Life™

An Informal History of the Greek
System at Texas Tech

Written By:
David Nail

Table of Contents

Letter to the Reader.....	2
Part One	3
Part Two	11
Men’s Clubs.....	22
Centaur’s	22
College Club	23
Kemas.....	23
Las Camaradas	23
Silver Key.....	24
Socii	24
Wranglers.....	24
Women’s Clubs	25
D.F.D.....	25
Ko Shari	25
Las Chaparritas.....	26
Las Vivarachas	26
Sans Souci.....	27
Part Three	29
Minutes of the Board of Directors’ meeting: June 21, 1952. Item 1166.	44
The Colonization of Sororities.....	44
Plan for Contact between National Sororities and Local Social Clubs on the Texas Technological Campus.....	46
The Colonization of Fraternities.....	47
Part Four	51
Excerpts from the Interfraternity Council Minutes	62
Part Five	69
Excerpts from the College Panhellenic Minutes	80
Fraternity and Sorority Founding Dates.....	96
Fraternity Founding Dates	96
Sorority Founding Dates	97

Letter to the Reader

To the reader,

Under the administrations of Telith Willman of Panhellenic and Keith Williams of the Interfraternity Council (1974-1975), I was asked to write a modest history of the Greek System at Texas Tech University. The result is an informal compilation of research aided by three student assistants to whom I am indebted: Kelli McDonald (Chi Omega), Patty Klunder (Kappa Kappa Gamma), and Geoffrey Walker (Sigma Phi Epsilon).

Others, of course, assisted me; in particular personnel in the Southwest Collection at Texas Tech were most helpful, as was Seymour Connor of the History Department. My secretary, Mary Ann Nichols, typed the manuscript and standardized my rather individualistic spelling. Others in the Dean of Students Office, George Scott, Jr., Deb Stanley, and Ridgley Denning, read part or all of my efforts. My old friend Susan Crews Bailey of the Department of English took time from her busy schedule of correcting freshman composition themes in order to tidy-up this rather longer one. The errors of fact or omission, however, are mine alone.

In any case, this informal history is offered for all who were in the Tech social clubs and Greek organizations, and particularly to Dean James G. Allen who oversaw the transition, Dean Lewis N. Jones who saw club member and Greek, Grace Thompson who was both, and my wife – the last of the Kappa nuns.

David Nail

Assistant Dean of Students

Amarillo

Christmastide, 1975

Part One

Being a brief description of the origins and evolution of the Greek-letter fraternal system in the United States, its various and sometimes strained relationships with institutions of higher learning and the general public, as well as its development into an American cultural institution.

Fraternities are an American institution, at least college fraternities are, although secret or restricted societies ranging from the Knights Templar to the Mafia has their roots in the European experience. European universities also produced secret fraternal societies – notably those connected with German institutions which carried the unusual custom of dueling – but it is in America where the fraternity system has flourished.

Indeed college fraternal organizations are as old as the Republic. Phi Beta Kappa, founded in December 1776, at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia, was the first such organization to adopt Greek-letters. It was predated, however, by several oratorical and debating societies at various colleges in colonial America.¹

These pre-Greek societies such as the Flat Hat Club (to which Edmund Randolph and Thomas Jefferson belonged) apparently arose from an affection for classical oratory which was held by many students of that era. Jefferson, in fact, considered himself rather a member-by-proxy of Phi Beta Kappa, as he thought it had evolved from the Flat Hat Club. Whatever the case, it was the Greek-lettered organization which endured, and by 1779 the parent chapter at William and Mary had issued charters to new chapters at Yale and Harvard. Thus the seed of national collegiate fraternities had been planted well before the end of the revolution.²

Although expansion thereafter was somewhat limited, and many local literary/social organizations maintained such names as the Hasty-Pudding Club, or the Brothers in Unity, or Social Friends, it is obvious that the use of Greek-letters was becoming increasingly popular. In part this usage was due to the mastery of Greek (or at least recitation ability) required of all students enrolled in colleges at that time. Moreover, Greek was a somewhat uncommon, if a somewhat unnecessary, language during the early national period, and thus it became the rather exclusive province of those

¹ Thomas Harding, College Literary Societies, New York, 1971, 1; John Robson, ed., Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities, 18th ed., Menasha (Wisconsin), 1968, 5.

² Robson, 5; Wayne M. Musgrove, College Fraternities, New York, 1923, 6-7.

college males who had to practice it. Then too was a certain tingle of mystery applied to early fraternities by the adoption of secret comings and goings often plagiarized from the Masonic Order. All this tended to mutate the ostensibly literary clubs into secret social societies, rather exclusive in their selection of members³

Faculty of the various colleges, who were then expected to monitor the ethical progress of their charges as well as instruct them in things academic (people now often labeled deans of students), were not all favorably inclined to tolerate the proliferation of secret clubs. By nature backing away from the lighter sides of life, these faculty considered the teaching of morals more important than manners, and since most institutions prior to the Civil War were church-sponsored, fraternities were considered to be antireligious. One college president remarked that the fraternities on his campus created “artificial and false position” among students, although he admitted that “one object of some of the societies here is the cultivation of manners, and do far they have improved”.⁴

By the close of hostilities in 1865, approximately 25 college men’s fraternities had established themselves nationally. And with the passage of the Morrill Act three years earlier, the new land grant public agricultural institutions became pregnant with possibilities for additional expansion. Indeed this expansion of college fraternities, despite the stern measures of college administrators, can be attributed mainly to a spirit of comradery those administrators often overlooked. Simply being students provided common interests; being young and therefore natural antagonists of authoritarian administrators suggested safety in numbers. For example, when the president of one state institution ordered a fraternity dissolved, the young men quickly set about subverting his order by meeting off-campus in an abandoned log cabin deep in the woods. This was the first fraternity “house” or lodge. (Residential fraternity facilities, or houses, are relatively new, having become rather common only in the last three

³ Musgrove, 13-15; J.C. Furnas, The Americans, New York, 1968, 747.

⁴ Mary Cable, American Manners and Morals, New York, 1969, 164-165, quoted 165.

quarters of this century.) Thus it was that faced with prejudices, both rightly and otherwise, the men of each chapter distilled comradeship into brotherhood. And in the last third of the nineteenth century, true brotherhood to come by not only the cornerstone, but the capstone of the fraternity experience.⁵

True sisterhood has, simply, to await its turn. But after being allowed admission into many of the previously all-male institutions, women rapidly followed the lead of their co-educational brethren. What are now known as sororities are by their own definition and formal charter known as fraternities for women.⁶ By 1890, sororities were well entrenched national institutions affording young ladies many of the same opportunities available to young fraternity men. Among the chief opportunities was the often unwritten but extremely acceptable social catalyst manufactured by fraternity man-meets-sorority lady; the male often losing both pin and heart to the female who might subsequently lose virginity, but gain a husband. In this respect the college Greek system became a rather exclusive Right of Passage.⁷

Indeed because most undergraduates were not Greeks, there grew an antipathy toward the fact the fraternities and sororities were exclusive, and by virtue of most students being excluded, they were. Critics often leveled charges that by being too small, and too sophomoric in their actions, Greeks were less academic. That "fraternities' only contacts with learning were their leaders' perfunctory efforts to make the brothers study enough not to flunk out. Occasionally not too unpersonable studious types were pledged to leaven the lump and show to the dean as Exhibit A."⁸ And yet under this cover of perceived snobbery and within the envelope of secret ritual there existed an innate something which insured (and insures) the survival of the American college Greek system. Undeniably part of that something is pragmatic: it works. To be a Greek on campus is to have connections upon graduation. To have connections is often the key to later success. In fact, in 1909 when the National Interfraternity

⁵ Musgrove, 18-19; David Nail, "Why Join a Fraternity," The Shield of Phi Kappa Psi, Vol. 96, No. 1, Fall, 1975, 10-11.

⁶ Robson, 7-8.

⁷ Furnas, 748.

⁸ Furnas, Great Times, New York, 1974, 378.

Council was founded, it was only for alumni of fraternities; undergraduates did not meet with the NIC until 1924. And the formation of the National Panhellenic Conference in 1902 indicated a similar interest on the part of alumnae.⁹ Yet that something which insured the survival of Greeks was and is almost metaphysical: it is the positive bonds of brotherhood and sisterhood which add a stabilizing and humanizing element to the undergraduate experience and are transferable far beyond four years and the campus.

So, in the last third of this century the Greek system had become not only an institution, but also one that was extremely influential in that many national leaders peopled its ranks. Most colleges had manufactured special breeds of administrators to deal (not always successfully) with Greeks on their campuses, although as late as 1928 the National Association of Presidents of State Universities went on record as doubting that fraternities “had anything of educational value to offer”. Additionally, all fraternities and sororities which advertised themselves to be national or even international had long since established headquarters offices to conduct fraternal affairs and administer policy. Greeks were not only national institutions, but big business. Indeed beginning in 1925, fraternities and sororities began to register their Greek letters with the government and were assigned trademark numbers like Coca-Cola and Cadillac.¹⁰

Following the Second World War, charges concerning the elitism of American college fraternities again were heard. This time, the rather nebulous degradations concerning the exclusiveness of the Greeks (mostly of an economic nature) were tempered with a good bit of demonstrable racism. Of course not all fraternities and sororities automatically excluded blacks, or Jews, or Catholics as a matter of national policy, but most did. In part this sort of racial and/or religious exclusion caused the formation of various other Greek-letter groups which were mainly black, or Jewish, or Catholic. But it was the old

⁹ Robson, 30, 38; “Address of Chairman Russell C. MacFall”, National Interfraternity Council Year Book, Proceedings of the 30th Annual Session, 1938, 143-150.

¹⁰ Ibid., 140.

line white Protestant groups which were put on the defensive, and they were in an unenviable position for several reasons.

Ideally, the individual chapter was to be composed of students sharing a set of common interests and, who together, would function as a democracy in miniature. Such was rarely the cause. Nearly all chapters had alumnus groups who usually exerted some sort of pressure, benign or otherwise, on the chapter. Additionally, there was expected certain conformance to ritual and compliance with policy as administered by the national office. And since most colleges had accepted Greeks, albeit not always ecstatically, deans of students applied to each resident chapter requisite institutional policy. Given what numerous outsiders thought valid criticism concerning exclusiveness and racism, and the system of multiple authority to which individual chapters had to answer, a rather brittle core was exposed among the Greeks.

Beginning in 1946 at Amherst and in 1949 at Connecticut, some colleges demanded that fraternities and sororities open their doors to all, or not open them at all.¹¹ With this sort of institutional pressure, which most Greeks (both collegiate and alumnus) thought restrictive, the first reaction was to simply remove their chapter from the campus in question. By 1953, the NIC adopted a resolution reaffirming the right of an individual fraternity to select its own members. The following year a proposal was made in the NIC national meeting to systematically withdraw chapters (and not install new ones) at institutions “where action inimical to the welfare of the fraternity system is taken or threatened.” However, most attending the 1954 meeting thought this method too risky, as cooperation with colleges had constantly proved more productive than resistance. Instead, it was agreed that for “fraternities to boycott colleges fraternities frowning on discrimination could only have one result – the suicide of fraternities participating in such action”. It was further noted that radicals were utilizing and attacking

¹¹ Robson, 26-27.

Greek discrimination clauses for “political and sinister” purposes in order to prove fraternities undemocratic.¹²

Within a decade, national fraternities and sororities were to face a diversification of what in 1954 was labeled radical students, as well as a modulation in the existing social and political climate. In the case of the latter, the Civil Rights movement forced many national organizations to grant more autonomy to their constituent chapter’s in the selection of members. By the late sixties, most nationals had either completely removed constitutional (if not actual) racial and religious restrictions, or allowed, by special dispensations, individual chapter discretion. The other element affecting Greeks which developed in the mid-sixties was the concurrent rise of student activism and the philosophy of “do your own thing”. Fraternities and sororities, being clear campus symbols of the “establishment” then under fire, suffered dramatic setbacks in numbers of students who sought affiliation. For example, at the University of California at Berkley, where the “free speech” movement began, a 1968 invitation to 209 prospective members by the local Phi Delta Theta chapter provided absolutely no pledges. The disheartened president remarked, “We were just looking for the kind of guys who’d fit in with the rest of us – the kind of fellow you’d do business with later”.¹³

Yet the campus radicalism evident in the late sixties and early seventies, fueled in part by reaction to both Vietnam and the impersonalization of vast bureaucratic educational institutions, began to ebb by 1973. The waning strength of Greeks then began a systematic renaissance. The concept of relevance so prevalent in the sixties was becoming frivolous; hard drugs were gradually yielding to cold beer. Nostalgia was in.

¹² “Discussion of the house of Delegates”, National Interfraternity Council Yearbook, Proceedings of the 47th Annual Session, 1954, 71-76.

¹³ Nathan Glazer, “‘Student Power’ in Berkley”, in Student Activism, Alexander Deconde, ed., New York, 1971, 295-317; Cable, 367.

And yet fraternities and sororities had learned something about involvement from the sixties. By the mid-seventies Greeks as a whole were much less inclined to be as complacent as they had been. “There’s no return to the sleepy ‘50’s”, remarked one California Dean of Students. “How the hell can we? We’ve become conscious now of war, conscious of the world as a whole.”¹⁴

In part, this fraternity and sorority consciousness was a return to the values which had inspired their origin and evolution. There was a return to the comradery of sharing which is brotherhood and sisterhood. There was again the rather melancholy memory that for something left behind in college, there is something taken into life. For millions of Americans – the good, the bad, and the indifferent – being a Greek has been an important part of what was left behind and taken on.

¹⁴ Mike Thomas, “Ghosts”, The Record of Sigma Alpha Epsilon, Vol. 95, No. 1, Feb. 1975, 4-8, quoted, 6.

Part Two

Being a discussion of the rise and expansion of the various social clubs on the campus of Texas Technological College, illuminating some of their attendant customs and traditions, with specific reference to the prohibition imposed against national fraternities and sororities by the administration of that college, and the ironic development of a non-Greek fraternal system.

In the early autumn of 1925, the first faculty meeting of the new Texas Technological College was called to order by President Paul W. Horn. "Our first big work", remarked Horn, "is service to the youth of the state." By service, the President referred in part to academic training to be rendered students in textile engineering. For chief among the conceived functions of the new institutions was the establishment of a curriculum devoted to the textile engineering, a curriculum also of obvious service to the region's cotton-centered economy.¹⁵

Horn also outlines what he considered to be the service to youth rendered by an educational democracy. By using the term democracy, Horn did not speak of direct student representation in decisions molding institutional policy, but rather of disallowing exclusiveness among the students, "We must have no class distinction", he said. "The Board of Directors have gone on record as not allowing Greek-letter fraternities and sororities."¹⁶

This decision was made on June 27, 1924, over a year before the first 914 students began classes. It reflected not only contemporary attitudes then held about the nature of what the new college should be. The very name suggested a pragmatic form of education, certainly an admixture of what was then regarded as "cultural subjects" as compared to "useful" ones. Of the four schools composing Texas Technological College when it opened its doors, three (engineering, agriculture, and household economics) tended to offer more practical or useful courses of study while the fourth (liberal arts) offered the more ethereal and cultural. Although the first college publication accurately identified that "it would be wrong to classify the college as strictly vocational", it is apparent that the new institutional was somewhat unusual given the trend of general liberal education in America.¹⁷

¹⁵ Ruth Horn Andrews, The First Thirty Years: A History of Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas Tech, 1957. 17-19; James G. Allen to David Nail interview, April 9, 1975, tape on file in Southwest Collection, Texas Tech University. For over a third of a century, Dean Allen was associated with student personnel work at Texas Tech. He is, at this writing, Dean of Students Emeritus.

¹⁶ Andrews, 19.

¹⁷ Ibid., 15-16.

President Horn was also concerned about educational economics – particularly the difficulty involved in formulating an initial budget without having any firm estimate of the corresponding initial enrollment. But Horn was also concerned with education economics as it affected student’s ability to attend the institution. Student tuition and fees were to be kept to the lowest common denominator in terms of the operation of the institution.¹⁸

So it was that three factors, or series of factors, combined which interdicted the formation of national Greek-letter organizations on the campus for over a quarter of a century. Chief among these was the obvious prohibition imposed by the first Board of Directors which was chaired by the colorful Fort Worth publisher, Amon G. Carter. Yet this prohibition was in part a product of what those directors anticipated that the college should be (as well as what it should become), and the matter of establishing a democratic institution insofar as students were concerned. And despite the mainly truthful disclaimers, Texas Technological College was founded to be technological on a rather restricted budget which simultaneously maintaining “generous...entrance requirements”. Operating in concert, these factors, coupled with the conceived class distinction manufactured by fraternities, served to generate an environment in which Greek-lettered organizations could not flourish.¹⁹

However, this sort of fundamental philosophy could not, nor was it intended to, stifle human nature. For if Greek organizations were banned, student (and conceivably more democratic) organizations were fostered. “The College encourages students to form societies and clubs”, stated an early freshman handbook. The publication also advised that meeting places were available in college buildings outside regular class hours, and stipulated that each student organization must “have a sponsor who is a faculty member”, a regulation which still obtains.²⁰

¹⁸ Ibid., Allen interview.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ “Freshman Handbook and Student Guide, 1931-1932”, Texas Technological College, 1931, 31.

The rise of a student organization on the Texas Tech campus can be attributed not only to the approval of the institution, but also to the social interaction and mutual interests maintained by students – something as common and regular then as now. Indeed the earliest clubs, formed during the 1925-1926 school year, reflected the mutual interests of students. For example, those students from Amarillo joined the Amarillo Club, those who had transferred from Texas A&M joined the A&M club (the Aggie Club was then as now for students of agriculture), those who had been De Molayers joined the De Moyal Club, and the like. Students who had similar sorts of academic interests had available the Pre-Med Club, the Dramatic Club, and the Home Economic Club, among others. Of particular interest was a group formed by sixteen enterprising young ladies who labeled themselves the Las Chaparritas, and later advertised themselves as being the oldest club on campus, and such advertisement continued for twenty-eight years until the Las Chaparritas were absorbed by a national sorority.²¹

By 1927 the Las Chaparritas were joined by another women's social club. Sans Souci, and an unusual and short-lived women's group formed not to be social but as its result. "At a certain dance given out at the country club a few of the College Inn girls were in attendance. Not being used to the long drive home after the dance they could not fail to take advantage of it. As a result ten of the girls came in fifteen minutes late, and were put on probation, not as punishment, but to instill in them the knowledge they should leave a dance early when there was a long and pleasant road to follow." Thus was born the Probation Club.²²

Within two years, San Souci and Las Chaparritas had been joined by Las Vivarachas, Las Cigales, and Las Leales. Not to be outdone, young men began forming social clubs, the first being the College

²¹ *La Ventana*, Vol. I, 1926, 126-159. A specimen of the Las Chaparritas stationery (circa 1940) is in the files of the Assistant Dean of Students; it advertises the organization as "the oldest club on campus". While it was the oldest social club, several special interest groups pre-dated it. However, in the current form of Kappa Kappa Gamma, the "Las Chaps", as they were known for a quarter-century, is currently the oldest surviving student organization at Texas Tech.

²² *Ibid.*, Vol. III, 1928, 173. The College Inn was an off-campus boarding house similar in function to the current College Inn.

Club in 1927. Within two years this organization had the company of the Centaurs, the De Ques, the Silver Keys, and the Wranglers.²³

Indeed by the spring of 1930, “the array of student organizations had risen to fifty-four in number – about one organization for every thirty-seven students”. The number of organizations prompted the editor of the Toreador, the student newspaper, to remark that “it would seem that some clubs exist only to provide titles for certain students. Also it would seem that some exist because members cannot ‘rate’ other clubs, and hence, they start a club of their own”.²⁴ Whatever the case, these clubs tended to exist in three principal forms. The first variety of clubs were those devoted to academic pursuits, and/or achievements, and career development. The Aggie Club, Pre-Med, and Engineering Club are adequate examples. The second variety of clubs were special interest organizations such as the Debate Club, the East Texas Club, and the like. The final variety was, of course, the social clubs.

These social clubs shared certain characteristics with national Greek-letter collegiate fraternal organizations. Division by sex obviously was patterned after fraternities and sororities, although membership was not always strictly limited to students. Under the watchful eyes of the Dean of Women, Mary W. Doak, and the Dean of the School of Liberal Arts, James M. Gordan (whose duties also included deaning for men), the social clubs formed a clearing house organization which set policies and rules to which each social club conformed. Thus the Inter-Club Council, representing both men’s and women’s social clubs was the precursor of the current University Panhellenic and Interfraternity Council. Importantly, the Inter-Club Council, founded on March 3, 1930 was charged by its constituent organizations with developing membership selection procedures; that is under the supervision of college administrators, a selective rush existed quite analogous to that rush maintained on campus

²³ Ibid., Vol. V, 1930, 207-216.

