Opdyke, Howard (Nov. 5, 1872–June 14, 1928). Professor of Physics, 1894–1928.

A New York City native, the son of Henry Beach Opdyke and Miriam Blagden Whiton Opdyke, Howard Opdyke graduated from Williams College in 1893 (AB). After a year at the Columbia University School of Mines, he joined the Union College faculty in 1894 as Instructor in Mathematics and Physics.

In 1899 the College divided physics and mathematics into separate departments, placing Opdyke in the former. He was apparently not well prepared for this responsibility—Charles Waldron wrote several years after Opdyke's death that he had been "a bit inadequate as a physicist"—and in 1901 the College gave him two years leave to study for a PhD in physics at the University of Zurich. Although he returned without a degree, he was appointed to the chair of physics.

Opdyke's principal importance in the College derived from his concern with ATHLETICS. He long devoted himself to service on the ATHLETIC ADVISORY BOARD, working, in a quiet, gentlemanly way, both to encourage college sports and to preserve their integrity and the spirit of amateurism. As the *Concordiensis* put it in 1908:

> Officially, Prof. Opdyke is Assistant Treasurer of the Athletic Board. Practically, he is the mentor of college athletics, the authority on all questions athletic, pertaining to the college and its relationship with other colleges. Moreover, he has the handling of the athletic funds.

Later he became the board's secretary.

In 1919, Opdyke was moved to the position of Professor of Theoretical Mechanics, with a reduced teaching load; thereafter he gave most of his attention to supervising student activities, serving as chairman of the faculty's Undergraduate Affairs Committee, of the Publications Board, and of the Mountebanks. He also helped run Commencement exercises, and was very active in Union's chapter of Sigma Phi, his Williams fraternity.

Outside the College, he ran unsuccessfully for First Ward alderman in 1899, and served from 1912 to 1916 on the first city parks and planning commission. He was credited with a role in the eventual development of Schenectady's parks and of the Western Gateway bridge to Scotia. He served as a vestryman of St. George's Episcopal Church. Williams College awarded him an honorary MA in 1923.

At the time of his death of a heart attack, though only fifty-five, Opdyke was the senior Union professor in years of service. He never married.

Paige, Alonzo Christopher (July 31, 1797–March 31, 1868). Lawyer, judge, trustee of Union College.

Born in Schaghticoke, New York, to the Rev. Winslow Paige, a Presbyterian clergyman, and Clarissa Keyes Paige, Alonzo Paige attended Williams College with the intention of following his father's vocation. Though only twelve at matriculation, he graduated second in his class of twenty-four, but after studying theology for a while with a Montgomery County clergyman, he decided to become a lawyer instead.

Removing to Schenectady to study law, he was admitted to the bar about 1819 and formed a law partnership with Abraham Van Ingen. Throughout most of his legal career, Paige held public offices—sometimes more than one at a time—in addition to his private practice. He served as District Attorney of Schenectady County (1823–39), State Assemblyman for three terms (1827–30), State Senator from the Third District for two terms (1838–42), and Justice of the New York State Supreme Court (1847–51; 1855–57). Paige was also the court reporter for the Court of Chancery from 1828 to 1846; his eleven volume *Reports of cases argued and determined in the Court of Chancery of the State of New York,* covering the years 1828–45, earned him a high reputation as a legal analyst.

His first important connection with Union College came when the Board of Trustees engaged him in 1835 as counsel in litigation arising out of the LOTTERIES. Elected a trustee in 1838, Paige eventually became chairman of the Finance Committee and a key member of the board in its dealings with President ELIPHALET NOTT.

Judge Paige (who also served as a director of railroad companies) was able to see more clearly than those many board members who had once been Nott's students that the trustees were responsible to the institution, not to its president. Accordingly, when it became necessary about 1860 to defend, against the claims of Nott's personal creditors, the assets Nott had transferred to the College under the Nott Trust, Paige induced the board to take a legal position embarrassing to the president but ultimately advantageous to the College. Although he had helped draft the Nott Trust Deed in 1854 (see NOTT TRUST FUND), in 1860 Paige called that document "a magnificent humbug," and the board's lawyers argued that the assets of the trust were not, as John Spencer '06 had earlier claimed in extricating Nott from a perilous legislative investigation, a voluntary gift by Nott to Union, but rather a necessary repayment of money the president owed to the College. The case outlived both Nott and Paige, but Paige's argument eventually prevailed.

Judge Paige's independence from Nott again manifested itself in December 1865, about five weeks before the latter's death, when Paige favored replacing the entirely incapacitated president without further delay.

Because several trustees opposed Vice President LAURENS PERSEUS HICKOK, the heir-apparent, the motion to hold an immediate election failed (4–6). Hickok continued to enjoy Paige's support after becoming president, even though the judge, like Hickok's firmest opponents, was an old-school Presbyterian. It may be that Paige's death on March 31, 1868—closely following that of another Hickok supporter, Chancellor Walworth—influenced Hickok's decision, a month later, to abandon his struggle with the board and submit his resignation, citing the lack of harmony among the trustees.

Paige married Harriet Bowers Mumford in 1832; she became an ardent botanist and an antiquarian, recording lore about Schenectady history and collecting old newspapers and coins. Four of their six children survived infancy, including EDWARD WINSLOW PAIGE '64. Trustee Platt Potter married Paige's sister Antoinette in 1836.

Paige, Edward Winslow (July 11, 1844–Oct. 13, 1918). Class of 1864. Trustee, 1878–1918. Corporation lawyer.

