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Harvard, Yale, and Princeton were selected for study for two major reasons. First, the "Big Three" are among the most prestigious universities in the United States, and they have trained proportionately more "leaders" than any other undergraduate colleges. Secondly, because of their urban locations, Harvard and Yale began to attract after 1900 the ambitious sons of immigrants, who were chiefly Catholic and Jewish. In contrast, Princeton, with its more collegiate atmosphere and its comparative geographical isolation, attracted few of them. While the "Big Three" were willing to admit students of immigrant and minority backgrounds, their traditional role was to educate sons of the middle and upper classes, primarily old stock Americans.

Although higher educational facilities expanded with the growing national wealth and in response to an increasing number of students willing and able to benefit from a college education, the large and rapid rise in
applicants after World War I forced many institutions to adopt more selective admissions policies. Academic standards remained the primary criteria of admission, but some college administrators began to consider subjective factors as well. If academic ability were made the only standard of admission, the number of students from immigrant families would undoubtedly have increased, thus threatening the hegemony of old stock Americans on the campus.

Probably the first universities to adopt some form of restriction, specifically a quota on Jewish students, were those in New York City. Discussion about or adoption of a quota system at one private Eastern university sparked similar consideration or debate at other colleges and universities. Each of the "Big Three" had its proponents of racial and religious quotas. Such men believed that an ethnically diversified student body was incompatible with the institution's traditional aims and culture. The movement for restrictive admissions was closely related to national trends during the 1920's and had its parallel in the Quota Laws of 1921 and 1924. Eastern and Southern Europeans were considered less "desirable" than those of Northern European origin not only as collegians but also as citizens. It was no coincidence that President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard as an advocate of both restrictive movements.

Catholic and Jewish students who gained admission
to Harvard, Yale, and Princeton during the 1920's were confronted by a rather rigid collegiate social structure. On the whole, Jewish students had a more difficult time than Catholic students. While some Catholics were found on social club rosters, Jews were almost entirely absent. Athletic teams of the major sports, debating societies, editorial boards, and musical clubs were also frequently closed to them. Undergraduate society had adopted the antipathies and fears of its elders. Nevertheless, when opportunities were open, both Catholic and Jewish students made substantial contributions to college life by their academic, athletic, and non-athletic extra-curricular achievements.

The period between 1900 and 1930 witnessed a significant diversification of student body composition, particularly at Harvard and Yale. Although the movement to reduce or stabilize minority representation achieved considerable success after the mid-1920's and during the 1930's, World War II unleashed democratizing forces which would open wider the doors of the "Big Three."
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CHAPTER I

THE CAMPUS SCENE

It was of the essence of the 'Harvard man' that he be not a type at all but a strong individualist; Harvard seems always to have encouraged intellectualism and individualism, the latter sometimes to the point of eccentricity. Contrariwise, it was of the essence of the 'Yale man' that he be a type: athletic, hearty, extroverted, ambitious, and intensely competitive. The Yale fraternity and senior-society system generally encouraged a frank and open pursuit of 'success,' and everyone 'knew' that he who was tapped by Skull and Bones had his financial security virtually assured. But the 'Princeton man' was different from these. It was of his essence that he be neither a strong individualist (to be at all eccentric was to risk being tabbed a 'bird') nor a conformist whose conformity was molded by an openly confessed ambition. He was, above all, 'smooth'—that is, socially adroit and graceful. ('I think of Princeton,' Scott Fitzgerald would have one of his fictional characters say, 'as being lazy and good-looking and aristocratic.')

--Kenneth S. Davis, A Prophet in His Own Country.

Generalizations about collegiate types are subject to many exceptions: Harvard attracted athletes and clubmen as well as intellectuals; Yale offered some opportunities to those who esteemed the Phi Beta Kappa key and Yale Literary Magazine charm above the athlete's adored "Y"; and Princeton had its eccentrics and serious writers. But from the turn

---

of the century until World War II, each of the Big Three was known for the kind of man it produced. And no one recognized an "Harvard man" or a "Yale man" or a "Princeton man" more quickly than an alumnus of a rival college. Such an identity, born with each eager freshman's arrival and forged upon the playing fields of Cambridge, New Haven, and Princeton, was cemented after graduation by the good fellowship of graduate clubs and alumni reunions and by generous financial contributions to the alma mater. Not only did this fraternal bond survive two world wars and a depression, but it was strengthened through shared ordeals. If today some alumni of the teens and twenties are disenchanted with their colleges, it is because these institutions underwent an intellectual and social transformation, beginning with the Second World War and culminating in the campus revolts of the 1960's. The world of their youth had been simpler and perhaps more innocent. Adlai E. Stevenson '22 spoke for his college generation when he recalled fondly, during a difficult primary campaign in 1956, his undergraduate days at Princeton: "'It was a different time [with] different mores and there are those of us who still shed a salty tear for F. Scott Fitzgerald and the departed glories and the Princeton Country Club.'"2

2Adlai Stevenson as quoted in Davis, A Prophet in His Own Country, p. 117. For the manners, morals, and mood of of the 1920's, see Frederick Lewis Allen, Only Yesterday (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1931).
The Big Three

Although Presidents Woodrow Wilson and John Grier Hibben had raised Princeton's academic standards considerably during the first three decades of the century, "its atmosphere of bright colors and its alluring reputation as the pleasantest country club in America," continued to attract young men like Amory Blaine of F. Scott Fitzgerald's *This Side of Paradise*. And Adlai Stevenson himself confessed to a friend that he did not have "'the remotest idea'" of his class rank. Since his "'greatest pre-occupation was with extra-curricular activities,'" especially with editing the *Daily Princetonian*, he "'was content with what we generally called "a gentleman's third group."'" Princeton could be considered a "country club" to the extent that most of its students came from comparatively well-to-do families and that extra-curricular activities were usually more important to most undergraduates than academic work.³

While Princeton was 'like a spring day," wrote Fitzgerald, Yale was "November, crisp and energetic." But his analogy to the seasons explained only in part the differences between the two colleges. It may also be said that Princeton was known for its "atmosphere" and Yale for its "system." According to historian George Wilson Pierson,

Yale provided "an education of soul, mind, heart, and body: all at once and in a sort of balance." Moreover, "the Yale system operated"

on the assumption, first of all, that the better part of a college education was a training in good habits: habits of worship and devotion; habits of industry and exact study; good moral and physical habits; habits of square and manly dealing. But habits come only by exercise and repetition. This meant that the undergraduates should be regularly practiced in hard and even unpleasant work, that their sense of duty to society and of obligation to each other should be cultivated on every occasion. Also that they should try out and develop their powers in constant action.

Yale perpetuated the traditions of New England schoolmasters by its strong emphasis on discipline and training. No less Puritan was its belief that "man by nature inclines to be lazy, perverse, and selfish" and that "college youth is mischievous and idly playful to boot." Therefore, the Yale system encouraged students "to engage in the unending exercises that would give them good habits by example, discipline and punishments, competitions, and rewards." The competition and discipline was as much social and physical as intellectual:

The competitions were the classroom rivalries on the assigned work, the prize speaking contests, and all the feverish competitions of undergraduate life—athletic, extracurricular, and social. Similarly not a part of Yale operated without its elaborate system of recognitions and rewards—the Academic Appointments or Honors List, the DeForest and other prizes, the editorships and managerships, the captaincies and society elections. Moreover all the honors from the Commencement List to Tap Day were public; and most, for their appeal, relied in part on tradition and
ceremony. Psychologically as well as physically the Yale system was a community system.

The Yale community was indeed unique, whether or not it fully merited Professor Pierson's eulogy as "an organic society of enormous vitality and power," which was "perhaps in its peculiar way as effective and successful a society as was to be found anywhere on this earth." To be sure, the victorious competitor at Yale carried the "habits" of success into his future career. Financially at least, Yale men earned more money than their rival brethren at Harvard and Princeton.

Even outsiders, like Edwin E. Slosson, an alumnus of the Universities of Kansas and Chicago, were impressed by the strength of Yale traditions and the caliber of its students. "The finest thing about Yale," he wrote in his article for The Independent of February, 1909, were the students, "a likable lot of fellows." While visiting the

---

campus, Slosson felt as he did "in the dynamo room of a great power house." And he sought an explanation for the fact that Yale undergraduates seemed "to train, control, and discipline themselves, leaving little for the official authorities to do in this way." The essence of Yale was symbolized by Professor William Graham Sumner's *Folkways* (1906), just as William James's *Pragmatism* (1907) represented the spirit of Harvard:

'Pragmatism' is the Harvard elective system applied to the universe. 'Folkways' makes the Yale system of social control the fundamental principle of all morals and manners. The former book preaches a defiant individualism that would free itself even from the bonds of its own past, that would shatter this sorry scheme of things and then remold it nearer to the heart's desire. The latter book shows how completely we are ruled by custom and tradition, and how righteousness and conformity come to mean the same thing. It would be hard to imagine 'Pragmatism' proceeding from New Haven or 'Folkways' being written in Cambridge.

Yale relied upon the tried and known to guide its conduct, while Harvard encouraged individual experimentation. Because of its traditionalism, Yale seemed to George Santayana, who visited New Haven in 1892, to be both an older and a more New England college than Harvard. Yale was "'in many respects what Harvard used to be,'" observed the philosophy instructor from Cambridge, Massachusetts.5

Harvard was different, friends as well as critics acknowledged readily. For example, Harvard, like Columbia and Pennsylvania, was closely identified with a large city. As a consequence, these three institutions, said Yale President Arthur Twining Hadley, "had developed their professional schools and their training of specialists more than they had developed a distinctively college life." On the other hand, Princeton and Yale, which were situated, respectively in a borough and a medium-size city, "had as a result of their age and size developed a national character and become not so much places of training specialists as places of training American citizens." Actually, while Yale could be considered a "national" institution—well-distributed representation and under thirty percent of the students from the "home state"—Princeton was a "sectional" college, because of its high percentage of students from the Middle Atlantic region. And Harvard was regarded as an "intersectional" university despite the large number it drew from outside New England, because almost 40 percent of its students came from Massachusetts. Urban universities usually drew a higher proportion of students locally than did colleges seeking geographical distribution.6

Harvard was a multi-track institution which could accommodate almost any type of student. According to historian Henry F. May, it "still retained some vestige" of the New England college within the cosmopolitan university.

There were, in fact, at least five Harvards in the pre-war years: a national center of strenuous educational reform, a world center of research, the parochial pleasure-ground of the clubmen (through which passed both Roosevelts), the teaching institution, and, already, the mecca of the disaffected young men who wanted to write.

Harvard thus brought together in a loose-knit community educators, scholars, serious undergraduates, clubmen, and literary rebels. The great professors included William James and George Santayana in philosophy; Albert Bushnell Hart in government; George Lyman Kittredge, Bliss Perry, and Barrett Wendell in English; Charles Eliot Norton in history Distribution, PUA. According to C. R. Foster, assistant professor of education at Rutgers University, and Paul S. Dwyer, associate professor of education at Antioch College, Antioch had "the most ideal distribution of students, with Asbury second and Sweetbriar third." In regard to percentage of students from home state and number of states so represented, Yale, Harvard, and Princeton had, respectively: 28.8 percent, 48 states; 39.8 percent, 48 states; and 22.4 percent, 40 states. While 4140 of Harvard's students came from outside New England, 3533 of Yale's were from outside Connecticut. The six other universities drawing students from all 48 states were Columbia, Chicago, Michigan, George Washington, Northwestern, and Pennsylvania. See Rudolf Tombo, Jr., "College Student Geography," Boston Evening Transcript, October 5, 1912, p. 3. In 1912-1913, the percentage of home state enrollment was 67 percent at the University of Pennsylvania, 62 percent at Columbia, 55 percent at Cornell, 50 percent at Harvard, 35 percent at Yale, and 21 percent at Princeton. During the next two decades, home state enrollment decreased substantially at Harvard and Yale, but only slightly at Princeton. On the whole, privately endowed Eastern universities were "more national in character" than either Western State universities, except Michigan, or Southern universities.
of art; and Irving Babbitt in French literature. Whether intentionally or not, some of these professors fed the spirit of rebellion in the hearts and minds of more than one generation of young men. Two factors explained why the University encouraged rebels: first, it was in contact with the wellsprings of dissent and revolt within the Western World; and second, "because Harvard was so much a center of American nineteenth-century culture." And there "the stresses and strains of that culture were intensified." Although most Harvard students of this period absorbed, like the young Franklin D. Roosevelt, "the standard mixture of morality and gentlemanly taste,"

a few went beyond the optimistic doctrines of official Harvard, beyond the crusty Yankee conservatism of Wendell, beyond the fashionable and amusing Boston cult of Anglo-Catholic monarchism, into a more serious dislike of contemporary civilization. Even these young pessimists, however, were living in a time and place full of the spirit of reform; they were impelled by their doubts not toward passive contemplation but toward action. If progress and politics were dismissed, literature at Harvard was still taken seriously.

The dissidents would create "a literature at once strenuous and unhappy."7

Notably among these "Young Intellectuals" were Van Wyck Brooks, John Dos Passos, Walter Lippmann, and John Reed. But even Princeton, in spite of its club system and

insouciant air, produced at least one future rebel, the Socialist Norman Thomas. Nor were Harvard's Conrad Aiken, Malcolm Cowley, E. E. Cummings, T. S. Eliot, and Wallace Stevens the only significant poets and littératoirs of the period. Yale nurtured Stephen B. Benét, Waldo Frank, Sinclair Lewis, Archibald MacLeish, and Thornton Wilder. Out of Princeton came F. Scott Fitzgerald and Edmund Wilson. And each of the Big Three educated its share of political leaders. Harvard contributed the two Roosevelts; Yale educated William H. Taft, Dean Acheson, and Henry L. Stimson; and Princeton sent forth Woodrow Wilson, John Foster Dulles, and Adlai E. Stevenson. According to George W. Pierson's The Education of American Leaders, Harvard, Yale, and Princeton have ranked, respectively, first, second, and third, in producing proportionately more leaders than any other undergraduate colleges. Their alumni have been at or near the top in 85 listings: statesmen; lawyers and judges; physicians, surgeons, and medical faculty; Protestant divinity; big businessmen, industrialists, bankers, and financiers; philanthropists, scientists and engineers; authors, composers, artists, and architects; educators and scholars; winners of the Freedom Medal; those elected to the Hall of Fame; and those included in Dictionary of American Biography, Encyclopedia of American History, Who Was Who in America. Such listings may not have been definitive, but they were impressive:

For Princeton, given its distinctly limited enroll-
ments and alumni constituencies, the almost consistent third-place ranking over a span of two hundred years represents an extraordinary achievement. ... The men of Harvard have indeed excelled in literature and the arts, in science and medicine and scholarship; while the sons of Yale have demonstrably lived up to their reputation for practical affairs and public service, as witness their records in government and the law, in business and philanthropy, in education and the Christian ministry.

Of course, the unanswerable question is whether individuals or the colleges should be congratulated for the distinguished achievements of alumni.  

"Was College Worth While?"

John R. Tunis, Harvard '11, asked his classmates this question twenty-five years after graduation. Thirty-three percent of those replying said that their college courses had no value for their later careers; thirty percent found English courses, especially the required Freshman English A, to have been valuable, while twenty percent thought Economics useful. But observed Tunis, "Whatever it taught these men, four years at Harvard did not teach them

---

to spell." Their punctuation and style were also poor. Forty-one percent recorded that they were not influenced by any of the great Harvard professors, probably because until the senior year their contact with Faculty was largely limited to assistants and instructors. Of those acknowledging some professorial inspiration, 16 percent chose George Herbert Palmer, professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity; 14 percent named A. Lawrence Lowell, professor of Government; and 13 and 8 percent selected, respectively, Frank W. Taussig, professor of Economics, and Charles T. Copeland, assistant professor of English. Other professors receiving votes of confidence were Le Baron Russell Briggs (Rhetoric and Oratory), George Santayana (Philosophy), Barrett Wendell (English), Thomas N. Carver (Political Economy), Hugo Münsterberg (Psychology), and Edwin F. Gay (Economics). And one man nominated "Professor" Percy Duncan Haughton (who coached Harvard to four consecutive Big Three football championships, 1912-1915), while another said that he was influenced by a Greek professor but could not remember his name.9

Dartmouth, 1 in 48; Virginia, 1 in 78; Michigan, 1 in 82; North Carolina, 1 in 87; Wisconsin, 1 in 89; and for state universities the median was 1 in 145.

College was hardly "worth while," concluded Tunis, for those whose ambitions were "to vote the Republican ticket, to keep out of the bread line, and to break 100 at golf." The Class of 1911 was overwhelmingly against the New Deal; Harvard men were only slightly less hostile (73 percent) than Yale (80 percent) and Princeton (92 percent) to Franklin D. Roosevelt's policies. Although college did little, if anything, to change political opinions, it could bring financial rewards. Not only was a college education useful and necessary for a professional or educational career, but success in college seemed to have a direct relationship to success in later life. Interestingly enough, of the twenty-seven men achieving Phi Beta Kappa in college, seven attained recognition in Who's Who and made an average annual income of over $6,000 in 1935. Their classmates earned an average income of only $4,450. The clubmen, second in income to the Phi Beta Kappas, were followed by the "average men" and finally the athletes. The modest financial position of the last group refuted "the old gag about making the football team to get a job and a partnership in the firm," said Tunis. Except for two men, there were "no big money-makers among the leading athletes in the class," and some were "barely getting by." And only two of the former athletes were among the twenty-three men of 1911 listed in Who's Who. By this criterion, the clubmen did about as well as the Phi Beta Kappas: six were so
recognized. None of remainder, however, had "stood out in the slightest manner during our four years at Cambridge, although several received scholarships and were brilliant students." They were obscure men in college, not having belonged to clubs, played on teams, or participated in extracurricular activities. Since Tunis could not explain their later prominence, he felt that recognition in Who's Who had "little reference to distinction and not a great deal to achievement!"

But whether their degree of financial success and public recognition was large or small, all good Harvard men dug deep into their pockets for their twenty-fifth reunion gift to the University. Not only did the Class of 1911 raise $100,000 during the depression to be spent at the President's discretion, but it also contributed another $50,000 for particular uses. The average donation was $375,

---

10 Tunis, Was College Worth While?, pp. 234, 232, 168, 72, 188-193, 226-227. The number of Phi Beta Kappas listed in Who's Who was either six (p. 191) or seven (p. 192). The class voted fourteen men to be worthy of distinction: Gluyas Williams, cartoonist; Richard Whitney, banker; Conrad Potter Aiken, poet; Arthur Sweetser, on Secretariat of the League of Nations; Hanford MacNider, onetime minister to Canada; Kenneth Macgowen, motion picture producer; Alan Gregg, M.D., Rockefeller Foundation; James G. Blaine, banker; Perry D. Smith, educator; Herbert Jacques, past president of the United States Golf Association; L. L. Winship, editor of the Boston Globe; Dr. Samuel Levine, eminent heart specialist; and Hoffman Nickerson, author. For some reason, Tunis did not identify the fourteenth man. Of the fourteen, three had been college athletes, four had been leading clubmen, and six just "average students."
and none exceeded $5,000. The fact that many gave as much as they could afford testified to the loyalty which the rank-and-file of the class felt for Harvard. And a large number were sending or hoped to send their sons to Harvard. To be sure, there were criticisms: some felt that Harvard had failed to keep pace with educational changes elsewhere, while others disapproved of its dropping of Latin as one of the required subjects for admission. There were also regrets as well as hopes. Although many regretted not having taken full advantage of their college opportunity—perhaps because they could not cope effectively with the freedom of the elective system—most were confident that their sons would receive a better education at Harvard. 11

The Days of Yale's Gridiron Glory

For a minority, college was "worth while," because of the academic interests fostered and the intellectual associations encouraged by a shared commitment to learning. But it is impossible to escape the conclusion that such intellectual passions left untouched the vast majority of undergraduates at the Big Three. Their enthusiasms were of an emotional and physical nature: playing on a winning team, squad, or crew; roaring from the bleachers in the stadium or bowl; receiving the look of approval, if not

envy, accorded to the "Big Man" on campus; and the good fellowship of clubs, fraternities, and societies. The supreme exemplar of this undergraduate passion for both player and spectator was football. No game was complete, however, without musical accompaniment. Each team needed songs to spur it on to victory. But a winning song was almost as difficult to come by as a winning team.