²⁴ William E. Schulze, “History of Student Culture of Texas Technological College: 1925-1942”, draft copy of unpublished Master’s Thesis, Texas Tech University, 1975, 91; Toreador, February 20, 1930, 2.

harboring Greeks. Pins and badges, often times bejeweled, appeared identifying the wearer by club. The acquisition of a boy's pin by a young lady indicated the same sort of engaged-to-be-engaged status as is currently the case. So it was that by the middle of the decade of the great depression, each social club was in function, if not name, a fraternity or sorority.²⁵

Yet there were certain differences between these social clubs and established national Greek organizations. Obviously the Tech clubs owed neither fidelity nor fees to a national organization, nor were they completely capable of setting "the social tone of the campus", of which Life Magazine stated most Greek groups were rather proficient. This "social tone", of course, would mean many things: from fraternities dominating campus politics (with the possible expectation of elective secretarial positions, traditionally the domain of young ladies possessing quick little hands) to sororities instructing their members in the social amenities of tea and crumpets which would stand their members in good stead with any Junior League in America. Such was rarely the case at Texas Tech; the social clubs were generally influential, but the college's "social tone" was neither their exclusive manufacture nor province.²⁶

Additionally, the college maintained rather strict eligibility requirements for membership in all student organizations. "Any undergraduate student not on scholarship or disciplinary probation, who is regularly registered for twelve or more semester credit hours, is eligible for participation and may represent the college in any extra-curricular activity other than intercollegiate athletics provided such a student has a grade average of at least a 'C'."²⁷

²⁵ Schulze, 154; Allen interview; Grace Thompson to David Nail, interview, April 24, 1975, notes in author's file.

²⁶ "Big Missouri", Life, Vol. 2, No. 23, June 7, 1937, 36. Schulze reported that the "social clubs certainly contributed to the social stratification within the student body, but they did not completely dominate the scene." 97.

²⁷ Fourteenth Annual Catalogue, Texas Technological College, 1938-1939, 58. During most of the thirties Tech belonged to the Border Athletic Conference which set its own regulations as to eligibility. Perhaps most people focused their attention on the eligibility of Tech's football players. Certainly the coach, the volatile Pete Cawthon, demand attention. By one method or another he somewhat regularly got from his players than they had to give. Cawthon also placed a prohibition on his players belonging to social clubs, although some did in secret.

The college also set certain restrictions for the formulation and operation of the social clubs themselves. In order to exist, all student organizations were required to make application to the College Administrative Council “stating the objective, type of membership, and other matters necessary for its organization”. (This operation was later assigned a committee on Student Organizations, and subsequently to a minor assistant dean of students). No club was permitted to organize unless its objectives were closely attuned with those of the institution, although the acquisition and use of bootleg liquor by an occasional club man or risqué club woman was hardly attuned to any sort of institutional objective, and certainly no county ordinance. Faculty sponsors were required to not only be present at all meetings, but also to chaperone social affairs, particularly those mixing the sexes where convulsive chemistry might well disturb decorum.²⁸ Although sponsors were charged with overseeing the activities of their respective treasurers (who in turn were required to place all club funds under the wardship of the college business office), they were not personally responsible for the conduct of their charges. This latter administrative quiescence possibly insured there would, in fact, be faculty sponsors. However, those sponsors who took an active part in sponsoring generally saw their group – most particularly the social clubs – both popular and influential on campus.²⁹

Official college publication, however, rarely if ever mentioned the social clubs. After all de facto fraternities and sororities were prohibited by virtue of being secret societies, ad nasium, thus there was little reason to mention the de jure ones in existence. Indeed the social clubs possessed well developed traditions, rituals, and mystics which would compare favorably with any national in the country. For example, the DFD girls’ club (the meaning of the initials were, of course, secret) had somehow assimilated a good portion of the secret ritual of Alpha Delta Pi sorority. No doubt this caused some consternation when DFD was assimilated into Delta Delta Delta sorority. The Ko Shari girls’ club was

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 63. See Schulze, 61-66, for a discussion of student drinking habits in the thirties.

²⁹ Allen interview.

somewhat more fortunate. Much of its secret ritual was based on the lore of the American Indian. In fact, young ladies were often spirited off to ceremonial kiva in New Mexico for initiation. This Indian tradition had matured to the extent that by the time nationalization was a forgone conclusion in the early 1950's, some of the members, and particularly some of the alumnae, did not wish to associate with a national sorority and thereby abandon over two decades of moccasins and arrows. It may well be imagined that pleasant surprise for all concerned when the Ko Shari ladies became Pi Beta Phi ladies and retained the same sort of Indian theme utilized in the national's mystics. They even began wearing sorority pins in the shape of an arrow. Ironically, when the Silver Keys became Phi Delta Theta fraternity and abandoned the name and obvious pin, the only keys on campus became the gold, and the property of Kappa Kappa Gamma.³⁰

Other traditions developed by the female social clubs were less secret and longer lived. Of these, the principal example was the formal presentation of pledges (usually in the autumn) which was rather a West Texas variety of debutant ball. It is unclear exactly when the practice of presentations developed, but certainly it was customary by the mid-thirties. Among those conventions adopted, indeed cultivated, by the national sororities after they had assimilated the social clubs, the presentation of pledges (marched down an aisle by proud fathers in anticipation of another such stately march perhaps consummated in the not too distant future), has remained an unusual if not unique practice to Texas Tech. And those sororities which have colonize at Tech since 1954 have adopted the custom just as if it were national policy.³¹

³⁰ Schulze, 98; Jean Jenkins to Patty Klunder, interview, April 16, 1975, tape on file in Southwest Collection, Texas Tech University. Mrs. Jenkins was in charge of the Tech Placement Service from shortly after the Second World War until her retirement in 1973. During that time she was an active faculty sponsor of Las Chaparritas and later of the national sorority which absorbed that organization.

³¹ Jenkins interview. The Toreador regularly gave extensive coverage to pledge presentations, listing all young ladies' names and those of their dates. A good example of this sort of "society page" coverage is that given the DFD presentation of 1936. Toreador, February, 19, 1936, 3.

Among the customs developed among the men's clubs which is still extant is that of "walking", a euphemism for kidnapping. The object of this action was for a pledge class or an active chapter to select one of their opposite number who was or had been something less than civil, remove that person to a rural environment, and allow that person to walk back to campus. The action was occasionally garnished with a bit of sport when the walkors left the walkees to their own industry in a state of ill-attire.³²

Of course the social clubs operated within a larger framework than that imposed by the regulations of institution or club council, for the social clubs were peopled with students who were each part of the campus. As part of the campus, all students were part of the developing traditions of a developing college.

For example, the Double-T bench was carefully reserved for the posteriors of upperclassmen. Indeed freshman, or fish (later labeled slime and required to wear green beanies) were certainly discriminated against at best and hazed at worst. Upperclassman regularly carried "boards of education" to pound, as it were, certain facts into the area where upperclassmen supposed the brains of fish were located. Athletes, particularly Pete Cawthon's footballers, favored bed slats, and maintained internal discipline by a form of kangaroo court – the matador court – at which all defendants were judged guilty, and justice rapidly and heartily disseminated. Steam tunnels on campus were used to test certain rat-in-the-maze theories on the uninitiated. Interestingly, male students quickly learned the Venturi effect generated in the open sally port of the Administration Building. This effect was most obvious on the more than few blustery days when, to the delight of all on looking males, ladies' garments might well be reordered. With a particularly strong gust even a thigh might be exposed to the persistent. Naturally the administration could not let such shameful activities continue, and in the mid-thirties an effective metal and glass structure corked each end – the same structures still in place.³³

³² Schulze, 126.

³³ *Ibid.*, 98-99, 123-124; Lewis N. Jones to David Nail, interview, April 22, 1975, notes in author's file. A former football player under Pete Cawthon, Lewis Jones returned to Texas Tech in 1947 as Assistant Dean of Men. He is

Yet while the social clubs were part of the campus they remained distinct entities. “For the student with ambition, membership in a social club meant almost instant upward social mobility, no matter how lowly he or she had been before.”³⁴ This rise in station was a result of rushing and pledging, the procedures of which had by the forties, been clearly set down by both the women’s and men’s Inter-Club Councils – products of the previous dual-gender Inter-Club Council.

Regulations governing rushing and pledging for females were clearly more complex and detailed than anything developed by the Men’s Inter-Club Council, which adopted a rather laissez faire attitude. With little doubt, the most demanding rush rule for women – both rushee and club girl – was that of “absolute silence” which was to be maintained “at all times except at scheduled rush parties”.³⁵ Rush, which occurred during September, included such amenities as rushee ribbons which were required to insure identification. Rush parties were divided into two sections or periods; attendance at period one parties was mandatory, and all rushees were instructed to accept no gifts, favors, or flowers (matches or name tags might, however, be retained). Moreover, each rushee was expected to remain at each party until its completion; no one could leave a party early in order to dress for another. And to pledge, the young lady was required to attend both periods of a given club’s parties, demonstrate a nominal scholastic record and, obviously be invited to join. Any club which violated rush rules was deprived of all dances the following semester with the exception of the almost holy presentation of pledges.³⁶

W.I.C.C. pledge rules were less complex, but included prohibitions on “ridiculous stunts...that interfere with regular school routine”. Pledges were not required “to perform tasks after 10:00 p.m. or

now Dean of Students. An early scandal column in the Toreador was called “Wind Through the Sallyport” with good reason. Hazing was certainly more wide spread in the thirties than is currently the case. By the early seventies when upperclassmen had ben administratively emancipated from the dormitory, the hazing (even disturbing) of freshman ground to a halt. So too did any semblance of good order in the dormitories. For if hazing had long been out of vogue, the mere presence of upperclassman in the dormitories tended to restrain the more moronic actions of many freshmen and sophomores.

³⁴ Schulze, 98.

³⁵ “Rushing Handbook”, Women’s Inter-Club Council, n.d. (circa 1950), 7. Pre-school rush for women’s social clubs occurred for the first time in 1951. Since that time, all rush periods have occurred before the start of fall classes.

³⁶ Ibid.

before 7:00 a.m.”, meaning apparently that whatever regular “school routine” existed between those hours might include “tasks” but not interference. “Taking girls out” (translate “walking” for boy’s clubs) was not sanctioned, but had certain practitioners. “Mock initiations”, meaning something less than physical torture, were approved if all participants’ names had previously been registered with the Dean of Women. Individual clubs also had disciplinary procedures for their pledges which were approved by W.I.C.C. and the dean. For example, Las Vivarachas (the “lively ones”) maintained that pledges who were either too lively or not lively enough would be given the “cold shoulder”, visit each active member before 5:00 p.m. Saturdays (until 1968 classes were held until noon on Saturday), and perform three hours of voluntary social work.³⁷

Rushing and pledging rules for Men’s Clubs were, as indicated, less involved and complex than those required to sustain the decorum of the women’s organizations. Basically each Men’s Club scheduled a series of parties, the first of which rotated by time, the remainder of which were somewhat indiscriminately scheduled and were attended only by invitation. These parties, usually based on but not limited by a dance format, were often held in local hotels such as the Hilton (now a parking lot) or the Pioneer. Whatever the case, each party was required to be registered on the college social calendar maintained by the Office of the Dean of Women.³⁸ The object of Men’s Club rush was to secure as many committals as early as possible, that is young men who indicated they would, at the appointed time, cast their lot with a particular club. In this way the initiated club men or actives could concentrate on more fickle rushees.

³⁷ Harriet Moltz to Margaret Twyan, letter, December 5, 1950, on file in the Dean of Students Office, Texas Tech University. Harriet Moltz was a member of W.I.C.C.; Margaret Twyman was Dean of Women. See also the Dean of Women’s correspondence file, 1950-1951

³⁸ “Social Calendar Card”, Texas Tech University, n.d., copies on file in the Dean of Students Office. Texas Tech University. All student organizations were required to register all social activities with the Dean of Women, who apparently, was through to be more social than the Dean of Men.

Thus by the early fifties, the result of interaction of social clubs' rushing and pledging practices, and of the established order, traditions, and practices of those clubs on the campus of Texas Tech suggested a stable student social system little different than that exhibited on campuses possessing national Greek organizations. It was at this point that various of the national Greek organizations and their local alumni constituency began concerted efforts to transform by assimilation the existing social into national fraternities and sororities. And it should be clearly understood that these existing social clubs were certainly strong enough to avoid being coerced into any hasty decisions. At this writing, in fact, the oldest social clubs, such as the College Club and Las Chaparritas, were social clubs at Texas Tech longer than they have been Kappa Sigma or Kappa Kappa Gamma.

Among the last hurrahs of the social clubs was voiced in the somewhat historical format utilized in the spring of 1951 by the La Ventana. It speaks for itself.³⁹

Men's Clubs

Centaurs

The Centaur Club, organized in 1929, was the first Men's social club on the campus whose members were all college students. The purpose of the club was to promote the ideals of honor, scholarship, integrity, and fraternal spirit among the members.

The club had its annual Lil' Abner Dace in November with all attending dressed Dogpatch style. A formal dance was given in January, followed by the "Joe College" sport dance in the spring. Social activities sponsored by the club ended with the Annual Spring Dinner-Dance on May 12 when gifts were presented to all the dates, members, pledges, and alumni present. On Sunday morning, a Mother's Day breakfast in honor of members' mothers was given by the club, after which members and their mothers attended church in a group.

³⁹ La Ventana, Vol. 26, 1951, 186-208.

College Club

The College Club, organized November 21, 1928, was the oldest men's social club on campus. The club was founded for the purpose of promoting the ideals of brotherhood and friendship. It was a Texas Tech tradition that the College Club had the first all formal dance and the first spring sport dance.

The College Club is always active in all inter-club activities on the campus. The organization won the award for the best descriptive float in the Homecoming parade in 1948 and 1949. In the fall of 1949, College Club was awarded the Thomas Trophy for entering the best all-around float in the parade.

Kemas

The Kemas Fraternity was organized in 1932 for the purpose of promoting fellowship and brotherhood among its members. High scholastic and moral standards are the principal goals of this fraternity. Each member strives to be truly Kemas, an Indian word for friend.

Activities for the year started September 2nd - 4th with the "Thirteenth Reunion Convention" at the Blackstone Hotel in Fort Worth. Other activities for the year included a fall semi-formal dance, Homecoming dinner, January anniversary dance, February dinner dance, spring picnic, and spring festival sport dance. Besides the social activities, Kemas participated in all campus and M.I.C.C. sports and activities.

Las Camaradas

Las Camaradas was organized in 1930 to promote a more friendly relationship between its members and other students on the campus.

A dance held on October 27th started off the year's social events. The highlight of the fall semester activities was the annual formal dinner-dance on December 2nd. This year's Homecoming activities included a reception held at the Lubbock hotel and a party afterwards at the Cotton Club. The spring activities included a sport dance and the semester was closed with the annual picnic dance at the

Mackenzie party house. The club also took a very active part in intramural football, basketball, baseball, and track.

Silver Key

The Silver Key Fraternity was organized in October 1929, for the purpose of promoting a closer feeling of brotherhood among its members and uphold the principles of democracy on the campus.

Silver Key was the second fraternal organization on the Tech campus.

Again this year, the Fraternity held its annual reunion in Mexico City. Fall activities included a dinner dance honoring new members and fall pledges, a Homecoming banquet honoring Silver Keys Exes, and the annual Christmas dance.

The spring dace was held in March and a farewell breakfast in honor of graduating members terminated the school year.

John E. Harding and Bob Renner were club sponsors.

Socii

Socii was the youngest social club on the campus, being formed in 1937. It is based on a social organization of the same name that existed at Oxford University during the 18th century. The club tried to follow the same principles and ideals as those set by the Oxford organization.

Activities of the year included two "Big-Brother, Little-Brother" breakfasts, a fall dance, a spring dance, and a picnic. The traditional Orchid dance, at which each member and pledge presents his date with an orchid, was held in February this year.

Socii colors are maroon and white; the flower is a carnation. Socii is a Greek word meaning "brotherhood".

Wranglers

The Wranglers fraternity was organized in October 1929 and had been active continuously since that date. The nine charter members founded the organization to promote high ideals among its

membership in all activities of their college life as regards scholarship, social activities, standards of living, true fellowship, and brotherly love.

Each semester, Wranglers held a rush function for prospective pledges and gave the traditional “Big-Brother, Little Brother” breakfast honoring new pledges. The annual Christmas dace was held before the holiday and the twenty-third George Washington Birthday Ball, honoring new members, was given in February. A spring sport dance in April and a picnic for graduating seniors at the close of the year were among the fraternity’s activities.

Wranglers participated in all intramural athletic events, winning the M.I.C.C. and All-College softball championship last spring.

Women’s Clubs

D.F.D.

With eight charter members, DFD was founded at Texas Tech College on March 2, 1930. It was the only social organization on the camps with a name and meaning known only to its members.

Activities for the fall semester included a Hawaiian rush party, a formal Thanksgiving dinner-dance, Homecoming breakfast honoring alumnae, an introduction tea for new pledges and a Christmas party.

During the spring semester, the formal presentation dance, the last presentation of the season, highlighted the activities. Other functions included the Founders’ Day dinner, at which time the year’s outstanding member and pledge were chosen and the farewell dance honoring seniors.

The climax of the year was the reunion held the first three days following the spring semester at Ruidoso, New Mexico.

Ko Shari

Ko Shari Club was unique in that its background was ancient, historical and of Indian origin. Ko Shari means “delight makers” and on the campus the club had sought high scholastic standards, a

democratic spirit toward college associates, and had encouraged participation in campus activities. Rush week was climaxed by the Indian dinner carrying out the tradition and background of the club. The Halloween masquerade, the patronesses' barbeque, December dinner-dance and annual Christmas party were main events of the fall semester.

Ko Shari was awarded the softball trophy by W.I.C.C. Following presentation in March, patronesses and alumnae join the members to make their annual Easter trip to Santa Fe. Easter festivities were climaxed by initiation at Arrowhead Khiva on Sunday evening. Picnics given by the alumnae and patroness groups and the farewell breakfast closed the year.

Las Chaparritas

Las Chaparritas functioned to unite girls of a common interest through association and engaging in social activities. The club, which was organized in 1926, was the oldest women's social club on the campus. It had perpetuated the aim to aid in campus-wide activities which needed its support, and to foster happiness among its own members and groups with whom they came in contact.

In the fall, the club honored new pledges with a picnic and a formal dinner-dance. The Christmas party, which was also a yearly affair, was another of the fall activities.

Highlighting the spring functions was the traditional Valentine presentation in February at which new members and pledges were presented to the tune of "Sweethearts on Parade". Included in the spring events were the tea dance given by patronesses, a spring farewell dance, and a picnic honoring graduating members.

Las Vivarachas

Las Vivarachas club, organized in the spring of 1930, was the youngest women's social organization on the campus.

The social activities of 1950-51 school year began with the annual starlight dance honoring fall pledges. A picnic was held Halloween night.

The Las Vivarachas alumnae, patroness, and active groups held a reception during Homecoming in November.

A Christmas motif was carried out in December parties, one being a coke party honoring patronesses and alumnae, and the other party given to the members by the pledge group.

The spring semester reached its highlight in March with the annual costume dance, at which time a "King and Queen" were crowned. On March 31, new members and pledges of the club were presented as the club song "Violets" was played.

The traditional farewell dinner honoring graduating seniors in May climaxed a year of fun-filled activities.

The club name is a Spanish word meaning "Lively Ones".

Las Vivis old and new meet together at their reunion held each summer. The club endeavors in all its activities to promote friendship and congeniality among its members and others on the campus.

Sans Souci

The purpose of the club was to promote congenial friendships, social activities, and to maintain the highest moral and scholastic standards.

Following the French theme offered by the name (Sans Souci meaning without care) rush week was concluded with the traditional Gold and White dinner which had the setting of a French sidewalk café, Sans Souci. An introductory tea is held in honor of the new pledges. Homecoming features a dance for all alums the preceding night and a breakfast the morning of Homecoming. Sans Souci begins the series of monthly presentations by holding their annual Christmas presentation in December. Each member has a Patroness Mother; these ladies are entertained with a picnic in the spring and entertain the active members by an annual Mexican Supper each fall. Between semesters finds the Club at Mountain View ranch playing in the snow and relaxing after finals. Traditional activities include formal

dinner-dance, Gypsy dance, baseball tournament, picnics, a breakfast given by the Lubbock Alumna Association, a party honoring graduating seniors, and reunion between summer and fall terms.