Born in Schenectady, the only son of trustee ALONZO CHRISTOPHER PAIGE and Harriet Bowers Mumford Paige, Edward attended the Union School before matriculating at Union College in 1860. He joined Sigma Phi and the Philomathean Society, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. A few months after graduating with an AB, he published a forty-eight-page *Catalogue of the flowering plants of Schenectady County,* apparently inspired by his botanical work with professor JONATHAN PEARSON '35 and probably also by his mother's botanical studies.

Paige graduated from the Harvard Law School in July 1866 and then briefly attended the Albany Law School to earn a second law degree from that institution in December of the same year.

After practicing in Schenectady with Judge Alonzo Paige Strong '64 until 1878, Paige moved to New York City where he entered into partnership with his brother-in-law, Douglas Campbell '60. He became an eminent corporation lawyer, arguing several cases before the U.S. Supreme Court on behalf of the Boston-Hoosick Tunnel Railroad (later the Boston and Maine). Active in Democratic politics and a friend of Gov. Samuel Tilden, Paige served as Deputy Attorney General of New York State, 1876–79.

Ten years after the death of his father, who had been a Union College trustee for thirty years, Edward Winslow Paige was elected to the board in 1878. Early in his forty years of service he supported the beleaguered President ELIPHALET NOTT POTTER; in 1887, as president of Hobart College, Potter rewarded him with an LLD degree.

Although he lived in New York City, Paige retained the family house and garden at 46 Washington Avenue in Schenectady. He never married.

Palermo, Anthony James (May 16, 1899–May 29, 1984). Class of 1922. Instructor in Electrical Engineering, 1922–36.

A Schenectady native, the seventh of nine children of Vincenzo Palermo, an Italian-born farmer, and his wife Maria Christine, Anthony Palermo entered Union College in 1918. He joined the Mountebanks, the Musical Clubs, and Delta Chi, and earned election to Sigma Xi. After graduating with a BS in electrical engineering, he remained at Union as an instructor in that field, subsequently earning a master's degree (1924) and a PhD (1931) in electrical engineering from the College. He was probably the first Italian-American on the Union faculty.

Palermo's teaching field shifted in 1930 to applied mechanics, and in 1933 to surveying. Eased out of Union in 1936 as a Depression-era austerity measure, he served for a year as head of the mathematics and physics departments of St. Francis College in Brooklyn, then worked as an engineer in the research department of the Westinghouse Co. He married Trigona E. D'Jimas of Albany in 1938, and in 1941 he joined her family's firm, D'Jimas Furs, retiring in 1962 as Vice President in charge of the Syracuse office. He and his wife had two children.

While at the College, Palermo published several technical papers related to radio. In 1957 he published *The Law of balance; better life through better thought.* His mystery novel, *Who?*, appeared in 1964; it embodied, according to the publisher, "certain new ideas and theories that the author is convinced will be a matter of scientific data in the future... [including] a reconciliation between Newtonian and sub-atomic physics, a sure cure for cancer, and a key to the fifth dimension."

Pan-Hellenic Council. In late 1977, after Union's first sorority had been established, the INTERFRATERNITY COUNCIL renamed itself the Pan-Hellenic Council and became open to sororities. In February 1979, as the College prepared to establish a third sorority, the Council reverted to the name Interfraternity Council; the following academic year a new Pan-Hellenic Council was formed as a sorority governing body.

Parents Association. A Parents Association organized by the College in 1963 made annual financial contributions to the College, most notably to construct library plaza in 1968/69. It eventually fizzled out, but was revived in 1979 under the auspices of the Office of College Resources.

Parents' Weekend. From 1950 through the end of the period covered by this book, except for 1972, Union held a Parents' Weekend late in spring term.

Early programs included visits to classes (until Saturday classes ended in 1966), PRIZE DAY (from 1964 to 1990), athletic events, concerts, dances, and play performances. Around 1961 the program began to include a faculty lecture, at first always on JACKSON'S GARDEN. During the years 1964 to 1971, when the Delphic Society served as hosts for the weekend, three faculty members lectured on topics of their own choice as part of the Delphic Lecture Series.

Parents' Weekend was cancelled in 1972 owing to fear that parents might be exposed to campus unrest; when the event resumed the following year faculty lectures had been dropped, although visitors were occasionally invited to attend seminars.

Starting in 1983, the College tried to put more intellectual content in the weekend as several departments scheduled Saturday class sessions and panel discussions. From 1984 until 1992, departments held open house.

Parents' Weekends have been numbered as if the 1972 event had been held.

Parietal Rules. The College has always tried to regulate the behavior of its students, and the older rules have long been an object of fascination for the window they seem to open on student life at its most "real." There are good reasons, however, to doubt that the rules give us much reliable information about student life or, indeed, about the rule-makers. Although we usually know what the rules were, we can know none of the other factors that would enable us to assess their significance: whether the rules were enacted in response to actual or to feared behavior, and if to actual behavior, whether it was widespread or isolated; whether the rules were generally violated or observed at any given time, and whether a serious attempt was made at any given time to punish violations. These questions are on the whole unanswerable because disciplinary records have seldom been preserved at Union College.

Some insight into the nature of early enforcement may be provided by a passage in the inaugural address (1796) of first president JOHN BLAIR SMITH (the original is in Latin):

> Wisdom and justice demand a disciplinary system that is neither indulgent nor harsh and truculent; for young men, whose maturing depends on discipline, can learn democratic citizenship only through freedom. As time advances they will be colleagues and peers of their teachers, perhaps superior to them in the performance of duty. Therefore, under no circumstances should they be cast down from the rank of men and reduced to the level of mere beasts through proud and arrogant handling. It is not advisable for anyone to be held in line by fear—young men least of all, for their spirits should be stirred to seek honor and should be fired with a love of glory and of manly excellence.