Encouraging the composition of an enduring college song was one of the more pleasant, but no less serious, tasks of college presidents in this era. For a successful college song, wrote President Arthur T. Hadley,

the fit is the important thing, the tune probably next, the words last of all. The best college song in the country is Old Nassau. The words by themselves are abominable; the tune can hardly be said to rise far above mediocrity; but the fit is something absolutely extraordinary.

One of the best Yale football songs was "March, March on Down the Field." Composer Stanleigh P. Friedman '05 will be remembered, no doubt, at least as long as Welch Hall stands on The Old Campus. To commemorate its composition, the title was carved in the wall beside an entryway to the dormitory in which he lived during his junior year. Friedman, who had been president of the Yale University Orchestra his senior year, also composed the march, "Under the Elms." After graduation, he wrote "Whoop It Up" and "Glory for Yale," his class reunion song.12

12 Arthur T. Hadley to John O. Heald, January 28th,
Cole Porter '13, who became one of America's greatest song writers, contributed "Bull-Dog" and "Bingo, That's the Lingo" to Yale's repertoire of football songs. Perhaps the most unusual, but nonetheless strikingly appropriate, song was " BOOLA, BOOLA." According to President Hadley, Pop Hirsch '01, catcher of the varsity baseball team for two years, once heard a crowd of savages singing 'BOOLA, BOOLA,' and he fitted some words to it. Both the tune and song were of the kind which forbade any possibility of long life; but the fit was so overwhelmingly accurate that it for the time being carried not only the college but the country.

"BOOLA, BOOLA" was only an earlier example of many popular songs which capture the hearts of many while making as little sense as possible.  

Whatever the band played, the Yale football team was very successful, especially during "the golden age of the sport." Of the 30 games with Harvard between 1875 and 1909, Yale won 22, tied 3, and lost 5. Of the 35 games with

---

13 Hadley to Heald, January 28th, 1907. Pierson, Yale, I, 351. For the college career of Allan Mortimer Hirsh, see Yale College, Class of 1901, Senior Class Book and later histories. Hirsh, who was also Jewish, later served on the Graduate Athletic Committee on Baseball, 1926-27-1931-32.
Princeton between 1873 and 1909, Yale won 19, tied 7, and lost 9. In all, from 1872 through 1909, Yale won 324 games, tied 18, and lost only 17. These impressive records made Yale "almost invariably the Big Three, Eastern, and national champion." After losing its first game of "football" with Princeton—under soccer rules—and with Harvard—under a combination of soccer and Rugby rules in deference to its rival—Yale began to develop the American game under Walter Chauncey Camp. The only man in Yale history to captain the team for three years, as a junior, senior, and second year medical student, 1878, 1879, and 1881, Camp sparked the Blue team to many victories. He also succeeded in persuading the Intercollegiate Football Association, founded in 1876, but not joined by Yale until 1879, to accept eleven, rather than fifteen, men on a team and to substitute the scrimmage line for the scrimmage-scrambling after a free ball—of Rugby. According to football analysts, Camp had thus "laid the foundation of American college football," because "everything that has developed in the structure of football from 1880 to the present all naturally flowed from the invention of the scrimmage": the set play, succession of plays, and strategy.  

While developing the unpaid Yale graduate system of coaching, Camp worked for New Haven Clock Company and rose to the presidency during his forty-two years there. But football was his greatest love, which fortunately for Yale, his wife, Alice, sister of William Graham Sumner, understood. In due course, wrote Professor Pierson, "there poured out of New Haven a host of player-missionaries—to carry football and sportsmanship across the country as once Yale's mission bands had carried evangelical Christianity to Iowa and Illinois." Of all the football players from Yale, Princeton, and Harvard who coached teams at other universities, "perhaps the greatest apostle of muscular Christianity and clean sportsmanship was wiry and eager Amos Alonzo Stagg '88," who departed from the Yale Divinity School after his first year, because talking made him ill at ease. He soon began what would become a successful forty-one year career as Director of Physical Culture and Athletics, with professorial tenure, at the University of Chicago. Much later Knute Rockne of Notre Dame would acknowledge that he "'learned everything!' he knew "'about football from Yale.'" "'Lonny Stagg taught it!'" to him. In not too many years,
however, the Big Three would have to yield its initial dominance of the All-American football team—the first eleven, chosen in 1889 was monopolized by five Princetonians, three Harvardians, and three Yale men—to later football factories like Notre Dame, Southern California, and Georgia Tech.\(^\text{15}\)

Football had become a great spectator sport during its "golden age," but at times it did not seem to be very far removed from the entertainments of the Roman Colosseum. Good sportsmanship was sometimes forgotten in the heat of combat, as in the Yale-Harvard contest of 1887, won by the Blue at the Polo Grounds. William Lyon Phelps '87, who became one of Yale's most popular professors (English), described the late action in the game: Quarterback Billy Wurtenberg

'miraculously ran through the entire Harvard team, and made a touchdown. This infuriated one Harvard player so much that he began pounding the spine of Wurtenberg as he play prone, which in turn infuriated a Yale player, so that he kicked the Harvard gentleman in the face, and a good time was had by all.'

At times, however, games resulted in serious injuries.

\(^{15}\)Cohane, *The Yale Football Story*, pp. 40, 50-52, 58-60, 67-70. Unlike many women today, Allie Camp was not a "football widow." Since Camp's job kept him from the Yale Field during the week, Mrs. Camp attended these practice sessions in his stead, took notes, and reported any problems to her husband before his evening meeting with the captain, head field coach, and players. Pierson, *Yale*, I, 33-34.
Football was caught between two dangerous types of action: almost unrestricted tackling and mass plays. Several variations on the V-wedge, which had been used first by Princeton in the mid-1880's, were developed, for example, the "flying wedge" by chess expert Lorin F. Deland of Harvard.16

In spite of some prohibitions or restrictions on mass plays, substantial reform was postponed. Football had become a religion, not only to the players and alumni, but also to much of the public. (Harvard Stadium, the first football amphitheater built in the United States, accommodated 22,000 spectators in 1903; but its seating capacity had to be enlarged, first to 35,000 and then to 58,000). And writer Ernest Poole, Princeton '02, expressed the feeling of exaltation felt by fans when they witnessed the game-winning plays of Tiger star, Arthur Poe '00. In 1898, Poe had run 95 yards from around the Princeton 15 to make a touchdown against Yale; with a successful conversion, Princeton won 6 to 0. The following year at New Haven, another Yale fumble lost the ball to Princeton. Trailing 10-6, with under two minutes remaining, Poe kicked his first field goal in a game from the Yale 35, giving Princeton a

one-point victory. With reverence, Poole described the reaction of the Princeton fans on that cold, late afternoon:

I remember the wild tornado of cheers and after it thousands of bared heads, as voices all around me, voices of men young and old from every part of the country, joined in the singing of Old Nassau, our hymn in victory or defeat. That song never lost its thrill for me, for it gave me a sense of belonging to something bigger than my little self, a feeling which in a larger way was later to mean so much in my life.

In this era, the days of the football warriors were touched with immortality.17

Many athletes had been prepared in boarding school for the rigors of physical competition as well as for the demands of course work, according to James McLachlan, an historian of American boarding schools. During the Progressive era

... a new generation of schoolmen embraced athleticism as a primary instrument of moral education and student control.... At Phillips Exeter athletics assumed such proportion that overambitious students had to be dismissed when it was discovered that they had hired professionals to play on the Academy football team.... At Groton athletics became one of the most pervasive of the school's activities. Peabody considered it a superior instrument for building character.

'Football,' his biographer wrote, 'he privately admired because it is a game that is rough and hard, requiring courage, endurance, and discipline. Instinctively he trusted a football player more than a non-football player, just as the boys did.'

The Reverend Endicott Peabody believed, however, that the game should be played by the rules and "the code of the gentleman." Deploring the brutality of both high school and college football games which resulted in 1905 in 18 players dead and 149 seriously injured, Peabody influenced President Theodore Roosevelt to invite Big Three coaches and physical directors to a conference and luncheon at the White House that October, 1905. Reforms in the game which followed during the next few years—notably, adoption of the forward pass—preserved football as an instrument of moral uplift. A young man exhausted by an alternating routine of academic work and strenuous play had little, if any, energy left with which to lose his innocence. Thus armed with "muscular Christianity," graduates of Groton, Hotchkiss, Lawrenceville, Phillips Andover, St. Paul's, and of other prestigious boarding schools, marched into battle on the playing fields of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. Football players were already seasoned veterans when they entered into the arena of business competition and trust wars. They also understood a world in which a "series of imperial and bellicose adventures . . . planted the American flag in the Caribbean and the Pacific and paraded the
American navy around the world."18

At least until the early 1940's, Yale "still ranked among the top ten in the country for football attendance." And during "the golden twenties" when "tickets fetched prices like General Motors and climax games regularly jammed the Bowl, filling Yale's athletic coffers to overflowing," it was reported that the Yale Athletic Association received over $1,000,000, from ticket sales in one season. Construction of Yale Bowl, with a seating capacity of 80,000 (opened in 1914, the same year as Princeton's Palmer Stadium), had been made possible, in part, by $135,000, which Walter Camp had saved by 1910, when he resigned as treasurer of the Yale Field Association—and was retired from direct influence over Yale football. Three years after his death

in 1925, the Walter Camp Memorial Gateway, at the entrance of Walter Camp Field and Yale Bowl, was dedicated to "the Father of American Football." Mighty contests had been and would be waged in this coliseum.¹⁹

Harvard, Yale, and Princeton Agreements--And Disagreements

Of all Big Three football contests the most important were the last two or three games each season when they played each other. For most of its football history, Yale reserved its final game for either Princeton or Harvard. In its first twenty-eight seasons, Yale played Princeton last eighteen times. Beginning in 1900, however, the Yale-Harvard contest was always the final game, except in 1931, 1933, 1935, 1943, and in the two war years of 1917 and 1944, when Yale played neither Harvard nor Princeton. The Tigers were thus excluded from a final Big Two contest. Although somewhat disgruntled by its third place position—Princeton liked to think of itself as co-equal with Yale—and occasionally annoyed when Harvard considered it only as an afterthought of the Big Two, the Tigers were mollified by

their inclusion in the Harvard-Yale-Princeton Athletic Agreements.20

In December, 1909, for example, President Woodrow Wilson of Princeton, who had coached football in his younger days, proposed to President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard and to President Arthur Twining Hadley of Yale that they have an informal conference in regard to the game's brutal and dangerous mass plays. Wilson agreed with the opinion recently stated in Harpers' Weekly that the three presidents "could, if they were to agree upon a principle of action and insist upon it, very largely and perhaps completely control the methods of the game of football," so great was their influence. Lowell accepted the proposal since he and Percy Haughton were already conferring with Hadley and Walter Camp. Apparently, Percy D. Haughton of Harvard and Howard Houston Henry of Princeton agreed to certain rule changes to prevent spinal injuries and other serious accidents, but Camp declined to sign their report. In essence, Haughton and Henry recommended to the three presidents that the Big Three play according to the changes approved by the Intercollegiate Rules Committee.21


21Woodrow Wilson to President A. Lawrence Lowell, December 6th, 1909, December 9th, 1909, December 23rd, 1909, January 1st, 1910; A. Lawrence Lowell to President Woodrow Wilson, December 24, 1909 and January 13, 1910; Woodrow
Not until June, 1916, however, did the Big Three formally agree to regulate the conditions of playing football among themselves. The Triple Agreement pledged the maintenance "'in mutual confidence at these three universities the same theory and practice in matters of eligibility.'" With the revival of athletic competition after World War I other reforms followed. Their representatives announced that "'proselyting in any form is injurious to college athletics.'" No "'inducement'" should be offered by any alumnus, undergraduate, or friend of the colleges to persuade promising athletes to enter the alma mater. Friendly relations between the colleges were further demonstrated by Dean L. B. R. Briggs's praise of the athletic chairmen at Yale and Princeton. The Harvard chairman of athletic sports said that Professor Robert N. Corwin, the past chairman of the Yale Board of Control, "'had the confidence of every Harvard man who has worked with him'" and "'perfectly illustrated Mr. Roosevelt's remark that Yale and Harvard are 'natural adversaries and therefore natural friends.'"

Association with both Corwin and Dean Howard McClennen of Princeton "brought to Harvard chairmen constant pleasure and constant examples of good academic sportsmanship."  

In March, 1922, a commission of alumni and professors, three appointed by each president, met to revise the Triple Agreement. As a result, the supplementary Three Presidents' Agreement became effective January 1, 1923. It covered "Financial Assistance or Inducements," Scholarship awards, "Athletic Status of the so-called Transferred Students," "Proselyting in Preparatory Schools," coaching staff, training period and number of games, and scheduling and publicity. Under another supplement, as of September 1, 1926, each university agreed to pay their varsity football coaches collectively not more than $22,500. The Big Three wished to preserve the amateur status of intercollegiate sports by not beginning football training before September 15th and by banning professional athletes from their teams.

The Committee of the Three Chairman would take under advisement "all debatable questions" arising out of their athletic relationships.\(^{23}\)

The future of Big Three football was seriously jeopardized when Harvard entered into a two-year agreement "to play the University of Michigan, in place of Princeton, in 1927 and 1928." Colonel William J. Bingham '16, who had been appointed Harvard's first Director of Athletics and Physical Education in 1926 (as well as serving as Chairman of the Committee on the Regulation of Athletic Sports and an ex officio member of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences), had undertaken these negotiations before consulting Princeton. Western alumni wanted a resumption of an Harvard-Michigan contest--the Crimson had won all three of their previous games with the Wolverines. Moreover, the president of the University of Michigan was Clarence C. Little, who had been varsity track captain of the Crimson during his undergraduate days. Harvard was thus scheduled to play Michigan in Ann Arbor at the dedication of its new stadium in November, 1927, and Michigan would journey to Cambridge in 1928. Understandably, Princeton was offended at being

dropped in favor of the Wolverines. The resulting controversy, which revealed much unbrotherly sentiment, was fanned by considerable publicity, especially by undergraduate literary talents in the Harvard Lampoon.\footnote{\textsuperscript{24}}

The Harvard-Princeton series, which began in 1877, had experienced two previous breaks. In 1889, Harvard charged that fifteen Tiger players violated amateur status. Princeton, captained by Edgar Allen Poe, first All-American quarterback and grandnephew of the poet, rolled over the Crimson 41-15 and over the Blue 10-0 to become Eastern champion. Even though the Intercollegiate League dismissed charges against Tiger players, Harvard withdrew from this association and decline to play Princeton until 1895, when it broke with Yale. Princeton won the next two contests, but their series was again broken off, when Harvard resumed playing Yale. The separation ended in 1911, and Princeton won the Big Three championship. Then Harvard went on to win four consecutive Big Three titles. After another two-year break during 1917-1918, Princeton and Harvard played tied games in 1919 and 1920. The next year, Princeton

defeated Harvard, but lost to Yale. In 1922, Princeton was the champion with an undefeated season. Smarting from two successive losses and accusing the Tigers of rough play, some Harvardians wanted to drop Princeton after that season. They succeeded four years later.25

As might be expected, Yale, placed in the middle by the threatened rupture of the Triple and Three Presidents' Agreements, attempted to mediate. In September, 1926, President James R. Angell explained his understanding of Harvard's action to President John Crier Hibben of Princeton. President Lowell "sympathized" with those who wanted to drop Princeton "to the extent involved in his desire to eliminate all but the Yale game." Perceiving this to be the prevalent attitude at Harvard, Director Bingham "saw that the rules would permit a western game if Princeton were dropped." He secured Lowell's consent, and "a contract with Michigan was signed or verbally agreed to." What had been intended to be a private agreement until after the 1926 season was somehow leaked to the newspapers, "and the fat was in the fire." Angell thought that Harvard would not

cancel Michigan, but that if the contract was
not revoked, it will fatally mutilate the present
good feeling in this triple alliance and will put
back a full generation the possibility of steady
advance in the improvement of intercollegiate athletic
conditions in the east. It is a blunder of the first
magnitude and as inconsiderate as it is stupid.

This certainly was one of the strongest and bluntest criti-
cism which Angell, who usually handled difficult situations
with a wry wit, ever made during his presidency of Yale. On
the other hand, Angell pointed out to Hibben that both Yale
and Harvard players were highly critical of, it not incensed
by, Princeton's tactics which went beyond "mere excessive
roughness." The Tigers escaped official detection by "the
more surreptitious effort to injure men by gouging eyes,
twisting ankles, and the like," during a scrimmage. Prince-
ton coaches were not considered "overly strict in the matter
of clean play." But Yale teams, Angell acknowledged, occa-
sionally had "'muckers,'" who engaged in "foul play, some-
times detected and punished, sometimes not." In major con-
tests, Angell observed "repeated instances of the cowardice,
or inefficiency of the officials in disregarding breaches
of the rules." He hoped that continuation of the Big Three
agreements would eventually eliminate these evils.26

26James R. Angell to President John G. Hibben, Sep-
tember 23, 1926, copy, HASP, 1920-1927, Box 36, folder
Princeton-Harvard Relations. James R. Angell to President
John G. Hibben, December 1, 1926, and John Grier Hibben to
President James R. Angell, November 12, 1926, Records of the
President, James R. Angell, Box PR-Provost, folder Princeton.
President Lowell's decision to drop Princeton, although it did not fully anticipate the consequences, should be seen in the light of his strong criticism of excessive undergraduate, alumni, and public enthusiasm for football, which eclipsed the educational purposes of universities. The importance of big, annual contests monopolized too much time. Managers and candidates for these positions spent about twice as many hours on athletics as the players—who regularly attended academic classes, except for the days of out of town games. Consequently, "the scholarship of managers and candidates for managerships was strikingly inferior to that both of players and of students not participating in the major sports." Moreover, Lowell doubted "'the necessity of maintaining a public spectacle attended by thousands of spectators every Saturday throughout the autumn,'" when one major contest—like the annual Harvard-Yale crew race at New London—might accomplish the desired end. Influenced by the practice of Oxford and Cambridge, whose only intercollegiate matches were with each other, Lowell had evidently come to believe, as his President's Report of 1920-1921 suggested, that Yale should be Harvard's only permanent football rival. Their contest would be "The Game." Harvard could then add, drop, or rotate other opponents on its schedule.  

27 Harvard President's Report, 1920-21, pp. 5-29. For
In mid-June, 1926, H. Alexander Smith, Executive Secretary of Princeton University, met with John W. Hallowell, President of the Associated Harvard Clubs, to discuss athletic relations in view of a recent conference and correspondence between Director William Bingham and Charles W. Kennedy, Chairman, Board of Athletic Control, Princeton. Although Hallowell said that he knew little of the circumstances, he defended Bingham's negotiations with Michigan and thought that such games would not "violate spirit" of their Agreements. But Smith believed that different "attitudes of Harvard and Princeton toward H.Y.P. relations" were involved. While Princeton wanted "a complete equality

all around," Harvard wanted "special relations with Yale," thus putting Princeton "in class with Michigan, Dartmouth, Brown, Cornell, etc." And Princeton resented Harvard's recent actions. Smith later wrote Hallowell that Harvard "consistently tried to reduce the Big Three to a Big Two (or as the Lampoon expressed it - a Big Two and a half) thus suggesting that Princeton should willingly take a minor part in what we thought was a mutual arrangement."

Moreover, Princetonians felt

agrieved [sic] that Harvard should think that we are trying to enhance our prestige at Harvard's expense. We are smaller, it is true, and have not the professional graduate schools which add so much to Harvard's prestige, but perhaps we are justified in believing that our lineage is no less honorable and our contributions to the nation's progress is no less important.