Each Christmas the group gives food, clothing, and toys to needy families of the city.

Organized in 1926, the second generation of Soucis is now active as this year's membership includes daughters of former Soucis.

Part Three

Being a consideration of those elements which led to the conversion of the social clubs to Greek-lettered societies at Texas Tech.

Following the Second World War, Texas Tech began a series of changes which, during the next thirty years, would remove it from the category of a rather nondescript technical school in a nondescript agricultural community, to one of a major state university in an almost-city. Succored by the GI Bill, returning veterans swelled the classrooms and dormitories of the institution. For example, the long session of 1945-1946 saw 3,744 students enrolled; the following school year registered 6,096. By the beginning of the next decade, the figure had stabilized at five and three-quarters thousand students.⁴⁰

That the institution had grown in population was undeniable, but that growth was accompanied by the pain of any puberty. Space was minimal. Classrooms and dormitories were crowded to overflowing, and a building program was instituted which was not equaled in scope until the mid-seventies. A new science building linked the Library (later the Social Science Building) with the existing chemistry edifice. The East Engineering Building was erected as were the Agricultural Engineering and Music Buildings. Wings were added to the Administration Building, and the Home Economic Building was enlarged. The Bledsoe-Gordon and Horn-Knapp dormitory complexes helped ease a critical undersupply of housing which had forced many students off-campus, much to their disappointment. Surplus wood barracks buildings – rather hopefully labeled temporary – sprang up like weeds. “Woodies,” as they were later called, housed classrooms and faculty offices as well as providing storage space. Perhaps the most important woodies acquired, at least from the student standpoint, were those situated south of the newly paved Administration Building parking lot. Known affectionately as the Rec Hall, the three hard-floored buildings provided meeting facilities and short-order snack service for students. The Rec Hall was the culmination of the efforts of many people (as well as out-right financial support by Lubbock citizens.) Not the least of these was James G. Allen, who, as Dean of Men, and later as Dean of Students, was also becoming increasingly involved in liaison work between Texas

⁴⁰ Forty-ninth Annual Catalog, Texas Tech University, 1974-1975, 452.

Technological College and various national fraternities and sororities which saw promise in a rapidly maturing young institution.⁴¹

What these nationals saw was not only the obvious quantitative growth in students and physical plant, but also that evidence in a more qualitative academic growth best exemplified by that of the graduate school. Tech had offered Master's Degrees since 1927, albeit on a rather restrained scale. However, in 1937 the graduate program became a separate school, which by the autumn of 1950 recorded 460 enrollees. That same year, doctoral programs were appended, reflecting not only the physical growth of the college, but the start of academic maturation as well. Texas Tech, reasoned various national Greek organizations, was rapidly becoming an important college – important enough that national fraternal organizations should certainly be represented.⁴²

Interest expressed by Greek organizations was not confined to national levels alone. Indeed among individual alumni living in Lubbock – of which there were more than a few – there had long been interest in assimilating the existing social clubs, or otherwise inducing a change in the then current institutional policy of not allowing Greeks on campus. But it took the initial interest of the various national organizations before any local movement could crystalize and therefore expect any success. Thus it was that by about 1950, discrete, but rather persistent inquiries, had begun to be directed toward the college from both the national level and from local and area alumni.⁴³

These inquiries were channeled through the then rather limited administrative units of the college to the office of the Dean of Students. In the rather resolutely usual manner in which these units

⁴¹ La Ventana, Vol. 25, 1951, 8-16; Lewis N. Jones to David Nail, interview June 27, 1975, notes in author's file (hereafter cited as Jones Interview, June 27). The Rec Hall was the start of the Student Union (now the University Center) which opened its first permanent \$540,000 facility on March 10, 1953. Toreador, March 11, 1953, 3.

⁴² University Daily, April 1, 1975, F:5; Allen interview.

⁴³ See Dean James G. Allen's correspondence files (1945-1951) relating to fraternities and sororities for specific and rather voluminous examples of inquiries regarding assimilation of the social clubs by national Greek-letter organizations, in the Southwest Collection, Texas Tech University. The masculine plural "alumni" is hereafter intended to include sorority ladies, otherwise "alumnae".

have sometimes functioned over the years, there then existed a Dean of Students (Dean Allen), a Dean of Women (Margeret Twyman) and her Assistant Dean (Marion Thompson). Curiously, there was also an Assistant Dean of Men (Lewis N. Jones), but no actual Dean of Men to assist.⁴⁴ It fell, therefore, to Dean Allen and Twyman the task of cordial correspondence with, and reaction to, those outside the institution for whom the establishment of a nationally-affiliated Greek system at Texas Tech had taken on an increasing importance.⁴⁵

There was, of course, a number of national Greek-letter honorary organizations on campus by the early fifties. Among these were Alpha Chi (men's and women's scholarship), Alpha Lambda Delta (freshman women's scholarship), and Phi Eta Sigma (freshman men's scholarship). Also there were specific academic honoraries such as Tau Beta Sigma (band women), Phi Upsilon Omicron (home economics), and Pi Sigma Alpha (government). Each of these organizations was tied not only to institutional policy, but to those regulations issuing from a national headquarters, particularly those governing entry requirements. But as these and others, such as the students' branches of the American Chemical Society and American Dairy Science Association, were not precisely social, no transgression of the long-standing administrative prohibition resulted.

Alpha Phi Omega presented a somewhat different image, for it was certainly a national men's Greek-letter fraternity of a mainly non-academic sort. But it was service-oriented rather than strictly social – a blend somewhat less discernible among current social fraternities. Yet Alpha Phi Omega was not exactly asocial. The middle third of its motto: "Be a leader, be a friend, be of service" suggested a camaraderie not dissimilar from social fraternities. In fact, Alpha Phi Omega had emerged from Sigma Alpha Epsilon shortly after World War One and had based many of its most admirable principles on

⁴⁴ *La Ventana*, Vol. 25, 1951, 37.

⁴⁵ Allen Interview. The position of Dean of Women experienced a rapid turnover in the late forties and fifties. Generally Dean Twyman was more involved in correspondence with national sororities than her immediate predecessor, Margarete W. Walker.

those of the Boy Scouts of America. It arrived on the Tech campus on April 30, 1939, with the formal installation of Beta Sigma Chapter, previously known as the Eagle Scout Club. Tech officials, particularly President Clifford B. Jones, had raised questions as to the nature of the organization, but reassured as to its service related goals by Dean Allen and Dr. J. O. Ellsworth of the Economics Department, he allowed its establishment. Dean Allen supported the establishment of A.P.O. partly through the recommendation of his friend Dean Arno "Shorty" Nowotny of the University of Texas. And during the war years, when a male's tenure on any college campus was tenuous at best, Dean Allen was largely responsible for maintaining Beta Sigma's existence. In the autumn of 1948, he turned the scholarship of A. P. O. over to Lewis Jones, who had joined the staff the previous year. ⁴⁶

Because Alpha Phi Omega had, unlike many other student organizations, survived the war by maintaining a marginal membership and had thereafter proven itself to be a stable and productive organization, undoubtedly implied that national Greek-letter organizations were not necessarily precursors of a campus aristocracy. That implication was apparently not lost on administrative officials and the Board of Directors. Indeed if any single student organization can be identified as helping precipitate the decision to allow Greeks on campus, that organization was Alpha Phi Omega. And if any single individual can be identified in catalyzing that precipitation it is James G. Allen. ⁴⁷

A graduate of Southern Methodist University where he was a member of Sigma Alpha Epsilon, and later of Harvard where he took a master's, Allen arrived at a very infant Texas Tech in 1927 and began teaching in the English department. In 1936 he assumed the position of Dean of Men but carefully retained classroom responsibilities. By the time that national fraternities and sororities had initiated concerted efforts to establish themselves at Tech, Allen was Dean of Students and therefore responsible

⁴⁶ La Ventana, Vol. 14, 1939, 287; Jones interview June 27. The first vice-president of Tech Alpha Phi Omega chapter was an outstanding half-back named Elmer Tarbox. Beginning with President Clifford B. Jones and continuing until the administration of Dr. Grover Murray, all Tech presidents have been honorary initiates of Beta Sigma chapter.

⁴⁷ Jones interview, June 28, 1975.

for the mechanics of their entry as well as its success. He retained that position until his retirement in 1968.

Allen always maintained a distinct affection for student organizations, particularly the opportunity they afford students to exercise leadership. "You do remember", he wrote a young assistant dean in the autumn of 1973, "that I always thought this a most important part of the Student Life assignment. You have a great opportunity in working with student leadership on the campus".⁴⁸ Although Allen also worked with individual students, particularly those experiencing personal problems, many of the disciplinary functions associated with dean of students' offices fell to his soft-spoken assistant, Lewis Jones, who, to the dismay of more than a few students, carried a big stick.

For the roughly third of a century in which James Allen was associated with student personnel work at Texas Tech, and particularly while he was dean, the office maintained an approachable, albeit somewhat formal atmosphere. In an academic environment too often distinguished by the narrowness of its various constituent disciplines, Allen remained a generalist, perhaps a necessity considering the maintenance of his dual roles as a teacher of literature and Dean of Students. As dean, Allen retained the intellectual and cultural qualities often associated with a professor. Precise of speech and memoranda, Allen was able to deftly encourage Greek inquiries and simultaneously remind those groups of the existing prohibition. And as those inquiries increased, he subtly related their substance to the administration, ingratiatingly asking advice, yet focusing those inquiries where they would judiciously be to alter the existing policy regarding Greeks.

That policy was the sort of thing which most hard-working and fair-minded bureaucracies efficiently administer. That is, it was firm policy, the sort of thing around which sometimes elaborate defensive paperwork can be constructed. Indeed few but the most enterprising bureaucrats are able to effectively subvert firm policy by equivocating. No Greeks was firm policy. But did firm policy work, was

⁴⁸ James G. Allen to David Nail, letter, September 13, 1973, in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs.

it effective? Had there, in fact, been discernable change in the attitudes concerning Greeks at Texas Tech held by people both in and out of the institution? Were the social clubs really anything truly different than fraternities or sororities? All these considerations had to be examined and weighed, and, obviously, offered fertile possibilities for equivocation – the sort that discreetly suggested “no, but...” Still one thing remained uncertain: there was an increasing restlessness surrounding the prohibitive policy. Tech officials were administering a policy which, while it certainly affected the existing social order of the campus, was no longer considered appropriate or even germane by numerous individuals, many of whom were rather organized Greek alumni. And as corollary, there was apparently a decrease in both institutional and local concern about Greeks being undemocratic. Indeed the American political climate during the early part of the decade had identified a monolithic communism as the single greatest carrier of antidemocratic pathogens, and the Korean War seemed proof positive. This concept, this gearing up to hold the lines, obviously affected local thinking. Greeks, despite their label, were American, and although some staunch protestant absolutists might fret over their occasional drinking and therefore their moral corruption, Greeks were not communists. Then too, local folks could discern Tech as emerging institution as easily as could the Greeks, and although many of these locals paternalistically thought “the Tech” (as it was once popularly labeled) as “their” college, it became increasingly apparent that some sort of trade-off might be arranged whereby a little sin might be exchanged for local publicity – that, in addition to the very apparent economic opportunities in a town that was mainly cotton and college. Thus it was that, given the gentle but resolute pressure from fraternal societies and their alumni (many of whom were both locals and Tech supporters) and the changing circumstances at the growing institution, the policy prohibiting Greeks had simply outlived whatever utility it had once carried.

There were, however, certain difficulties which required administrative attention. Among these was the rather soft academic underpinning of the social clubs, particularly those of the masculine

gender which consistently managed to prove girls smarter than boys. While the actual men's clubs' grades (then based upon a three-point scale) were not always spectacularly lower than the all-men's average – about 1.25 and 1.30, respectively – Dean Allen realized that a continuance of this below-average performance could provide fuel for whatever fires of opposition that might be laid. By specifically planning to improve the academic situation might be kept to a minimum, if not altogether negated. Too, those nationals which had become increasingly attentive to the Tech clubs would obviously pay no little attention to the quality of scholarship maintained by those organizations. The methodology Dean Allen and others employed to affect the desired changes was the institution of rather structured scholarship programs for each pledge class. While the results did not automatically and specifically raise grades, a general if rather hesitant improvement began to be manifested, but this occurred as much after nationalization as before.⁴⁹

Also there was the problem of personnel available to work with the necessary College Panhellenic and Interfraternity Council which would assume the functions of the Women's and Men's Interclub Councils when national sororities and fraternities did, in fact, absorb the local clubs. Obviously the Dean of Women and her staff would be pressed into service with the College Panhellenic. That the staff suffered rather radical and rapid changes due to resignations during the early 1950's did not deter the eventual successful formation of College Panhellenic. Copious rules, regulations, and authoritative suggestions governing college Panhellenics had long issued from the National Panhellenic Council, and these were able to be applied by practically anyone possessing courage enough to attempt comprehension.⁵⁰ Additionally, there was a well-organized and effective group of assorted alumnae –

⁴⁹ Allen interview. By the end of the spring semester, 1954, the fraternity average was 1.30. The all-men's average was 1.29.

⁵⁰ Once upon a time, this author found himself in the unenviable position of "advising" the tech Panhellenic as it entered formal and rather ritualistic rush period. It is his consideration that NPC regulations can only be fathomed by the women for whom they are intended.

the Lubbock City Panhellenic – always ready with well-meaning advice, although occasionally of the muddy-the-water variety.⁵¹

The possible IFC presented different administrative difficulties, as there was little in the way of a prescription from the national Interfraternity Council, and while local alumni were generally interested in the establishment of fraternities at Tech, they rather consistently had their days filled with mundane (if gainful) employment. Also, there was no Dean of Men to whom IFC might be assigned, although as mentioned, Lewis Jones served as the Assistant Dean. Coupled with this was the fact that James Allen, as Dean of Students, had held the position of faculty sponsor of the Silver Key Club. (His wife, Louise, who taught in the Journalism Department, occupied a similar position with the Las Chaparritas). Thus to sponsor a single club and simultaneously the necessarily ecumenical clearing house of IFC could be construed as a conflict of interests. Allen wisely wanted no part of that.⁵²

As an aside, it should be mentioned that when the Silver Keys became Phi Delta Theta, Allen had to sever his ties as he was an SAE, which had absorbed the Adelphi Club.⁵³ Several years before, Mrs. Allen resigned the sponsorship of the Las Chaparritas. Her husband then asked Mrs. Harmon Jenkins, a former Tech student (and non-club person) who had, in 1947, taken duties in the new Placement Service, to assume the sponsorship of the “Las Chaps”. This she did, and was duly initiated. When that club became Kappa Kappa Gamma in 1953, Mrs. Jenkins became one too, and was therefore both a faculty sponsor and an automatic alumna.⁵⁴ She continued in this role (not unlike various other faculty sponsors/alums) until her retirement in 1974, whereupon the chapter elected an unknowing male

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Jones interview, June 28, 1975; Allen interview.

⁵³ Toreador, September 23, 1953, 1.

⁵⁴ Jenkins interview. Mrs. Jenkins had, at various times, served as secretary to the Dean of Women (1936), to the Dean of Arts and Sciences (1938-1939, and 1942-1943) and to the Registrar (1939-1942). The Placement Service was at first attached to the President’s Office. (Mrs. Jean Jenkins), Placement Services file, Office of Vice President of Student Affairs, n.d.

whose only redeeming value to the group was that he was therein wived, mother-in-lawed, autned, and sister-in-lawed.

In any case, Dean Allen's problem remained one of those locating someone to sponsor IFC. In the spring of 1952 he saw certain possibilities in a young man then in charge of Bledsoe Hall, and as dormitory staff were responsible to the Dean of Students at that time, Allen approached one James P. Whitehead with the idea of learning, among other things, the fraternity business. Since there was no fraternity business to learn at Tech, Allen arranged a sort of lend-lease agreement with his friend, Robert W. Bishop, Dean of Men at the University of Cincinnati. Whitehead then became Bishop's assistant at Cincinnati and set out to learn the trade. For Bishop, who was active in the NIC as well as being executed secretary of Omicron Delta Kappa (men's academic and leadership fraternity), was a noted fraternity figure, and Whitehead was exposed to a great deal of pragmatic work. During that year, Allen and Whitehead rather frequently corresponded, the latter informing the former of his pitfalls, problems, and progress. And Allen relayed those events then unfolding in Lubbock, for while Whitehead was in Cincinnati, the old prohibition died. When he returned to Tech in 1953, the Greeks had arrived, and he was able to put his IFC experience to immediate use.⁵⁵

Just how and why that prohibition died involved factors other than administrative adjustments designed to accommodate Greeks and the dynamic growth of the institution which attracted the attention of national fraternities and sororities. Chief among those factors to be considered was the reaction of the students to the possibility of Greek-letter organizations on campus – this preceding the necessary modification of policy required from the Board of Directors.

In the spring of 1951, the Lubbock City Panhellenic thought it expedient to begin to assay student opinion, particularly that opinion held by the existing women's social clubs. Spearhead by Mrs.

⁵⁵ James P. Whitehead to David Nail, interview, July 14, 1975, notes in author's files. Whitehead is currently Associate Dean of Students at the University of Houston. At Tech he had, in addition to IFC duties, responsibility for foreign students and financial aid.

W. R. Anthony, a former Tech student who had also been a Chi Omega as the University of Texas, Panhellenic contacted the W.I.C.C. and appropriate administrative officials (in particular Dean Allen) with the proposition of conducting a poll, initially among the women's clubs, to determine their interest in possibility of affiliating with national sororities.⁵⁶ Permission was granted, and the polls were prepared.

By April Fool's Day, 1951, Mrs. Anthony and City Panhellenic were about ready to being distribution of the poll to women's social clubs. The scheme remained less than secret, but not exactly public domain in order to assure that no under pressure would be directed against the clubs. Apparently it was determined that the existence of the polls and the results of their inquiry should be shielded from the Toreador so that its reporting, editorial comments, and resulting letters to the editor would be based upon something other than the possible perception of an aristocratic subterfuge.⁵⁷

Two weeks later the Toreador carried a page one story revealing "Coeds Receptive to Sorority Talks". Had Harry Truman's firing of Douglas MacArthur on April 11 not provided extraordinary grist for many a front page mill, it is likely the sorority story would have elicited more reaction. As it was, campus events were a bridesmaid to those in Korea, and the first official notice of the possible arrival of Greeks slipped rather quietly upon the Tech scene.⁵⁸

But it did not go unnoticed, for the story disclosed that all of the women's social clubs, save one which had yet to report, were favorably disposed "to hear sorority women discuss national organizations in preparation for organizing Tech chapters". The M.I.C.C. plan to conduct a similar poll among the men's clubs was also revealed. Moreover, the Lubbock City Panhellenic indicated that if the social clubs were "interested in forming national sorority and fraternity chapters, Panhellenic (meaning the city variety) will back students in petitioning the college Board of Directors to change the policy". It

⁵⁶ Toreador, April 14, 1951, 1.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

was obvious that the women's clubs were prepared to seek information, if not the outright policy change suggested by City Panhellenic, and the men's clubs were behind only administratively.⁵⁹

The first editorial comment in the Toreador appeared on April 18, 1951. Entitled "Greeks at Tech...?" the rather non-committal reaction (at least for a college sheet) confessed that "most of us know little about them", but rather prophetically suggested that "this semester may possibly tell whether or not national social organizations will be accepted in the near future here at tech". The editorial called for an outpouring of student opinion concerning the advisability of admitting Greek organizations to the Tech campus.⁶⁰

Three days later a single letter appeared under the label "Appeal for Democracy". That appeal, however, by an author who chose to remain anonymous, was more against Greeks in general than for democracy in particular. "You cannot have Greeks without having snobbery", the writer maintained. "Social cleavages will develop... (and) the democratic atmosphere for which Tech has always been known will disappear." The author resolutely asserted that, "Democratic unity cannot exist in a community which has in it a self-elected and self-assured social aristocracy. Let no one be fooled about that," the writer added. But accurately predicting the future, the young populist called for the Board of Directors to assay all student opinion – not simply club members – for "if we are to become undemocratic, let us at least do so by democratic procedure".⁶¹

Jinny Henley, the business manager of the Toreador and occasional author of the column "Henley's Heap," was much less concerned with the possibility of the subversion of Tech democracy by a conspiracy of Greek organizations. In a column run beside the letter, Henley rather correctly assumed that fraternities and sororities were discriminatory, but added that "even Tech's social clubs are not indiscriminate in admitting members", which was equally correct. Cleverly dismissing his own

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid., April 18, 1951, 4.