The 1802 laws, issued under third president JONATHAN MAXCY, reiterate the message:

> The officers of college are to be considered as invested with a discretionary parental authority; and it is expected by the trustees that they will constantly treat the students with mildness and moderation, governing them by applying the more honorable and generous excitements to good conduct; and that they will not, except in cases of great enormities, proceed to inflict the higher punishments, until the discipline of advisory and lenient measures shall have proved ineffectual

Fourth president ELIPHALET NOTT (1804–66) held (and is often credited with inventing) views on discipline that were entirely consonant with these statements by his predecessors.

We also know some of the characteristics of rulemakers; for example, that when they meet, they frequently neglect to concern themselves greatly with the question of whether proposed rules are necessary or enforceable, and that, if moral issues have been invoked, not all who doubt the wisdom of a proposal will take the risk of dissenting. Likewise, it does not usually seem urgent to remove dead letters when revising the code.

To state the problem more concisely: What could a historian legitimately conclude from the fact that Union's student conduct code from 1979/80 through 1982/83 explicitly proscribed blackmail?

Codifications of the Rules. In 1795, 1802 (supplement, 1805), 1807, 1815, and 1821, the College published editions of its "laws." These detailed both required and prohibited behavior, often specifying the punishment for violations. President Nott was ambivalent about a legalistic approach; rather than encourage the notion that any behavior not specifically outlawed was allowed, he preferred employing "moral suasion" to persuade students to be guided by their own better nature. At the same time, undergraduate culture was very legalistic, as shown by the premium STUDENT POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT placed on exploiting loopholes, and Nott himself several times showed his mastery of that art in crafting legislation, especially in connection with the LOTTERIES.

After the 1821 laws, Nott published only a much shorter *Abstract of the laws*, which went through at least nine revised editions. None bear printed dates, but some can be provisionally dated on the basis of internal evidence or contemporary inscriptions; they appear to range from 1833 to sometime in the 1860s. Generally stated in one short sentence, the rules in the *Abstracts* seldom specify punishments.

In 1871, President CHARLES AIKEN, a sterner and more rigid man than his immediate predecessors, published a new code of laws. Although it relied much

more heavily than the earlier codes on broad strictures that manifestly meant whatever the administration wanted them to mean, all students admitted to full standing were required to sign a promise to obey these laws.

From 1871 until 1965, the College published no gatherings of student rules, except possibly for ephemeral lists of dormitory regulations. The doctrine "in loco parentis," which described Eliphalet Nott's stance *vis á vis* students, was finally fully applied: as the ad hoc arbiter of acceptable behavior, the "parent" was not obliged to announce the rules in advance.

Elaborate written rules returned in the second half of the twentieth century for two related reasons: students began to insist on consistent and equitable treatment by the College and by other students, and the courts began to require a measure of due process in student disciplinary proceedings. The result has been increasingly detailed, frequently revised, attorney-vetted statements of all regulations.

The *Student handbook*, published in 1965, 1974, and from 1979 through the end of the period covered by this book, and a smaller pamphlet, entitled *Student life, a guide for students at Union College,* of which 1966, 1968 and 1969 printings are extant, record the rules of recent decades.

Although the rules tell us little about more important matters, they have their own history of change. The major parietal rules, historically, have concerned morals (especially gambling, drinking, and sexual behavior) or the practical exigencies of communal living (peace, safety, and preservation of property), or decorum and civility. In practice, the three categories overlap.

The Regulation of Morals. Respectable Americans of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries usually viewed as immoral many kinds of behavior, including drinking, smoking, swearing, and gambling, which have more recently been either widely accepted or else condemned only on grounds of prudence or "appropriateness." The scope of the College's regulations has narrowed to reflect the fact that the field of morals, to many, is now largely restricted to questions of honesty, integrity, and respect for the rights of others.

Two other premises held by the authors of Union's early rules have also long been abandoned: that the College is responsible for the development of character, and that students must not only be forbidden to sin, but protected from temptations and opportunities to sin.

Fully committed to those premises, President Eliphalet Nott planned Union's present campus, occupied in 1814, as a residential college, with students and faculty living in the same buildings. By contrast, many other American colleges at that time followed the European model, allowing students to live in the surrounding community. One of Nott's favorite adages held that "it is better to prevent evil than to correct it."

Etymologically, "parietal rules" concern the behavior of students within the College walls, but from the time old West College was completed in 1804 until late in the nineteenth century, Union's protective stance also engendered many rules designed to keep students out of mischief and away from the corrupting influences in the outside world. Unless they had permission or were accompanied by a faculty member, students were prohibited from leaving town (1802–60s); going into town in the evening (1807–60s) or on Sunday (1807–21); taking any meals out of college (1807–21); attending balls or the like (1807–60s), or horse races or parades (1807–21); or going anywhere a billiard table was kept or to any "place of amusement" (1807–21). From 1802, students were not allowed to visit taverns, and even groceries "or other places where intoxicating liquors are sold" were off limits from 1833 through the '60s.

Attending any "entertainment" (sometimes, "festival entertainment" or "convivial entertainment") in the College or in the town, or even attending dancing school, was forbidden without permission (1802–71). From the beginning until 1821, the laws tried to prevent students from "associating with persons of known bad character" (who could presumably be found only outside the College). The popular diversion of going down to the station to watch the trains arrive and depart was permitted only outside of study hours, but students had to get permission to go down to the post office at any hour (1833–circa 1859).

In 1830, Davis McFarland, newly transferred from Yale, wrote to a friend still there. Comparing the two institutions, he claimed:

> For morality and freedom from disipation your college cannot compare with this...yours is in reality what this is nominaly—"Botany Bay".... We are permitted on no occasion to visit public places of resort this saves dissipation from drink. We are not permitted to be out of our rooms at night after seven this saves dissipation from whoreing....