Loyal sons of Nassau would not honorably yield to "Harvard's dictation." 28

A stronger argument than Princeton's hurt feelings was the fact that article 3, section VI, of the Three Presidents' Agreements which forbade "post-season contests, or contests for the purpose of settling sectional or other championships, or involving long and expensive trips, or extended absence from the University," covered the proposed

28 Memorandum of Conference between J. W. Hallowell and H. Alexander Smith re Harvard-Princeton Relations, June 14 and 15, 1926, and Conference between H.A.S. and Harold Edwards June 15, 1926; Kennedy to Bingham, June 21, 1926; and H. Alexander Smith to John W. Hallowell, November 12, 1926 (Although this letter was not sent because of Hallowell's death, it expressed clearly the attitude of Prince-
Harvard-Michigan games just as it had the earlier Princeton-Chicago series. Because the Agreement had been post-dated to January 1, 1923, Princeton could play its final game with Chicago in October, 1922. But Princeton had "very cheerfully abided" by the decision of Angell and Lowell that it could not play Oglethorpe in Atlanta at the opening of the latter's new stadium in 1923. And Yale, also, had observed the Agreement by resisting alumni pressure that it play Chicago. Finally, Princeton pointed out to Lowell that dropping the Tigers in favor of Michigan would undermine the purpose of the Athletic Agreements ratified by the Big Three since 1916. In regard to eligibility, for example, the Triple Agreement of 1916 had to "assume continuous competition in football" or else produce a situation in which an institution against which we at Princeton were not competing would have a vote as to the eligibility of Princeton football players, since any difficult case, under the Agreement, is referred to the vote of the three Chairmen. Such a situation would seem wholly incongruous.

All things considered, Princetonians saw no reason for continuing to play Harvard at all, unless on a permanent, annual basis.

---

Lowell recognized the logic of Princeton's arguments and canceled the Michigan proposal. But he denied that the custom of playing "the same five colleges" should "become regarded as a prescriptive right and duty." While Harvard men had no "desire to break with Princeton," they did want it clearly established that neither they nor Princeton was "under a moral obligation to play every year, and that no one has a right to feel hurt by playing, let us say, every other year." Once "this principle" was accepted, "a wholly friendly understanding and arrangement" could be reached upon which to continue the existing Big Three Athletic Agreements. "The athletics of the University, like everything else," argued Lowell, "ought to be freely conducted for the welfare of its students, and not be fattered by claims of other institutions." 30

Realizing that "the agitation by the pro-Princeton men in the Harvard ranks" and "the attitude of Yale" had "brought a change of heart in the Harvard family," Smith cautioned Princetonians against pressing "for further advantages" lest they "consolidate" Harvard and "antagonize Yale." Smith optimistically believed that Harvard would not soon, if ever broach, the matter of dropping the Princeton game. Since he believed that Princeton was "gaining in the

confidence in the country, both athletically and intellec-
tually," he felt "that a policy of dignified modesty would
be wiser right now than an aggressive program for improving
our technical position." For example, Princeton wanted to
rotate home games with Harvard, whereas the Crimson always
wanted to play the Tigers in Cambridge.31

What Lowell and Harvard had actually done, wrote
Alan Tabor in Liberty magazine, January 22, 1927, was "to
formulate the general policy of considering Yale the only
fixed opponent." Such a policy, he continued, "would have
paved the way for severing relations with Princeton in an
outwardly diplomatic form, had it not been for the Lampoon
explosion." After a conference in New Haven had suffi-
ciently patched up Harvard-Princeton relations in October,
their teams met at Soldiers Field on November 6, 1926.
Greeting Princeton alumni and fans were copies of the Har-
vard Lampoon, entitled "Princeton Game," for only twenty-
five cents. Harvard undergraduate wits ran Princeton through
the gamut of insult: placing "'Come, brother, let us root
for dear old Princeton!" beneath a cartoon showing two hogs
in the mire; a cartoon with a puritanical John Harvard

31 H. Alexander Smith to John R. Munn of Boston,
October 23 and November 11, 1926; Munn to Smith, October 30,
'26 handwritten; and H. Alexander Smith to Walter E. Hope,
July 17, 1926; Hope to Smith, October 11, 1926; and clipping,
"Harvard Grads Are Indignant," New York Sun, September 30,
1926, HASP, folder Princeton-Harvard Relations.
admonishing Coach William Roper—a little boy who had brought his muddy tiger into the kitchen—not to "'bring that cat around here again, Bill!'"; and referring to "Old Nassau" as "'Old Nausea.'" Finally, an editorial proclaimed that Harvard undergraduates "'would still like to see Princeton dropped, but they would like even more to see her licked.'" No doubt realizing that they were in the most hostile territory of their playing days, the Tigers shut out Harvard 12-0, thus paving their way to winning the Big Three championship. Princeton fans made the victory complete by one of the rituals of victory—tearing down Harvard goal posts. Much was said, publicly as well as privately, which revealed a deep-seated antipathy between undergraduates and alumni of the two universities. After a few days, the decorum characteristic of gentlemen and scholars prevailed. A Harvard Crimson editorial criticized the Lampoon's tactlessness and "'poor taste.'" And although Director Bingham declined to apologize to Princeton for the Lampoon, President Lowell and Dean Chester N. Greenough apologized, respectively, to President Hibben and Dean Christian Gauss. Even the Lampoon tendered apologies to the editor of the Daily Princetonian.32

Peace might well have been restored had not Bingham sent simultaneously to the Princeton Board of Athletic Control a statement drafted October 18 by the Harvard Committee on the Regulation of Athletic Sports. It was the death-knell of the Big Three for the time being: "Except for its final game with Yale, it is Harvard's policy, as soon as circumstances permit, to play football with other colleges only at suitable intervals." Harvard had planned to inform Princeton of its change in policy and playmates once the season had ended. But lest the Tigers jilt Harvard first on account of the Lampoon insult, Bingham took this opportunity to seize the initiative. In reply to Harvard's message, Chairman Charles W. Kennedy immediately telegraphed the unanimous decision of the Board of Athletic Control "'to sever athletic relations with Harvard in all sports,'" because that necessary "'spirit of cordial good will between undergraduates!'" was obviously lacking.33

Although some alumni, chiefly from Harvard, were distressed, most undergraduates at the two universities accepted the break calmly, if not with relief. According to Alan Tabor, beneath Crimson charges that Tiger players "deliberately" tried to injure opponents lay "Harvard's Idea of the Typical Princeton Man:"

An extremely collegiate youth who has preserved too much of the prep-school tradition; wears a coonskin coat and ultra-fashionable clothes; never studies; drinks with a flourish and is inclined to become noisy in public places; New York night clubs are his natural habitat and his taste for feminine companions lacks discrimination.

The countryclub playboy was thus the direct descendant of the debauched Cavalier. And beneath Tiger countercharges that Crimson officials were "high-handed, dictatorial, and arrogant" lay "Princeton's Idea of a Typical Harvard Man:"

A stiff and supercilious youth with an affected accent; a solemn slave of good form, afraid of showing enthusiasm over anything; given to wearing the high hat among other college men; drinks gloomily, is too dignified to dance well or to carry a good conversational line, and so is forced to be content with the dullest and most unattractive girls.

The bespectacled and galoshes-wearing prig evidently found his true ancestor among the bluenosed, joy-kill ing Puritans.34

These stereotypes were strong enough to prevail against the factors favoring reconciliation. For example, Harvard and Princeton men did business together in New York,

and both enjoyed a good game of football between worthy rivals. Harvardians could hardly brag about terminating their series with Princeton when the scorecard read 9 wins, 3 ties, and 16 losses to the Tigers. And instead of resenting their weakness or lack—in comparison with Harvard—in graduate and professional training, Princetonians could take pride in the strengths of their college. Moreover, Vance C. McCormick, influential Fellow of the Yale Corporation, reassured H. Alexander Smith that his university would not sanction a Big Two arrangement in place of the Big Three. In fact, he proposed a Big Three league, possibly expanded to include Dartmouth, whose members would play each other twice, alternately at home and away, to decide the championship. Whatever the final form, its object would be to bring about "radical reforms in the whole football situation," for instance, the abolition of scouting and sidelines coaching. Lastly, the break obviously called into question the athletic and educational leadership of both Harvard and Princeton. Howard Elliott, board chairman of the Northern Pacific Railroad and prominent Harvard Overseer, must have voiced the concern of both alumni when he said: "'For these two national institutions to show to the world that they cannot engage in manly sports without friction and bad feeling weakens their influence in the nation and does not help in the general cause of wise
For five years, athletic relations between Harvard and Princeton remained severed, largely because of the attitudes of their respective Athletic Associations. Finally, undergraduate action, under the leadership of the Crimson and Princetonian, effected a renewal of athletic contests, except in football. When that sport was resumed in 1934, the Tigers defeated Harvard, but were upset by Yale, which became the season's Big Three champion. By the 'thirties, however, undergraduates no longer shared "the rather old-fashioned view that one must be ready to die for dear old Princeton on the athletic field." Football had become too much of "a grind," demanding long hours of practice and rigorous training. It was, moreover, "a big business; let it take care of itself." Once the frenzy of partisanship had passed, football could again become just a game, although it was likely to remain as important source of revenue for many colleges and universities.  

---


36Henry M. Kennedy '32, "These Sophisticated 'thirties'
Tally on Football: Did it Develop Leadership and Democratize Collegiate Life?

During its days of glory at Harvard, Yale and Princeton, football had competed successfully with education for the attention of undergraduates and was the strongest tie binding alumni to their alma mater. Obviously, football provided exercise for players and entertainment for spectators, but did it justify the devotion of its votaries? On the positive side, it was no financial parasite. Indeed, its gate receipts supported all the other sports at Harvard, except baseball, which also paid its own way. Enthusiasts also claimed that it developed character, leadership, and manliness in young men. But as a teacher of future leaders, the game had a mixed record. On the one hand, a number of players never outgrew their Saturday afternoon exploits. Like F. Scott Fitzgerald's Tom Buchanan, varsity end at Yale, they had reached "such an acute limited excellence at twenty-one that everything afterward savor[s] of anti-climax." On the other, many varsity players, like Archibald MacLeish, Yale '15, combined athletic prowess with academic achievement and distinguished careers.37

---

According to Albert Beecher Crawford, editor of *Football Y Men, 1872-1919 -- Men of Yale Series*, "14%, at a minimum, of the Yale College Football Y men attained honors standing (orations) and received their degrees *cum laude*, or with higher praise," In addition, 7 percent or 24 of the Yale College football men achieved Phi Beta Kappa. Although there were higher percentages of honor men among non-players, "the football men of that era made a decidedly credible scholastic record," considering also that 488 out of a total of 516 graduated with their class. They also participated in non-athletic activities. Some 23 percent were elected to class offices, committees, and councils. Finally, a very high proportion of football players received social recognition by election to fraternities or societies. Of those Football Y men enrolled in Yale College, 85 percent belong to Junior Fraternities, and of those in the Scientific School, 89 percent were elected to the Sheffield Fraternities and Societies. And 68 percent of those eligible were "tapped"—but not Irishman Tom Shevlin, 1905's captain and son of a Minneapolis lumber magnate—for one of Yale College's four Senior Societies: Skull & Bones, Scroll & Key, Wolf's Head, and Elihu Club. Only about 20 percent of each class usually received these coveted elections. A further testimony to the athlete's prestige was the annual vote of Yale senior classes on the most desirable undergraduate honor: the "Y" was easily first,
with the Phi Beta Kappa key second, and the Literary charm, third. Yet the letter man had rivals. President Hadley believed that the chairman of the Yale Daily News carried more weight with undergraduates than the athletic captains.38

Football was less an agent of democratization at the Big Three than has often been supposed. Not only did private school students outnumber public school students until the early 1950's, but a higher percentage of them became athletes. Over two-thirds of all Harvard and Yale lettermen in football, baseball, and crew, 1911-1960, were private school graduates. While 55.2 percent of Harvard students (1911-1920) had been prepared in private schools, 72.2 percent of the athletes had been so educated. For the decades of the 1920's and 1930's, the percentages of private school graduates were 53.7 and 55.7, but the percentages of athletes from private schools were 81.4 and 80.7, respectively. By the 1940's and 1950's, however, private schools provided 50.4 and 47.1 percent of the students and 55.4 and 44.5 percent of the athletes. The corresponding figures for

privately prepared students and privately prepared athletes at Yale were, respectively, 75.1 and 79.7 (1911-1920); 74.8 and 75.8 (1921-1930); 76.0 and 78.8 (1931-1940); 65.8 and 59.8 (1941-1950); and 42.8 and 51.9 (1951-1960). During the teens, 92.8 percent of Football Y men were private school students; during the 1920's and 1930's, 86.8 and 83.9 percent; by the 1940's, 60.0 percent; and from 1951 to 1960, only 38.4 percent. For the same five decades, the percentages at Harvard were, respectively, 77.1, 75.1, 72.0, 43.6, and 32.4 The proportion of high school students increased more rapidly in baseball and football than in crew, which was encouraged by preparatory schools as a gentleman's sport. 39

But evidence suggests that popular spectator sports were an avenue of advancement for some students from minority or immigrant families. A definite "shift in the typical origins of player-names on the All-American Football Teams" had occurred since 1889. In that year, wrote sociologists David Riesman and Reuel Denney,

all but one of the names (Heffelfinger) suggested Anglo-Saxon origins. The first name after that of Heffelfinger to suggest non-Anglo-Saxon recruitment

was that of Murphy, at Yale, in 1895. After 1895, it was a rare All-American team that did not include at least one Irishman (Daly, Hogan, Rafferty, Shevlin); and the years before the turn of the century saw entrance of the Jew. On the 1904 team appeared Pierkarski of Pennsylvania. By 1927, names like Casey, Kipke, Oosterbaan, Kopisch, Garbisch, and Friedman were appearing on the All-American list with as much frequency as names like Channing, Adams, and Ames in the 1890's.

Some of these Irish and Jewish football players later coached at their alma mater, for example, 1920 Harvard captain, Arnold Horween (born Horwitz), became a Crimson coach in 1926.40

The game of football itself, said Riesman and Denney, "was soon permeated by broad social meanings unanticipated by the founders of the sport." By the early teens, about the same time that "innovation in American industry had ceased to be the prerogative of Baptist, Calvinist, and North of Ireland tycoons," second generation immigrants began to change the game of football. Their fears of social rejection at elite private universities probably contributed to the fact that the game of boyish and spirited brawn played at the eastern centers of intellect and cultivation was to be overthrown by the new game of craft and field maneuver that got its first rehearsal at the hands of two second-generation poor boys attending little-known Notre Dame.

Knute Rockne, a Danish Protestant who later converted to Catholicism, and Gus Dorais upset Army in 1913 with effective use of the forward pass. The new maneuvers and style

of play brought forth the ethnic hero, who saw his victory as a result of "cooperative enterprise" and as "a means to career ascent."\(^4\)

All things considered, however, Big Three football probably contributed to white Anglo-Saxon Protestant "tribalism" during the 1920's and 1930's, while doing little to democratize collegiate life. Since success in "a rapidly developing, managerial society" depended upon not only a degree from the right college but also the appropriate undergraduate activities and associations, it was natural that the boys who played together in prep school stayed together in college. Princeton was the ultimate example of this upperclass homogeneity. It became, wrote sociologist E. Digby Baltzell,

\[
\text{a class institution primarily in the twenties, when the proportion of undergraduates who were Episcopalians (the College of New Jersey had always been Calvinist), sons of alumni and products of private schools all reached their heights (of the forty-four members of the Princeton football squad in 1927, all had graduated from private schools).}
\]

To be sure, even Princeton had non-Anglo-Saxons on its team, for example, a Jewish graduate of Horace Mann School "made" the 1925 Football Squad. But neither he nor a member of the 1926 Baseball Squad, who had graduated from New York High School and belonged to the Dutch Reformed

Church, was elected to one of the Princeton's eating clubs for upperclassmen. On the other hand, Irish Catholic athletes usually gained admittance to a club. A football player who transferred from Notre Dame, was a member of Dial Lodge. The proper boarding school was, of course, of great benefit to Catholics in making a club, fraternity, or society. Of the fourteen Football Y men of 1912, for example, four were Catholics: two graduated from Andover; one from Hotchkiss; and one from Williston Academy, after attending Hotchkiss. All were elected to one of the Yale fraternities or Sheffield societies: two in Delta Kappa Epsilon, one in Alpha Delta Phi, and the fourth in Sheff's Berzelius. In addition, the two DKE's were "tapped" by Elihu (one of whom achieved further distinctions by serving on Senior Council and Class Day Committee); the ADP was circulation manager of Yale Record; and the Berzelius man was a member of Sheffield's Aurelian Honorary Society.  

Undoubtedly social acceptance depended on such

---

factors as length of a minority's residence in the United States. By the late 1890's and early 1900's, some fifty to sixty years after the period of massive immigration from Ireland, the Irish were beginning to achieve social as well as athletic recognition. For the Jews, ironically, such recognition became increasingly difficult to attain by the second decade of this century. Second generation Jewish immigrants encountered a growing tide of racism in the United States, one of whose currents was anti-Semitism. Since athletic success was reciprocally linked to social acceptability at the Big Three, Jewish students found less competition in the quieter, but more enduring, fields of scholarship.
CHAPTER II

THE CHANGING CAMPUS

We came to college at a queer time. The present is always a time of transition, but the opening years of this decade were peculiarly so. The war had just ended. The Classes of '20 and '21 had been in camp or overseas; '22 had spent almost its whole first term in uniform, for Princeton in the fall of '18 was itself a military camp, a mere appendage to the S.A.T.C. and Naval Unit....The University itself had no authority over these uniformed cadets quartered in its 'barracks'; cuts were completely unlimited, and in order to lure the military into attending classes, credit was given simply for going to lectures, quite regardless of whether or not you passed the exams!...Organized athletics had of course been practically suspended during the war, but the clubs still managed to exist, and in some cases juniors returned to college in 1920 who had never seen the inside of their clubs, having received their bids while patriotically absent.

—Thomas S. Matthews, Princeton '22

World War I changed the American campus in three major ways: first, it disrupted academic routine by turning the campus into an armed camp; then it dramatically increased enrollments through returning veterans; and finally, by relaxing moral standards, it created new social norms. The older generation complained frequently that students misbehaved and acted contrary to traditional values. To be sure, the college generation of the 1920's was different and

1 Thomas S. Matthews '22, "Those Inflated 'Twenties (The Sixth in a Series of Articles Interpreting Princeton by Decades)," PAW, XXXI (March 13, 1931), 559.
perhaps more rambunctious than that of their parents: They had grown up with innovations and inventions which destroyed the innocence and security of an earlier age. At the same time, youth accurately reflected parental morality in their disregard of the 18th amendment and their penchant for fast cars, girls, good times, and money. Some indeed argued that young people handled the dilemmas of the transitional twenties with greater confidence and sophistication than their elders. Somehow, in spite of the moral, intellectual, and social challenges of the period, universities did more than merely survive; they thrived. Harvard, Yale, and Princeton launched substantial building programs financed, in part, by the prosperous twenties.²

Martial Valor and Academic Freedom

Yale responded to the bugle call earlier than its rivals by becoming the first and "only civilian college to attempt artillery training." Since 1915, wrote President Hadley, Yale "gradually organized, in cooperation with the United States Government, a group of special schools, each with its own curriculum," to instruct officers in field artillery, navy line and engineering, radio engineering, and army laboratory work. Undergraduates demonstrated their enthusiasm "For God, for country and for Yale" either

²Christian Gauss, "This New World and the Undergraduate," The Saturday Evening Post, December 17, 1927, pp. 21, 95, 96.
by joining active military service—with the British or the French before the United States entered the war—or by enrolling in one of the military units on campus: Reserve Officers' Training Corps in Field Artillery, Yale Naval Training Unit, or Students' Army Training Corps. By the Armistice, Yale had 8,000 men in service, of whom 3,500 had been commissioned and no less than 130 had died. All 15 of the 1918 Football Y men, for example, served during the war: two received decorations and a third, citations; and one was killed at Dunkirk, France. Indeed, 110 out of 138 or 87 percent of the Football Y men, 1910-1919, were in the Armed Forces, while 11 others served in war-connected civilian positions. Of those in military service, 106 received commissions, 10 percent of them ranking as Commander or Lieutenant Colonel or above. Twenty percent were decorated by the United States or Allied Governments. The Yale Banner and Pot Pourri for 1917-1918 showed that other 1918 Y men enlisted: six of eight in baseball, four of seven in track, but only one in four of the crew. Junior Fraternity men showed a similar dedication, judging from the record of the Class of 1918: 32 out of 43 in Alpha Delta Phi, 2 of whom died; 34 out of 36 in Psi Upsilon; 34 out of 35 in Delta Kappa Epsilon; 38 out of 45 in Zeta Psi, 1 of whom died; and 33 out of 40 in Beta Theta Pi, 1 of whom died. Sheffield Society men also joined the service, although proportionately in somewhat smaller numbers than
the Junior Fraternity men. Their deeds of valor were com-
memorated by erecting Memorial Tablets to the fallen and
by carving names of battles fought by the American Expedi-
tionary Force in the frieze of Yale's Dining Commons. 3

Harvard and Princeton men also rallied to the colors.
As of December 5, 1919, President Lowell proudly reported
that some 13,375 Harvard men had served in World War I:
more than 7,000 in the United State Army and over 4,200 in
civilian war work. In addition, 6,565, or 72.8 percent of
those in the military, were commissioned officers; 602
received military distinctions; and 345 died, of whom 322
were service connected. They were remembered by the con-
struction of Memorial Church in Harvard Yard and by two John
Singer Sargent murals above the central stairway in Harry
Elkins Widener Library. Lowell donated these murals to the
University and wrote the inscriptions: "They crossed the
sea crusaders keen to help/ The nations battling in a
righteous cause" and "Happy those who with a glowing faith/

3 Arthur T. Hadley to Brigadier General Charles G.
Long, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D. C.,
October 18, 1918, MSS Letters from Pres. Hadley, April 25,
1918 to November 30, 1918, Book 33, p. 589. Pierson, Yale,
I, chap. 22 "American Higher Education and War," pp. 435-
446, and chap. 23 "Yale and the Guns," pp. 447-476, espe-
cially pp. 452, 457, 461-476. Crawford, Football Y Men,
1872-1919, I, 117-121, and Football Y Men, 1940-1960, III,
27, 21. The Yale Banner and Pot Pourri The Year Book of
the Students of Yale University, X, 1918 (New Haven, Conn.,
1918), 119-142, 151-169, 175-181, 219, 315-329 and 413-431
("On Leave of Absence for War Service").
In one embrace clasped Death and Victory." Princeton honored one of its star athletes, Captain Hobart A. H. Baker '14, who died in a post-Armistice airplane accident in France, with the construction of hockey rink. Having learned to fly before the United States entered the war, First Lieutenant Baker was among the first Americans to go to France in early summer of 1917. According to a laudatory tribute in the Princeton Alumni Weekly: "As might have been expected of probably the best and most successful athlete this country ever produced, he excelled in flying as he had at football and hockey." But, suggested John D. Davies, in The Legend of Hobey Baker, perhaps he had been too successful. At age twenty-six, Baker had done it all; little was left for him to achieve, given his range of ambition. His fatal crash may have been for him a glorious finale.  