⁶¹ Ibid., April 21, 1951, 4-5.

arguments, he pointed out the conceived snobbishness of Greeks was objectionable, but countered that this could easily be tranquilized by the “unusually friendly” Panhandle and South Plains social mores. In that region the columnist firmly stated, “Snobbishness is taboo.” True, Greeks often devoted too much time to mundane campus politics, and, Henley added, were often over-anxious to elect their own members to campus offices. This tendency, he suggested, could politically divide Greeks and independents, but would thereby generate some enthusiasm in the normally listless campus elections. “Certainly more enthusiasm is needed when only 40 percent of the students vote in an election,” a proportion of participation which astound candidates at a much larger Texas Tech a quarter century later.⁶²

By equivocating the negative aspects of fraternities and sororities, Henley purposely developed their positive facets. Enthusiasm, he maintained, was their principal product. “Everyone who is active in student affairs is constantly seeking a means to draw out people who hole up with their studies..., take no active part in student activities, and think they are getting a college education.” Greek-letter organizations could change this deplorable apathy Henley reasoned. Besides, he added, “Some students took more interest in their duties as members of national honoraries than their local social club duties.” Encompassing all these virtues was what Henley felt to be the presence of an ethereal “fraternal spirit,” although domiciling that spirit in “fraternity houses for residences would be rather impractical while dormitory regulations remain as they are today.”⁶³

Whatever the case with dormitory requirements, general student opinion favoring national Greek organizations had jelled by the late spring of 1951. Of course it was too late in the school year to affect any change in the existing policy (which after all required action of those worthies assembled as the Board of Directors), but it was not too late for it to go on record as favoring that change. Under the

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

watchful eyes of Dean Allen, a campus-wide meeting was scheduled in the Aggie Auditorium a few weeks after the Toreador had broken the story concerning the possibility of a Greek arrival. On May 3, 1951, the president of W.I.C.C., Mary Anne Kelley, officially wrote Tech President Dossie M. Wiggins identifying eight reasons why those students at the meeting felt the Greeks should supplant the social clubs. In part those reasons concerned the adoption of superior academics, leadership, and what was labeled “standards which are higher than local clubs now have.” But the primary reason was listed simply as “free advertisement of Tech throughout the nation.” And a young institution on the verge of greatness recognized that appropriate sorts of advertising need not be counter-productive.⁶⁴ Thus it was that by the autumn of 1951, the administration had determined to take the matter to the Board. The prospects of having fraternities and sororities appears bright.

That is, the prospects were certainly greater than they had been before precisely because they had never existed before. Then again, the administration did not propose to take the matter to the Board half-baked. Indeed the proposal to admit Greeks had to be fully baked before it would stand any chance for approval. And to be fully baked required a certain amount of time in the oven – in this case, enough time to allow James Allen opportunity to design a functional admission and affiliation system which would protect the social clubs from Greeks bearing gifts.

During the school year, 1951-1952, Allen developed such a system and designed into it procedures which would allow the Tech social clubs the greatest possible freedom in their selection of a national fraternity or sorority (the outline for this system can be found on page 64). At the same time, the system had to allow each notional organization opportunity to adequately assess the existing social clubs. Nonetheless, the system was adjusted to the extent that wat club became what fraternity or sorority rested with the club and not with the national. Allen correctly assumed that the board might be favorably disposed toward Greeks provided their subsequent arrival could not be constructed as an

⁶⁴ Mary Anne Kelley to Dr. D. M. Wiggins, letter, May 3, 1951, in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs.

invasion. His system was defensive enough to insure that who invited whom would not become distorted.⁶⁵

In large measure that system was a sequence of steps not greatly unlike the later sorority rush system at Tech. That is, a field of many would be narrowed by choice to a few, and finally to one. Initially, all national fraternity and sorority offices which had expressed interest in Texas Tech would be contacted. Generally, this was simply a matter of diplomacy as their local and area alumni had for several years provided a constant flow of information. Moreover, as the Lubbock City Panhellenic had spearheaded the drive for Greeks at Texas Tech, the correspondence with and transition to national sororities was several months ahead of that to fraternities. But whatever the differences in timing, Allen's plan called for screening the interested nationals using such criteria as number of chapters (and particularly those chapters proximal to Lubbock, which at the time meant TCU) and the sort of support as a function of size which could be generated by Lubbock alumni of a particular group. As developed, Allen's system allowed joint discussion between national representatives, local alumni, the W.I.C.C. and M.I.C.C. as well as his office. Particularly this was true in finalizing a given club's selection which was to be made by the primary, secondary, and tertiary choices. These preferences would in turn be matched (rather like the later sorority bid lists and rushee preference cards) with those choices of the national organization. After the matching was completed and the smoke had cleared, the individual Tech social club could petition the assigned national for membership as a chartered chapter. The specific alumni and alumnae of each club, and there were many, could, at their election, become an initiated member and thereby an alumni or alumnae of a given national.⁶⁶ For example, a young lady who had held membership in the DFD's in the late thirties might well become a Delta Delta Delta alumna fifteen years

⁶⁵Allen interview.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*; James G. Allen to Marjorie Neely, memorandum, December 23, 1952, in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs; "Plan for contact between national sororities and local social clubs on the Texas Technological Campus (sic), n.d., in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs. The rules are listed at the end of The Colonization of Sororities.

later. The same sort of proposition applied to those San Soucis who became Kappa Alpha Theta, or later, those men who had been Wranglers and wanted to become Alpha Tau Omegas, or Centaurs who became Phi Kappa Psi's. In any event, by the spring of 1952, Allen had developed the plan sufficiently to present to the administration. And the Administration was then ready to go to the Board.

Minutes of the Board of Directors' meeting: June 21, 1952. Item 1166.

Upon motion made by Mr. Benson, seconded by Mr. Pfluger, the Board approved the admission of Greek Letter Fraternities and Sororities at Texas Technological College, and further provided that no fraternity or sorority houses will be allowed, either on or off campus, without first securing Board approval.

The Secretary was asked to record the vote. Voting for fraternities and sororities were: Mr. Benson, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Weymouth, Mr. Pfluger, and Mr. Price. Voting against fraternities and sororities were: Mr. Ince and Mr. Wooldridge. Mr. Abbott was present but did not vote.⁶⁷

The Colonization of Sororities

Dean Allen's plan thus had early utility; during the autumn of 1952, national sororities and fraternities were in contact with local clubs. Implementation of the plan occurred more rapidly among the women's clubs due to their superior organization and, of course, with the illumination provided by City Panhellenic's guiding light. By Thanksgiving the process of club girl-meets sorority lady had run its course and decisions had been reached. In November and December petitions from the various social clubs were prepared (and this was no small task as the national required detailed information relating to

⁶⁷ Minutes of the Board of Directors of Technological College, June 21, 1952, in Marshal Pennington to Grover Murray, memorandum, April 16, 1968. In files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs, n.p. This lengthy memorandum was requested by Tech President Murray on February 16, 1968. It concerns Greek history at Tech, particularly as it relates to the office lodge policy. Pennington as Vice President of Business Affairs.

the history of each club) and presented to the national offices of the sororities which had been selected. During the following spring semester, W.I.C.C. became College Panhellenic; of its constituents, DFD became Delta Delta Delta, Ko Shari became Pi Beta Phi, Las Chaparritas became Kappa Kappa Gamma, Las Vivarachas became Zeta Tau Alpha, and San Souci became Kappa Alpha Theta.⁶⁸

The following September, what had been club rush became sorority rush, replete with NPC rules, regulations, and provisions. Dean of Women Marjorie Neely stuffed 240 beaming rushees into Knapp and Horn Halls and fretted that all would not find a happy sorority home. In order to assure that no one sorority would over-shadow another, NPC had for years established a quota system which limited the size of pledge classes. In that fall of 1953, that quota was 28 pledges per sorority, which means that with five organizations and 240 rushees, an even hundred girls would remain among the uninitiated. Moving quickly, Dean Neely secured the colonization of Alpha Chi Omega in October and Delta Gamma in November, an act which obviously pleased some of the hindered hundred and two national sororities. Both groups then participated in an open rush and in the spring of 1954, the first two sorority colonies at Tech had received their respective charters.⁶⁹

Meanwhile, the last in the rapid series of changes in Deans of Women occurred when Miss Florence Phillips assumed duties. A position labeled Panhellenic Advisor was appended, reflecting both the growing strength of the Tech sorority system, as well as a perceived need for control. Miss Jane Matthews, the first Panhellenic Advisor, was charged immediately with the problem of another expansion, and in October of 1954, colonies of Alpha Phi and Sigma Kappa were added. Thus in the period of two years, what had been five local social clubs had growth into nine national social sororities.

70

⁶⁸ La Ventana, Vol. 28, 1953, 284-293.

⁶⁹ Lubbock Avalanche-Journal, September 9, 1953, 4:9; September 13, 1953, 1:8.

⁷⁰ La Ventana, Vol. 30, 1955, 9, 252-254, 267.

Plan for Contact between National Sororities and Local Social Clubs on the Texas Technological Campus

1. During the period of October 1, 1952, and November 8, 1952, inclusive, meetings will be scheduled by the Dean of Women for representatives of a national sorority to talk with an individual local social club.
 2. Invitations to the national sororities for the above scheduled meetings will be issued by the local social clubs through the Dean of Women.
 3. The maximum number of alumnae of a national sorority at any one meeting shall be twenty. The number of national officers and/or actives of another collegiate chapter shall not exceed a total of four.
 4. Only alumnae or patronesses of a local social club who are initiated members of the Greek-lettered sorority may attend a meeting.
 5. The meetings are to be of the informal group discussion type. Refreshments are limited to one food item plus a beverage; no favors are to be given.
 6. All members of a local social club and its pledges are to be present at the scheduled meeting of their club.
 7. No national sorority group is permitted to entertain any local social club until October 1, 1952. Likewise, no local social club is permitted to entertain any national sorority until that date. Each national group may entertain the same local group only once.
 8. Requests to petition a national sorority may be initiated by any local group any time after November 15, 1952.
 9. All petitions are to be submitted to the Dean of Women for approval.
 10. Installations of national chapters may take place any time after April 1, 1953, the exact date to be determined later.
 11. All national sororities which establish a chapter on the Texas Tech Campus must have a faulty sponsor.
-

The Colonization of Fraternities

Last, but not precisely least, there occurred the formation of national fraternities. During February, 1953, the men's social clubs had begun a series of interview meetings with nine national fraternities. Following almost the same procedural steps already taken by the women's clubs, the arrival of fraternities constituted a somewhat less detailed mechanism, but not less important. The next month advertisements by the College Bookstore in the Toreador announced a sale of "local club decals and stationary while the supplies last. Our loss is your gain", the advertisement continued. So it was, for shortly thereafter the enterprising Varsity Book Store disclosed "Fraternity decals now in stock". Thus during the late spring of 1953, the club decals, for decades affixed to the rear windows of various young men's cars, were removed and replaced with a series of Greek letters.⁷¹

Installation of chapters – the transformation from club to fraternity – began in the late spring of 1953. As was the case with sororities, each men's club prepared lengthy and polished petitions which were presented to the national fraternity selected by each social club. For example, Silver Keys presented Phi Delta Theta with a discerning twenty-page document carrying the endorsement of all regional Phi Delt chapters – ranging from the University of Texas to Oklahoma A&M (Oklahoma State) – all of which had sent delegations to Lubbock in February to represent that fraternity to the Silver Keys. Like other club's petitions, the Silver Key document carried the endorsement of the Lubbock alumni club, in this case headed by Parker Prouty of the Avalanche-Journal. Also, prominent area alumni backed their fraternities in assimilating the social clubs. The Phi Delta Theta cause was furthered by influential Amarillo alumni, such as oilman Lawrence Hagy and Attorney Ben Monning. Younger Amarillo Phi Delt, such as Wales Madden, Jr. (who would later chair the State Coordinating Board for Colleges and Universities) and Shelby Krister (who had recently helped engineer the sale of his father-in-law's

⁷¹ Toreador, February 18, 1953, 1; March 11, 28, 1953, 7.

newspaper holdings, including the Avalanche-Journal), also attached their names. Other petitions to other fraternities carried no less influential names, and in substance were quite similar.⁷²

By the following autumn the men's social clubs had permanently adjourned themselves or were preparing to do so. The Interfraternity Council replaced the M.I.C.C. and held its first regular meeting under the direction of Deans Allen and Whitehead on September 20, 1953.⁷³ The meeting represented a blend of the old social clubs and the new fraternities, as Adelphi awaited its charter from Sigma Alpha Epsilon and the Kemas awaited the national convention of Phi Gamma Delta to ratify their petition. Otherwise, the Centaurs were now Phi Kappa Psi; the College Club, Kappa Sigma, Los Camaradas, Pi Kappa Alpha; Silver Keys, Phi Delta Theta; Socii, Sigma Nu; and the Wranglers assembled as Alpha Tau Omega.

During the spring semester of 1954, the new IFC recorded a most successful rush period by taking 253 pledges; approximately one in five undergraduate men that semester were pledging a fraternity. But quantity was not quality – either pledge or fraternity scholarship program – as six in ten men decreased their GPA of 0.43 on a 3.00 scale. That summer James Whitehead prepared a rather detailed and dismal statistical analysis in hopes of establishing a deferred rush system for fraternities at Texas Tech whereby a young man would be required to complete one semester of college work without becoming entangled in scholastic probation. Whitehead reasoned that if a young man could survive his first semester he might be better equipped to survive both the second and pledge ship. On September 30, 1954, he took his well-reasoned deferred rush proposal to IFC where Sigma Alpha Epsilon and Pi Kappa Alpha backed the matter but were temporarily defeated. However, Whitehead was a persistent man, and the subsequent deferred rush system which was put into practice (and which remains in

⁷² Silver Key Club, "A Petition to Phi Delta Theta", n.d. (circa 1953), n.p., in files of Dr. Bill Dean, Department of Journalism, Texas Tech University. Other club petitions are in Dean Allen's fraternity files in the Southwest Collection, Texas Tech University.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, September 30, 1954, 2-4; "Grade Analysis of Men's Social Fraternities, Spring, 1954", n.d., n.p., in the files of the Assistant Dean of Students for Programs.

effect) is a direct result of the poor initial academic performance of the fraternities and James Whitehead's attempt to solve the problem.⁷⁴

But regardless of its initially poor academic performance, the Tech fraternity system did not apparently want for members, although the initiated variety was undoubtedly chagrined at the astounding number of hold-over pledges due to the latter's lack of scholastic presence. Indeed, another 154 pledges were added to the ranks during the fall semester of 1954, and IFC began to see the need of increasing its constituency to equal that of Panhellenic. By November the matter of expansion had passed beyond idle discussion and IFC cryptically recorded in its minutes that: "Discussion then centered around the possibility of a new fraternity being colonized on the campus. The secrecy of this matter was urged and until such time that this discussion may be revealed, it will not appear in the minutes".⁷⁵

What ultimately did appear was a newly organized but poorly disguised social club labeled Chi Sigma which was unanimously admitted into IFC on January 10, 1955, and became a "recognized club" the following day. Whitehead, himself a Lambda Chi Alpha by virtue of an honorary initiation occurring while he was at Cincinnati, assumed a temporary faculty sponsorship. In September, Chi Sigma received a national charter and became the more easily recognized Sigma Chi in accordance with the "secret" plan devised by IFC and the Dean of Students Office the previous fall. The sponsorship passed to Fred Warn of the Geology Department and later to Earl Camp of Biology.

So it came to pass that by the middle of the decade which saw the rise of Elvis and Fats Domino that the social clubs had died by a method of deliberate transformation. The little comings and goings which comprised the routine for their members for a quarter of a century were to be left behind. And yet in the misty mental hinterland where memory distills fact into tradition, the old social clubs retained their influence on procedure, on the ways and means by which the new Greek-letter organizations

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, minutes, November 14, 1954, 6 quoted November 21, 2.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, January 9, 1954, 1; Whitehead interview; Sigma Chi file, in files of Assistant Dean of Students or Programs.

began to function. “I’m not making invidious comparisons,” remarked a faculty sponsor about her group changing from club to sorority, “but there is so much more involved in the development of any organization than human beings. You don’t just cut them all out like little paper dolls, put their little dresses on them and say ‘Now you’re a Kappa or you’re a Pi Phi.’”⁷⁶

The social clubs, better or worse, have left their mark on the Greek system at Texas Tech – a mark that, while it has grown less distinct, is, in all probability, indelible.

⁷⁶ Jenkins interview.

Part Four

Being a short condensation of various factors which led to the formation of that area known as Greek Circle; also certain noteworthy customs and habits of Greeks and other students are herein enumerated.

More than a year after the Board of Directors of Texas Technological College initially approved the admission of fraternities and sororities, that same Board clarified the status of the prohibition on housing which it had originally imposed. The clarification, issued on August 8, 1953, granted permission to the Greeks to secure off-Campus facilities “suitable for a meeting place and storage for a maximum time of twelve months”. Residential quarters were again specifically prohibited as had been the case in the 1952 decision. The Board further specified that both “location and terms of the lease must be approved by the President of the College”.⁷⁷ It was with this decision, then, that the lodge system was established at Texas Tech instead of the more standard residential house system. And by giving the president specific control over off-campus lodge facilities, the Board indicated that the Greeks were responsible to the administration.

Yet the Board was aware that Greeks being on campus suggested a change in various student affairs policies, some which has been in force for nearly two and a half decades. Concurrent with the policy clarification regarding Greek housing, the Board directed President E. N. Jones to ask the Attorney General for an opinion advising the Board if it had the “power to enter into a long-term agreement with campus fraternities and sororities, whereby the College would lease land for use as a building site for a lodge by the Greek-letter Societies”.⁷⁸

On September 14, 1953, President Jones wrote then Texas Attorney General John Ben Shepperd requesting that opinion on leasing “Fraternities and sororities sufficient space on the campus of the college for the building of a lodge first, and later construct a fraternity (or sorority house around the lodge as a nucleus”. Jones added a question of his own (which has been raised during a conversation with Assistant Attorney General Jesse Lutton on August 28) concerning the period of the proposed leases, should they be legal. He also expressed that the “Board of Directors, the Dean of Student Life,

⁷⁷ Minutes of the Board of Directors of Texas Technological College, August 8, 1953, in Marshal Pennington to Grover Murray, memorandum, August 8, 1953, in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

Dean of Men, Dean of Women, and I are in complete agreement that...location on campus will make possible a much more efficient, consistent, and desirable type of supervision". Although Jones envisioned that "after the lapse of some years the lodge will be enlarged to include the usual sleeping quarters and meal serving provisions", he maintained having lodges "scattered throughout the city, even reasonably close to the college, will create problems which are inevitable because of neighbors who are not particularly sympathetic with even the normal habits of young people living in groups."

Furthermore, Jones expressed concern that the "democratic spirit in the student body" might be reduced by a cleavage between the fraternity and sorority group on the one hand and other students on the other hand, if lodges were not under close...college supervision." The President also maintained that a uniform style of architecture was necessary in order to prevent "any one or more of the organizations from building expensive lodges and later houses to the disparagement of the other organizations."⁷⁹

Assistant Attorney General Bill E. Lee replied to President Jones several weeks later stating that existing legislation made it necessary for the Legislature of Texas to specifically authorize the Board of Directors to make the proposed series of leases. That opinion meant that for Texas Tech to lease part of its spacious and rather uncrowded campus to Greek-letter organizations would require a legislative act prior to the Board of Directors doing anything. "You will note," Lee added, "that the Legislature has enabled the University of Texas and Texas A&M College to lease their lands without limitation as to term, or for certain stipulated terms," thus conveniently separating the sheep from the goats in Texas higher education.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ E. N. Jones to John Ben Shepperd, letter, September 14, 1953, in Pennington to Murray memorandum.

⁸⁰ Billy E. Lee to E. N. Jones, letter, September 29, 1953, in Pennington to Murry memorandum. A&M and U.T. have continually occupied a somewhat favored position in the domain of Texas politics/money/education. When the Texas Constitution of 1876 was adopted, it provided for a "university of the first class", meaning U.T., and later for all practical purposes, A&M. Each was subsequently granted large tracts of land in barren West Texas. The idea was that the income derived from gazing a few intrepid cattle on this land would be assigned what was (and is) called a Permanent University Fund. But oil and gas were found, and U.T. and A&M suddenly found themselves well-healed petroleum producers. Other Texas colleges and universities do not share this income.