To supplement College regulations of student behavior, Nott obtained passage of several state laws, from 1813 onward, designed to reduce the opportunities for sin in Schenectady. It became unlawful

> for any persons to entice the students of Union College...into the vice of gaming, by keeping within the City of Schenectady any billiard table, or by keeping any other of those instruments or devices...contrived or used for gaming.... [or to] furnish any student...with any wine or with any other spirituous liquor...or to furnish them...with a festival entertainment, or entertainment of any sort...[or] with a room or other place of resort." [Further], "it shall not be lawful for any person [to enter the college grounds without permission] or to act as a pimp or pander, or to afford in any other way, facilities to dissipation or debauchery.

It was also made illegal for

> any theatrical exhibition, or any puppet-show, or any feats of horsemanship, or horserace, or any other idle sport or shows of any sort, to be performed or exhibited within [the City of Schenectady]. And it shall not be lawful for any owner or occupant of any house, out-house or enclosure, to furnish any accommodation therefore, or to furnish any accommodation for any suspicious & vagrant females or for any females of ill-fame, or any disorderly person.

No one supposed, of course, that sin necessarily originated off-campus, and many regulations concerned behavior without regard to location. From 1795 through 1833, the laws even tried to suppress lying.

Drinking per se was apparently not proscribed in the beginning; from 1795 to 1821, the regulations only forbade "getting drunk." Students could not bring "any spiritous liquor into College" *without permission*, 1802–21, but the actual use of "ardent spirits" was not forbidden until 1833. The ban mentioned above on giving or attending "festival entertainments" was intended in part to control drinking, and "joining any society having a supper or entertainment during term time" was prohibited in the 1850s and '60s for the same reason.

Gambling—"playing at cards, dice or any unlawful game"—was forbidden from 1795 through the 1860s; billiards was specifically added to the list in 1833. For good measure, the 1795 laws also forbade being present at such games, or keeping "instruments of gambling."

Using tobacco in any form without parental permission was proscribed from 1833 to 1859, but that widely-ignored ban dropped from the last edition of the *Abstract.*

The 1795 laws forbade "cursing, swearing or any unbecoming language." From the next edition through the 1860s, the wording was sharpened to "blasphemy, profane or obscene language," with "or lewd conduct" added from about 1850. Beginning in 1802, students were also prohibited from "avowing or propagating principles subversive of religion or morals." Shortened to "infidel principles" in 1833, this remained unlawful through 1871.

Regulations forbade "frequenting houses of ill repute" in 1795, and fornication in any circumstances from 1802 to 1821, but thereafter sexual matters were not explicitly mentioned; Nott preferred to deal with them privately. On at least one occasion, in 1831, he appealed to parents to forbid their sons' attendance at a planned post-graduation party in Troy: "There are reasons for this request which, if communicated, would, it is believed, be entirely satisfactory." The unmentionable reasons doubtless concerned "houses of ill-repute" in that city.

Fraud was prohibited in 1795, and dueling, forgery and robbery from 1802 through 1821.

From 1854 through the 1860s, the College laws tried to hold students responsible for "moral conduct during vacations."

Little is known about the College's regulation of morals during the nine decades between the last edition of the *Laws* in 1871 and the return of detailed regulations to the *Student handbook* in 1965. Sometime in that period, the administration essentially gave up trying to protect students from the corruption of the outside world and stopped trying to suppress such behavior as smoking, cursing, card-playing and avowing infidel principles. The influx of veterans following the two world wars was only the most pressing of many societal factors forcing change.

During those nine decades, the only surviving printed statements reflecting parietal rules were brief warnings in the College catalogue. From 1873 to 1879, the statement began with wording straight from Eliphalet Nott:

> The discipline of the institution is moral and parental. Disgraceful punishments are not inflicted; but no young man who indulges in gaming, intemperance or other vice, who is absent from his room at night or who habitually neglects his studies, can be allowed to remain.

New language added to this statement in 1880 then stood alone from 1881 to 1950 as a threat accompanied by no rules at all:

> Evidence that a student's continuance in College is resulting in no advantage to himself, or in harm to others, will occasion his separation from the institution.

During the 1950s, the College assumed even greater autonomy in disciplinary matters, while casting its expectations in a positive mode:

> All students are expected to conduct themselves in a manner becoming scholars and gentlemen. The College reserves the right to dismiss or suspend at any time a student whose conduct is in its judgment unsatisfactory.

By 1960, the phrase "a scholar and a gentleman" had become a facetious cliché and the statement had to be recast; oddly, the concept of moral corruption then made a brief return in inhospitable times:

> All students are expected to conduct themselves in a manner that will reflect only credit upon themselves and the College. The College reserves the right to dismiss or suspend at any time a student whose influence is found to be injurious to the standard of morals of the student body, or whose conduct is in its judgment unsatisfactory.

After 1965, the College catalogue made no statement concerning parietal rules, but in that year the *Student handbook* began to carry increasingly detailed regulations.

A ban on alcohol was included in the leases of early fraternity houses built on campus. In 1939, the trustees ruled that the dean could give permission for beer parties (as he had in fact been doing for several

years). In the spring of 1954, the College sanctioned the service of liquor at a prom weekend, probably for the first time.

State law has dictated College alcohol policy since the legal age for drinking in New York State was raised from eighteen to twenty-one at the end of 1985. Alcohol use was eventually seen as a health and safety issue rather than a moral one, and the regulations since 1986 have prohibited "Behavior stemming from excessive use of alcohol."