One serious consequence of the transformation of the

---

4 Harvard President's Report, 1917-18, pp. 6, 16, and 1918-19, p. 5. These figures did not include those in S.A.T.C. Henry Aaron Yeomans, Abbott Lawrence Lowell 1856-1943 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), pp. 343-344. John D. Davies, The Legend of Hobey Baker (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966). Major Charles J. Biddle '11, "Captain Hobart Baker's Career in the Service, PAW, XIX (January 15, 1919), 279-280. Believing in war as in football that "a team that won't be beat can't be beat," a motto which he may have coined, former halfback, John Prentiss Poe, ex'95, was killed while serving with the Black Watch. Neilson Poe, '97 B.S., another football-player and Jayvees' coach, was among the most decorated infantry officers of the A.E.F. The British Government awarded twenty-six decorations to Princetonians. See Cohane, The Yale Football Story, p. 100, and "Many Ties Have Developed in Past Years Between the British Isles and Princeton," The Princeton Herald, clipping in Subject File Students-Nationalities British," PUA.
campus into an armed camp was the threat to academic freedom. Stanford's President Emeritus, David Starr Jordan, who had not been allowed to speak on behalf of peace at Princeton, was almost denied permission at Yale. President Hadley, an early advocate of military training within the college curriculum, was persuaded to acquiesce by Reverend Anson Phelps Stokes, Secretary of the University, and by Professor William Lyon Phelps. Stokes also convinced the Student Council that they listen first, since "Yale should stand for freedom of speech," although "they could raise Cain afterward," if necessary. Nevertheless both Jordan and Phelps received threatening letters. On the night of the meeting, uniformed undergraduates marched forward and occupied the first two rows of the hall, but Phelps won them over and thus helped avert potential trouble. The audience had swelled to such an extent that the meeting had to be moved to Woolsey Hall where it proceeded without incident and was ended with a parade. Phelps commended the students' behavior in a letter to the Yale Daily News, April 2, 1917: they had given Jordan "'full opportunity to speak and thus a great victory for free thought was won, a victory that left no bitterness in anybody's mind.'" But in the aftermath, Phelps received many insolent letters, some anonymous, and pressure was put on Yale to dismiss him.
Phelps, however, kept his professorship.5

Another incident involving freedom of expression at Yale had its humorous side. In 1918, eleven Seniors voted the Kaiser "the greatest man of the hour." Responding to a number of outraged inquiries, President Hadley called the vote "an act of incredible silliness" and "boyish smartness," but not of intentional disloyalty. These students, he explained, "voted for him as greatest man in the same way that in past years they voted for Mother Goose as the greatest English poet." Nevertheless, Hadley promised to investigate the nine Seniors and punish any who might be disloyal, while admonishing the others. Subsequently, he reported:

to my surprise and, I will own, to my relief, that no joke was intended; that as the question was phrased it was a vote for the greatest man of the hour, 'for good or evil,' as one of the boys expressed it; that all the eleven who voted for the Kaiser are thoughtful men and that seven of them are in the United States service -- two of them, in fact, having sent votes from France, where they have been fighting from the very start and are impressed with the need of recognizing ability in an opponent, however much we may dislike him.

No charge of disloyalty, he continued, could be lodged against the men. While Hadley supported their right to have their own opinion and blamed newspapers for publicizing the matter out of all proportion, he agreed "that it was unwise to ask this question during the current year or to

5Pierson, Yale, I, 452, 465-466, and n. 15, 677.
tabulate the answers." He also promised to see that "this mistake" would not be repeated. On the other hand, Hadley defended the teaching of German to students whose specialization required it. Prohibition of such instruction would "be a great aid and comfort to the enemy, because it would mean permanent impairment of our efficiency." For many Americans even faint praise of the Kaiser and the teaching of German language and literature were tantamount to disloyalty.  

Several professors were dismissed for disloyalty at the universities of Minnesota, Nebraska, and Virginia and at Columbia University. President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia had argued that once the United States entered the war "'what had been wrongheadedness was now sedition.'" As a consequence, Columbia dismissed J. McKeen Cattell, psychologist; Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana, comparative literature; and Leon Fraser, politics. Historian Charles A. Beard resigned, after having been admonished by the trustees and commanded to impress upon his colleagues that

---

6 Arthur T. Hadley to Lewis A. Williams, Jr., June 1, 1918, p. 177a; to Edward A. Stevenson, June 4, 1918, p. 195; to Frederick A. Guild, June 5, 1918, pp. 210-209; to George B. Phelps, June 22, 1919, pp. 279-278; and to Perry Dickie, Chmn. Committee on Americanization, American Defence Society, September 24, 1918, p. 487, MSS Letters from Pres. Hadley, April 25, 1918, to November 30, 1918, Book 33, F. S. Jones to President Hadley, June 1, 1918, Yale President Hadley Correspondence, Box 41 Jon Jul 1 1916 to Ken Jun 30 1911, folder Hadley Jon-7/1/1916-1/1/1919.
"teachings 'likely to inculcate disrespect for American institutions' would not be tolerated." Professors Henry R. Mussey, economics, and Ellery C. Stowell, international law, also resigned as well during "the loyalty craze" at Columbia. In contrast, when an Harvard alumnus threatened to rescind a $10,000,000 bequest to the University unless Hugo Münsterberg, Professor of Psychology, was dismissed, the Harvard Corporation officially refused to "'tolerate any suggestion that it would be willing to accept money to abridge free speech, to remove a professor or to accept his resignation.'" Münsterberg, of German birth and sentiment, offered to resign if the alumnus immediately sent Harvard $5,000,000. The Corporation declined the offer, and the professor continued to teach at Harvard until December, 1916, when he suddenly died in the classroom.7

Since President Lowell firmly believed in one's right to speak his own opinions--although he was sometimes annoyed when others did not share his views--he strongly defended academic freedom. In his annual report of 1916-1917, Lowell wrote:

The teaching by the professor in his classroom on the subjects within the scope of his chair ought to be absolutely free. He must teach the truth as he has found it and sees it. This is the primary condition of academic freedom, and any violation of

it endangers intellectual freedom. In order to make it secure it is essential that the teaching in the class-room should be confidential.

Neither the professor nor his students should give his remarks or lectures to the press for publication; a restraint that did not apply to scholarly publications. As a citizen, however, the professor had the same right of freedom of speech as other people. A professor's integrity would be severely diminished if he lost some of rights as a citizen. For the University to assure the role of censor, moreover, would be burdensome:

It is sometimes suggested that the principles are different in time of war; that the governing boards are then justified in restraining unpatriotic expressions injurious to the country. But the same problem is presented in war time as in time of peace. If the university is right in restraining its professors, it has a duty to do so, and it is responsible for whatever it permits. There is no middle ground. Either the university assumes full responsibility for permitting its professors to express certain opinions in public, or it assumes no responsibility whatever, and leaves them to be dealt with like other citizens by the public authorities according to the laws of the land.

Lowell thus endorsed full freedom of speech for professors, not only in their role as teachers but also in their capacity as citizens. But he counseled professors to "speak in public soberly and seriously, not for notoriety or self-advertisement, under a deep sense of responsibility for the good name of the institutions and the dignity of their profession."8

A few years later, Lowell's firm stand prevented the Harvard Board of Overseers from pushing for Harold J. Laski's resignation. Laski, a visiting lecturer from England, had defended the Boston police who went out on strike in September, 1919, in protest against the firing of nineteen men for belonging to a union. The policy won very little public support, although their own grievances were genuine—very low pay and wretched working conditions. Most Bostonians feared the collapse of law and order. Responding to the "crisis," Lowell urged "all students who can do so to prepare themselves for such service as the Governor of the Commonwealth may call upon them to render." One hundred and forty-four undergraduates answered Governor Calvin Coolidge's request for volunteers as special police or State Guards. But Lowell neither did compromise on the principle of freedom of speech on this incident or during his "most critical fight" on behalf of Zechariah Chafee, Professor of Law at Harvard. Along with Dean Roscoe Pound and Professors Francis B. Sayre and Felix Frankfurter, and Edward B. Adams, Law School Librarian, Chafee petitioned for executive clemency for those defendants whose convictions had been upheld under the 1918 Sedition Law in Abrams v. United States (1919). Chafee had argued, moreover, in both the Harvard Law Review and in his book, Freedom of Speech, that the original trial had been conducted disgracefully. Thereupon several Harvard Law School graduates, led by
Overseer Austen G. Fox of New York, presented a thirty-two page "'Statement'" to the Corporation and Board of Overseers "'with respect to certain teachers in the Harvard Law School.'" At the meeting of the Overseers, Lowell strongly defended academic freedom, and the Board voted that Fox's "statement" be referred to the Committee to visit the Law School.9

On May 22, 1921, the so-called "Trial at the Harvard Club" took place. Eleven of the fourteen members of the Committee attended--Henry L. Stimson was one of the three who could not--and "'sat' on the case." Among the seven judges and four lawyers were Francis J. Swayze, judge of the New Jersey Supreme Court and chairman of the Committee; Benjamin N. Cardozo of the New York Court of Appeals; Robert Grant, Probate Judge in Boston; Julian W. Mack, United States Circuit Court Judge in New York; and Langdon Marvin, a New York law partner of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In view of Lowell's subsequent role in the Sacco-Vanzetti case, there was a certain irony in his defense of Chafee, who had charged that Judge Clayton, the trial judge, had "'allowed the jury to convict!" Jacob Abrams and others

"for their Russian sympathies and their anarchistic views."

In the end, the Committee voted "'6 to 5, the majority being determined by Judge Cardozo,'" to drop charges against that Law professor. Earlier Fox had withdrawn his charges against the five defendants after Lowell had convinced him that he had misinterpreted the "Recommendation for Amnesty" which was based on the fact that Abrams et al. were Russian citizens who had agreed to deportation. In the dedication to his Free Speech in the United States (1948), Chafee paid tribute to Lowell's "'wisdom and courage in the face of uneasy fears and stormy criticism.'"

Lowell's defense of academic freedom was his "finest hour" as an educational leader. He had no fear of radical ideas as long as countervailing ideas also had full opportunity for expression. He continued to criticize those who exaggerated "these tales of socialism, bolshevism and other things in our colleges." They had "lost their head," Lowell wrote in 1924, and were "fighting shadows largely the

creation of their own overheated imaginations." Upon calm examination the few radicals would turn out to be no more threatening than the wolves which General Ulysses Grant described in his Memoirs. Investigating their loud howling, the General found only two wolves, not a pack. Similarly, Lowell knew of no bolshevists on the Governing Boards, in the Faculty, or among the students at Harvard. Lowell's stand, which was unpopular among some Harvard alumni, won him the support of his predecessor, Charles William Eliot. Although the two men differed sharply over a number of educational issues, Eliot saw no reason to believe that any harm has been done to Harvard through the firm maintenance by President Lowell of the traditional consecration of Harvard College to religious, political, and industrial liberty, or indeed by the expressions of concern about socialistic tendencies at the College on the part of either graduates or undergraduates.

Unlike Columbia and several other universities, Harvard had emerged from World War I and the Red Scare which followed with its liberal traditions not only intact, but strengthened. ¹¹

"Those Inflated 'Twenties"

No sooner had students readjusted to the end of the war and the disillusionment of the peace, than they were swept up into the "Ballyhoo Years." Then they were censured for behaving like their parents. Typical of the conservative professorial view of undergraduates during the 1920's was the criticism of Dr. Albert Parker Fitch. As quoted in The Daily Princetonian, the former Amherst Professor of the History of Religion, denounced undergraduates because

'They...read frothy stories....They are strong on college games, gossip and athletics....
'And they...regard their professors with a mild and benevolent indifference....They are dull because they won't study--they think they were sent to college to make money or to get married. They drink because their communities disregard the Volstead law. They play cards because they think it's the social spirit of the times. They have no religion. They are unmoral. They swear like pirates because their vocabularies are so limited they have no other means of expression.'

Although admitting that some of Fitch's comments had "an element of truth," others, said the Princetonians, were "ridiculous." According to the paper, "the worship of the Aristotelian mean" was "too great today to put up with excesses of any kind, which includes swearing and drinking as well as an excessive religious fervor." Rather than being the generation of excesses, some youthful commentators saw their age as one of moderation. Nor did they agree with their elders' definition of vice. There was, after all, no "eleventh commandment against card playing." In short,
Dr. Fitch's criticism was on the level of "a discussion of the modern generation at an old maids' tea-party."\(^{12}\)

Many professors, on the other hand, treated the younger generation with a firm hand guided by a generous spirit. One was Christian Gauss, Dean of the College of Princeton. Judging from their reading preferences, he found the undergraduates in 1927 "not so romantic as most of us were in the '90's." Even before the war, they had begun to turn from literature courses on the romantics—Scott, Shelley and Byron, to those on the "Age of Reason"—Pope and Dryden. "Our age does not wish to be deeply moved, as did the romantics," Gauss said: "We wish to know and to be beguilded of our boredom." Most college students were neither despondent nor over-indulgent, according to the prize winning student essay on "Is the American Undergraduate Suffering from a Postwar Neurosis?" Rather undergraduates conducted themselves like worldly young men.\(^{13}\)

On the whole, they handled quite well "a hugger-mugger world . . . devised without a plan and as yet unmastered" by their elders. The scientists and inventors who created this "new world" had "no moral or social aims in


\(^{13}\)Christian Gauss, "This New World and the Undergraduate," The Saturday Evening Post, December 17, 1927, p. 21, 95.
view." Among the conceptions and inventions shaping modern life since 1900 were "the long-distance telephone, wireless, jazz, bobbed hair, brain storm, the bootlegger, the hijacker, the aeroplane, the airship, antitoxins, the flapper, camouflage, propaganda, the automobile." Not the least were the movies, which had shown these college students "far more life than the ordinary undergraduate of 1895 ever dreamed of." Thanks to biology courses and contemporary literature, they were socially although not intellectually, more mature than previous college generations. But collegiate publications which have challenged the old taboos had invited suppression--Nassau Literary Magazine--and denial of the mails--Harvard Lampoon. To be sure, parallels existed between the twenties and nineties, but young men would never return to "the 1895 of blessed memory." The "realistic, unromantic, matter-of-fact" undergraduates accepted this condition, while their elders were futilely attempting to turn back the clock. 14

Growing opposition to required religious services gave evidence of a new undergraduate frame of mind. The insistence of Yale College and Princeton upon compulsory chapel decades after Harvard had made attendance voluntary--in 1886--aroused considerable resentment among their undergraduates. (The Yale Sheffield Scientific School had never required attendance at either morning prayers or Sunday

14 Ibid., 95-96.
services). As a consequence, compulsory Sunday chapel was abolished at Yale beginning with the academic year, 1926-1927. Princeton continued to require Sunday chapel for almost another decade, although morning weekday chapel was made voluntary in 1915. In 1935, it, too, grudgingly yielded by waiving all chapel attendance for Juniors and Seniors. But for at least another twenty years, Freshmen and Sophomores were required to attend a certain number of services in the hope "that familiarization with the chapel exercises and the truths which they express will lead large numbers of upperclassmen to regular voluntary attendance and the spiritual cultivation which can be gained thereby."¹⁵

One obvious sign of student dissatisfaction with Sunday chapel at Yale was a lack of attention during services. An impressionable Andover Academy boy, who planned to attend Yale, went to New Haven for an athletic competition. Not only was his sleep disturbed by intoxicated songsters during the night, but his religious observance was distracted at Sunday chapel. He reported to an alumnus that he

never laughed so much as during that ten minutes. Very few people stood up for hymns or prayer, no one sang except a few members of the choir and funniest of all was that openly many fellows were reading the New York Times and funny papers during the entire service. They had scholarship fellows come around to the pews and marked if present or absent. As soon as one gave his name, if he were near the rear, he casually walked out and when the preacher started to say the Benediction, there was a rush for the door and when he said the final Amen, the place was almost deserted.

When the alumnus expressed displeasure over this situation, Dean Frederick S. Jones reassured him that the boy had "exaggerated the conditions which exist here at Yale." The students, he said, reflected the views of their homes and of society as a whole. "Perhaps we shall have to give up the chapel service," Jones wrote, but he would "regret doing this." He added that "the general disregard of the Prohibition Amendment throughout the country" may have made "it impossible to enforce it rigidly at college," even though he believed "in the possibility and propriety of enforcing the law among our students." 16

Dean Jones was concerned about the future of the

---

16 Charles W. Smith '02 to Dean Frederick S. Jones, March 25, 1925, and Jones to Smith, March 30, 1925, Records of the Dean, Frederick S. Jones, Box 6, folder Temperance and Prohibition
Christian religion at Yale, especially since many other colleges had given up the fight. After listening to Harvard's representatives at a meeting of the New England Colleges, Jones concluded that as far as he could determine "Harvard has practically abandoned all thought of exerting either moral influence or restraint among her students." He shuddered at its onesided concern for instruction and intellectual development. "Now our chance" was "to take the other tack," the Dean argued, and "keep our numbers within reasonable limits and do as much as we can to stamp these boys with the hall-mark which has always been the pride of Yale." To this end, he suggested that the building program of 1920's should include a chapel large enough to house both the college and Sheffield students.17

In 1923, Yale authorities had ruled that students be required to attend a ten-minute Sunday service at Battell Chapel before or after going to their own church in New

17 Frederick S. Jones to Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, November 20, 1922, Records of the Dean, FSJ, Box 1, folder Chapel (Battell). Judging from the "Appleton Chapel and the Phillips Brooks House" report in the Harvard President's Reports, hundreds of Harvard students belonged to religious organizations. In 1911-1912, for example, there were 305 members in the Harvard University Christian Association, 300 in St. Paul's Society, 250 in St. Paul's Catholic Club, 60 in the Graduate School Christian Association, 55 in the Harvard-Andover Divinity Club, and 184 in Phillips Brooks House Association directly, for a total of 1154. See Harvard President's Report, 1911-12, p. 172.
Haven. This move was taken because of abuse of the previously granted exemption from Sunday chapel to those who went to their own denominational services. This ruling aroused general opposition, but especially from Catholic alumni. The Episcopal Bishop of Connecticut, the Right Reverend Chauncey B. Brewster, hoped that the ruling might be "modified," so that students could participate in Sunday school work. Otherwise, many might decide that a ten-minute chapel service fulfilled their religious observance for Sunday. Father Sill, headmaster of the Kent School, urged headmasters of other Episcopal Church schools to write President James R. Angell, asking that the ruling be reconsidered. The headmaster of Canterbury School and other Catholics pointed out that "sons of prominent Catholic families from all over the country" had chosen Yale for twenty years or more because of the "fair treatment" which they had received in religious matters. It would be unfortunate if those Catholics, who already disliked the idea of sending sons to universities like Yale, made capital out of a ruling whose only justification was disciplinary. And one of Yale's prominent Catholic alumni,

always felt that the daily chapel was a very good thing from the point of view of any religion, since it partakes of so little religious exercises, but...that compelling a man to go to any particular church on Sunday other than his own, comes pretty near to being religious intolerance, and a harkening back to days which we have all felt were gone for good.