But regardless of the rather apparent step-child status assigned by law, it is clear that Tech administration was initially thinking in terms of residential house system eventually supplanting the lodge system established by the Board of Directors. It is equally clear that the administration was greatly concerned with maintaining rather strict controls on that emerging lodge system, lest the Greeks transgress the rather traditional social folkways of Lubbock. And given a surface examination, those folkways seemed formidable indeed. For example, due to an intense Protestant ethic related to tipping which was held by a vocal minority, Lubbock had yet to recover from the national disgrace of prohibition – something more impious cities (or urbane, depending upon one’s perspective) did in 1934. And like the old prohibition, being dry in Lubbock was more law than fact, and those who chose to tipple were either making weekend trips, or were regularly supplied by enterprising bootleggers traveling north from Midland-Odessa, east from New Mexico, or South from that liquid peccadillo known affectionately as “Whiskey-rillo”. In any case, it behooved the Tech Administration to establish certain policies relating to lodges which included a no-nonsense ban on liquor, gambling, hazing, residential living, and other forms of sin which have generally made the fraternity system what it is. Moreover, social functions, obviously sans lubrication, were to be placed on the Dean of Women’s social calendar at least one week before that function was to occur. Chaperones were generally in order, and were specifically required “when women are present”, which was nothing new. Chaperones included “faculty members, parents of members and other persons approved by the Dean of Women”. The policies did not elaborate on precisely how the Dean selected these “other persons,” but there is little doubt that their characters were as forthright as their courageousness.⁸¹

But even arranging for the maintenance of decorum in the various lodges did not alter the fact that by lacking specific approval to lease college land, the administration was stymied in its attempts to

⁸¹ Policies Regarding the Use of Fraternity and Sorority Lodges, revised September 1967, in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs.

maintain that decorum in a centralized campus location. Too, the administration was faced with a growing problem caused by a lack of dormitory space for an expanding student population. That problem has been, and to some extent remains, a thorn in the sides of both students and administrators. Alternatively the need for more university owned, on campus housing has been voiced by students who were crowded off campus, and to their way of thinking often victimized by predatory capitalists. When these requests for additional on campus housing were answered by extensive and elaborate dormitory construction programs financed by bond issues underwritten by the college, the resulting “thou-shalt-live-on-campus-forever” stipulations elicited howls of protest from students, which, if sometimes justified, were equally fickle. In any event, the expansion of the Greek system in the mid-fifties corresponded with the general growth of student population and physical facilities. It was therefore quite logical for the administration to consider the possibility of housing fraternities and sororities on campus in dormitory-like abodes to be a segment of the larger problem of housing student in general. Thus could two problems be solved at once, and the perceived need to monitor the behavior of Greeks would dovetail with monitoring the civilian population residing in the dormitories.⁸²

These considerations crystalized in the spring of 1954 when President Jones requested a preliminary plan from the supervising architect dealing with housing fraternities and sororities on campus at the college expense, and with the understanding that each organization pay the current rate for that housing. Considerable research was undertaken, including a trip to the East Coast, to study existing facilities similar to those contemplated by Texas Tech. Out of these efforts came a proposal to build several large residential housing units for Greeks in the area now occupied by Thompson Gaston and Carpenter-Wells Halls. Although certain flexibilities were designed into the proposal (such as movable hall partitions allowing for variations in each group’s ability to absorb rooms), the Greeks

⁸² “Fraternity and Sorority Land”, compilation of a Campus Planning Committee report, February 23, 1960, in Pennington to Murray memorandum.

voiced disapproval from the standpoint of both housing and college control. Submitting a three page counterproposal during the autumn of 1954, the IFC and its respective alumni organizations noted that they could not identify any other college which “prefers the fraternity dormitory to fraternity houses”. IFC requested that Tech either build separate houses for each fraternity and lease them at fair market value, or deed (and/or sell) each fraternity land along the north side of Nineteenth Street (in the area now occupied by al-Gates, Hulen, Clement, Coleman Halls, and the Law School) and allow each group to construct its own house. Such construction, without architecture controls, was precisely what President Jones did not want.

A second proposal was presented by the administration to various Lubbock alumni in the spring of 1955. Containing certain refinements, the plan called for the construction of “master units consisting of three elements, one dormitory and two fraternity units, the fraternity units being separated by the dormitory unity” – this latter provision necessary to help insure the domestic tranquility. The plan also allowed for separate Greek dining facilities, as had been requested.⁸³

This amended proposal was again not precisely what the Tech Greeks desired, possibly because some of the more vocal alumni had lived out their undergraduate days in sorority or fraternity houses, and what they had done was rather by definition what Tech ought to do. But these same alumni would have to pay for their groups’ respective residential houses, and with real estate valuation being the better part of fraternal valor, they began to perceive all sorts of reasons to recommend the civilian dormitory-fraternity facility. In short, if Tech, as a state institution, saw cause to increase its campus hotel business and still make special dispensation for Greek residents, then both alumni and undergraduates opted for accommodation.⁸⁴

⁸³ *Ibid.*; Fraternity Housing, n.d., n.p., (ca. autumn 1954), in minutes of the Interfraternity Council.

⁸⁴ “Fraternity and Sorority Land”, in Pennington to Murry memorandum.

The State of Texas did not. Replying to President Jones' inquiry regarding the legality of the proposal in November 1955, the Attorney General's office stated: "It is the obvious Legislative intent that no such building be used exclusively by fraternal groups, and this prohibition extends also to a part of such a building dedicated to such exclusive use. To constitute an "exclusive use" does not mean that the fraternity is the only occupier of the dormitory, but here applied, means that its use, even of a portion, is a proprietary use and not a use by the student body generally."⁸⁵

The attorney General's opinion, based upon recent acts of the Legislature, thus burst balloons carried by both administration and Greeks. The Greeks were reduced to an off-campus, non-residential lodge system in order to conform to the policy set by the board of Directors, and this they did not want, given the proposed alternatives. Simultaneously the administration, and particularly the Dean of Students Office, was reduced to rather regularly putting out off campus brush fires fueled by what a few of the more righteous Lubbock citizens felt to be "wild" fraternity boys. (True, there were "wild" sorority ladies as well, but at least until the early-seventies, their "wildness" was largely confined to the smoking-behind-the-barn variety.)

In any case, students still sought on campus housing in the mid-fifties. To meet their demands, Texas Tech obligated itself for nearly nine million dollars of revenue bonds, and built Weeks, Thompson, Gaston, Carpenter, and Wells residence halls. Texas Tech also obligated students to live in those halls so that the bond issue might be retired.⁸⁶ Although this subsequently brought about student complaints, it became clear that requiring most students, both Greek and non-Greek, to serve some time in the dormitories had positive aspects. Chief among these was that each could see that they had many common interests and concerns as students. The Sigma Kappa, or, in fact, Kappa Sigma, living next to or with an independent found that those who shower together, eat together. And the Delta Gamma who

⁸⁵ E. N. Jones to John Ben Shepperd, letter, November 15, 1955; Billy E. Lee to E. N. Jones, letter, November 29, 1955, both in Pennington to Murry memorandum.

⁸⁶ "Fraternity and Sorority Land", in Pennington to Murray memorandum.

lived down the hall from the Alpha Phi realized that one did not have to pull the other's hair to make a point. Indeed, more than any other single factor, the dormitory system has done more to moderate ill-feeling between Greeks and non-Greeks, and Greeks and Greeks than anything else at Texas Tech.

But it did not negate all problems. Concurrent with the housing question was a lesser if non less interesting, matter regarding the Dean of Women's serenade policy. Serenades, and other forms of more or less musical expression, had long been a part of the American college scene. Tech was no exception, as, at least on a limited basis, the practice had originated with the old social clubs and for the most part commanded a godly number of practitioners until the late sixties. Serenading was usually occasioned by a pinning (whereby a young lady came into possession of the badge of a particular young man's fraternity – or more if she were cagy) or dropping (whereby a young lady came into possession of a young man's Greek letters which were fastened to a small chain and "dropped" about her neck). Of course, serenading was not limited to Greeks; a young lady dropped to a civilian wore a Double-T. It is not recorded if this practice required a serenade, and if so, solo.⁸⁷

In any case, the perceived problem with serenading was not necessarily the somewhat untuneful renderings offered by sweatered fraternity boys standing beneath spreading Chinese Elms, but rather that it was all too easy for the occasion to lose its decorum. For experience taught that indecorous young men were just the sort of folk from whom panty raids were manufactured. The problem was predicated by the fact that both serenades and panty raids tended, like other varieties of sin, to occur at night, particularly after the women's dorms had closed, all inhabitants accounted for and presumably safely tucked abed. (Men, obviously needing less supervision than women, had no dorm hours.) It thus became necessary for the harried but sympathetic Dean of Women, Florence Phillips, to require that serenades be scheduled through the given dormitory in which the particular lady resided.

⁸⁷ At other colleges being "dropped" was called being 'lavaliered'. It may thus be assumed that French was not in vogue at Tech; being lavaliered never caught on. And being dropped was not nearly as serious as being pinned.

This sort of rear-guarded action to preserve propriety – often part of a dean’s job – was not highly regarded by the melodious fraternities, as scheduling anything (or in fact operating on a fixed schedule) has not ever been one of their more noteworthy successes.⁸⁸

The matter of scheduling serenades struck a sour note with the fraternity boys and elicited more than a moderate amount of comment in IFC. An Alpha Tau Omega representative, possessing all the charming physio gamy of a pit bulldog, and who, ironically, was an excellent singer and later a high school choir teacher maintained: “That serenaded be held within one hour after the dorms close. He also suggested that the dorm mother be notified of the serenade. It was the general opinion of the Council that serenades should not have to be scheduled a certain time in advance. An example was given that if a man is pinned in the afternoon, and if his girl isn’t serenaded that night, the novelty wears off.”⁸⁹

Yet being novel was relative. One indignant senior wrote Dean Phillips that upon a certain night in May he had observed a fraternity and sorority blocking the entrance to Weeks Hall. He justifiably noted: “Sorority girls have late permission but the other girls do not, and it is very inconvenient to have to push through the crowd...The couple for whom the serenade was being held showed deep affection publicly during this ceremony. The couple held a mouth-to-mouth kiss while the people present counted to the number 36...Every serenade I have observed at Tech has displayed the couple showing affection. Nothing has ever been done. The sorority girls have never received an ODA...I demand to know why. I assure the Dean that this display of affection is standard for serenades, and I find it difficult to believe the Deans office is unaware of this...if nothing is done copies of this letter will be sent to the Board of

⁸⁸ Serenade Policy, n.d., in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs.

⁸⁹ Minutes of the Interfraternity Council, October 30, 1955. The writer referred to Bill Cormack, who, if not particularly easy on the eyes, was easy on the ears. He later taught choir at Amarillo Tascosa during the mid-sixties where the writer’s future wife was his lead soprano. Coincidentally, this entry was made twenty years to the day from that upon which Cormack expressed himself to IFC.

Directors, State Representative McIhaney, the Lubbock Avalanche Journal, and officials of the State Government.”⁹⁰

Indeed reference to ODA – obvious display of affection – was enough to cause concerns (if caught) to most Tech coeds. Dean Phillips requested an explanation of Mrs. Dorothy Garner of the dormitory staff, who signed herself with a resolutely Tech title as “Coordinator – Women’s Supervision.” Coordinator Garner stated “no young woman serenade, sorority or non-sorority, has been given an ODA for the kiss which is given by the young man.” Garner asserted that “the kiss at this time is as traditional as the kiss of the bridal couple at a wedding,” which is about as chaste as is possible.⁹¹ But chaste or not, an ODA was about as serious a write-up as a young lady could receive, particularly a sorority lady, who might well be called before the personnel committee of her organization for being loose, or at least lacking discretion. One sorority, however, gave the impression of being immune to ODA’s; Kappa Kappa Gamma, known collectively as the Kappa Nuns, regularly won Panhellenic scholarship trophy, probably because they lacked anything else to do. For to receive an ODA was to be overtly obvious, and being obvious was precisely what the policy prohibited, partially to shield the traditionally dateless such as the Kappa Nuns. For if kissing were forbidden in or near the dorms, it was not in whatever parking lot might be proximal. And while those lots were later patrolled by campus police, the promises made and covenants produced off campus in the back seats of cars or handy apartments had a way of being ever so human. For regardless of a student’s object of affection, the bittersweet and curious chemistry of youth, both learning to think and to act, could not be denied. And it was an understanding Dean Philips and Dean Jones who, if they had to put down their respective feet, did so only firmly enough to make a point, not to cause injury.

⁹⁰ James V. Simpson to Florence Phillips letter, May 9, 1966, in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs. This case was not particularly exceptional. The 1966 date indicates principally the social mores which then obtained.

⁹¹ Dorothy Garner to Florence Philips, memorandum, May 17, 1966, in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs.

However, serenading practices in particular and male reaction to female residential living in general was not solely the product of Dean Philips and personnel in the housing office. The Association of Women Students – the AWS – not only helped set policy regarding women’s dormitory hours, but generally coordinated most all women’s programs on campus. Yet its strength lay in the women’s residence halls for therein was a mosaic of coed life at Tech: Greek and independent; the good, the bad, and the uncertain of each. The AWS was thus an extremely persuasive student organization, even more so than W.I.C.C., or Panhellenic, although many AWS officers were Greeks. It rather effectively set the framework of women’s residential life – and in the main with the consent of the governed. But in 1968 a secession movement began under the label Women’s Residence Council, and because AWS drew most of its strength from the dorms, it was eventually splintered apart. By the autumn of 1970 it was dead. Yet in its 41 years tenure it significantly influenced women’s policy, the nuts and bolts rules and regulations at Tech, almost as much as Dean or Housing. Among its legacy are such Tech traditions as Dad’s Day and the Carol of Lights.⁹²

It is apparent, then, that because of a series of intermeshed factors: the ban on residential fraternal houses, the legal restriction precluding the Tech administration from providing on campus housing for Greeks, the growth of the dormitory system and the necessity to pay for it, the sometimes trivial social sorts of problems such as serenading and dating mores, all served to establish a system of accepted practices and customs relating Greeks not only to the housing system but to the campus as a whole. In large measure these still remain.

Indeed, those incidents drawing the attention and action from both Greeks and administration are almost identical to those which still occur and which still command one variety of alacrity or another.

⁹² University Daily, September 21, 1970, 1; Genelyn Cannon to Grover Murry, letter. January 16 1967, in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs. Miss Cannon was president of the Association of Women Students.

Excerpts from the Interfraternity Council Minutes

“Gene Brown told of some trouble Sigma Nu had with the Lubbock Hotel. The cloak room had been torn up on the same night Sigma Nu was having a dance in the hotel. The Lubbock Hotel cancelled all further reservations Sigma Nu had...Dean (James) Whitehead talked to the manager...”⁹³

“Bill Cormack reminded the council that Alpha Tau Omega had not lost their charter; they have been placed on social probation by their national office because of bad grades...Bob Beckham appointed Bill Cormack as chaplain for the next meeting.”⁹⁴

“Bob Beckham said a lot of money goes into the building of floats, and his fraternity was dissatisfied with the judges of the parade. He said he has heard that some floats were graded down because they did not follow the homecoming theme.”⁹⁵

“Mixers with the sororities were discussed with representatives from Panhellenic. The representatives explained to the Council that if it did not decide to accept the schedule concerning mixers that they had to present, that the sororities would not share in the mixer expenses.”⁹⁶

“A representative from Koens Photography discussed fraternity pictures.”⁹⁷

“Gene Steel reported as chairman of the committee on intramural sports. He announced he had received no cooperation from the intramural department.”⁹⁸

“Jim Strawn reported that the rush pamphlets needed stamping. It was suggested that each fraternity send a pledge to complete this work.”⁹⁹

⁹³ Minutes of the Interfraternity Council, November 20, 1955.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid., November 5, 1956. Panhellenic’s schedule was voted down nine to nothing.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid., November 19, 1956.

⁹⁹ Ibid., December 3, 1956.

“Scott Hickman then read a letter from the March of Dimes Drive. He then proposed that IFC support the March of Dimes by having an all-star basketball game, charging admission, and giving the proceeds to the March of Dimes.”¹⁰⁰

“Bill Jones then asked for the cooperation of the IFC members in the forthcoming Pajama Dance of Kappa Sigma. He stated that no shorty pajamas should be worn and that other costumes should be conservative.”¹⁰¹

“Bob Laughlin then made a report on insuring men who take part in the Intermural sports program.”¹⁰²

“Ray Moore informed IFC of an incident in which eight pledges of Phi Kappa Psi were caught “rolling” a member of Phi Kappa Psi on November 9th. The campus police caught the men, questioned them and reported the incident to Dean Whitehead’s Office.”¹⁰³

“Ray Gressett explained the disappearance of Phi Delta Theta’s bell and the Phi Gamma Delta Owl.”¹⁰⁴

Yet these sorts of rather mundane problems did not alter the more general Greek housing problem. With the construction of Weeks, Thompson-Gatson, and Carpenter-Wells Residence Halls in the late fifties, it became obvious that little accommodation could be reached between administration and fraternities and sororities, ironically so as each group had been at least able to approach a compromise prior to the Attorney General’s ruling. Thus the new dormitories had no provision for segregation by social affiliation as the administration had initially hoped to achieve. Left to their own devices, the Tech Greeks, and particularly the various alumni associations joined ranks to affect some sort of solution. What was devised eventually became Greek Circle.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., January 7, 1957.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., February 11, 1957.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid., November 24, 1958. This writer is unclear exactly what “rolling” was, but no doubt it was sinful.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

Dissatisfaction with the existing housing situation had, of course, long fueled the fires of discontent voiced by the undergraduate Greeks, particularly those who chose not to understand the true situation. “Texas Tech is still archaic in that it clings to the idea of ‘no fraternity housing’ for our system”, wrote an irate IFC member to Dean Glen Nygreen of Kent State University early in 1957. “The only proposals made by the IFC for housing have even blocked by an entrenched and all-powerful administration”, which was precisely not the case. IFC, in point of fact, had gone on record as being appreciative of “the work the administration was doing on housing”, although it, like Panhellenic and alumni associations had held out too long. Understanding this, a group of Lubbock and area alumni agreed to take positive steps to secure adequate and appropriate off campus facilities.¹⁰⁵

During the autumn of 1958, these alumni had filed articles of incorporation with the Texas Secretary of State in order to establish the Texas Tech Interfraternity Housing Corporation. The stated objective were “to acquire land for the purpose of providing housing and meeting places for student organizations of Texas Technological College, without profit to the corporation, such facilities when completed to be owned and operated by student organizations on a non-profit basis”.

Twenty prominent Lubbock citizens formed the first Board of Directors of the Housing Corporation which was chartered for a term of fifty years, and without intention of issuing capital stock.

106

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, January 7, 1957.

¹⁰⁶ “Articles of Incorporation of the Texas Tech Interfraternity Housing Corporation”, in Pennington to Murray memorandum. Directors of the housing corporation were: Fern Cone, Norman Igo, J. C. Chambers, Nelson G. Terry, Mrs. R. A. Jennings, Joe M. Jenkins, Thomas Duggan, Jr., Mrs. G. R. Bowen, J. R. Moxley, Mrs. Tom S. Milman, Mrs. W. W. Carroll, Lois Alexander, Mrs. Catherine P. Elle, Mrs. W. B. Rushing, Earl D. Camp, Robert Maxey, Mrs. Bill Coker, Charles B. Jones, Pat S. Moore, and W. B. Rushing. At the same time that the housing corporation was being launched, it came to the attention of Deans Allen and Jones, among others, that certain of the fraternities had come into possession of a pornographic film featuring the infamous Candy Barr. Admission had been charged to more than a few bug-eyes and panting fraternity boys. The film even filtered into Gordon Hall at one point, and later attracted the attention of the FBI which was closely following Mexican important of the eight millimeter variety directed at an audience whose brains were little larger. Dean Allen went before IFC on September 29, 1958; a special committee was appointment and on October 27, “gave...a report concerning pornographic films”. Minutes of the Interfraternity Council, September 29, October 27, 1958; Lewis N. Jones to David Nail, conversation, November 14, 1975.