Use of marijuana at Union began to be noticed in the early 1960s, though student pot-smokers were quick to point out that they had an illustrious predecessor in Fitzhugh Ludlow of the Class of 1856. The author of the *alma mater* had recorded his drug-induced visions of Tartars marching across the College Pasture in his book *The hashish eater*, published the year after he graduated.

In modern times, College policy on "controlled substances" has reflected state law, and the student handbooks have warned since 1968 that the College cannot protect students from enforcement of the law. Since 1984 they have added, "Students who are found guilty of selling controlled substances will most likely be permanently dismissed from the College." No data exists from which one could compare either the extent of drug use or the diligence of College enforcement in various periods, particularly as concerns marijuana.

Gambling was apparently less appealing to most students in the twentieth century than it had been in the nineteenth, but it was explicitly prohibited in the dormitories from 1965 and anywhere on campus from 1984.

Sexual behavior within the College continued to be strictly regulated after 1871, but the arrival of fraternity houses, starting in 1892, made enforcement of all parietal rules more uneven.

It is not known what policy, if any, existed before President Day suggested in early 1932 that unchaperoned women not be allowed in fraternity houses. In February 1939, Dean Garis asked the Interfraternity Council to act on the issue, and when they refused, he forced them to approve a rule permitting women to be entertained in fraternity houses only in public rooms and only when chaperoned. Women were not allowed in any building where beer was being served.

In the fall of 1946, as veterans of the Second World War began to arrive in large numbers, Garis refined the rules: no chaperones were required for lunch or dinner, but women had to leave by nine. All parties required the dean's permission, nothing stronger than beer could be served, and if women were present, the parties had to have chaperones approved by the dean.

In early 1948, the administration called for closer supervision of fraternity parties. For the first time a concern about sexual behavior was made explicit, as the president of the Christian Association contributed to the debate a *Concordiensis* article deploring "sexual intercourse outside the marriage bond."

A *Concordiensis* editorial in April 1958 complained that Union's social rules were archaic by comparison to those of Amherst, RPI, Tufts and Hamilton, and that the rule against women venturing above the first floor was commonly violated and "loosely enforced." A month later, the newspaper proposed that women be allowed in student rooms during limited hours, provided two couples were present. Nothing came of this proposal.

The alumni still had a major voice in fraternity house rules as late as 1960, when the Interfraternity Alumni Council asked the trustees to enact a set of rules to which many students took strong exception.

In the spring of 1962, the Student Council asked the trustees to lift the ban on alcohol in the dormitories, lengthen visiting hours for women, and allow them to be in dormitory and fraternity rooms with the door open. The board took no action on the request.

By the mid 1960s it had become common for fraternities to turn their houses over to their members' dates on prom weekend, while the members were expected to find other places to sleep. One fraternity was punished in 1963, and another in 1965, for failure to vacate the houses for the night while women were there; this action was decried as selective enforcement.

In response to increasing demands for liberalized social rules, President Martin declared in early 1966 that though a revision of the rules was long overdue, "The College will not condone premarital sexual intercourse, or deviant sexual behavior, within its precincts. As for other breaches of the community welfare, offenders will be subject to discipline up to and including suspension." A few months later, the *Concordiensis* editor denied that the community welfare was at issue: "This newspaper neither advocates nor condemns fornication. We merely state that the decision on whether or not to engage in such behavior is highly a personal matter."

The first action of the newly formed All-College Council, in the spring of 1966, was to approve, with some amendments, a proposal of the Student Council to liberalize the rules concerning the presence of women in fraternities and dormitories. Students were permitted to entertain guests in their own rooms from 7–12 on Friday nights, from 12–5 and 7–12 on Saturdays, and 1–6 on Sundays. One lounge in each dorm was reserved for men. Students over eighteen could possess and serve alcoholic beverages in their rooms, subject to certain conditions. Approving these rules, the board gave the Administration permission to make future changes.

A year later, the Council allowed longer hours: Student rooms were open to female guests from 12

noon until 2 AM, on all Fridays and Saturdays and from noon until 8 PM on other days. Each living unit could request four 3 AM weekend curfews per term.

In January 1969 the trustees and the president agreed to an All-College Council proposal that each living unit (including fraternity houses) be allowed, by a three-fourths majority, to increase its own parietal hours, or by a simple majority to decrease its parietal hours. Most units immediately voted for unlimited hours.

By the fall of 1969, the *Concordiensis* reported that the campus police, on their regular patrols through the dorms, had been reporting to the dean of students the names of students whose dates had been observed in nightdress in the dorms after 2 AM. The dean pointed out that "visitation rights are...not lodging rights."

Regulations since that time have been concerned primarily with protecting the privacy rights of roommates.

Union became co-educational in 1970, and by 1973 some dormitory floors were choosing to house both male and female students.

Condom dispensers were first installed in the dormitories in the fall of 1987, one in a men's room in Davidson House, the other in a women's room in Fox House.

Communal Living. By contrast with moral rules, the other rules concerning communal living have changed little. Supervision of the dormitories was long the responsibility of the faculty, who were originally expected to make frequent inspections. From 1795 onward, the *Laws* required the faculty members responsible for dormitory sections to visit rooms whenever they thought it "necessary and proper...entering by force if necessary." Although routine inspections of rooms eventually ceased, faculty members continued to live in the houses at the ends of North and South Colleges until the late twentieth century. Student dormitory proctors were tried in 1932; it is not known how long the system continued. West College (1950) and Richmond House (1960) were built with quarters for faculty proctors. A new system of student resident assistants (at first called "dormitory counselors") was established about 1960 and continues in use.

Dormitory residents were required to be in their rooms during study hours (1802–60s) and were even forbidden to lie down (1805–21 and again circa 1856–60s).