Whatever students of other denominations did, Catholics,
he insisted, returned permission forms "truthfully made out." 18

As a result of these protests, the matter was turned over to a Committee of the College and the Freshman Year Faculty for further consideration. After consultation involving President Angell, deans, and faculty, Yale decided to accept written parental requests to excuse their sons from Sunday chapel if they attended a church service. To enforce such church attendance, College authorities relied on "the Honor System" with its signed pledge. Dean Jones felt, however, that this was the first step in adopting voluntary church service. Since Battell Chapel could no longer accommodate the three upper College Classes in one seating by the fall of 1925—Freshmen already having been required attend an earlier service—the Dean divided them into two sections which would alternate days of attendance. 19

18 Rev. George E. Quaile, M.A., L.H.D., Headmaster of Salisbury School, to Dean Frederick S. Jones, October 10, 1923; Jones to Dr. Quaile, October 12 and 16, 1923; Nelson Hume, Ph.D., Headmaster, Canterbury School, to President James Rowland Angell, October 10, 1923; J. C. Brady to President Angell, October 16, 1923; William V. Griffin to Dean Jones, October 17, 1923; Jones to Griffin, October 19, 1923; Chauncey B. Brewster, Bishop of Connecticut, to Dean Jones, October 31, 1923; Jones to Brewster, November 5, 1923, Records of the Dean, FSJ, folder Chapel (Battell).

19 Roswell P. Angier to Frederick S. Jones, November 1, 1923, enclosing draft of letter and student pledge; Jones to Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, January 18, 1924, with copy to E. F. Blair, Chairman, Student Council of the College; Jones to Coffin, March 25, 1924; Jones to President James R. Angell, September 19, 1925; Angell to Jones, September 21, 1925; and copy of the December 15, 1925 vote of the general
Immediately, the Yale Daily News began an editorial campaign to abolish compulsory chapel. After presenting arguments for and against required chapel, the News polled the student body. About two-thirds of the undergraduates—1,537 out of 2,317—signed the News petition, which the Student Council then sent to Dean Jones. The Permanent Officers of the Yale College Faculty temporarily blunted this challenge to the older order, and both daily and Sunday chapel were required throughout that academic year. But when the issue came to a vote of the entire Faculty in April, 1926, Dean Charles R. Brown of the Divinity School dramatically changed his position and argued against the continuation of compulsory chapel. Thereupon, the Faculty voted 29 to 12 to abolish "one of the immemorial ingredients of a Yale College education." The Freshman Year Faculty followed suit. With the endorsement of President Angell, the matter was presented to the Corporation, a majority of whom concurred in these votes on May 8, 1926. Henceforth, means other than compulsion would be used "to uphold and propagate the Christian Protestant religion" at Yale.  

At Princeton, the administration and Faculty

Faculty to continue both daily and Sunday services, 1925-1926, Records of the Dean, FSJ, folder Chapel (Battell). Pierson, Yale, II, 84-87.

20 Gabriel, Religion and Learning at Yale, pp. 225-229; Pierson, Yale, II, 84, 87-93.
maintained the University's religious traditions—which included compulsory chapel—although the majority of students no longer adhered to the founders' Presbyterian faith. The Philadelphian Society, the major, voluntary, non-denominational Protestant campus religious organization, founded in 1825, conducted its various activities in and from Murray-Dodge Hall: religious services; Bible study; Princeton's Summer Camp for underprivileged children; Y.M.C.A. and boy scout work; Sunday School and English classes; and Princeton Work in Peking. Episcopalians, the largest denomination at Princeton by 1921, participated in the services and mission work of St. Paul's Society. But in this post-war decade, many undergraduates, as shown by their responses to a questionnaire on religion in 1927, were divided on the question of a personal God, although in the battle of statistics believers in some kind of God outnumbered atheists 973 to 101.

On the question of a personal God, the negatives outnumbered the affirmatives by 557 to 504, while the same question as to belief prior to entrance into Princeton shows a preponderance of 657 ayes to 418 noes. Belief generally seems to have lost ground in proportion to the length of the college course, while more Freshman and Sophomores were conscious of a belief in a personal God before coming to college than were Juniors and Seniors.

A college education, even at Princeton, seemed to weaken or, at least, modify the beliefs and teachings of childhood. On other questions of belief, the students voted affirmatively 482 to 477 for an impersonal God, 520 to 478
for personal immortality, and 573 to 525 for agnosticism. The tabulation was confused by the fact that 121 voted affirmatively for both a personal God and agnosticism.21

Voting on other questions revealed that two-thirds or more of the respondents believed the physical to be more real than the psychical, preferred present time to the future one hundred years hence, and would choose tyranny over anarchy. And almost 55 percent described themselves as "militarists" as opposed to "pacifists." But almost 77 percent believed that "culture was more to be valued than wealth." If these voting patterns were a true index of student opinion in the 1920's, this undergraduate generation was a questioning one, but one that asked its questions within well-defined limits.22

Although student protests were unsuccessful in obtaining the abolition of compulsory chapel—a thirty-five


22 Princetonian, March 2, 1927, p. 1, 3.
foot long petition with 1050 signatures was presented to President John Grier Hibben in 1925—religious influence was definitely on the wane at Princeton. President Hibben barred evangelist and Lutheran minister Frank N. D. Buchman from the campus in 1924, because, as he later wrote Yale's President Angell, "Buchmanism" placed undue emphasis upon sex as the source of all sin and shortcomings in human nature; secondly that it exacts as part of its program, public confession; thirdly, that it produces in highly sensitive and naturally introspective natures many disturbances which prove some times quite disastrous....

I object also to Buchmanism because the followers of Buchman exhibit a total lack of tolerance of other forms of Christian experience or belief. Their slogan is '100% Christian', and that means as far as I can interpret it the accepting fully of the program laid down by Mr. Buchman.

Not only was Buchmanism intolerant, but it made sensitive undergraduates feel guilty about sex, in particular about autoerotism. (Princeton, like other universities, soon saw the need for a trained psychiatrist on its medical staff.) Three years later, however, the University investigated the Philadelphian Society to determine the extent of Buchmanism within its ranks. The Society was subsequently exonerated, but its General Secretary, Ray Foote Purdy '20 was censured for having invited the "Soul Surgeon" to Princeton. Because of their allegiance to Buchman, Purdy and five other alumni members of the staff resigned in February, 1927. A majority of the Undergraduate Cabinet followed suit. Religion in the 1920's, commented Thomas S.
Matthews, '22, had begun "in the shadow of a postwar revival (prayer meetings in undergraduate rooms were a common phenomenon) and rounded out the decade with the overthrow of the Christian Student and the suspension of the Philadelphian Society." Thus the oldest college religious service association had lost much of its former appeal and prestige. Undergraduate grumblings over compulsory attendance, however, were silenced at least partially, with the dedication of an impressive Gothic-style University Chapel in 1929.23

Apparently, Purdy considered moving to New Haven, where President Angell awaited "a seige by the Buchmanites." No such confrontation developed, even though Henry B. Wright, Professor of Christian Methods in the Yale Divinity School and son of the late Dean Henry P. Wright, had been Buchman's "long-time friend and acknowledged master," until his death in 1923. According to Ralph Henry Gabriel's Religion and Learning at Yale, Buchman adopted Wright's "four absolutes" of "purity, honesty, unselfishness, and love"; his "technique

of the group confessional, the idea of guidance, and the emphasis on personal evangelism," but not his "self-forgetfulness." Buchman and his followers found a more receptive field in England where they began the Oxford Group, later known as Moral Rearmament. As for Yale, rationalism and relativism, resulting in part from seeds once sown in the classroom by William Graham Summer, triumphed in the 1920's over Henry B. Wright's evangelical Protestantism and moral absolutism. A more rational and practical religion was preached five days a week in Dwight Memorial Chapel, consecrated in 1931, and on Sundays in the older Battell Chapel (1876). 24

By most accounts the twenties were not only "boisterous" but downright rowdy. Undergraduate seemed to have forgotten the sage advice which the worldly Le Baron had imparted to fictional Yale freshman Dink Stover:

'Don't ticket yourself for drinking.'
'I won't.'
'Or get known for gambling--oh, I'm not preaching a moral lesson; only, what you do, do quietly.'
'I understand.'
'And another thing: no fooling around women; that isn't done here--that'll queer you absolutely.'
'Of course.'
'Now, you've got to do a certain amount of studying here. Better do it the first year and get in with the faculty.'
'I will.'

Before World War I, the reward of winning out in the end had been sufficient to keep many undergraduates willing to "'play the game as others are playing it.'" In the postwar years, they not only began to question the old religious values, especially the merits of compulsion, but also actively rebelled against codes of social conduct. Alumni bemoaned the passing of college life which they had known: time and memory had gilded the "old-fashioned hazing, in the 'Nineties, sometimes too rough" and carousing jaunts to New York and Philadelphia.25

Probably the greatest social problem afflicting campuses during the 1920's was widespread violation of the Volstead Act. Even if college authorities could have succeeded in obtaining police suppression of the local bootleggers and speak-easies, they would have encountered greater difficulties in persuading alumni that reunions should be completely sober. Undoubtedly undergraduate drinking behavior was influenced to some degree by the standards set by the alumni. In June, 1923, the Divisional Chief, General Prohibition Agents, of the Internal Revenue Service in Philadelphia, informed Princeton's Executive Secretary, H. Alexander Smith, of reports indicating "such

flagrant violations of the law in connection with the commencement exercises at Princeton, that something ought to be done to check them." According to the agents, the 176th Annual Commencement had been marked by "gay and rotten parties" and "drunken orgies." However alumni conduct improved thereafter under threat of arrest. Princeton authorities cooperated with Treasury agents in closing down local speak-easies, one located on Witherspoon Street, "within two hundred feet of the main college gate." Professor Christian Gauss, who became Dean of the College in September, 1925, "soon found that it was impossible to do anything through the local authorities." He reported to the Joint Committee of Faculty and Trustees on Undergraduate Life that although a dozen stores—grocery and candy and cigar—and nearby hotels sold liquor, students usually obtained their personal supplies from visiting bootleggers or from Kingston, New Brunswick, and Trenton. Because progress in stopping the liquor traffic was slow, in spite of several raids, Gauss offered "to go to Washington or to Trenton and put the case before the authorities again." Enforcement showed improvement by 1928; the Mayor of the Borough of Princeton reported to Dean Gauss in October that the police had raided half a dozen places and were considering three others. And in June, 1929, Gauss told a concerned Princeton father that "through our insistence there have been closed in Princeton and the neighborhood some twenty-seven speak-
easies in the last four years."  

Under the influence of alcohol, students, like their parents, exhibited a range of behavior from pranks to drunken driving and riotous conduct. For the most part, the actions of undergraduates seemed to be more high-spirited than vicious, such as holding a beer party in front of Nassau Hall or disturbing the sleep of townspeople. In June, 1922, a lady was awakened by suspicious noises near the monument of George Washington, which commemorated his Revolutionary War victory. She called the police, who discovered one or two students "with apparently the jocular intention of depositing a whiskey or gin bottle on the rim of George Washington's hat." Before the policeman could apprehend them, the pranksters fled the scene. Fearing possible vandalism to the monument from this or future escapades, the college authorities were not amused. A more

26 F. A. Hazeltine, Divisional Chief, General Prohibition Agents, Internal Revenue Service, Philadelphia, to H. Alexander Smith, June 19, 1923, and Report of Russell H. Skeels, General Prohibition Agent, to Hazeltine, from Princeton, June 18, 1923, HASP, 1920-1927, Box 37, folder Executive Secretary Prohibition. Dean of the College [Howard McClenahan] to R. B. Sams, Divisional Chief, General Prohibition Agents, Philadelphia, January 22, 1924; Sams to McClenahan, November 26, 1923, and January 23, 1924; [Dean Christian Gauss] to President John Grier Hibben, February 3, 1926; list of grocery stores and hotels selling liquor, dated 12-19-27; Pearl E. Karlberg, Secretary, for Harlan Besson, Asst. United States Attorney, Trenton, to Gauss, July 2, 1928; B. Franklin Bunn, Mayor, Borough of Princeton, June 21, 1929, and to Gauss, June 25, 1929, Gauss to Meeker, June 24, 1929, College, Dean of the, Old Files, Box I, folder Prohibition, PUA.
serious incident involved the presence of an intoxicated student in Tower Club at two o'clock in the morning. He was accompanied by several young women, at least two of whom had also been drinking. Such incidents undoubtedly occurred at other clubs as well.  

The Reports Of The Dean Of The College To The Committee Of The Board Of Trustees On Morals and Physical Education provided the best record of undergraduate sins and weaknesses at Princeton. It indicated that Deans had always had to keep a vigilant eye upon their charges. After all, undergraduate and alumni drinking on campus had been a problem even before Prohibition. Although the War Department had closed all bistros within a five mile radius of the campus in the spring of 1918, drinking increased markedly in the months after the Armistice, "perhaps as a result of the relief from the war tension" and because of "a general feeling of restlessness among the undergraduates." In April, 1929, Dean Howard McClenahan, Gauss' predecessor, reported that sixteen students were disciplined for drinking at two University dances, some of whom explained that they drank in order to "get through the exertions of the dance."

27 H. Alexander Smith, Memorandum for Dean McClenahan, June 8th, 1923, [Howard McClenahan] to Smith, June 10, 1922; and Memo for Mr. Smith, October 26, 1923, College, Dean of the, Old Files, Box II, folder H. Alexander Smith, Exec. Secy.
While Dean McClenahan found most of the girls to be more modestly dressed and of higher character than on some other occasions, he felt that their mothers should realize "the dire necessity, for more modest conduct on the part of their daughters."^28

It would be a gross exaggeration to portray undergraduate life--on the basis of a few sensational incidents--as one uninterrupted drunken orgy. Although Princeton had earned "a bad reputation for drinking" early in the decade, the Discipline Committee of the University began to apply stricter punishments in October, 1923. Previously, first offenders who were not involved in publicity or disorderly conduct had been punished by a reprimand and a letter home, second offenders by short suspension, and third-timers by a longer suspension or dismissal. The new policy, allegedly with the hearty support of the undergraduate members, imposed

a short suspension upon any man reported for even the simplest case of intoxication, to send him home in order that he may know the feelings of his parents, and to post on the bulletin board a Nassau Hall a statement

---

^28Princeton University, Report Of The Dean Of The College To The Committee On Morals And Physical Education, April twelfth, Nineteen hundred sixteen, pp. 1-4; October twenty-sixth, Nineteen hundred and sixteen, pp. 6-9; October twenty-third, Nineteen hundred and eighteen, pp. 9-10; October twenty-third [Nineteen hundred and nineteen], pp. 1-2; and April seventh, Nineteen hundred and twenty, pp. 3-5, Subject File, Trustees' Committee on Undergraduate Life, Box II, Reports, PUA.
of his suspension, the penalty imposed, and the reasons for it. This action is to be accompanied by a warning to all offenders that in case of a second reported offence of this character, the question will be seriously considered whether or not the man's connection with the University should not be permanently ended.

From October 1, 1923, to January 1, 1925, the Dean reported the following number of suspensions for intoxication: a Senior's degree was withheld a year; two students were each suspended for a term; two for a month each, second offense; one for two weeks for possession of liquor in his dormitory room; and forty-nine one week each for either first offense or participation in dormitory drinking parties. Nine others were reprimanded for either possession, or being under the influence of alcohol, or for frequently drinking in Trenton. Given the length of time surveyed, Dean McClenahan considered the number of disciplinary cases to be "gratifyingly small." To be sure, drinking would pose disciplinary problems in subsequent years, but Princeton's record was neither consistently bad nor unique.29

Drinking was not the only moral problem which college administrators had to handle. Occasionally, some students became involved with prostitutes, contrary to the advice given in Stover at Yale: "'no fooling around women.'"

---

29 Report Of The Dean . . . To The Committee On Morals . . . , October 24, 1923, pp. 5-10; and January 7, 1925, pp. 1-2, 4. Minutes, Meeting of Trustees' Committee on Undergraduate Life, October 24, 1929, Subject File, Trustees' Committee on Undergraduate Life, Box I, Minutes, PUA.
Preventive action was thus necessary. "To supplement the effect of public sentiment," wrote President Hadley,

this office, the Secretary's office, and the Deans' offices of the different departments are in constant communication with the police, to prevent the arrival of prostitutes just before the opening of the term (which is the really dangerous time); and also with the physicians to whom the students resort for medical advice. We find that we can do a good deal for the younger boys by getting them in communication with the right sort of men. But these matters are of less importance than the creation of student public sentiment.

Apparently, the combined efforts of Yale University and the New Haven police kept this social problem under control. In the early twenties, Princeton also found itself "threatened by a great increase of attentions from young women of undesirable character," who were coming from neighboring cities on a rather regular basis. But the proctors soon took successful countermeasures: "Some were arrested and turned over to the civil authorities, others were detected, were promised arrest if they were again found in Princeton; and still others were taken and put aboard the train or trolley, with a warning not to return." Such women were far easier to identify in New Haven or Princeton than in metropolitan areas like Boston and New York. 30

All colleges had their problems with disorderly conduct and periodic riots. Sometimes it was difficult to draw the line—especially in the eyes of a father whose son had been suspended—between boisterous boyish behavior and rowdiness. In 1909, for example, President Woodrow Wilson suspended ten freshmen, most for four weeks, because of "extreme disorder." Many of the fathers complained that their sons' offense was not as serious as drunkenness. But Wilson replied that their "disorder went very far beyond the bounds of such occasional outbursts of roughness as might be attributed to the thoughtlessness and high spirits of young men just out of school." The boys had "very systematically" harassed two women boarding house keepers, who feared to protest, lest their house be blacklisted and they lose their livelihood. Suspension was a just punishment, Wilson argued, although he considered "sexual impurity," followed by drunkenness, to be the worst offenses in terms of demoralization. He was pleased to note that intoxication had "greatly decreased in recent years at Princeton."