The housing corporation then began looking about for a suitable parcel of land upon which to build something approaching a West Texas/Texas Tech “Fraternity Drag,” albeit of the non-residential sort. Several factors immediately suggested themselves: zoning requirements limited fraternity and sorority lodges to the same sort of restrictions imposed upon apartments; whatever land which might be obtained should allow for expansion, given the assumption that the number of chapters comprising the Tech Greek system would increase; proximity to campus was desirable, more so for convenience than college control. Several areas were considered, including one southwest of Tech property in the vicinity of Raleigh and Quaker, and between the Brownfield Highway and Nineteenth Street. However, interest settled on what was commonly called the “Turner Tract” due to it being owned by a family of that name. The unplatted parcel of land lay east of Quaker, between Thirteenth and Sixteenth Streets and was bounded on the east by college property. It had not been part of the main campus bounded by Fourth, Nineteenth, Quaker, and College Avenue (not University Avenue).¹⁰⁷ Indeed interest in the 25 acre Turner Tract had been voiced by various Lubbock alumni as early as June 1957, when an informal committee (composed of several members of the subsequent fraternity housing corporation) had approached the owner, Mrs. Lizzie Turner. However, it was not until November 1958, that a contract was signed between Mrs. Turner and the Texas Tech Interfraternity Housing Corporation. Sale price of the Turner Tract, which later became Greek Circle, was \$75,000. The twenty sororities and fraternities then at Tech each contributed \$3,750 to the housing corporation to fund the initial purchase price. An additional amount was later assessed each group to pay for taxes. The housing corporation retained the

¹⁰⁷ “Fraternity and Sorority Land”, in Pennington to Murray memorandum. In the early twenties, the Texas legislature provided \$150,000 and the citizens of Lubbock assembles \$77,828 in order to purchase the 2,008 of the original campus.

title to the property until it was platted and streets and utilities added which were funded on a pro rata basis by each group.¹⁰⁸

The college, however, continued to review its efforts to establish Greek facilities on campus during the time that the housing corporation was forming, and later as it came into possession of the Turner Tract. One short-lived Tech consideration involved allotting space along the Brownfield Highway – otherwise rather hopefully labeled the “Tech Freeway” – near the existing Army Reserve and National Guard armories. But the Board of Directors had offered this area to the Navy so that it too might have a new armory, thereby providing a sort of interservice parade along the south side of Fourth Street. (The Navy was several years in responding.) Another proposal involved allotting land north of the Tech Freeway near the underpass leading to the college farm (containing, obviously, the attendant pungent barnyard odor). This proposal was dismissed as the underpass was not large enough to accommodate a large traffic volume (not to mention the malodorous atmosphere.) Locations north of Fourth Street were quickly discarded due to the fact they would be as far, or farther, from the campus as the Turner Tract.¹⁰⁹

Realizing the college’s concerns, the corporation early in 1960 proposed that an exchange be made: the Turner Tract (then, of course, given over to agriculture) for college agriculture land along the north side of Nineteenth Street, from Flint Avenue to Brownfield Highway. President Jones directed Vice President M. L. Pennington to inquire as to the legality of the matter, and Pennington sent a letter to college counsel, R. Briggs Irvin. By mid-February Pennington reported that Irvin had informed him that while such an exchange would not be illegal, it would require the sanction of the Legislature, as title rested with the state rather than the college. Pennington also noted that Irvin raised a “dollars and

¹⁰⁸ Mr. Charles Jones to David Nail, interview, November 19, 1975, notes in author’s files. Jones, an attorney, was active in the housing corporation through his fraternity, Phi Gamma Delta, and later served as chairman of the corporation.

¹⁰⁹ “Fraternity and Sorority Land”, in Pennington to Murray memorandum.

cents” question, meaning that the “values of the two tracts would need to be adjusted and would require the services of a qualified appraiser.”¹¹⁰ The Campus Planning Committee, chaired by crusty Leo Urbanovsky of the Parks and Horticulture Department, was more direct. “The exchange would not be trading agriculture land for agriculture land, but would be trading land on which college buildings will be constructed probably within the next thirty years, for land which could be used for only agricultural purposes.” The committee also asked “would it be particularly appropriate for the back door of the fraternities and sororities to be the front door of much of the college?”¹¹¹ So the college backed out.

The housing corporation on the other hand was down but not out. The IFC and Panhellenic were, curiously, up. By 1962 two sororities (Phi Mu and Chi Omega) and two fraternities (Delta Tau delta and Kappa Alpha Order) had been added to the Tech Greek system. All but Delta Tau Delta, which appeared on the campus in 1957, arrived after the housing corporation was formed and therefore were unable to be a part of the Turner Tract. The solution to this inequity was simply to acquire more land in order to accommodate not only the three **unpropertied** groups, but any others which at some future date might present themselves. (The expansion of the Tech Greek system since the late fifties will be considered later.) The acquisition of more land translated into more contiguous land, for land anywhere else would physically divide the groups, and to do that would be to dilute the concept of a separate Greek area. But to provide contiguous land meant returning to the administration and Board of Directors of Texas Tech with another proposition, and this the housing corporation was prepared to do.

Strangely enough both administration and Board were favorably disposed to sell a ten acre parcel of land to the housing corporation as requested. The administration again turned to the Campus Planning Committee for recommendations as to the ten acres which might most conveniently be unloaded. That committee eventually recommended ten acres of Tech agricultural land immediately

¹¹⁰ M. L. Pennington to R. Briggs Irvin, letter, February 10, 1960; R. Briggs Irvin to M. L. Pennington, letter, February 15, 1960, both in Pennington to Murray memorandum.

¹¹¹ “Fraternity and Sorority Land”, in Pennington to Murray memorandum.

north of the housing corporation property along Quaker Avenue. All this pleasant accommodation did not take into account the Texas Legislature which still held final authority in the sale of Tech land to private concerns. Assembled in the autumn of 1963 was the Fifty-eighth Legislature, and it too smiled providentially upon the ten acres north of the Turner Tract. Senate Bill Twenty-five authorized the Board of Directors of Texas Technological College to “sell and convey...certain land in the City of Lubbock, Lubbock County, Texas...(at) a sum not less than its appraised value at the time of sale.” Specific articles instructed the Board that three independent appraisals would be required, that the land must be utilized only by sororities and fraternities having national charters, and that no state funds could be used to build or equip any lodge. ¹¹²

There was, naturally, a catch. That catch was that proceeds of the sale were to become part of the General Revenue Fund of the State of Texas, and not part of anything controlled by the Board of Directors. And it was that catch that stuck in the craw of the Board and is the reason that Greek Circle separated the haves from the have nots. ¹¹³

¹¹² ibid., S. B. 25, 58th Legislature, 1965.

¹¹³ ibid.

Part Five

Being a conclusion to this modest effort, wherein are related certain of the comings and goings of the sororities and fraternities during the recent years.

During those late years of what has rather pretentiously been labeled the “Fabulous Fifties,” Texas Tech was an educational institution rapidly losing the somewhat lethargic bonds which held it to the past. In 1958, enrollment had yet to surpass 10,000; two years later it approached 12,000. By the 1964-1965 school year, enrollment reached nearly 16,000.¹¹⁴

This growth, at Tech and throughout the nation, was caused by several factors: the post-war baby boom swelled the ranks of those who ventured off to college; those who had not possessed opportunity to so venture now commanded increased scholarships, grants, slide rules, and other tools necessary to help slay the dragon of sputnik. The public complacency assigned research science and applied technology was rudely punctured by a fireball in the night, in orbit around the earth and weighing but 184 pounds. Sputnik was what one historian later said, “a psychological Pearl Harbor” which “led to a critical comparison of the American educational system, already under fire as too easy-going, with that of the Soviet Union.” What were considered to be frills were replaced with what were considered to be more solid subjects, in a manner that substituted “square foot for square dancing.”¹¹⁵

Of course materially, Americans had both the most and the best, but in some respects seemed possessed by their possessions. Simultaneously, if rather ironically, the emerging science and technology of the space race of the late fifties and beyond required such an amount of research and application that new products were inevitable. Mushrooming concepts and processes were rapidly put to work in public and private laboratories across the nation in a burst of collective activity which had not been seen in America since the war effort. Each new machine and technique had the possibility of changing most others with which it came into contact. As these changes accelerated, often far above the bulk of society, they nonetheless began to percolate down into that society. Visual spectrum cathode ray tubes

¹¹⁴ Fifteenth Annual Catalog, Texas Tech University, 1975-1976, 432.

¹¹⁵ Thomas A. Bailey, The American Pageant, Boston, 1961, 953-954. Although the “Sputnik Crisis”, failed to generate outright federal scholarships, Congress did authorize \$887,000,000 in 1958 for loans and grants to needy college students, and for the improvement of teaching the sciences and languages. Additional money was channeled into research projects in colleges and universities throughout the nation.

ushered in color television, almost frictionless chemical coatings covered electric frying pans, micro-integrated circuits and transistors revolutionized existing computers and fueled a dependency for complex machine answers – if less reasonable human ones. Technology fed itself. And American (technical) education contributed a great deal of that feed, although it was not exactly responsible for the resulting bill. Technological education was not only necessary, but also in vogue. So was Texas Technological College.

Tech students were insulated by time and understanding from the less routine of these technological advances, although they, like everyone else, consumed the products. The stylish red-lipped coed of the late fifties was ordinarily the skirt-and-sweater sort, rather pragmatically coiffured by neatly combed and curled short hair. Mid-calf length dresses, often petti coated, were set off by carefully rolled white socks and black suede penny loafers. Blue jeans, then only rarely worn by coeds outside the dormitory, were cuffed to expose the sock top; flopping shirt tail and pony-tail established a casual ensemble. Males in blue jeans were rather more usual (particularly among agricultural students, who then wore short crowned cowboy hats), although the monotony was occasionally broken by pleated and baggy pants held aloft by thin belts. Very little, however, broke the **bigendered** monotony of white socks. In fact, as a holdover from the **bobby-sockers** of the forties, white socks stayed alive (outside gyms) until the mid-sixties. Male **shirtings** were most regularly either plaid or white, each with flat fly-away collars. On formal occasions females adopted strapless evening gowns which were held aloft by acts of Providence and abundant petticoats. Thusly attired, female tottered about on three-inch spike heels. On these formal occasions, crewcut males exchanged white socks for white sport coats (and sometimes an attendant pink carnation), black slacks, and a thin bow tie.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁶ Referral to those issues of the La Ventana from 1957 to 1960 will confirm the general fashion vogue of that period.

Dances at the Student Union Building, otherwise the SUB, attracted the casually dressed, particularly to such occurrences as sock hops, which were nothing more than unshod dances wherein white socks were displayed by all. At these sorts of occasions, and too, at the more formal, such memorable bands as the “Sultans of Swing”, and lesser known but rising local groups such as Buddy Holly and the Crickets (or Holley as spelled by his Lubbock parents) provided the requisite bop music. Homecoming parades still flourished as did train trips to the Big Game, which got even bigger with Tech’s entry into the Southwest Conference competition in 1961. Tech was even able to field its own home-grown All-American in E.J. Holub.¹¹⁷

Yet, if Tech students were insulated from the somewhat amorphous technological flux, they were not from the social flux which more readily lent itself to media exposure. Beginning in 1950 with McLaurin v. Board of Regents (University of Oklahoma) and Sweat v. Painter (University of Texas), the Supreme Court began to crack the tough nut that was racial segregation in public educational institutions. In 1954, that nut was cracked with the decision rendered in Brown v. Board of Education. It was subsequently specified that desegregation should proceed with “all deliberate speed”. And while compliance was deliberately and painfully slow in some places, it was inevitable in all.

Tech, like most Texas colleges, was initially established by the Legislature as a white-only school. And when the Board of Directors was faced with conforming to the Brown decision and various other federal directives, it reasoned that what the Legislature had adopted, the Legislature should remove. The issue was, of course, volatile, and it was only during the second summer term of 1961 (and then only after a bid of pressure) that black students were quietly and rather uneventfully admitted – possibly because the local news and media was deliberately not informed.¹¹⁸ Since blacks were admitted to Tech, their numbers have grown rather slowly, due in part to the somewhat limited regional

¹¹⁷ La Ventana, vol. XXXII, 1957, 67; University Daily, November 3, 1972, 1.

¹¹⁸ Kline A. Nall and Jane G. Rushing, Evolution of a University: Texas Tech’s First Fifty Years, Austin, 1975, 121-123.

black population base. But regardless of their numbers, where there were students, there were alumni organizations of various sororities and fraternities not far behind. And as education for blacks had for so long generally been operating under the assumed compatibility of the terms separate and equal, there existed black Greek-letter sororities and fraternities – separate and equal. The establishment of black organizations as part of the Tech Greek system was thus merely a matter of time. Yet long before black fraternal organization came to Texas Tech, that college’s Greek system had expanded.

College Panhellenic, having observed the successful colonization and chartering of Alpha Chi Omega and Delta Gamma in 1954, and shortly thereafter, Alpha Phi and Sigma Kappa, saw need to add another group. During the spring and summer of 1955 – while IFC was acknowledging the chartering of Sigma Chi – the Tech Panhellenic completed expansion plans as prescribed by NPC. Gamma Phi Beta was invited to colonize in October, following the regular Panhellenic rush. That rush saw 201 coeds pledge, rather equally divided among the then existing chapters. In order to secure a number roughly in parity, and to establish a viable colony, the national Gamma Phi Beta office arranged for the transfer of Joan Knight who was an initiated member of that sorority’s chapter at the University of Missouri. Miss Knight, who for a while would serve as an active chapter of one, was charged with being both colonizer and pledge trainer. Panhellenic arranged the necessary special open rush and by the spring of 1956, what would become Beta Tau chapter of Gamma Phi Beta had secured approximately 33 pledges.¹¹⁹ The newly formed alumnae association later established contact with those local individuals who were studying the matter of Greek housing.

The IFC also was considering expansion, and after a successful fall rush in 1956 (105 pledges) and spring rush in 1956 (255 pledges), there seemed to be ample justification for adding another fraternity.¹²⁰ In the autumn of 1956, a group of young men approached the Dean of Student Office with

¹¹⁹ La Ventana, Vol. XXXI, 1956, 187, 210-211.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 186.

the idea of forming a new fraternity, albeit not of the national variety, but with hopes in that direction. As had occurred with Chi Sigma/Sigma Chi, the young men had designs on a particular national fraternity, and the adopted name of Tau Delta Tau fooled few. As was later recorded, the principal goal of the group was to “create a more memorable social experience,” which over the years has certainly been evident. Other (and presumably lesser) goals included the encouragement of “higher scholastic attainment” and the promotion of a “better democratic and fraternal attitude between the chosen brothers.” Being among the chosen did not, obviously, register Tau Delta Tau as an official student organization, but on February 6, 1957, the group was approved by the Committee on Student Organizations and shortly it joined IFC. Dean Whitehead assumed temporary sponsorship. The following month Dean Allen wrote the Delta Tau Delta national office endorsing the Tech’s group petition for charter. “The young men who make up Tau Delta Tau are young men of unusually fine scholarship and character,” wrote the dean. “I recommend Tau Delta Tau to Delta Tau Delta fraternity as being worthy of being granted a charter.” Visits were arranged that spring whereby national representatives of Delta Tau Delta met with members of the local group. On May 23, 1957, word was received that the national had approved a charter. The letters were therefore rearranged and Texas Tech had a new national fraternity, bringing the total to ten so as to equal the number of sororities. Sponsorship of Epsilon Delta chapter of Delta Tau Delta passed to William Pasework of the Education Department, and he was duly initiated.¹²¹

Arriving when it did, Delta Tau Delta was the last fraternal organization to gain entry to the Interfraternity Housing Corporation and thereby assure itself of a place on what would become Greek Circle. In fact, even prior to chartering the national Delta Tau Delta office had made inquiry “regarding

¹²¹ Quoted from preamble of constitution of Tau Delta Tau fraternity, n.d., (ca. 1956); James G. Allen to whom it may concern (Delta Tau Delta Headquarters), letter, March 13, 1957; W. Edgar West to Joe D. Brown, letter, May 23, 1957; Hugh Shields to James Whitehead, letter, June 4, 1957; all in Delta Tau Delta files, in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs. West and Shields were Delta Tau Delta officials Brown was president of Tech’s Tau Delta Tau.

the temporary financing of the down payment” by area alumni. The housing corporation (or more precisely, those who were about to form that corporation) were quite agreeable to securing the additional participation as well as the additional revenue. As has been indicated, the housing situation during the summer and fall of 1957 was rather plastic. But given the perspective of the period, Dean Allen reported to Delta Tau Delta headquarters that “Everything looks as if it is going to work out fairly satisfactorily for our fraternity and sorority lodges, though of course I am old and at least hypothetically wise enough to know that something may intervene at any time.” As events developed, there were elements which did intervene, but only after Delta Tau Delta joined the housing corporation by virtue of a loan from national immediately following chartering.¹²²

With that chartering, two separate phases in the growth of the Tech Greek system could be identified. The first was the conversion of the local social clubs to national Greek-letter organizations. The second was the colonization of those sororities and fraternities which established themselves in time to become part of the Interfraternity Housing Corporation and to therefore be indistinguishable from those affiliated groups by having property at Greek Circle. These two phases of expansion produced ten sororities and a like number of fraternities. The third phase had, by the autumn of 1975, produced three additional sororities and four fraternities.

The third phase of expansion was initiated by College Panhellenic shortly after the arrival of Delta Tau Delta. Suggested by a combination of an increasing number of rushees and an attendant number of quota victims (being those unfortunate young ladies unable to pledge the sorority of their choice), Panhellenic recognized the need of another sorority. By the late spring of 1958, plans had been formulated, and Phi Mu was invited to colonize. Under the direction of Assistant Dean of Women Jacqueline Sterner, who served as Panhellenic sponsor, the expansion procedures differed little from

¹²² Hugh Shields to Joe D. Brown, letter, May 15, 1957; Shields to James Whitehead, letter, June 21, 1957; James G. Allen to Shields, letter, July 25, 1957, all in Delta Tau Delta file, on file in Dean of Students Office, Texas Tech University.

those employed in the addition of Gamma Phi Beta. Following formal fall rush, Panhellenic arranged a special open rush for Phi Mu. This proved successful, and moving with a speed unusual for sorority ladies, a charter was granted that October. By the spring semester, 1959, the sorority had acquired 58 members, 37 of whom had been initiated into Alpha Chi chapter of Phi Mu.¹²³

The Interfraternity Council also began to consider expansion, but first (or so it seemed to Dean Whitehead) it had to put its own houses in order regarding the use of alcohol. Old Demon Run had long been a part of fraternity life at Tech, but surreptitiously, as sneaking it about had always been part of its attraction. For, as has been mentioned, Tech established a prohibition on the “possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages at student functions or meetings held either on or off campus.” But anyone who faced reality realized that while the dormitories might be rather successfully sopped-up by shake downs and the like, what occurred off campus was much more difficult to police. And it was almost impossible if the tipping were done with discretion and moderation, which sometimes was the case.¹²⁴

The problem, as Dean Whitehead viewed it, was not one of the abuse of alcohol (although it was certainly abused by some), but rather one of conformance to regulations. In a lengthy memorandum to IFC in September of 1960, whitehead correctly maintained that “no fraternity is dry and many are more than mildly wet”. He suggested that the alcohol problem “is one that causes many to look the other way when discussing fraternity matters on the...campus” – which was the crux of the entire matter. “As a result of not complying with the policy,” Whitehead continued, “and with the apparent inability to openly discuss the subject in IFC, we as fraternity men, face the constant criticism of our own members

¹²³ La Ventana, Vol. XXXIV, 1959, 3, 48-49. Vol. XXXV, 1960, 46-47; Phi Mu semester report, May 27, 1959, on file in Dean of Students Office, Texas Tech University in Addition to handling the complexities of Panhellenic, Dean Sterner was charged with complexities of the college social calendar.

¹²⁴ James Whitehead to FC, memorandum, n.d. (ca. 1960), in minutes of the Interfraternity Council. Whitehead apparently referred to the complete prohibition of alcohol as enumerated in the a954 Code of Student Affairs, then still in effect

as well as that of the College.” For IFC had obligated itself through its own regulations to uphold (if not **tactly** help administer) applicable institutional policy. It could not in good faith ignore a policy its constituents rather freely violated, nor could various administrative officials.¹²⁵ Thus what came to the attention of both most regularly was not the single fact of drinking, but the subsequent actions of drunks. And what IFC chose to ignore – either partially or wholly, by design or default – rendered any solution to the dilemma difficult. Indeed it was not until 1968 that a revision of the Code of Student Affairs dropped off campus consumption by those over 21 from its list of sins. And while that tended to moderate administrative difficulties, it did nothing to solve the problem of alcohol abuse which later supplanted the more sensational abuse of other and harder drugs during the late sixties and early seventies.