Until 1950 all the College's dormitories were built partly of wood, and until about 1903 each room had a stove. Although the dormitories escaped any serious fire damage, other institutions, such as Princeton, were less fortunate, and a concern about the danger of fire was a constant of the regulations from 1802 to the present (see also: FIRES AND FIRE-PROTECTION). In addition to being warned "to be peculiarly careful respecting fire" (1802–60s), students were forbidden to carry oil lamps into the literary society meeting halls at night (1833–60s) and from using Camphene (a kerosene-like liquid) "or any burning fluid" (circa 1850–60s).

Keeping guns or gunpowder has likewise been forbidden since 1802; other "deadly weapons" have been proscribed since 1832.

From 1807 to 1821, the *Laws* tried to prevent students from throwing snowballs.

Physical and verbal assaults have been linked since the *Laws* forbade "striking or insulting any person" (1832–60s). In the 1871 *Laws* President Aiken tried to expand this provision to suppress HAZING AND CLASS FIGHTS: "All violent, injurious and offensive treatment of student by student [including] all attacks by class upon class" were outlawed. Later administrations generally ignored hazing of all kinds through the first half of the twentieth century. Class fights became benign by the late 1940s and ended in 1960, while class hazing died out in 1970. Fraternity hazing, however, has been a continuing problem, despite being addressed by stern College regulations since 1980 and by state law since 1985.

The effort to keep the dormitories quiet resulted in rules against playing musical instruments in hours of study (1802–71), conversing from windows and doors in study hours or in the evening (1807–21), noisy gatherings inside or outside the dormitories (1832–71), and making "indecent noise" in rooms (1802–7).

Students were enjoined to keep the rooms clean (1821–1860s), and warned against throwing things out windows (1807–71). From 1802 to the 1860s, they were required to buy a pail for use as a chamber pot, but only in 1871 were they specifically warned against urinating ("creating a nuisance") in the hallways, out windows or around the doorways.

A fear of insurrection surfaced several times in the rules; in 1821 students were required "to help officers [i.e., faculty and administration] maintain order on request, and to give evidence." "Entering into combinations to oppose the authority of the College" was forbidden from 1821 to 1846, and in 1871. The 1871 *Laws* went so far as to outlaw "all public expression of dissatisfaction with the discipline of fellow students."

Appraising the enforcement of dormitory regulations in his diary, Jonathan Pearson wrote in 1854:

> Our regulations are thus: the three Halls in each building contain 16 rooms, each of which contains 2 lodgers; this suite of rooms, called a "section," is presided over by a tutor or Prof. whose duty is to keep good order and studious habits in his little dominion—to visit each room at least once a day and night to look to the cleanliness of it as well as to its occupants and take a general supervision of the studies of the young men of the "section."
>
> Our laws and customs are such as might be called "common law" that is unwritten, but sanctioned by long usage and precedent. The student is expected to obey them, yet I

> think they have but little binding effect on his conscience and conduct. They are bound to attend church, they go when they please. They are expected to be in their rooms at study at certain hours, to keep quiet and behave like gentlemen, they do as they please in all such cases and the penalties are seldom if ever imposed. Experience teaches that Professors will not make good Police officers and scavengers; they despise the business and think it a lowering of their dignity to watch and spy upon young men who ought to regulate their own conduct and manners. I say then, upon a moral view of the question, the old plan of lodging students in Colleges with the intention of improving or preserving their virtue and manners is a bad failure, and that no young man who cannot take care of himself ought ever to go to a College away from parental influence. Another reason may be urged for the same opinion. Great bodies of young men clustered together corrupt each other, they become clannish and exclusive, boorish and rough; their correct habits and manners deteriorate, and their rooms are the abodes of disorder and filth.

Since they began again to be printed in 1965 in the *Student handbook*, dormitory regulations have grown steadily more detailed, in part because modern dormitories present more potential for mischief and for other problems, and in part because it has seemed legally necessary to spell out all prohibited behavior. The only fundamental innovation has been the provision for dormitory residents to establish certain kinds of rules, such as additional quiet hours, by vote of those affected.

Decorum and Civility. Students were prohibited in 1802 from "appearing in indecent dress or women's apparel," and from wearing a hat in college buildings (1802–21). A separate law (1807–21) required them to remove their hats when meeting or speaking to professors. Although the College soon abandoned such laws, they returned in more elaborate form as a part of sophomore hazing of freshmen.

From 1802, the laws tried to compel a minimum standard of civility: "If any student shall insult or abuse another, by reproachful language or disrespectful behavior, he shall be fined, admonished, or obliged to confess his fault, and promise good behavior for the future." With the addition of a prohibition on striking other students, insults continued to be prohibited through 1854.

Similar language returned in 1979, guaranteeing: "Freedom from blatantly obscene or offensive behavior (including malicious harassment or persecution.") This was expanded in 1983 to a ban on: "Abusive or offensive behavior which includes but is not limited to malicious harassment and/or persecution, stemming from sexism, racism, ethnic, or religious prejudice."

The *Student handbook* has included the College's policy on sexual harassment since 1983.

Rules concerning pets and automobiles are described in the article on CAMPUS.

See also: BOTANY BAY; COURTS AND JUDICIAL BOARDS

Parshelsky, Isaac (d. March 18, 1935). An impoverished Jewish immigrant, Isaac Parshelsky was befriended as a young man by Union treasurer FRANK BAILEY '85. In gratitude to Bailey, Parshelsky gave Union $20,000 in 1927 to establish a scholarship for students from Brooklyn, available alternately to a Jew, a Catholic and a Protestant. At Dean Garis's request, the fund was changed to a student loan fund in 1930, and the religious stipulations were later dropped. The donor's brother, Moses Parshelsky, added $5,000 to the fund in 1954.