Mass meetings on campus, parades, and theater performances often provided the spark for a riot. Underlying the specific cause was a long tradition of ill will between college boys and "townies." During a parade of returned

31 Woodrow Wilson to the Rev. A. F. Schauffler, December 3rd, 1909, WWP, PUA.
soldiers--both Yale students and "townies"--in New Haven on May 27, 1919, students on the sidewalks shouted to their classmates. But the local boys thought that the insults were aimed at them. This situation was further aggravated by an afternoon paper report which asserted that Yale students "'two thousand strong and all whiskey crazed,' threw ancient eggs, doorknobs, kindling wood, and water bags at the soldiers as they paraded by." Continuing, the article stated that townspeople would meet on the Green at 7 o'clock that evening "to attack the University." An "unruly mob" gathered, many of whom had not served in the war, "but who welcomed the opportunity to vent their spite against Yale." "Hundreds of windows were broken" and hapless students found off campus were "unmercifully beaten." While the Yale College men stayed within the protection of the Old Campus, Sheff students entered the fray swinging firewood, pokers, and handy furniture. But they soon beat a hasty retreat to Van Sheff before the stone-throwing mob. Although they repelled the "townies" from their doors by dropping logs and furniture on them, the mob tore down a protective fence before moving on to other streets. Since the police did nothing to restrain the rioters, the mob roamed for hours that night. The next day, Yale students were told to stay close to their dormitories in the event of further trouble; Sheff societies and fraternities were permitted to defend their houses, apparently to the death. Firearms
were loaded in readiness. Neither the mayor's command nor Fire Department hoses could disperse the mob which again assembled on the Green. Only the militia, with bayonets fixed on loaded guns and the threat of martial law, ended this town-gown clash, during which, according to Loomis Havemeyer's *Sheff Days And Ways*, "the students incurred no blame."\(^{32}\)

But such was not always the case. Forty-three Princeton students were suspended for rioting along Nassau Street the night of October 29, 1930. After a mass meeting in Alexander Hall, at which President Hibben had addressed the students, who "had been unusually obstreperous," cries of "riot" ignited, according to Dean Gauss, "the most protracted and generally disgraceful exhibition of irresponsible yahooism that has been held in Princeton in my time." Two hundred undergraduates broke down a door into the Garden Theater and, "amid cries of 'Let's put the Garden on the bum,'" disrupted the performance by putting a pine tree on the stage and by wrenching up fifty chairs from the floor. On the street, rioters blocked traffic, released brakes in parked cars and sent them rolling into a confused mass

---

\(^{32}\)Havemeyer, *Sheff Days and Ways*, pp. 135-137. Rollin G. Osterweis, *Three Centuries of New Haven, 1638-1938* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1953), pp. 407-409. Osterweis said that "the pent-up emotions" of wartime had been largely responsible for the riot, which "was not part of a contemporary pattern but an unfortunate deviation from the normal trend" in town-gown relations.
on lower Nassau, and rocked buses as well as a number of cars. As they were preparing to burn in the street the demolished Garden Theater ticket booth, Dean Gauss arrived. While some took his advice and returned to campus, others continued toward the Hun School, smashing lights and signs in their path. Gauss succeeded in dissuading them from entering the School. On the whole, he fared better than two state troopers who had come to untangle the traffic. Some unknown undergraduates deflated their tires and took their hats and badges from the car. The troopers wanted to call for fifteen to twenty reinforcements, while the mayor wanted to bring out the fire department. Gauss feared that such action might result in shooting, and possible fatalities. Shortly thereafter, the rioters went back to campus, but some sixty to a hundred of them headed for the statue of the Christian Student (commemorating Princeton's role in this international religious movement). In spite of the proctors who were trying to protect it, the mob tied a rope around the statue and pulled it from its pedestal. Dean Gauss met them as they were dragging it toward Nassau Street. He "stood guard over the prostrate Student," until a University truck could remove it to safety. One Senior still called upon his fellows to drag the statue away. Obviously, such students had little respect for anyone's authority. Gauss commended several athletes who tried to halt the riot; Only one athlete, a substitute on the Sophomore class foot-
ball team, was among the rioters. (Interestingly enough those meriting the most severe discipline were high school boys on scholarship.)

Although few, if any of the older generation, would condone such wilful destruction and disobedience, a degree of boisterousness was tolerated. Indeed such behavior was preferable to getting mixed up with fast cars, faster girls, and questionable booze. "I am no great Puritan," wrote one alumnus to Dean Frederick S. Jones of Yale College, "but the mixing up of Champagne and chorus girls and society halls indicates a degeneration from the time when young men drank whiskey and licked the towns-people - which on the whole indicated a more wholesome atmosphere."

---

33Princeton University, Report Of The Dean Of College To The Trustees' Committee On Undergraduates Life, January 7, 1931, pp. 1-5. Damage to private property came to around $2,000, and the bill for the broken electric lights on Nassau Street was $130. A year's suspension was given to those tying the rope to the Christian Student, because such action involved not only the attempted destruction of property, but also bold defiance of proctors. The Faculty decided that in the future rioting or incitement to riot would render students "liable to dismissal from the university."

For the riot which was triggered in Harvard Square, February, 1927, by egg throwing in the University Theatre, see Dean of Harvard College-Correspondence-(Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27), #47 Riot Cases 1927.

34W. D. Washburn to Prof. Fred Jones, 4/7/14, and Jones to Wm. D. Washburn, April 13th, 1914, Records of the Dean, FSJ, folder Temperance and Prohibition. Dean Jones told the alumnus that Yale students did not "accumulate automobiles and chorus girls." The presence of an automobile on campus was "exceptional," while "the chorus girl is not so much in evidence, in spite of the newspaper talk regarding the D.K.E. troubles, as was the case in our days in College."
College students, like their elders, were affected by the currents of racism sweeping the United States during the 1920's. Campus social organizations became much more exclusive, often dominated by a small clique who had become friends in one of the selective preparatory schools. By assuming that election implied an inborn superiority, such clubs, fraternities, or societies protected their members from both association and competition with newcomers to the college campus. The teens and twenties were the first years that sons and daughters of Southern and Eastern European immigrants began to seek admission to prestigious private universities. While old-stock Americans might admit an Irishman to one of their clubs, especially if he were a good athlete, they rarely extended such an invitation to Jews or Italians. These students, if numerous enough, formed their own social organizations, which gave them some leverage in campus affairs. Although the small handful of black students were noticed, they were usually ignored by their white classmates. Obvious parallels existed between this social segregation of some Catholic and almost all Jewish and black students and the prejudices of the Ku Klux Klan. Most undergraduates would have protested, however, that they neither condoned the Klan nor participated in similar activities. After all, hazing was done in the spirit of fun. And had not student editorials at Princeton
denounced the Klan as "un-American"? To show their opposition, more than eight hundred students rioted in 1924 against the appearance in Princeton of a number of hooded Kleagles, who had to be rescued from threatened harm by the police.35

At Cambridge, the Harvard Crimson amused itself by running stories in October, 1923, about the existence of Klansmen within the University. There was even some talk about establishing a group of Kamelia at Radcliffe. On October 22, the Crimson announced: "Ku Klux Klan At Harvard Awaits Moment To Strike" and "'We May Be Inactive but Our Influence is Felt' are Leader's Ominous Words." Allegedly, the Klan began at Harvard two years previously and had been increasing its membership, especially in the last six months. The Crimson added that while "The action of the University last year in decreeing the policy of non-discrimination" may not have increased membership, it certainly "was a signal for violent demonstrations in meetings of the Harvard Klan." At that time, Harvard had publicly reaffirmed its tradition policy of neither racial nor religious discrimination in admitting students.36


Several Harvard students believed these Klan stories to be fabrications; one congratulated the Crimson "on its ability to kick up a row in the Boston and New York papers."
The New York Times called upon Harvard to prove the worth of its education "when confronted by a danger like this."
And the Boston Transcript divulged that "the main object of the Klan at Harvard is to institute compulsory chapel."
The hoax was ended on November 1, when the Crimson, describing "strange and terrible manifestations" in Cambridge the previous night, concluded:

And finally as the height of Klanishness, a flaring banner was seen suspended from a window on Massachusetts Avenue announcing the Klan's entry in the mayoralty race, in the following dreadful legend:
KOPEY FOR KLEAGLE
K.K.K.

Incidentally, last night was Hallowe'en. Given the racist feeling of the day, the Crimson had gone too far for a Hallowe'en trick. Someone signing himself J. E. Sinclair '91 wrote a letter to the newspaper denouncing the presence of Catholic students at Harvard, especially their election to athletic captaincies and class offices and the formation of a Catholic club. Although no one of that name was listed in the Alumni Directory, several Harvard men wrote letters to the Crimson attacking anti-Catholic bigotry. The Harvard Alumni Bulletin then charged the Crimson editors with poor judgment in printing the Klan stories and the "Sinclair" letter. Yet the Crimson maintained that it had "proved to all, except those who were
determined not to believe, that there was a comparatively large number of Klansmen within the walls of the University and that they acted as a body."37

Whether a Klan really existed at Harvard was questionable, but many believed the newspaper reports to be true. Consequently, James Weldon Johnson, Secretary of the National Association For the Advancement of Colored People, sent a telegram to President Lowell and Board of Overseers urging expulsion from the University of those who brought the Klan to Harvard. "It would be better to close the university," Johnson said, "than to permit it to become a vehicle for disseminating the poison of race and religious hatred upon which the infamous Klan depends in recruiting its membership."38

One of the contradictions of the twenties was the fact that social contraction occurred in a period of great


38 James Weldon Johnson, telegram to The President and Board of Overseers of Harvard University, Oct. 23, 1923, ALLP, 1922-1925, #507 Ku Klux Klan.
physical expansion. Among the numerous buildings--mostly in revival Gothic architecture--constructed at Princeton during this "boom decade" were seven dormitories, Graduate School quad, Baker Rink, McCarter Theater, new School of Science, and a new Chapel. Yale's great building program also in the Gothic style, was financed largely by Edward S. Harkness '97, heir of wise investments in Standard Oil Company, and by John W. Sterling, 1864, New York corporation lawyer. Sterling's bequest of $15,000,000 capital in 1918 was "the greatest gift an American university had ever received." And $22,773,648 of the almost $39,000,000 appropriated for Yale University by the Trustees of Sterling's Estate went into buildings. Beginning with the Harkness Memorial Tower and Quadrangle (1920), the gift of Mrs. Stephen V. Harkness, Yale's building program culminated in the 1930's: Sterling Memorial Library; Sterling Law Buildings; Hall of Graduate Studies, Sterling Divinity Quadrangle, and Sterling Tower; Sterling Quadrangle, later named Trumbull College; and ten residential colleges, eight of them given by E. S. Harkness--Branford, Calhoun, Davenport, Jonathan Edwards, Pierson, Saybrook, Berkeley, and Timothy Dwight. The bequest of Frederick W. Vanderbilt provided for the building of the tenth quadrangle, Silliman, in 1940. During Lowell's presidency, Harvard, too, had its multimillionaire benefactors, but preferred to build in red brick: the School of Business Administration (the
$5,000,000 gift of George F. Baker, president of the First
National Bank of New York; the Freshman Halls; Lehman and
Straus Halls in Harvard Yard; half a dozen laboratories;
Widener Library; Fogg Art Museum; Memorial Church and the
Harvard House Plan, the gift of E. S. Harkness. When his
offer to build residential quadrangles at Yale had not been
accepted after almost two years, Harkness met with President
Lowell who accepted the proposal with alacrity. Three
months later, in January, 1929, Harvard received a written
promise of $11,392,000. Fortunately, for Yale, Harkness,
after considerable negotiations, agreed a year later to
donate $15,725,884.96 to build eight colleges of Yale's
Quadrangle Plan. 39

In time, these magnificent buildings at Harvard,
Yale, and Princeton would accommodate a considerably diver-
sified student body. But during the 1920's, these univer-
sities became more selective. "Socially it has tightened
up," alumnus Thomas S. Matthews wrote of Princeton, a situ-
ation as true of Harvard and Yale. In fact, he complained:

39 Matthews, "Those Inflated 'Twenties," pp. 568,
559-561. Pierson, Yale, II, 594-601, 213, 236-252. See
chap. 10 "Mr. Harkness and the Quadrangle Plan--I," pp. 207-
230, and chap. 11 "Mr. Harkness and the Quadrangle Plan--II,
p. 231-252. Historical Register of Yale University 1701-
27-29. Yeomans, Lowell, chap. XIII "Housing the Under-
graduates The 'Houses,'" pp. 180-198; chap. XV "Material
Development of the University Growing by Plan," pp. 219-
229; chap. XVI "Material Growth of the University Building
for Needs," pp. 230-244, and chap. XVII "Material Growth:
Endowment and Its Use," pp. 245-274.
Every year has seen Princeton getting a little more like Yale, the bulldog god of Success. Every year, as the practical social-business value of a college education has gone up, like a seat on the Stock Exchange, more and more embryo junior executives have hopefully applied for admission to the freshman class. . . .

Princeton is a university in name only. A university is a place where all types mingle but where the different types can go their own way. You cannot go your way in Princeton. Or rather, you can, but if you want to, you had better go somewhere else.

Matthews found "the junior executive" type "very uninteresting," although with "slightly better manners than his Eli contemporary (softening influence of pastoral surroundings) but . . . approaching complete Elification with the speed of light." 40

Not only did Princeton, Yale, and Harvard draw upon the same preparatory school pool, but their social systems contributed to the creation of a "type." While Yale College had its Senior Societies and Junior Fraternities (the latter fed its members) and Sheff its societies and fraternities (which housed members), Princeton had its upper-class eating clubs. Of 1313 Princeton graduates from 1920 through 1923, 959, 73 percent, belonged to a club. The five most prestigious were Ivy (1879), Cottage (1886), Colonial (1891), Cap and Gown (1892), and Tiger Inn (1892). Each tended to attract, respectively, the following types of students: snobs, literary men like Fitzgerald, social register, noble Christian students, and football men. In

the period 1920-1923, the percentage of private school graduates was 100 in Ivy, 86 in Cap and Gown, 81 in Cottage, 76 in Colonial, and 72 in Tiger Inn. Most of the remaining members in the last four clubs were transfers from other colleges. The percentage from high schools was 8 in Cottage and Colonial, 6 in Cap and Gown, and 2 in Tiger Inn. Considering all five clubs over the four year period, 83.5 per cent came from private schools, 11.4 per cent from other colleges, and only 5.1 from high schools. Some preparatory schools, moreover, provided better club connections than others. Whereas both Groton and Polytechnic Prep sent only one man to a top club in four years, Lawrenceville sent 31 men to four of the five, excluding Ivy, and Hill sent 24 to all five, with 22 entering Ivy, Cottage, and Cap and Gown. Gilman almost evenly divided its 17 graduates between Ivy and Cap and Gown, while Phillips-Exeter sent 8 out of 11 to Tiger Inn, 2 to Cottage, and 1 to Colonial. Membership seemed almost predetermined.\(^1\)

On the other hand, some Harvard men felt that "the liberality of their club system is superior to ours," because a higher proportion of Princeton upperclassmen were

\(^1\)Stanley E. Howard to H. Alexander Smith, April 21, 1924, four page memorandum on "Club Statistics," with six pages of tables on classes, 1920-1923; see pp. 1, 4 and Table III. "Composition of Senior Class Membership in Certain Clubs (Ivy, Cottage, Cap and Gown, Tiger Inn and Colonial) from 1920 through 1923," HASP, 1920-1927, Box 37, folder Executive Secretary Statistics.
elected and all clubs were ostensibly of equal rank. At Princeton, moreover, clubhouses were opened to non-members as well as to those belonging to other clubs. As late as 1947, Cleveland Amory, author of *The Proper Bostonians*, maintained that "as currently constituted Harvard's club system is probably the most exclusive of that in any college in America." First, in order to be in the social swim at all, a man had to be among the 150 selected out of a class of about 1,000 for membership in "Hasty Pudding--Institute of 1770." One's position in this organization, which produced a musical comedy in the spring, was further defined by the presence of the letters "D.K.E." If he was a "Dickey," a man was among the first forty-five sophomores chosen for membership and "hence very definitely a social somebody." But the ultimate goal was to be elected to one of Harvard's ten "final" clubs. The path to these social pinnacles was strewn with hurdles: residence in one of Mount Auburn Street's "Gold Coast" halls; invitations to Boston Society events; and the avoidance of certain "taboos." Among the most damaging, if violated, were "overcareful dress, undue athletic exertion, serious literary endeavor, rah-rah spirit, long hair, grades above C, and Radcliffe girls." Development of the proper instinctual behavior was fostered by the right preparatory school background. The best were the Episcopal boarding schools--Groton, St. Mark's, St. Paul's, St. George's and Middlesex ("St. Grottlesexers")--
followed by schools like Milton Academy, Noble & Greenough, Pomfret, and several country day schools. Third came Phillips Exeter, Phillips Andover and Roxbury Latin; "as their social standing has declined in Boston's Society, so it has in Harvard's." Although "Proper Bostonians" like Charles W. Eliot had once attended the public Boston Latin School during the mid-nineteenth century, by 1900 it was becoming populated by bright sons of the newer immigrants. High schools had almost no social status at the College. As Samuel Eliot Morison, historian of Harvard, wrote: "a lad of Mayflower and Porcellian ancestry who entered from a high school was as much 'out of it' as a ghetto Jew." Acknowledging these social realities, Bernard Berenson '87--born in the Jewish Pale of Settlement in Lithuania and educated at Boston Latin School and Boston University before coming to Harvard--"preferred the conversation of James, of Toy, of Climer, of Wendell, to that of my fellow students." These professors were "better worth while" and "more accessible." "Nothing," he maintained, was "so clicky and exclusive as the schoolboy or the schoolboy-minded Angle-Saxon of all ages." 42

According to Corliss Lamont, son of Thomas W. Lamont, chairman of the board of J. P. Morgan and Company, the preparatory school cliques were so powerful that 82 of the 85 selected from the Class of 1923 for "final" club membership were private school graduates. These top ten clubs were ranked in three groups by prestige. The two best were Procellian (including such prominent Bostonians as the Cabots, Lowells, and Saltonstalls as well as some suitable New Yorkers like Theodore Roosevelt) and A.D.. In the second group were Fly (Franklin D. Roosevelt), Spee, Delpic or Gas, and Owl, followed by Fox, D. U. (James B. Conant), Phoenix, and Iroquois. Surprisingly, not all Proper Bostonians made one of these "final" clubs. A. Lawrence Lowell, 1877, became an honorary member of the Fly in 1904. And Charles W. Eliot, 1853, turned down an invitation from Porcellian, judging it "given to dissipation," although he joined the Institute of 1770, then concerned with debating and literary activities, and Alpha Delta Phi for those with some scientific interests. On the other hand, Joseph Patrick Kennedy '12, a graduate of Boston Latin and member of St. Paul's Catholic Club, belonged to both Hasty Pudding—

Institute of 1770, D.K.E., and Delta Upsilon. His son, John Fitzgerald Kennedy '40, was chosen by fourth-ranked Spee. The elder Kennedy had played on the freshman and University baseball teams, while his son, John, a graduate of Choate, was on the junior varsity football team and the swimming squad and played golf, hockey, and softball. 43

The monopoly of athletics and extra-curricular activities by private school graduates could indeed be successfully challenged by any exceptional individual, even though his social background was undistinguished. But wrote a member of the Harvard Class of 1924, "there is no use talking of a 'spirit of common brotherhood' between the graduates of St. Mark's and the Menorah Society." Since

Jewish students, especially those of poor, immigrant backgrounds, were shunned by the prep school cliques, they began to form their own social organizations. The first was the Menorah Society in 1906, whose purposes were religious and cultural as well as social. Within six years Harvard had three Jewish fraternities, one of which was the Tau Chapter (1912) of the national Zeta Beta Tau. Founded in 1898 "to interest college men in the Zionist movement," Z.B.T. had broadened its appeal from Zionism to Judaism and had evolved into a Greek-letter Society by 1910. Although the charter members of Tau encountered strong opposition from those who argued that "'Harvard isn't a fraternity college,'" the chapter had 35 active members by 1916, some of whom were on the football, baseball and soccer teams as well as on the Lampoon and in drama organizations. In 1921, it purchased a second house for its growing membership and shortly thereafter "abolished all physical punishment during the pledge period and initiation," preferring "more morally uplifting performances than slam-bam and cuckoo-clock." And in 1918, Zeta Beta Tau, Sigma Alpha Mu (1909), and Argo Club (1911) had been joined at Harvard by three other Jewish fraternities: Kappa Nu, Tau Delta Phi, and Tau Epsilon Phi. Only through such organizations could Jews

really find any social life outside the classroom.44

Similar developments occurred at Yale, although until the early teens that College had been reasonably liberal in regard to social distinctions. Interestingly enough, the head of Beta Theta Pi fraternity in 1896 was Jewish, but a generation later his son was not accepted. To be sure, even during the "tribal twenties," a young man of distinguished Jewish lineage would be accepted into one of the Yale Junior Fraternities. For example, John Mortimer Schiff '25, grandson of investment banker Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, was a member of Beta Theta Pi. Apparently, Schiff had considered joining the Alpha-Lambda chapter of Zeta Beta Tau, established at Yale in 1921, but his father, Mortimer L. Schiff, a member of Beta Theta Pi at Amherst, from which he had graduated in 1896, persuaded him to join the Yale chapter of his own fraternity. Certainly, young Schiff had the proper credentials for membership in a gentile fraternity: a graduate of the Taft School; a member of the Class Crew Squad for each of his first three years, including the championship Class Crew of May, 1924; assistant business manager of the Yale Record,

---

Junior year; and manager of Varsity Swimming Team, Senior year, for which he received a minor "Y." At some point in his life, he became an Episcopalian; he also married Edith Baker, granddaughter of banker George F. Baker, although he still carried on the family business of Kuhn, Loeb & Company.  