While alcohol was, and remains, a problem among the Tech Greek system, it in no manner diluted the perceived need for new fraternities. Indeed by Yuletide 1960, a group of young men had banded together under the label “New Fraternity.” Apparently lacking overt designs on any particular national organization, a nucleus of 16 men was allowed to participate in an open rush under IFC supervision following the regular fall rush – a system quite familiar to Panhellenic. Shortly after the opening of spring semester, the New Fraternity had acquired 22 members, and again under IFC supervision prepared to participate in spring rush. Meeting at Lubbock’s Pancake House on March 1, 1961, IFC president Carlye Smith announced that Dean Allen had said grace over the group and that it had become a registered student organization. Smith further announced that “the new club is leaving to IFC the decision of recommending one of the following nation fraternities: Kappa Alpha, Lambda Chi Alpha, and Sigma Phi Epsilon.” The following week Dean Whitehead suggested that matter be cloaked in

¹²⁵ ibid.

secrecy “until contact with the various national fraternities is made.” This request is in order not to jeopardize any possibilities with the three national fraternities concerned”.¹²⁶

Thus was provided the first opportunity for the Tech IFC to actively consider which national fraternity to add to the existing system, as both the Sigma Chi and Delta Tau Delta expansions had been initially directed toward specific national fraternities. In the case of the New Fraternity, the membership had apparently narrowed the list of possibilities to three, any one of which would be suitable, and assigned IFC the responsibility for making the final selection. By mid-March the Dean of Students Office was in contact with the national offices of Kappa Alpha, Lambda Chi Alpha, and Sigma Phi Epsilon regarding the assimilation of the New Fraternity. The following month, positive replies were received from Kappa Alpha and Lambda Chi Alpha; both expressed a willingness to charter the New Fraternity by mid-October. The decision was left to IFC. Following the protocol of presentations, that body voted to accept the petition of Kappa Alpha on May 2, 1961. Gamma Chi chapter of Kappa Alpha Order was installed on September 2, 1961.¹²⁷

The establishment of Kappa Alpha gave IFC a total of 11 organizations, something that superficially seemed to suggest a game of one-upmanship with Panhellenic. Such was not truly the case, but Panhellenic appeared determined to keep matters unsymmetrical. For by the time that Kappa Alpha was chartered, Panhellenic proudly offered shelter to a new sorority colony – Chi Omega. Under the direction of Maryanne Reid, who had assumed duties from Dean Sterner in September, Panhellenic marched resolutely ahead with its special rush procedures which, due to such a regular use, appeared almost habit. Chi Omega reciprocated by confirming Panhellenic’s habit of successful colonial rushes. With chartering in February of 1962, Kappa Zeta Chapter of Chi Omega had amassed 61 young ladies, all

¹²⁶ Minutes of the Interfraternity Council, November 30, 1960; February 15, 1961; quoted, March 1 and March 8, 1961. IFC meetings were then rather regularly held either in the SUB or in the conference room of the Dean of Students Office. Nearly all meetings were opened with a prayer.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, April 19, May 2, 1961.

as wide-eyed as owls over their new fortune. Indeed, “Her eyes speak Chi Omega,” remarked the La Ventana in 1962. “It’s a new talk on campus and the newest sorority in Tech’s Greek world. You know her,” the annual confided, “the girl with the giggle in her laugh, the fun in her life, the sparkle in her eyes.”¹²⁸

While sparkling eyes might well have been indicative of a successful expansion rush, they did not moderate Panhellenic’s administrative responsibility for its own rush. Moreover, Panhellenic was responsible for the evaluation of each rush – an enterprise frequently occupying the entire period between the end of one rush and the start of another. Over the years, in fact, rush evaluation has seemed to maintain a consistency for attempting to identify even the most minute components which have contributed to a rushee’s squeals or tears, or both – even if identification did not attempt solution. For example, in fall of 1965, “the question of how much information to give rushees on recommendations came up. This was discussed, and a straw vote was taken. Most felt that the policy should continue to be the way it is for lack of anything better to say.” By way of translation, this suggested that while certain cosmetic changes might be affected in rush procedures, the same rather successful inertia which propelled IFC was present also in Panhellenic.¹²⁹

The inertia therefore allowed a certain amount of time to be expended on rather trivial events, just as was the case among the fraternity boys.

¹²⁸ By-Laws of Kappa Zeta chapter of Chi Omega, adopted (with chartering), February 17, 1962; Chi Omega semester report, February 22, 1962, both in Chi Omega file, on file in Dean of Students Office, Texas Tech University; La Ventana, Vol. XXXVII, 1962, 42. Sara Fickertt, an alumna and then in charge of Drane Hall, assumed the faculty sponsorship of Chi Omega.

¹²⁹ Minutes of the College Panhellenic, October 27, 1965. Recommendations, or “recs”, are required by most sororities on rushees in order to assure their good characters, intentions, looks, and the like.

Excerpts from the College Panhellenic Minutes

“Due to an incident in one of the women’s dorms, the sorority (sic) are asked to be careful when playing tricks on each other. This applies mainly to stacking the rooms.”¹³⁰

“It was suggested that perhaps there was food poisoning at the Panhellenic Pledge Luncheon. Because no concrete evidence could be obtained the matter was dropped.”¹³¹

“Ann Courtney, who is in charge of the annual Panhellenic Tea announced that Margaret’s would furnish the clothes.”¹³² (Presumably someone else furnished the tea.)

“A vote of confidence was taken to determine which sororities were interested in continuing sing song.”¹³³

“Sorority Presidents were asked to attend the AWS Howdy Party on September 15 at 7:30 p.m. in the SUB, where they will be introduced. They were instructed to wear fall cottons, heels, and a feather for their heads.”¹³⁴

“Sorority girls were asked not to wear pants into the academic buildings, and to be courteous in their dealings with personnel in college offices.”¹³⁵

“A letter was read...concerning intramural football. The P.E. Department does not approve.”¹³⁶

“There was a discussion about pledge stunts and the ways in which sororities handle them...The student handbook section on hazing...was read and it was concluded that much retaliation by sororities or ‘pledge punishment’ for stunts is in violation to (sic) this rule.”¹³⁷

¹³⁰ Ibid. November 24, 1964. The writer is uncertain as to the meaning of “stacking”, but it probably was a method of one sorority harassing another.

¹³¹ Ibid., December 9, 1964.

¹³² Ibid., March 24, 1965.

¹³³ Ibid., May 11, 1965. It is unclear why a vote of confidence was necessary to determine interest in sing song.

¹³⁴ Ibid., September 3, 1966.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Ibid., November 9, 1966.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

“IFC voted the rules Panhellenic voted on passed by Panhellenic concerning University Sing. Each sorority should check to see if they have a copy of University Sing rules.”¹³⁸

“There will be a \$5 fine for dirty rooms after rush; this was decided by the standing Panhellenic committee.”¹³⁹

Fortunately the term dirty was applied particularly to rooms and not generally to rush itself. In 1964 and 1965, rush quota was set at 35 pledges per sorority, and remained so until the end of the decade. During those years, the number of young ladies pledged increased from 368 in 1964 to 403 in 1965. Such an increase suggested to Panhellenic that there was justification in adding another sorority. Although little was mentioned in the minutes of Panhellenic meetings during the spring of 1965, applicable NPC regulations and procedures were introduced, and by the end of September Alpha Delta Pi had colonized. Panhellenic announced that several of its officers “and one Alpha Delta Pi representative will be traveling around the dorms to give information concerning the sorority’s colonization.” Within two weeks 219 young ladies had enrolled for interviews; 64 had pledged, and these joined six initiated members who has transferred to Tech. In February of 1966, Panhellenic scheduled a welcoming tea in anticipation of chartering (which occurred the next semester), and to denote another in its series of successful colonial rushes.¹⁴⁰

The IFC, however, had become something less than successful. The Council’s first advisor, James Whitehead, left Tech in 1960; he was replaced by Tom Stover and later by Dennis Watkins, both of whom were assistant deans and responsible (at various times) for foreign student programs and financial aids in addition to advising IFC. In September of 1967, Dr. William Duvall replaced the likeable Dean Stover, who was assigned full-time duties in financial aids. Dennis Watkins, an imposing sort of

¹³⁸ *Ibid.* February 15, 1967. Due to the syntax of this statement, the writer is uncertain just who voted what.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, April 18, 1967

¹⁴⁰ Panhellenic rush statistics, 1964, 1965; Panhellenic Minutes, quoted, September 22, October 13, 1965, February 16, 1966.

fellow, then became Dean Jones' first assistant. Duvall, a cherub-faced Virginian, took the title Assistant Dean of Men and two years later acquired a curious amalgam labeled Assistant Dean of Students for Programs. (This latter title was a product of the changes in Office structure which followed Dean Allen's retirement in 1968. The position of Dean of Women and Dean of Men were dropped; Lewis Jones became Dean of Students. The position of Assistant Dean of Students for Administration was created concurrently with Duvall's second position. In 1969 George Scott, Jr. assumed duties of Assistant Dean of Administration.) Regardless of title, Dr. Duvall inherited an IFC that, through its own devices, was beset with the sort of petty bickering that was rather analogous to that confined to a children's sand box. Long bubbling just below the surface, this bickering threatened to seriously divide the IFC. Dr. Duvall resolved to do something about it, and being rather quantitative sort of educator, he began to produce a series of statistical reports and scholarly monographs dealing with this or that phase of fraternity doings.¹⁴¹

By March of 1968, Dr. Duvall had ready six pages of what he called "evaluatory observations" with which to bombard IFC. "We sit here week after week," Duvall began, "and make promises to each other, make rules, and agree to conduct ourselves in a certain manner – then one or two days after the meeting we go out and do as we darn well please." This reference accurately characterized the cut-throat rush practices which burst through the fog of hypocrisy in the spring of 1968. "There is a desperate need for more mutual trust between fraternities," Duvall continued, because a pattern of backstabbing was "actually accepted, tolerated, and even expected." Paraphrasing Lincoln, Duvall maintained that "a house divided within itself cannot stand." He further suggested that the wholesale violations of IFC rules and regulations subverted the system because there violations were received with "leniency at best, and were ignored at works. Evasive tactics and the amending of rules every time

¹⁴¹ IFC Minutes, September 27, 1967; George Scott, Jr. to David Nail, conversation, December 18, 1975. The titles Assistant Dean for Administration and for Programs said little about their duties. Programs meant mainly student organizations, freshman orientation, and until 1973, foreign students. Administration meant mainly off campus housing verification and individual disciplinary action, although individual counseling was its most important function. Both male and female student frequented the spate offices.

someone is inconvenience...is a symptom of a dying system” Duvall noted. He felt that the then current interest in adding a new fraternity would cause Dean Allen to consider exactly what the existing fraternities were contributing to “our campus and student body. Nothing,” was both the rhetorical and factual reply.¹⁴²

The IFC difficulty paralleled those troubles in the Greek world generally, but Tech’s problem of a lack of internal respect and cooperation was not exactly congruent. By the late sixties, the American campus scene was (at least for media purposes) dominated by a minority of vocal dissidents. Yet there was also a bedrock majority of students who, perhaps to a greater degree than ever before, began to question the Old Values, Old Practices, and Old Traditions. A do-your-own-thingism generated an often lonely individualism, a person isolated in a crowd, of standing aside as the social order seemed to accelerate by geometric proportion in a world that stood still. There were escapes of course; withdrawal into what the establishment thought most damnable – drugs – proved even more mindless than the establishment’s reaction. The unconforming minority – the hippies, the flower children, the unwashed – ironically conformed completely among themselves and became more intellectually sterile than the Polyester Society from which they had deviated. These were just the sort of diseases for which the Greek idea of brotherhood and sisterhood could provide some relief. But to belong was to become a joiner in a world of drop outs; it was to uphold the Old Order that had as its crowning achievement a rat-hole war. The Greeks were the Old Order, maintaining forms of juvenile idiocy like hazing. They suffered. They suffered at Tech too – that is the IFC did because of its own inability to solve problems – but not the system. For whatever reason, or series of reasons: resolute regional individualism, the moderate student consideration of the political environment, or even indifference, the Tech Greek system survived, and rather handily.

¹⁴² William H. Duvall to IFC, speech, March 6, 1968, n.p. in IFC Minutes. This writer was a rather recent transfer to Texas Tech in 1968, a junior of 21, and, of course living in the dorm – but mainly by his own choice. The writer participated in that rush which Duvall found so divisive. He did not become a fraternity member.

Why it survived, particularly so the IFC, was that it began to recapture its own integrity.

President Mike Thomas put forward four goals to be accomplished, beginning in the spring of 1968.

1. To have a good and compete rush program by May.
2. To start a movement for new fraternities on our campus.
3. To have the IFC Constitution revised to be in accord with the Code of Student Affairs.
4. Start a movement toward fraternity housing.¹⁴³

The council considered each matter important, and planned “to get something started” quickly. “Greek unity,” IFC observed, “is a must.”¹⁴⁴

Interestingly enough, something was started concerning each item, and it was only through unity that results were obtained. Items one and three – the revision of the rules and regulations were essentially cosmetic, for it was people and not paper which made the IFC and by the end of the decade, both rush rules and constitution were revised. More importantly a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect was slowly resurrected, and IFC began once more to become an effective clearing house organization for its members, and to occupy an influential position on campus.

Initially, IFC had little to do with the realizing of its own item four. Kappa Alpha Theta did. Only four days before IFC recorded its goals, Mrs. John E. Birdwell and Mrs. John R. Chalk, alumnae representing the lodge planning committee of Gamma Phi chapter, wrote Panhellenic advisor Kathryn Peddy requesting “permission to construct a lodge on a portion of the property owned by the Texas Tech Interfraternity Housing Corporation”.¹⁴⁵

Replying on March 26, 1968, Miss Peddy reviewed the status of the Interfraternity Housing Corporation since it had secured the Turner Tract, and particularly its policies regarding the

¹⁴³ IFC Minutes, March 13, 1968.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Mrs. John E. Birdwell and Mrs. John R. Chalk to Miss Kathryn Peddy, letter, March 9, 1968, in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs.

development of that parcel of land. In November of 1958, when the corporation had come into possession of the Turner Tract, it had tentatively decided to develop the land, that is add streets and utilities, by 1960, provided three-quarters of the membership approved. Such approval was not forthcoming (given the attempts to acquire other property) and in 1963 another proposal was adopted to allow the fraternities to proceed on half of the land if at least three-quarters of those groups provided the necessary funds. Such funds were not voted, and it was only in 1965 that “an amendment to the By-laws was recommended to divide the land and let the men’s groups proceed on the development. A roll call was made and all the men said they were ready and all the women said they were ready to divide.”

146

The division was more hypothetical than actual and as one alumna house board president wrote, “the western part of the campus is till agricultural and only a wire fence divides our land from where cattle graze.” Indeed it was only in 1969 (and then after Kappa Alpha Theta’s request) that the Interfraternity Housing Corporation divided the land by chance drawing, and issued deeds to the individual sororities and fraternities. Streets, sewers and the like were rather quickly added, raising the total investment for each group to \$7,950 per lot. By early 1970, the Turner Tract had been transformed into Greek Circle, but for the moment sans any sort of Greek facility, and lacking what theretofore had been considered to be the necessary sanction from Texas Tech.¹⁴⁷

With the movement toward a Greek Circe solution, the only IFC goal remaining unresolved was item two – the institution of a new fraternity. And like a phoenix, from the ashes of the spring 1968 rush came a new fraternity. That rush recorded 214 men unpledged who were otherwise academically eligible, possessed cast iron stomachs (if not wills), were able to walk on the ground, and had other sorts

¹⁴⁶ Miss Kathryn Peddy to Mrs. John E. Birdwell and Mrs. John R. Chalk, letter, March 26, 1968. Peddy quoted minutes of the corporation’s meetings.

¹⁴⁷ Mrs. Roy M. Wilkins to Mrs. John M. Shelton, letter June 12, 1972, in files of the House Board of Kappa Kappa Gamma. Mrs. Wilkins was president of the house Board in 1971 and 1972. Mrs. Shelton, who lived in Swanee Mission, Kansas, was a national official.

of general attributes to recommend them to the fraternities. “The main reason they gave for not pledging,” noted the IFC minutes, “was that they were interested in a fraternity, but did receive a bid” – something rather obvious. Yet “a number of these students also indicated an interest in starting a new fraternity.” This interest paralleled that of IFC, and by mid-April an expansion committee was formed and was “authorized to speak on behalf of IFC regarding a preference for a new fraternity.”¹⁴⁸ Late in the semester the expansion committee reported its findings and recommended that Beta Theta Pi be invited to colonize the following autumn after regular IFC rush. On May 15, Beta Theta Pi accepted the invitation to colonize and arrived in October. Tom Stover, who was an alumni, and who had previously worked with IFC and later was responsible for financial aids, became the faculty sponsor. By March of 1969, 24 young men had been initiated (among 56 affiliated) and established themselves in an old house at 22nd and University Avenues, which was noteworthy (if the phoenix metaphor is retained) only because it rather promptly burned to the ground. But this did not deter the eventual charting of Delta Mu chapter.¹⁴⁹

The Beta’s lodge burning was only a candle in the sun to the tornado of May 11, 1970, which, with the clear exception of the injuries and fatalities, probably was the most effective urban renewal program Lubbock had experienced. Greeks were not unaffected, particularly so Kappa Alpha Theta as its lodge was rather severely storm damaged. And as that sorority had been largely responsible for the final disposition of Greek Circle, it became somewhat of a fish or cut bait choice; Kappa Alpha Theta began to build in the summer of 1970. Other sororities were in similar circumstances, that is their old lodges were rapidly deteriorating, or the neighborhoods were, or both. Alpha Chi Omega, Pi Beta Phi, and Sigma Kappa quickly followed the lead of Kappa Alpha Theta, and were situated at Greek Circle for the fall rush of 1972. And by that fall, basement excavation was underway on the Zeta Tau Alpha lot, and “the Alpha

¹⁴⁸ IFC Minute, March 20, April 17, 1968.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., May 1, 1968; *La Ventana*, Vol. 44, 1968, 8; Burton W. Folsom to James G. Allen, letter, May 15, 1968. Folsom was General Secretary of Beta Theta Pi.

Phis (were) piling up old brick on their lot.” Delta Gamma and Delta Delta Delta, theretofore satisfied with their storefront lodges, began making plans for a move, and, obviously, collecting the requisite funds. The fraternities, having made the most noise initially, were strangely silent. Curiously Texas Tech University (the name change occurred in 1970) was not silent at all. The Board of Regents (that name too was altered in order to conform to the new university status) rather quickly divested itself of the entire Greek housing question on May 12, 1972, when it rescinded its prohibition on residential fraternity and sorority houses. But the lodge system, like many of the old social club traditions, was fixed in the Tech Greek experience. Moreover, several new lodges of the \$100,000 sort had been built at Greek Circle, and given the general affection for apartment living held by undergraduates, it seemed fruitless for the Greeks to become involved in the same sort of hotel business in which the University was engaged.¹⁵⁰

So it was that the growth of Greek Circle into the seventies was based on a lodge system rather than a house system. Phi Delta Theta, the first fraternity to build on Greek Circle, tended to lend the location an air of the more tradition fraternity row (if not its decorum), as it occupied space proximal to Alpha Phi and Delta Delta Delta. But with rapidly increasing construction costs, it was several years before other groups could amass the necessary money to even consider building. Some groups gave thought to selling their lots, which had also increased in value, as construction costs became exorbitant. There was, of course, a market, as several of the late arriving groups such as Alpha Delta Pi, Chi Omega, and Kappa Alpha were most desirous of obtaining property on Greek Circle. Phi Mu was considerably interested too, but because of declining membership necessitated to complete recolonization in the spring of 1970, it was unable to secure appropriate backing. Chi Omega could and in the summer of 1974 purchased the lot belonging to Phi Gamma Delta for the tidy sum of \$25,000. The following year

¹⁵⁰ Wilkins letter; Minutes of the Board of Regents of Texas Tech University, May 12, 1972, in files of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs; William H. Duvall to Larry Watkins, letter, May 31, 1972. Watkins was an IFC Officer.

Gamma Phi Beta moved into its new facility, raising the total of lodges on Greek Circle to ten. And after long deliberations which proceeded with all the frenzied speed of a glacier, Kappa Kappa Gamma began building shortly before Christmas, 1975.¹⁵¹

Still, the rather cheerful resolution of Greek Circle did not negate certain basic difficulties present in the rush and initiation practices of the fraternities. In the autumn of 1969, approximately 55% of those pledged withdrew themselves during the course of their **pledgeship**. This was perhaps indicative of the reluctance of more Tech fraternities to alter their pledge programs. National offices could easily gauge the dour Greek experience in the late sixties and began to take a hard look at their existing pledge programs. Changes followed. But the Tech's Greek system remained successful, if isolated, and the fraternities tended to view suggestions from the national level as unnecessary. Indeed, it was only in the early-seventies that the traditional and sometimes juvenile pledge programs at Tech were amended to become more pragmatic. These changes were initiated for two reasons: pressure from the assorted nationals, and as a function of a new fraternity at Tech (which absorbed some of the 107 young men who chose not to pledge in the fall of 1968), and which possessed a rather untraditional pledge program by Tech standards.¹⁵²

In February of 1970 (the same month that the Tech Beta Theta Pi chapter received its charter), Sigma Phi Epsilon colonized. By the spring semester, 33 young men had affiliated, and promptly surprised the IFC by capturing its scholarship trophy. On March 6, the fraternity became a registered student organization, and Ralph Sellmeyer of the Mass Communications Department became the faculty sponsor. Nine month later, the national president of Sigma Phi Epsilon presented a charter to Texas Iota chapter and commented that it was the shortest colonial period yet experienced by the fraternity. By 1972, the group had over 100 men and continued to claim the scholarship trophy, in part because the

¹⁵¹ IFC Minutes. September 3, 1969; George Miller to David Nail, conversation, November 19, 1975. Miller is a Phi Gamma Delta alumni.