Parthenon (The). One of the College's earliest substantial undergraduate periodicals (following the *FLORIAD*, 1811, and the *STUDENTS' ALBUM*, 1827), the *Parthenon* was first published 1832–34, and subsequently revived three times.

Near the end of their junior year, Samuel D. Tillman '33 and Henry Sanford '33 announced plans to start a magazine the next year. Sanford died soon afterward in the cholera epidemic of 1832, but in November, Tillman, finding that he had received ample literary contributions, issued the sixty-four-page first number on his own. It initially bore the sub-title "...and Academian's Magazine.") Tillman published the magazine monthly until graduation, and later claimed, "It was ranked only third among all published at that time in this country...and was soon followed by one at Yale and another at Williams." A rival literary magazine titled the *CENSOR* was published monthly at Union, November 1832–May 1834.

Several students vied to succeed Tillman, including John Jay Hyde '34, who bought the subscription list. Interested members of the Class of 1834 formed a Parthenon Society, agreeing that Hyde would be the first editor. The society was intended to be self-perpetuating, electing a group of juniors shortly before Commencement, but by the time it met for this purpose on the day before the 1834 Commencement, the society was wracked by dissension. When, in the heat of dispute, John Woodward '34 accused Hyde of having gotten someone else to write his Commencement oration, Hyde hit him on the head with a cane, drawing blood. The meeting broke up without arranging for a transfer of editorship, and the magazine died.

Revived May 15, 1847, by an unknown editor, the *Parthenon* appeared twice a month until July 15, 1847. Again, it published a mixture of poetry, fiction and nonfiction, and again it failed to survive commencement.

The magazine's next revival, four years later, was foredoomed to failure by a political stunt. With promises to publish nothing of a partisan nature, senior A. Firman Carman persuaded his classmates to allow him to bring out the *Parthenon*, third series, as a Class of 1851 publication. When the first issue appeared on March 12, 1851, it was discovered that Carman had printed on the cover of some copies, evidently for cir-

culation among his friends, his name as Commencement marshall—the highest class honor. Carman had already been defeated in an election for that position, and his classmates reacted with outrage. No further issues appeared. This stunt brought about the revival of the SCROLL.

When the CONCORDIENSIS changed in the fall of 1896 from a monthly literary and news magazine to a weekly newspaper, the *Parthenon* was revived as a literary monthly managed by the *Concordiensis* board. The *Parthenon* published frequent articles by faculty and alumni, but the student contributions were disappointing, and at the end of three years the editors concluded that "here at Union under present conditions there is no field for a separate literary magazine." The magazine then died for the last time.

Pastime (The). Sometimes incorrectly called Union's first undergraduate magazine, the *Pastime* was edited, published and largely written by JOHN HOWARD PAYNE from February 21, 1807, to June 1808.

Before coming to Union, the precocious Payne had already published a literary journal, the *Thespian Mirror*, in New York City from December 1805 to May 1806. A few months after arriving at Union, still only fifteen, he issued a prospectus in December 1806: "On suitable encouragement, it is proposed to issue a weekly paper in this city, to be called the *Pastime*."

Payne hoped to pay personal debts by getting subscribers from the general public as well as from his fellow students. The new journal, very similar to the *Thespian Mirror*, began in February and appeared weekly during term; it contained his poems, theatre reviews, miscellaneous essays and humorous stories, and a few pieces reprinted from other journals.

Although Payne mentions a "board of editors," the magazine was entirely his own enterprise; no other Union students are known to have contributed. When he left College in the fall of 1808 to make money as an actor, he announced the merger of the *Pastime* with the *Boston Mirror*.

R. Packard printed the first eighteen numbers of the *Pastime* in Albany. For issues nineteen through thirty, Payne switched to the Schenectady printer Ryer Schermerhorn, but issues thirty-one through thirty-seven were again printed in Albany, this time by E. & E. Hosford.

The earliest true student publication issued at Union was the *FLORIAD*, jointly published in 1811 by the Philomathean and the Adelphic societies.

Pasture. From 1814 until WEST COLLEGE closed it off in 1953, the campus faced west. The foreground of its outlook, the part of the campus lying west of the TERRACE WALL, was called first the College Park, and later the Pasture. For much of that period, it was a bucolic pasture in fact; early engravings view the College buildings from the west, with the Pasture and its animals forming an integral part of the scene.

Throughout the nineteenth century, the College Park extended from the Terrace Wall westward to Park Place; Seward Place did not exist until 1902. Except for three locust groves planted about 1830, a central group of elms and pine trees which existed in 1865, and two College wells, the "Park" was unimproved; cows and horses sometimes grazed in it.

A low fence notwithstanding, townspeople often entered the College grounds via the Park—so often that in 1857 Eliphalet Nott ordered a higher fence built along Union Street to keep them out. In 1910 the first part of the present spiked iron fence was built to prevent ALCO workers from cutting across the Pasture (see FENCES).

Professors long had the right to keep a cow in the Pasture, a benefit which has received attention proportionate only to its quaintness. The disadvantages of owning a cow, especially in a Schenectady winter, and especially for the dignified, were manifold; most faculty members must have found it simpler to buy the dairy products they needed. Only professors Nott, Lewis, Jackson and Pearson availed themselves of the grazing privilege in 1852; Pearson gave it up by 1854 and Lewis by 1857.

There were times when no cows grazed in the Pasture, but most of the "large number of cattle" an 1865 visitor saw there must have belonged to townspeople who had paid a grazing fee; twenty years later, all the cattle fell into this category.

The cows' various owners had to expect them to be the targets of nocturnal raids by students, who milked them, painted them with zebra-stripes, and sometimes led them into classrooms or even second-floor dormitory rooms.