Although not the first Jewish fraternity founded at Yale, Z.B.T. was the most exclusive. It gave preference to German and Spanish Jews from private schools and to those whose fathers had graduated from Yale or from another prestigious college. Hence a boy whose father had belonged to a Z.B.T chapter at a less prestigious institution, for instance, Syracuse, was denied admission to the Yale chapter. To gain status in the eyes of gentiles, some chapters of Jewish fraternities imitated the snobbishly exclusive practices of gentile fraternities which had led to the establishment of separate Jewish social organizations in the first place. The brothers of Z.B.T. were quite well represented in athletics: two played freshman football, a third was a swimmer, a fourth a track man, and a fifth a varsity golfer. Jewish students in other fraternities also

participated in extra-curricular activities. Jews of Eastern European usually joined Sigma Alpha Mu, begun in 1917, or in Tau Epsilon Phi, founded in 1918. One member of S.A.M., Class of 1925, played Varsity Basketball for three years, was on the Varsity Baseball squad, and earned both numerals and a minor "Y." Other Jewish students might find social comfort in Pi Lambda Phi or Phi Alpha. Jewish fraternities were designated as University fraternities, which meant that they drew members from both the College and Sheffield. Often they existed unofficially for several years until investigated by a Faculty committee. Although a chapter of Pi Lambda Phi appeared at Yale in 1917, it was not recommended for official recognition until 1923.

The Committee on University Fraternities reported that the graduates of the Iota chapter had purchased a house on Trumbull Street for members and that its financial affairs are well managed (as is not surprising). The graduate membership numbers fifty and the active membership twenty, the latter comprising men in the College, Scientific School and Law School. The active members have good records of scholarship and conduct. Four of them hold Phi Beta Kappa keys, one is a member of Sigma Xi and the group is well represented in the varied forms of student activity.

Two social worlds had developed at Yale as at Harvard by the 1920's.  

There were too few Jewish students at Princeton before World War II to establish more than informal groups, although some of them may have joined the more daring campus organizations such as the Liberal Club and Society for the Study of Socialism. But both were moribund, if not defunct, by the end of the 1920's. 47

Princeton had a reputation, moreover, of giving Jewish students a hard time. Two leading novels of the 1920's recorded this treatment. In Fitzgerald's This Side of Paradise, Amory Blaine and his friends amused themselves by filling "the Jewish youth's bed with lemon pie," a fairly

from Pres. Hadley, January 1st, 1906, to May 20th, 1906, Book 12, p. 620. "Report of the Committee on University Fraternities," 5 pp.; "Report to the University Council by Special Committee Appointed to Investigate Position of Pi Lambda Phi Fraternity for Official Recognition by the University Authorities," April 12, 1923, 2 pp., "Alpha Chi Rho," 3 pp. report, and Dean of Yale College to Phi Delta chapter of Alpha Chi Rho, Apr. 17, 1923, Records of the Dean, Frederick S. Jones, Box 3, folder Fraternities. Since fraternities with "membership from among Christians only" were recognized by the authorities, they had no justifiable grounds for denying recognition to Jewish fraternities "Foundation of Societies," Yale Banner and Pot-Pourri, Vol. XXII, 1930, p. 171. The two best accounts of Yale and Sheffield fraternities and societies are by Loomis Havelmeyer: "Go To Your Room" A story of Undergraduate Societies and Fraternities at Yale (Yale University, 1960) and Undergraduate Activities in The Sheffield Scientific School Yale University 1847-1945 (New Haven, Conn., 1958).

mild form of hazing. To protect himself from possibly more serious abuses, Robert Cohn in Ernest Hemingway's The Sun Also Rises became the middleweight boxing champion of Princeton. Cohn, whose character was apparently drawn from one of Meyer Guggenheim's grandsons, was the scion of both wealthy and old New York Jewish families. While preparing for Princeton at a military school, he had "played a very good end on the football team," and no one had made him race-conscious. No one had ever made him feel he was a Jew, and hence any different from anybody else, until he went to Princeton. He was a nice boy, a friendly boy, and very shy, and it made him bitter. He took it out in boxing, and he came out of Princeton with painful self-consciousness and the flattened nose, and was married by the first girl who was nice to him.

Although a few well-to-do Jewish students--those who were usually willing to become "pet Jews"--probably had a good time at Princeton, most experienced the reception given to Robert Cohn. Then they either learned to fight or transferred to another college. Columbia, Harvard, and Pennsylvania were generally more hospitable. Accordingly, Mrs. Philip J. Goodhart, one of the leading lights of New York German-Jewish society, "believed that little girls should wear round sailor hats and white gloves, and that boys should concentrate on Harvard or Columbia, not Princeton." Although one of her sons went to Yale, "Princeton had graduated too many people she did not visit." 48

48 Fitzgerald, This Side of Paradise, p. 48. Ernest
CHAPTER III

THE PURSUIT OF KNOWLEDGE

Likewise I was too ignorant of the personal history of the men whom I was trying to teach. One could place the graduate students roughly, for one knew the colleges from which they came and something about their records and their plans. But I never knew even the names of the majority of students in the big undergraduate courses, nor their preparatory schools nor their Harvard groupings and social affiliations. I had to leave all that to my assistants who read the blue-books and conferred personally with the men. I trust that my natural sympathies, like my father's, were with the poor, the aliens in race, the 'untouchables'; but I did my best to treat each student precisely as I treated every other.  

—Bliss Perry, And Gladly Teach

Bliss Perry, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Harvard, was only one of many outstanding and popular professors at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton from the 1890's to the 1930's. Such men were only partly the reason why growing numbers of students sought admission to these institutions. Most students realized that playing on the football team and membership in a social club derived some prestige from the Big Three's then unchallenged academic standing. The best colleges had to lead in all fields, academic as well as athletic and extra-curricular. Harvard

assumed, of course, that it was academically superior to all other colleges. During a conversation about two brothers who were playing on opposing teams in the annual Harvard-Yale-football game, a "Cambridge lady" ventured that this was not "'so strange as it seems,'" because "'it often happens that one of two brothers is brighter than the other.'"²

Not only were the Big Three bastions of scholarship and intellect, but they also influenced secondary school curriculum by their admission requirements. Since the Big Three accepted only classical and traditional academic subjects—eventually broadened to include the newer sciences and modern languages—private preparatory schools provided them proportionately more students than public high schools, from the early 1900's through the 1940's. While about 50 to 55 percent of Harvard and about 70 to 90 percent of Princeton Freshmen were private school graduates, between 40 and 60 percent of Yale Freshmen were so educated, with an additional 10 to 20 percent "High Plus Prep." When in the years before World War I the Big Three, led by Harvard, began to modify and expand their admission requirements in the hope of attracting more able high school boys, they found that a higher percentage of these young men made the honor roll than the prep school graduates and a lower percentage were dropped for academic reasons. Perhaps the high

²Ibid., p. 229.
school boys were more practical: academic achievement was a more certain avenue of career advancement than extra-curricular activities. Not a few of these high school graduates, especially at Harvard and Yale, were the sons of recent immigrants to the United States. At first this "alien" element was too small to cause concern, but about the time of World War I, college administrators began to show alarm at what seemed to be an immigrant invasion of these oldstock institutions. They became increasingly hard put to cast their "natural sympathies" on the side of "the poor, the aliens in race, the 'untouchables.'"

The Great Professors

At the turn of the twentieth century, wrote Bliss Perry, "Old Cambridge" still reigned supreme in "the leisurely charm of Brattle Street," which "was like an island in the stream of new and alien races swarming into Greater Boston" and of American suburbanites coming to Cambridge. Perhaps it could count fewer men of world-wide reputation than in 1850, and yet within half a mile of the Craigie House there were probably as many men of personal distinction

---

as could be found anywhere in a similar radius, outside of the great European capitals. Family still counted for something, but money for very little. A typical figure was President Eliot, riding his bicycle every morning on his way to market or for tranquil exercise.4

In 1900, the most illustrious department within Harvard University was Philosophy. Not only were its best men productive scholars, they were also "interesting personalities," whom the senior among them, Professor George H. Palmer, called a "'philosophical menagerie.'" His colleagues included such antithetical intellects as William James, psychologist and philosopher of pragmatism; Josiah Royce, monistic idealist; Spanish-born George Santayana, multi-faceted philosopher-literateur of naturalism and aesthetics; and Hugo Münsterberg, a German-Jew, who was generally considered to have been the founder of applied psychology.5

The Department of English also had its "brilliant array of primadonnas, each supreme in a chosen role," with no obvious "common denominator" linking their courses and approaches to teaching. Bliss Perry immediately realized that he should "walk delicately" when dealing with such colleagues as Dean Le Baron Russell Briggs, Barrett Wendell, Charles T. Copeland, F. N. Robinson, George P. Baker (whom

4Perry, And Gladly Teach, pp. 227-228.

5Ibid., pp. 223-224.
Harvard allowed to go to Yale where he became Director of the University Theatre), George Lyman Kittredge, the Shakespearean scholar, and younger men like William Allan Neilson and Chester N. Greenough. Not only did Perry have "to reckon with the 'filio-pietistic' loyalty to the methods of dead masters," but he "had to reckon also with the prescriptive right to certain authors or fields, claimed by men already giving instruction in them." 6

Nevertheless, Perry recalled with great satisfaction his long professorial career. He had first taught at Williams College, his alma mater, then went to Princeton University where he enjoyed his "seven happiest years." After a ten year editorship of The Atlantic Monthly, during which he also taught part-time at Harvard, he served as Harvard lecturer at the University of Paris and at other French universities in 1909-1910. The following autumn, he began the first of twenty years of full-time teaching at Harvard, in English and Comparative Literature. His career thus illustrated the professorial ideal of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. To be sure, the stereotype of the beloved professor, a collegiate "Mr. Chips," had become almost a caricature, while in reality the average professor was often financially threadbare, over-worked, and underproductive in scholarship. But Bliss Perry

\[6\text{Ibid.}, \text{ pp. 242-243.}\]
was both a prolific writer and editor and a great teacher. He reminded students that college could be educational. Six hundred of them thronged in his "English 41," an undergraduate survey course from *Beowulf* to Rudyard Kipling, until he limited its enrollment to three hundred, with a waiting list. In spite of these large lecture courses, Harvard was "a true Cockpit and Paradise of Learning," because within his classroom, which was "'dukedom large enough,'" he was free to teach and experiment. Few, if any, regrets had clouded his comfortable, happy, and "sheltered life," during which his "day's work, for more than half a century, has been with gentlemen."^7

To be sure, other departments could boast of their famous professors—for example, Charles H. Haskins, Roger B. Merriman, and Frederick Jackson Turner in history, and Alfred Bushnell Hart, A. Lawrence Lowell, and Charles H. McIlwain in government. But Harvard by no means monopolized all the academic talent. Bliss Perry had found that Princeton's "'young faculty,' most of them still in their thirties, numbered some brilliant investigators and teachers," and that "there was more substantial work done at Princeton in

that epoch of 'the golden nineties' than is generally supposed." The "'young faculty,'" who first numbered a majority in 1893, was led by Woodrow Wilson, professor of Jurisprudence and Political Economy. Among his supporters were Winthrop M. Daniels, professor of Political Economy, Henry B. Fine, professor of Mathematics, William F. Magie, professor of Physics, and John Grier Hibben, then Wilson's intimate friend and professor of Logic. Together with Wilson and Daniels, Perry coached the Princeton debating team which met Yale and Harvard teams coached, respectively, by Arthur Twining Hadley and George P. Baker. 8

Like Harvard and Yale, Princeton was particularly strong in the liberal arts: English and other literature courses, the Classics, Ethics and Philosophy, and history and government. George McLean Harper in Belles Lettres and English Language & Literature, Bliss Perry in Oratory and Aesthetic Criticism, the Reverend Henry van Dyke, Jr. English Literature, and Andrew Fleming West in Latin and Pedagogics, were among Princeton's leading lights at the turn of the century. After Woodrow Wilson became President

of the University, he brought several eminent professors to Princeton: Harry Augustus Garfield in Politics, who later resigned to become President of Williams College; Frank Thilly in Psychology, who resigned after two years to become professor of Philosophy and Ethics at Cornell University; and the Englishman James Hopwood Jeans in Applied Mathematics, who was knighted in 1928.⁹

Since the College provided only one course of study, rooted in the classical languages, and awarded at first only the Bachelor of Arts degree (the Litt. B. was added for those who entered with Latin, but without Greek), a separate school had to be provided for students interested in science. The John C. Green School of Science, founded in 1873, began instruction leading to the B.S.; and Departments of Civil Engineering and Electrical Engineering were subsequently established. As part of curriculum revision in 1919, the undergraduate College dropped the Litt.B. degree; eliminated the Greek requirement for A.B. candidates; and began to grant a B.S. degree, which required no Latin. Princeton and Yale, being more conservative in curriculum matters, had protected the classical languages as long as possible from the competitive challenges of modern disciplines, especially the sciences. Charles W. Eliot, a chemist

⁹General Catalogue of Princeton University 1746-1906 (Princeton, New Jersey: Published By The University, 1908).
and mathematician, applied a Latin phrase to those classicists who argued that public high schools should provide three years instruction in Greek: "'Quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat'" ("Whom the god wishes to destroy he first drives mad"). By the late nineteenth century, Harvard allowed applicants to offer other courses, often more demanding, in place of Greek. Their "distinctly above the average" performance in College had demonstrated that Greek was unnecessary for either matriculation or graduation. Classicists successfully fought rear guard actions elsewhere, however.10

Yale did not abolish the Greek requirements for entrance until 1903, sixteen years after Harvard. It had been a four-year battle, but "Greek was costing the College tuitions as well as prestige." Yale's enrollment had stood still, "while Harvard had doubled its lead." Classicists continued to be influential, nevertheless. Henry P. Wright and Clarence W. Mendell, both professors of the Latin Language and Literature, served as Deans of Yale College,

respectively, 1884-1909 and 1926-1937. Yale also developed solid departments in English, chemistry, geology, anthropology, and linguistics, and fostered scientific training in the Sheffield Scientific School, just as Harvard had done in the Lawrence Scientific School (phased out after 1906). Among the luminaries in New Haven during the last three decades of the nineteenth and the early years of the twentieth century were the little noticed Josiah Willard Gibbs, professor of Mathematical Physics; Thomas Raynesford Lounsbury, professor of English; and William Graham Sumner, professor of Political and Social Science. Of them all, records Henry Seidel Canby Ph.B. '99 in *Alma Mater*, Sumner "was the only faculty member that parents feared, the only man that alumni tried to have discharged from his post."

He had dared to challenge the economic status quo:

> Protection (we were most of us Republicans), taxation, capitalism in general, imperialistic war--these sacred bulls should be kept off the college campus, where irreverent theorists might prod them until they broke loose upon the college town and the city beyond it. And with the parents and the alumni most of our faculty secretly or openly agreed.

Although some of Sumner's barbs could produce reactions, the majority of Faculty knew only how to use "blunt weapons," with the result that most students pursued the extra-curricular activities of "college life."\(^{11}\)

---

But beginning in 1919, the University began to emerge from the shadow of Yale College and to develop its graduate and professional schools "into first-rate parts of a modern university." By the late 1940's, ten of Yale's twenty-four departments ranked "in first place," of which four had no rivals: the three well-established ones of German, Linguistics, and Oriental Studies and a newcomer, Philosophy. To be sure, Yale's strengths continued to be in the Humanities, with six in first place, while only one in Social Sciences (unless History, Philosophy, and Psychology were also included) and two or three in Natural Sciences earned that distinction. Such strong emphasis on the Humanities suggested that the Big Three were bastions of culture as well as learning. Since this culture was derived from Christian and Anglo-Saxon traditions, it was difficult, if not impossible before the 1940's, according

Press, 1965), pp. 37-40, 178. Henry Seidel Canby, Alma Mater The Gothic Age Of The American College (New York: Farrer & Rinehart Incorporated, 1936), pp. 96-97, Ch. IV "The Faculty," 81-100, Ch. VII "The Professor," 171-193. Canby, who became an assistant professor of English at Yale, 1908-1922, remembered four "outstanding professors" of his undergraduate days: Henry Augustin Beers, English Literature, 1874-1916; Albert Stanburrough Cook, English Language and Literature, 1889-1921; William Henry Brewer, Agriculture, 1864-1903; and Charles Sheldon Hastings, Physics, 1884-1915. These men were not "great thinkers," yet "they were great personalities: to students and young instructors. See also Ch. VIII "Scholars and Scholarship," 195-221. Mention should also be made of Chauncey Brewster Tinker, one of Yale's most eminent professors of English Literature from pre-World War I to the 1940's.
to E. Digby Baltzell, for a Jew
to secure a tenure appointment at any good university in most disciplines: English, history, chemistry, sociology and engineering departments were, for various reasons, the most rigidly exclusive (no Jew ever held a tenure appointment in any English department at the 'big three' until the Second War). It is of course appropriate that anthropology, with its discipline in transcultural values, was rather an exception to this prevalent rule.

World War II would decisively end, however, the era of Anglo-Saxon dominance of the academic establishment.  

"The Life Line of Empire"

Not only did the Big Three compete in intercollegiate athletics, but more importantly they also competed for students. So jealous were they in maintaining lines of communication with their respective "feeder" schools and in attracting the best prospects that they declined for the most part to cooperate with each other in admission policies. While President Conant of Harvard referred to admission policy as an imperial "life line," Vermont-born President James R. Angell of Yale chose a homespun metaphor: "A New England collegiate institution is per se a fairly independent horse, and likely to be affected only by questions of

---

of pasturage." Both Harvard and Yale, however, began to face serious competition from ambitious smaller colleges.\(^\text{13}\)

By the mid-1920's, President Lowell, Conant's predecessor at Harvard, noted that "the endowed schools" had ceased "to be feeders for a single institution," and were "tending to send their graduates to different colleges." Princeton, which had once "stood among the small colleges," had put herself in the class with Harvard and Yale, which means, of course, tapping the same sources for students. Indeed, the gain of Princeton is quite as much from Yale as from Harvard; but it is a gain in percentage, the numbers that Harvard and Yale are drawing from the preparatory schools being as large, or larger, than ever.

Lowell attributed Princeton's success to "one advantage, - that her graduates are always lauding their college in preparatory schools; whereas our graduates are always criticizing Harvard." In fact, he was surprised "that the constant criticisms of certain groups of Harvard men have not had a more substantial effect on the number of students from the schools."\(^\text{14}\)

---


\(^{14}\) A Lawrence Lowell to Frederick R. Martin, May 22, 1926, ALLP, 1925-1928, # 124 Admission.
When distressed alumni reported to the president or one of the deans that their alma mater was losing its hold on a particular territory to either of its two closest rivals, a letter, both reassuring and concerned, would soon be sent in reply. Dean Jones was particularly deft at upholding the values of the Yale system, while implying that educational programs at rival colleges had weak underpinnings. When an alumnus wrote Jones that Yale was yielding ground to Princeton in the Middle West, the Dean expressed a lack of conviction in the accomplishments of Princeton's preceptorial system. He could not "see how" they were "as good as what we get here at Yale." And to those who claimed that Yale had become a rich man's college, especially for "the successful New York men," Jones defended their scions as "the men here at Yale who do the most serious work, who are the most temperate, upright and well-behaved." Princeton was justifiably proud of its educational innovation, however, and was somewhat annoyed when Harvard began to boast of its own tutorial system, introduced about a decade later. "If we do not look out," warned Princeton Trustee Walter E. Hope '01, "these people will claim that they originated the tutorial system." In its publicity, Princeton "ought from time to time to touch the preceptorial system, linking it perhaps with the name of Woodrow Wilson, as that will tend to fix the date of its origin." Such self-publicity was an essential part of student recruitment,
carried on in large measure by enthusiastic alumni.\textsuperscript{15}

Although alumni could encourage promising young men to apply and pressure administrators and faculty to admit, the applicants themselves had to meet fairly demanding entrance standards. And these requirements had consisted mainly of passing examinations which each College gave in certain prescribed subjects, Greek, Latin, Mathematics, and English. Harvard led the Big Three, however, in permitting both alternative subjects and methods of examination. Not only had it been the first of them to drop Greek as a requirement for entrance and graduation, but President Eliot had "anticipated 'unrestricted election' in entrance requirements by several years." In January, 1898, he told the Board of Overseers that "the future attitude" of Harvard was likely to be, not continued insistence upon certain school studies as essential to preparation for college, but insistence that the gate to a university education shall not be closed on the candidate in consequence of his omission, at school, of any particular studies, provided that his school course has been so composed as to afford him a sound training of some sort.'