¹⁵² IFC Minutes, October 8, 1969.

pledge program was not based upon exploitation. And seeing that such a program could be successful, other fraternities began to make certain modifications.¹⁵³

The Tech fraternity system was further changed early in the spring semester of 1971 with the arrival of Pi Lambda Phi. That fraternity, being a member of NIC, was brought to the campus by an undergraduate long associated with starting various student organizations. And while Pi Lambda Phi possessed the criteria necessary to recommend itself to IFC, it lacked an invitation and its arrival created a sort of fraternal faux pas. IFC president Greg Wimmer (who was later Student Body President) wrote the Committee on Student Organizations explaining that the council had “voted not to accept Pi Lambda Phi and to discourage their coming on campus at this time.” Wimmer further explained that “our fraternity system is not ready for expansion at this time – to this or any other fraternity.” Moreover, “it is the feeling of IFC that Pi Lambda Phi should obtain IFC approval before coming on campus.” But IFC did not have the authority to govern the comings and goings of student organizations; it did have the authority to govern its own membership. Thus Pi Lambda Phi became a student organization of the fraternal variety at Tech, but without IFC sanction or approval.¹⁵⁴

Something approaching an internal schism subsequently beset the group; its Tech founder was purged, and a splinter group announced in the University Daily that Pi Lambda Phi was a “Brotherhood of men, women, Black, Brown and White,” which, in the feminine case, was not accurate, semantically or otherwise. Student Organizations Advisor Jane Terry, who assumed the position in 1970, thought the announcement had “negative connotations toward the Greek System as a whole.” The entire matter remained unresolved when Dr. Duvall resigned in the summer of 1972 and was replaced on an interim basis by Joy Cox (who had been on the staff of Assistant Dean George Scott, and previously of the

¹⁵³ Ibid., February 4, 25, 1970; La Ventana, Vol. 44, 1970, 75, Vol. 47, 1972, 186; Sigma Phi Epsilon report to the Committee on Student Organizations, n.d. (ca. Spring 1972), in Sigma Phi Epsilon file on file in office of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs.

¹⁵⁴ Greg Wimmer to Dr. Mary Brewer, letter, February 22, 1971, in Pi Lambda Phi file on file in office of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs. Dr. Brewer was chairman of the Committee on Student Organizations.

housing staff). Cox, a Tech graduate and Kappa Alpha Theta, quickly had her attention drawn to the Pi Lambda Phi semester report in the fall of 1972, which suggested that faculty and staff were eligible for membership – something prohibited by the Code of Student Affairs, as student organizations were specifically for students. By the time this matter was corrected, the personnel composing the fraternity had rather effectively stabilized the group, and late, in spring of 1975, again applied for IFC membership. But IFC had a long memory, if not exactly a judicious one, and the application was denied.¹⁵⁵

Preceding the Pi Lambda Phi addition, Panhellenic had noted the arrival of a new sorority, Delta Sigma Theta, which chartered in April of 1970. In the main a sorority for black ladies, the group answered an involvement need for the relatively few black coeds at Tech. Later that semester another black sorority, Alpha Kappa Alpha, colonized, giving the university two new sororities – black, but not racially-restricted. This presented certain problems to Panhellenic, as both groups arrived without invitation. And Panhellenic (like IFC) was rather insulated from black students and therefore unable to judge their needs for sisterhood and brotherhood. Specifically, Panhellenic did not know precisely how to accept Delta Sigma Theta and Alpha Kappa Alpha into the existing structure. After both groups had arrived, Dr. Duvall noted “it would not be appropriate for us simply to stand by and wait until they come to us to ask to be include.” Thus the black sororities became associate members of Panhellenic. This associate membership status was carefully not assigned as a racial differentiation, but due to procedural differences involving rush, among others. Delta Sigma Theta and Alpha Kappa Alpha were part of the National Pan-Hellenic Council (the black counterpart of NPC), and the resulting variances in rules indicated a special position within Panhellenic.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁵ Jane Terry file memorandum, January 8, 1973; Joy Cox to James Roberts, memorandum, October 2, 1972. Roberts was president of the Texas Alpha Omega chapter of Pi Lambda Phi. Jane Terry, an Alpha Delta Pi, was Panhellenic advisor.

¹⁵⁶ University Daily, September 23, 1970; William H. Duvall to Rita Jones, letter, December 10, 1970; Duvall to Joan Mobberley, Pat Neal, and Gary Harrod, memorandum, April 29, 1971. Rita Jones was president of Alpha Kappa Alpha; Joan Mobberley (who preceded Jane Terry) was Student Organizations Advisor on Duvall’s staff; Pay Neal was president of Panhellenic; Gary Harrod was president of IFC. Although the membership was limited, both Delta

Black young men obviously possessed the same sort of involvement needs as did the young women. Various male students formed an interest group in the autumn of 1970 to review information which had previously been requested from four black fraternities and to consider proposals from various local alumni groups. By April of 1971, the interest group opted to affiliate with Alpha Phi Alpha. Kenneth Baker was elected president, and Dr. Reid Hastie of the Art Department (who was both white and chairman of the Committee of Student Organizations) became the interim faculty sponsor. Like the black sororities, Alpha Phi Alpha became involved in various civic and service projects in the black community of Lubbock, and on January 12, 1972, the 15 members of the fraternity received a charter from the national office. Although a few of the Tech Alpha Phi Alpha's, who began calling themselves "the brotherhood", occasionally attended IFC meetings, the group did not apply for membership in IFC. And like Panhellenic, IFC did not know how to insert into its structure a fraternity possessing a significantly different rush format as well as organizational procedures.¹⁵⁷

Also there was the matter of conceived ethnic compatibility. For example, for about a decade Kappa Alpha had followed its national tradition and seceded from the university, refought a rather alcoholic version of the civil war on the losing side, reconstructed themselves, and labeled the whole thing "Old South." The event generally preceded with decorum and in part attempted to recapture the nobility of the antebellum south. But acting was acting, and the campus witnessed semi-gallant and bearded young men-in-gray, mounted upon an occasional swayback charger, parade around Memorial Circle. Stars and Bars fluttered as swooning dates-in-hoopskirts batted attached eyelashes. But more than a few black students had a completely different view on the old-times-there-are-not-forgotten myth, and Kappa Alpha was obliged to secede privately after 1970.

Sigma Theta and Alpha Kappa Alpha had active local alumnae chapters. Indeed it was Mrs. Willie Lusk of Delta Sigma Theta and Mrs. Willie Washington of Alpha Kappa Alpha who made initial arrangements for the colonization of their respective sororities.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, Duvall memorandum; *University Daily*, February 4, 1972, fragment, n.p.; Alpha Phi Alpha file, on file in office of Assistant Dean of Students for Programs.

Phi Gamma Delta, otherwise the Fijis after the Pacific archipelago of that time, also presented a problem of ethnic compatibility by maintaining a traditional saturnalia labeled the "Fiji Islander." This partly public event called for not only black face, but also grass skirts and rubber spears in a rough approximation of what might have been seen by early missionaries in the South Pacific. Black students interpreted the occasion as a return to the white preconception of a Stepin Fetchit Africa, and the Fijis were also obligated to keep what was, after all, a private party private.

In both cases, and in a few more somewhat similar, the problem was not so much one of intentional racial slur, but rather of a lack of sensitivity on the part of many white students; this was frequently matched by an equal amount of misinterpretation on the part of black students. But by the mid-seventies, the most readily apparent problems had been dealt with, if not mainly solved, and the matter of racial and cultural relations – black, brown, and white – settled into a slow evolution which had as a propellant only time.

Time altered other customs as well. Hemlines soared upward in the late-sixties, often leaving little to the imagination of sly little boys, even if the young lady managed to maintain an Emily Post posture. On the other hand, hair of both sexes flopped downward, a vogue initiated by European rock and roll groups which recycled a uniquely American product and resold it as music to pimply adolescents on this side of the Atlantic. Many students at Texas Tech, like those at most other public institutions, became part of a blue jean society, and their cultural values seemed to revolve around stereos, suds, sometime studying, and in the case of Lubbock, the strip. But the strip, a row of liquor stores south and east of town charging outrageous prices, did not have a monopoly on liquid sin after 1973. Reflecting a changing set of values and a more secular society, Lubbock voted in corruption-by-the-cup which led a proliferation of bars, clubs, and hovels catering to the college crowd. Coupled with the institution of majority at 18 (which made pledge classes more restless) and enlightenment for women, clubbing, it was called, became a favorite pastime. Young ladies, many of whom felt quite

comfortable unescorted, frequented saloons looking for unescorted young men who were also looking. The music was loud, the drinks bland, the beer passable, and crowd college.

In that respect, the Greek crowd was a portion of the college crowd, albeit more identifiable due the regular use of blue windbreakers with the appropriate Greek letters of the wearer attached thereto. Additionally, the Greek crowd was rather successful at what it attempted to do, particularly in providing campus leadership as confirmed by Greek majorities in such organizations as Mortar Board and Omicron Delta Kappa. Greeks possessing a political turn of mind readily found a constituency among their chapters and were somewhat regularly elected to such august bodies as the Student Senate, which was really nothing new. Whether these sorts of things were done from a sense of noblesse oblique or from more pedestrian chauvinism is problematical.¹⁵⁸

Nonetheless, the Tech Panhellenic was honored for its campus contributions in 1973 when it won an award from NPC for being the best university Panhellenic in the country. This sort of honor followed campus leadership and certainly reflected well upon the Student Organizations Advisors (Joan Mobberley, 1967-1970 and Jane Terry, 1970-1973) who, by principally confining themselves to Panhellenic business, helped manufacture a noteworthy sorority system.

While IFC won no prizes, excepting some academic awards for mediocrity from NIC, it too provided campus leadership. But in the early seventies its advisors came and went with rapidity, leaving "IFC...rather soft, mechanically doing only that which had to be done for rush and pledging." When Dr. Duvall left in 1972, Robert Burnett (who served on Duvall's staff as foreign student advisor) was assigned IFC by interim Assistant Dean Joy Cox, who had replaced Duvall. But Burnett, who worked with Jane Terry, had little interest in fraternities, and IFC gradually began to drift. Matters became even more

¹⁵⁸ This, and much of what follows, is drawn from the writer's personal experiences.

difficult (and for Panhellenic as well) when Cox, Terry, and Burnett resigned en mass in the summer of 1973.¹⁵⁹

Before Cox left, however, she hired a former sorority field secretary to fill the position of Student Organizations Advisor. (The foreign student advisor's position became an office of its own, and no longer reported to Dean of Students, Lewis Jones.) That left open the position formerly held by Duvall and Cox and its traditional duty of providing the faculty sponsor for IFC. Dean Jones decided to fill that slot with one of George Scott's staff members who, at the moment, was vacationing on the West Coast. Upon his return, David Nail was abruptly told to move bags and baggage to a new office. Originally a refugee from the History Department and a sort of half-baked authority on such a dry topic as the Dust Bowl, Nail had no particular qualifications to recommend him for an assistant deanship at age 26, and the transfer seemed to be more one of desperation than anything else. He joined the new Student Organizations Advisor, who had been on the job three days, and a secretary, who had three months' experience. The situation was thus something resembling fourth down and punt.

Actually, by Yuletide 1973, the situation had begun to resolve itself, expecting that involving the Student Organizations Advisor who seemed unable and unwilling to accept the workings of the Tech Panhellenic and its alumnae associations. The feeling was mutual, and in March of 1974, the advisor resigned leaving Nail in the unenviable position of trying to soothe young ladies' ruffled feathers, of placating the alumnae, and having to learn the myriad of NPC rush rules as the new faculty sponsor of Panhellenic. He was not particularly successful, but given the fact of a man working in a women's world, he survived and so did Panhellenic. In August of 1974, he carefully hired a local pharmacist, Deborah Stanley, who was an Alpha Omicron Pi from the University of Texas and was therefore not of Tech or of any sorority represented at Tech.

¹⁵⁹ David Nail, "IFC Makes Itself", Bulletin of Interfraternity Research and Advisory Council, no. 256, September 1, 1975, 3-4,

During this time several fraternity chapters at Tech had won awards from their national offices; a few represented those of the best-chapter-in-the-nation-variety. Given these local successes and the stabilization of Kappa Sigma which has experienced membership problems in 1972 and 1973, IFC felt it worth the risk to consider expansion. Under the administration of David Cook an expansion committee was formed, and by the time Keith Williams assumed the IFC presidency in 1974, expansion was a foregone conclusion. The committee interviewed three fraternities, and selected Lambda Chi Alpha, an organization which had been attempting to establish themselves at Tech since the days of the social club affiliation.

But those days were past – two decades and more – and IFC and Panhellenic had grown up. The Greek system, indeed the social system at Tech, had matured as the institution had become a major university. In large measure the Greek system had, knowingly or otherwise, retained the spirit and many of the traditions of the old social clubs and fortunately remained mostly **inexclusive**. And while the students who peopled the sororities and fraternities came and went, what they produced remained in the organic tissue of the organizations.

Fraternity and Sorority Founding Dates

Fraternity Founding Dates

Year	Organization	College or University	Location
1776	Phi Beta Kappa	College of William and Mary	Williamsburg, Virginia
1825	Kappa Alpha Society	Union College	Schenectady, New York
1827	Sigma Phi	Union College	Schenectady, New York
1827	Delta Phi	Union College	Schenectady, New York
1832	Alpha Delta Phi	Hamilton College	Clinton, New York
1833	Psi Upsilon	Union College	Schenectady, New York
1834	Delta Upsilon	Williams College	Williamstown, Massachusetts
1839	Beta Theta Pi	Miami University	Oxford, Ohio
1841	Chi Psi	Union College	Schenectady, New York
1844	Delta Kappa Epsilon	Yale University	New Haven, Connecticut
1845	Alpha Sigma Phi	Yale University	New Haven, Connecticut
1847	Delta Psi	Columbia College (University)	New York, New York
1847	Zeta Psi	New York University	New York, New York
1848	Phi Delta Theta	Miami University	Oxford, Ohio
1848	Phi Gamma Delta	Washington and Jefferson College	Canonsburg, Pennsylvania
1850	Phi Kappa Sigma	University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
1852	Phi Kappa Psi	Washington and Jefferson College	Canonsburg, Pennsylvania
1854	Chi Psi	Princeton University	Princeton, New Jersey
1855	Sigma Chi	Miami University	Oxford, Ohio
1856	Sigma Alpha Epsilon	University of Alabama	University, Alabama
1856	Theta Chi	Norwich University	Norwich, Vermont
1858	Delta Tau Delta	Bethany College	Bethany, West Virginia
1864	Theta Xi	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Try, New York
1865	Alpha Tau Omega	Virginia Military Institute	Richmond, Virginia
1865	Kappa Alpha Order	Washington and Lee University	Lexington, Virginia
1868	Pi Kappa Alpha	University of Virginia	Charlottesville, Virginia
1869	Sigma Nu	Virginia Military Institute	Lexington, Virginia
1869	Kappa Sigma	University of Virginia	Charlottesville, Virginia
1873	Phi Sigma Kappa	Massachusetts Agriculture College	Amherst, Massachusetts
1889	Phi Kappa Theta	Brown University in 1889 as Phi Kappa Lehigh University in 1919 as Theta Kappa Phi	
1890	Delta Chi	Cornell University	Ithaca, New York
1895	Alpha Chi Rho	Trinity College	Hartford, Connecticut
1895	Pi Lambda Phi	Yale University	New Haven, Connecticut
1897	Sigma Pi	Vincennes University	Vincennes, Indiana
1898	Zeta Beta Tau	Jewish Theological Seminary	New York, New York
1899	Delta Sigma Phi	College of City of New York	New York, New York
1901	Sigma Phi Epsilon	Richmond College	Richmond, Virginia
1904	Pi Kapa Phi	College of Charleston	Charleston, South Carolina
1904	Acacia	University of Michigan	Ann Arbor, Michigan
1904	Phi Epsilon Pi	College of City of New York	New York, New York

1905	FarmHouse	University of Missouri	Columbia, Missouri
1905	Kappa Delta Rho	Middlebury College	Middlebury, Vermont
1906	Alpha Phi Alpha	Cornell University	Ithaca, New York
1906	Phi Kappa Tau	Miami University	Oxford, Ohio
1907	Triangle	University of Illinois	Champaign, Illinois
1908	Alpha Gamma Rho	Ohio State University	Columbus, Ohio
1909	Sigma Alpha Mu	City College of New York	New York, New York
1909	Lambda Chi Alpha	Boston University	New York, New York
1909	Phi Sigma Delta	Cornell University	New York, New York
1910	Beta Sigma Rho	Cornell University	Ithaca, New York
1910	Phi Sigma Epsilon	Kansas State Teachers College	Emporia, Kansas
1910	Tau Delta Phi	College of City of New York	New York, New York
1910	Tau Delta Phi	Columbia University	New York, New York
1911	Omega Psi Phi	Howard University	Washington, D.C.
1911	Kapa Alpha Psi	Indiana University	Bloomington, Indiana
1913	Alpha Epsilon Pi	New York University	New York, New York
1914	Alpha Kappa Lambda	University of California at Berkley	Berkley, California
1914	Alpha Phi Delta	Syracuse University	Syracuse, New York
1914	Phi Beta Sigma	Howard University	Washington, D.C.
1918	Phi Mu Delta	Massachusetts Agriculture College	Amherst, Massachusetts
1920	Sigma Tau Gamma	Central Missouri State College	Warrensburg, Missouri

Sorority Founding Dates

Year	Organization	College or University	Location
1851	Adelphian Society (Alpha Delta Pi – 1913)	Wesleyan College	Macon, Georgia
1852	Philomathean (Phi Mu – 1904)	Wesleyan College	Macon, Georgia
1867	IC Sorosis (Phi Beta Phi – 1888)	Monmouth College	Monmouth, Illinois
1870	Kappa Alpha Theta	DePauw University	Greencastle, Indiana
1870	Kappa Kappa Gamma	Monmouth College	Monmouth, Illinois
1872	Alpha Phi	Syracuse University	Syracuse, New York
1873	Delta Gamma	University of Mississippi	Oxford, Mississippi
1874	Gamma Phi Beta	Syracuse University	Syracuse, New York
1874	Sigma Kappa	Colby College	Waterville, Maine
1885	Alpha Chi Omega	DePauw University	Greencastle, Indiana
1888	Delta Delta Delta	Boston University	Boston, Massachusetts
1893	Alpha Xi Delta	Lombard College	Galesburg, Illinois
1895	Chi Omega	University of Arkansas	Fayetteville, Arkansas
1897	Alpha Omicron Pi	Barnard College	New York, New York
1897	Kappa Delta	Longwood College	Farmville, Virginia
1898	Zeta Tau Alpha	Longwood College	Farmville, Virginia
1898	Sigma Sigma Sigma	Longwood College	Farmville, Virginia
1899	Alpha Sigma Tau	Eastern Michigan University	Ypsilanti, Michigan

1901	Alpha Sigma Alpha	Longwood College	Farmville, Virginia
1902	Delta Zeta	Miami University	Oxford, Ohio
1904	Alpha Gamma Delta	Syracuse University	Syracuse, New York
1908	Alpha Kappa Alpha	Howard University	Washington, D.C.
1909	Alpha Epsilon Phi	Barnard College	New York
1912	Theta Phi Alpha	University of Michigan	Ann Arbor, Michigan
1913	Phi Sigma Sigma	Hunter College	New York, New York
1913	Delta Sigma Theta	Howard University	Washington, D.C.
1917	Sigma Delta Tau	Cornell University	Ithaca, New York
1917	Delta Phi Epsilon	New York University	Washington Square Campus, New York
1920	Zeta Pi Beta	Howard University	Washington, D.C.
1929	Sigma Gamma Rho	Butler University	Indianapolis, Indiana