Circa 1898–1901 the pasture served as a primitive golf links. In 1903 the trustees spurned a $10,000 offer from the Schenectady Railway Co. "for a [trolley line] right of way across the college grounds parallel with and adjacent to the college terrace." The departure of the last faculty cow was probably ensured in June 1907 when the Board of Trustees' Instruction Committee authorized the president to "offer to Professor Landreth an increase of $250 in his annual salary with the understanding that Professor Landreth's cow shall disappear from the college campus."

About 1910, both College and local high school teams used the Pasture as a baseball field, but during the First World War, President Richmond had the land sown with oats. A tree nursery started at the north end in 1926 remained until 1941.

From 1937 until 1941, the Pasture reverted for the last time to its former function: at the suggestion of MARIAN OSGOOD FOX, the trustees bought five Shropshire sheep, which grew to a flock of about eight-

een. When not harried by dogs or teased by students, the animals picturesquely cropped the grass; they wintered on a farm in Rexford.

The College's unused land was one of its few disposable assets. In hard times, from the mid-nineteenth century onward, the trustees sold lots at the edge of the Pasture, and in 1885 they mortgaged the entire parcel for $40,000 to pay faculty salaries. Deciding to sell land in a systematic way, in 1899 the board disposed of the GENERAL ELECTRIC REALTY PLOT on the other side of the campus, while a group of alumni tried to persuade the City, which had no park, to lease the Pasture from the College for $5,000 a year and create a park there. Opponents successfully argued that the Pasture hadn't enough trees and that the City couldn't afford the proposition.

In 1901, the College put on the market forty-four lots of the Pasture fronting on Park Place. In the same year the City, ready to build a public library, bought the lot on which WEBSTER HOUSE now stands. Following creation of Seward Place in 1902, the College offered the building lots on its east side for sale. With those sales, the shrinkage of the Pasture ended.

During the Second World War, the American Locomotive Co. manufactured tanks. To provide additional parking for employees in 1941, the company leased the Pasture for the duration, at $10,000 a year, banishing nurseries and sheep. At one time ALCO parked rows of tanks on the south pasture, and until at least 1953 the company continued to rent the pasture north of the creek (which the City had used as a dump around 1909).

In the two decades after the War, the Pasture filled up. Temporary VETERANS' HOUSING arose south of the present RICHMOND HOUSE in 1947 and remained until 1953. When the College built West College (1953), its first new dormitory in 139 years, the architects sited it in the center of the Pasture, a major aesthetic departure from the RAMÉE campus plan, which had been open to the west. Richmond House was erected to the northeast in 1960, and in 1967 FOX and DAVIDSON dormitories were built to the southeast, on the location from 1954 to 1965 of Achilles Field.

The south end of the Pasture had been a source of anxiety to the College since 1944, when first the City and then the State proposed a road through the southwest corner of the campus (see THRUWAY). The trustees had responded in 1950 by commissioning from the College architects an elaborate plan for the future campus, showing a Fine Arts building facing Union Street between the Terrace Wall and Webster House, and several new buildings along Seward Place. Although those buildings were never built, and perhaps never seriously projected, the desire to block the proposed road, or at least limit its incursion, was a major reason for siting the West College, Fox and Davidson dormitories in the Pasture.

After the period covered by this book, the College launched in 1998 a major initiative, with substantial investments, to reverse the deterioration of the neighborhood on Seward Place and westward.

Payne, John Howard (June 9, 1791–April 9, 1852). Actor, playwright, diplomat.

John Howard Payne, who attended Union from July 1806 to November 1808, enjoyed transitory fame for his theatrical and literary accomplishments but is remembered primarily as the author of the song, "Home Sweet Home."

Born in New York City (or possibly in East Hampton, Long Island), the son of William and Sarah Isaacs Payne, John Howard was raised in both places until the family moved to Boston when he was five.

His father, a schoolmaster, drilled the child in the art of elocution, and Payne soon found his talents brought him public attention. Precocity was much admired in that era, and young Payne strove to impress his elders. As a fourteen-year-old, he had already edited and published the *Thespian Mirror* (Dec. 28, 1805–May 31, 1806), a respected journal of theatrical criticism; seen his original play, *Julia,* produced at the Park Theatre in New York (Feb. 7, 1806); and enjoyed hobnobbing with worldly men twice his age. His worried father tried apprenticing him to business, and when that failed shipped him off to college after a wealthy patron, John Seaman, agreed to cover the expense. Spurning Columbia's offer of a full scholarship, and rejecting Princeton as too near New York, Seaman selected the eleven-year-old Union College for its "detached situation," and entrusted ELIPHALET NOTT with the job of reclaiming a youth devoted to the "love of pleasure." Payne's journey to Schenectady in the summer of 1806 indicated the magnitude of the task; he idled along the way and managed to run up over ninety dollars in "tavern debt" before he even arrived at school.

When he enrolled at Union, which was then in "Stone College" on lower Union Street, Payne was a headstrong fifteen-year-old who regarded college attendance as equivalent to a term in state prison. He chafed at the college regimen and complained about bad food and cold rooms, but he came to admire Dr. Nott. He wrote his father a few weeks after arriving, "I am his companion at college, his chum (as they call it), and even share his bed." Doubling up in bed, a common practice in the days before central heating, probably enabled Nott, then a widower, to prevent the youth from sneaking out at night. Subsequently Payne lived with the other students. For his part, Nott recalled much later that he had thought Payne a remarkable conversationalist who talked like a mature man of the world and not like a boy.

Payne made the best of things at Union by writing and publishing *THE PASTIME* (February 1807–June