Some knowledge of any reputable subject would qualify a student for admission. Eliot recognized that "'in a democratic nation'" with "'great local diversity, colleges and

universities, if they would retain a national character and influence, must be careful not to offer unnecessary obstacles to the admission of young men of adequate though diversified training."

In May, 1904, Harvard preceded Yale and Princeton in voting to join the College Entrance Examination Board, which had been established by the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools in the Middle States and Maryland, following a conference at Columbia University in December, 1899. Beginning in 1901, the CEEB held its examinations at various centers during June and issued certificates of the results which member colleges would accept in place of their own examinations. Such a system had several advantages; foremost it insured "a uniform definition of requirements and uniform tests for admission to all participating colleges." It would "greatly promote," both "the convenience of the secondary schools" and "the efficiency of their instruction." Secondary school teachers and college

professors would be brought closer together through joint participation in the preparation of examinations. Student answers, graded by Board-appointed readers from different colleges and secondary schools, had to meet a common standard, although each College could still decide what it would accept as a passing grade.17

The Yale Faculty voted to join the CEEB in 1909, after Dean Henry P. Wright pointed out that better college work was being done by members of the Classes of 1907 and 1908 who had been admitted under the Board examination than by those who had taken Yale's own examinations.

Princeton followed suit the next year. Then in the spring of 1915, the Big Three mutually agreed to "discontinue their June entrance examinations in 1916 and through the agency of the C.E.E.B. offer one identical paper in each subject, which shall serve as the test of admission in that subject for all three universities." In relinquishing their own examinations, the Big Three expanded their pool of potential applicants. CEEB examinations were conducted in many places where the Big Three had not previously held

their own examinations. And representatives of the Big Three became increasingly influential on the Board. For example, Robert Nelson Corwin, chairman of the Joint Committee on Admissions for Sheff and Yale, represented the University on the CEEB from 1910 to 1934 and was its chairman, 1916-1919. 18

Adoption of the CEEB examinations was only one of the important steps in the modernization of Big Three entrance requirements. While they still insisted on examining applicants in a certain number of subjects--Yale demanded fifteen examinations as of 1911--such state

18 Pierson, Yale, I, 401-402, 660. Professor John Preston Hoskins '91, Chairman of the Committee on Entrance, Princeton, "Co-operation in Entrance Examinations, College Entrance Examination Board to Conduct the Princeton, Harvard and Yale June Entrance Examinations After June, 1915," PAW, XV (May 5, 1915), 724-726. Each continued to conduct its own September examinations as a second opportunity for weaker candidates and those with deficiencies in certain subjects. See also four earlier articles by Hoskins in PAW: "The Princeton Entrance Requirements as Compared with Those of Harvard and Yale," X (November 24, and December 1, 6, 15, 1909); folder on College Entrance Examination Board in WWP, PUA; and Memorandum from Alexander Leitch to Radcliffe Heermance, November 27, 1951, "Extracts From Minutes of the Faculty and Trustees dealing with various phases of Admission," Secretary's Office, Miscellaneous Correspondence, 1940-1951, Box II (of 5) F-L, folder Heermance. Radcliffe - material re Coll. Bd. Exams. Elimination Latin, Greek, for admission; Limitation enroll; Appt. Dir. of Admission, PUA.
university as Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Iowa began during the 1870's to admit candidates on certificate from accredited secondary schools. The certificate system invaded the East by 1890, and the future trend was clear when Pennsylvania accepted certificates in 1907. To attract promising high school students, especially outside the East, Harvard pioneered a compromise of the certificate and examination systems, called the "New Plan." On January 17, 1911, Harvard's Faculty of Arts and Sciences voted that "as an alternative of the present system the requirements for admission shall consist of evidence of an approved school [course] and examination in four subjects" with satisfactory results: English; Latin, or, French or German for S.B. candidates; Mathematics, or Physics, or Chemistry; and a choice of Greek, French, German, History, Mathematics, Chemistry or Physics, but not a subject upon which the candidate had already written. All four "comprehensive" examinations had to be taken during the same June or September testing period.19

Whereas the New Plan emphasized quality of reasoning powers as well as quantity of knowledge and allowed the Committee on Admission to exercise a certain amount of

19McKown, The Trend of College Entrance Requirements, pp. 6-12. Record of a Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, January 17, 1911; and Harvard College bulletin on The New Plan of Admission, 1912, ALLP, 1909-1914, #15 New Plan. Pierson, Yale, I, 402-404.
discretion, the Old Plan was "quantitative" and non-discretionary. While high school graduates usually sought admission under the former many preparatory school students preferred the anticipated and well-known Old Plan method, whereby a candidate secured admission by accumulating twenty-six points worth of subject matter. If he remained deficient in a few subjects, he could enter "on condition" and make up these points later. Since the Old Plan favored the preparatory schools, several headmasters expressed concern that Harvard was just trying to increase its enrollment under the New Plan by reducing the required number of examinations to four. But as President Lowell explained to Alfred E. Stearns, Principal of Phillips Andover Academy, Harvard desired to extend by letting in boys from schools in other parts of the country which did not hitherto fit our requirements, not to let in boys more easily from the schools which have been in the habit of sending them....In short, my hope and my belief in regard to the working of the new system is that it would be rather more difficult for the poor scholar who goes to a good preparatory school to get in, but would be more easy for the good scholar from a school that does not habitually prepare for Harvard.

To be sure, the College wanted the prestigious private schools to continue preparing their brighter boys for Harvard, but it also wanted to extend its educational leadership to all sections of the United States.20

20Harvey N. Davis, Assistant Professor of Physics, Harvard, "The New Harvard Plan for College Admission," reprinted from Proceedings of the National Education
Even before the New Plan went into effect, Andrew Carnegie wrote a brief letter of approval to President Lowell. Harvard's overtures to the public high schools were both democratic and practical:

I cannot repress my desire to congratulate you and Harvard University upon its action in linking the graduate of the high school with the university. There is now a clear path for the poor boy from the bottom to the top. Scientific knowledge ranks with classical studies; in other words, Harvard now becomes a Republic of Letters, one department's privilege every department's right.

Lowell was more concerned, however, with making Harvard into a "national" University than into a democratic escalator.21

During the decade before the New Plan went into effect, all of the fourteen public schools sending annually one or more graduates to Harvard were located in Massachusetts. In contrast, among the 33 candidates admitted under the New Plan in 1911 were "boys from twelve states whose schools sent not a single boy under the old system this year." Although 34 came from Massachusetts, Harvard also attracted at least one representative from each of the following: Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Kentucky, Michigan, Association, San Francisco, Cal., July, 1911, pp. 567-571; and A. Lawrence Lowell to Alfred E. Stearns, Principal, April 24, 1911, ALLP, 1909-1914, #15 New Plan.

Minnesota, Nebraska, Vermont, Virginia, and Wisconsin. Thereafter the number of successful New Plan candidates increased substantially; 154 and 197 were admitted, respectively, in 1912 and 1913. And after six years' experience with the plan, John Goddard Hart '93, Secretary of the Faculty and Chairman of the Committee on Admission, found that such candidates, even those admitted with unsatisfactory examinations, achieved better than average academic records their Freshman year. In fact, they generally achieved higher records than men admitted under the Old Plan.\(^\text{22}\)

Yet the New Plan had not really increased the percentage of students coming from outside New England. Between 1911 and 1923, the percentage of such students fluctuated between 20 and 23, with the exception of the year 1917, in which 24 percent had entered from non-New England schools. Geographical diversity was supplied by transfers from other colleges. In 1919, 322 transfers were admitted out of 404 applicants; the 214 who registered represented 97 colleges and 43 states and foreign countries. Moreover, the percentage admitted from public high schools had fallen from 50 in 1911 to 40 by 1917, although it rose to 43 percent in

1919. To encourage the application of more non-New England public high school graduates, Hart suggested that Freshman candidates from distant parts be admitted on the same basis as transfer students, on their records rather than on examinations. Their first year they would then register either as Unclassified Students, or, if they achieved satisfactory grades on the New Plan examinations in September, as Freshmen. But few of the 1202 students admitted on high school certificates during World War I to the S.A.T.C., Naval, and Marine units at Harvard achieved satisfactory records. Not until 1923 would Harvard again experiment with a certificate system, when it began to admit students who ranked in the "highest seventh" of their graduating high school class.23

The number of students admitted to Harvard under the New Plan continued to grow; 343 out of 636 applicants were accepted in 1922. And many of the other private, Eastern, especially women's, colleges had adopted some form of certificate and examination system. Although President Arthur T. Hadley of Yale had proposed such a system of comprehensive examinations in 1901, Yale did not adopt its so-called "Plan B" until 1916. Like Princeton (which had

voted in favor of an "Alternate Method of Entrance" in May, 1912), Yale allowed candidates with satisfactory school records to take comprehensive examinations in four specified subjects: Latin, English, Mathematics, and French, German, or Greek. Plan B candidates for Sheffield Scientific School, like New Plan candidates for Harvard, were allowed more alternative subjects within two or three of the four groups. To facilitate the operation of these New Plans, the CEEB decided to offer comprehensive examinations as of June, 1916. A dozen years later, Robert N. Corwin would boast to President Angell about the expansion of the New Plan "under Yale's leadership." "To Harvard thus belongs the credit for starting the experiment," he wrote, "and to Yale that of making it workable and generally available."  

24 McKown, The Trend of College Entrance Requirements, pp. 13-21. Pierson, Yale, I, 404-411. For the most comprehensive study of Yale admissions, see Harold Potter Rodes, "Educational Factors Affecting the Entrance Requirements of Yale College" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1948), pp. 103-140. While Yale had been 10-20 years behind Harvard in 1900, said Rodes, it caught up to within five years of its rival by adopting a New Plan in 1916. See also Robert N. Corwin to President James R. Angell, June 25, 1928, Records of the President, JRA, Box 2 and folder Board of Admissions; Corwin, "The Western High School and the Eastern University," An Address before the Associated Western Yale Clubs, May 2, 1913, at Louisville, Ky., YAW, XXII (May 16, 1913), 884-888. Gilbert F. Close '03, Editor of Official Publications, "The New Entrance Requirements," PAW, XIII (January 8, 1913), 271-273. See also Princeton University, "Report of the Special Committee of Three on Entrance Requirements and Maintenance of Standards," 1911, 91 pp. printed "Confidential Document," Subject File Administration--Entrance Requirements; Princeton University, "Report of the Special Committee of Nine on University Entrance Requirements," February 19, 1972, [7 pp.] printed, Subject File Admission; and Princeton University, "Revised
But Yale itself would first undergo a major reorganization at the end of World War I. This reform movement, demanded by alumni, had a number of objectives: improve the quality of undergraduate teaching and curriculum; bring the College and Sheff into closer relationship; modify entrance requirements so as to increase Western representation; build up the graduate and professional schools; and increase the University's endowment and raise Faculty salaries. President Hadley initially hesitated and then opposed such fundamental changes on the grounds that they would be excessively costly. But he ultimately accepted "Reorganization," as did the conservative old guard Faculty who felt that these reforms not only enhanced the authority of the University at the expense of the College, but also weakened instruction in the College by creating the Common Freshman Year and transferring the Select Course to the College. In brief, Reorganization effected the following changes: Sheff's course of study was extended from three to four years; the College began to award the Ph.B. (formerly given in Sheff's Select Course) for those who entered without Latin; and the Freshman Year, Yale College, and Sheff admissions were to be combined under newly created Board of Admissions. Freshmen admitted under this

Entrance Requirements and Courses Leading to Bachelor's Degrees" (Princeton, N.J.: Office of the Secretary, May, 1919), 8 pp. printed, Subject File Admission, PUA.
procedure would participate in a Common Freshman Year, before electing to study at Yale College or Sheff for the remaining three years. Finally, the Faculty would be organized into University Departments, under University Division, which in turn would be represented on a University Council, headed by a Provost. Although Hadley's last years as president were marred by disagreements with the alumni and Corporation, Yale had grown "from a group of loosely related schools into a well-coordinated University" during his administration. At Yale, Hadley had brought together, with some success, the ideals of English and German university training. And he had fostered the unity of spirit and intellect, represented by two of the achievements of his administration: the Memorial Quadrangle and the University Press.  

---

Of major importance for Yale admissions was the creation of a University Admissions Board in 1920. Robert Nelson Corwin was, in many ways, an excellent choice as Yale's first director. Descended from Colonial English stock, Corwin was the heir of generations of solid, if not illustrious, Congregationalists on both sides of his family. His own father was a farmer. Although Corwin was not one of the distinguished scholars in the Yale College Class of 1887--achieving only a second dispute Junior and a second colloquy Senior appointment, respectively a "C" and a "D"--he was a Varsity football player Junior and Senior years, attaining the distinct honor of being elected captain of the championship Football Team of 1886. He was also a social success. Not only was he elected to Psi Upsilon, but he was also "tapped," like Dink Stover, for Skull&Bones. He later became a charter member of the Graduates Club of New Haven. After studying for his M.A. and Ph.D degrees in Berlin and Heidelberg, he began his forty-one year professional career at Yale: instructor, assistant professor, professor and head of the German department in the Sheffield Scientific School. He also held the position of chairman of the Committee on Admissions in Sheff as well as serving as graduate representative for football and then as chairman of the University Athletic Association. When the Joint Committee on Admissions, of which he was chairman, was reorganized in 1920, Corwin was the logical choice for the chairmanship of
the University Board. Until he retired from that position in 1933, he was more influential than any other administrator in determining the kind of applicant accepted at Yale.26

Admissions policy at Princeton was shaped in much the same way by Director Radcliffe Heermance. Of "old Dutch stock," Heermance graduated from Williams College '04 and earned Master of Arts degrees from Williams, Harvard, and Princeton, before becoming an instructor of English at Princeton in 1909. There he remained for over forty years, except for military service in World War I. A major of infantry in the Army Reserve, he commanded a Training Detachment in Georgia before assuming command of the S.A.T.C. at Harvard as Professor of Military Science and Tactics. This experience and a "resonant voice"—he conjured "an vision of a cavalry officer, sabre at point, at full gallop towards a line of green hills..."—made him an effective disciplinarian when he was appointed Supervisor of Freshmen in 1921 and Dean of Freshmen, 1925-1942. Students who were failing soon heard the rough side of his tongue. "A lot of the young brats were doing work far below their predictive group," he commented to a colleague, "so I gave them a few

26 See autobiographical sketches of Robert Nelson Corwin in Yale College, the Twenty-Fifth, Thirty-Fifth, and Fiftieth Year Records of '87, YUA. Nellie P. Elliot, former Executive Secretary of the Yale Board of Admissions, interview, New Haven, Connecticut, October 2, 1970.
golden words, more in the vein of Colonel Gilmore than a la Buchman." 27

In 1921, however, Heermance was discouraged because he had not been promoted to professor, along with several other assistant professors. He was not, some Princetonians have said, an intellectual "heavyweight." But he was well suited for positions in administration and admission. In 1922, he was promoted to professor and appointed to the new post of Director of Admission, which he held for 28 years.

And as Chairman of the College Entrance Examination Board, 1933-1936, Heermance worked to improve relationships between the college and the secondary schools. He was particularly concerned with maintaining close ties with the preparatory schools. He drove to the nearer schools in his big car—he loved cars and wanted to own a Marmon, "a convertible Franklin Coupé, a Packard Straight Eight and the Locomotive for

27Biographical Information on Radcliffe Heermance, Director of Admission, Emeritus, Princeton University, July 21, 1955, folder PUA. See also the following in a folder on Radcliffe Heermance, Office of Secretary of the University, Mr. Jeremiah S. Finch, 318 Nassau Hall: Heermance to Wilkie (Varmum Lansing Collins) Jan. 15, 1921, handwritten, and 19th January, 1927; Gordon G. Slkes, "Radcliffe Heermance," January 8, 1952, dedication by the Class of 1953 in Bric-a-Brac; Princeton University, Department of Public Information, News Release on the death of Radcliffe Heermance, Oct. 30, 1958; and a Memorial Resolution for Radcliffe Heermance adopted at the Faculty Meeting of December 1, 1958, C. William Edwards, Willard Thorp, Jeremiah S. Finch. Jeremiah S. Finch, Secretary of the University, interview, Princeton, New Jersey, February 24, 1971.
heavy traffic." In 1927, for example, Heermance and Dean Luther P. Eisenhart went to the Hill School in Pottstown, Pennsylvania. While Eisenhart gave "a few well chosen words to the Faculty," he did "the glad hand act with the student body." Heermance personally interviewed the applicants and usually decided who would be admitted. A genial man of strong moral character, who drank no hard liquor, he defended the values of a liberal education to his charges: "'You will not solve the problems of middle life, young man, by feats of memory.'" 28

No less effective in handling young men was Henry Pennypacker, chairman of the Board of Admission at Harvard, 1920-1933. Evidently an old stock American, Pennypacker graduated from Harvard in 1888, after winning the intercollegiate shot-put as a Senior. In 1891, he began a nineteen year career at Boston Latin School as a teacher of Latin and Greek, becoming headmaster in 1910. During these years, the ethnic composition of the student body at the Latin School changed from old stock American to that of the newer immigrant, chiefly Catholic and Jewish. Consequently, Pennypacker was probably in closer contact with the sons of immigrants than either Corwin at Yale or Heermance at Princeton. At the same time, Pennypacker maintained his Harvard ties, serving first as graduate

28Ibid.
member of the Committee on the Regulation of Athletic Sports, 1918-1923, and then as faculty member, 1924-1933 (including two years as chairman, 1924-1926). Like Corwin, Pennypacker was both a former athlete and a supporter of athletic sports. To the chairmanship of the Harvard Committee on Admission, he brought similar qualities of leadership. According to the Faculty Minute on Pennypacker's death, "his commanding presence, his resonant voice, his manliness, and his high ideals always made a favorable impression upon his audience." Not only did Pennypacker develop "to a considerable extent the use of the personal interview," but he also visited in person schools and Harvard Clubs all over the United States. And the message he carried to potential applicants was similar to that conveyed by Corwin or Heermance: Harvard (or Yale, or Princeton) "would be glad to admit them if only they could show themselves worthy candidates."²⁹

²⁹See autobiographical sketches of [Charles] Henry Pennypacker in Harvard College, Class of '88, Secretary's Report, VIII (January, 1920); and Fortieth Anniversary Report, IX (December, 1928), also obituary in Fiftieth Anniversary Report (1938) (adapted from the minute prepared for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences), HUA.
Money, no less and perhaps far more than students, was a source of competition among the Big Three. For instance, Yale always maintained that Harvard was the wealthier institution, although Harvard graduates in turn often claimed that Yale graduates went into the more lucrative careers. President Hadley, discouraged by the response of Yale alumni to the Bicentennial Fund, wrote:

Harvard is a local institution to a degree which Yale is not, and Boston is a much richer city than New Haven... The Harvard Corporation lives in Boston, and represents very large and wealthy Boston financial interests. The Harvard Directory of Living Graduates says as its first line, 'If no state is mentioned it will be understood that the graduate lives in Massachusetts.'

Although "Yale has had a large hold on the moneyed men of New Haven, and some hold on the Yale moneyed men of New York," once "you go outside of this you find a distinct unwillingness to give." People were more willing to leave something to Yale in their wills, continued Hadley, "but for getting things in life instead of in death one has to work quite carefully." Yale had to economize, while Harvard could spend "over $300,000—for an athletic stadium which in her annual reports she characterizes as a concession to folly." In contrast, Yale was proud to argue that "the amount of instruction per capita given our students is, on paper at least, very much greater than the amount of instruction per capita given Harvard students, and that that makes
all the difference in the world."\(^{30}\)

To be sure, the Big Three shared a certain camaraderie. Not only did the undergraduates of one college attend the graduate school of another—in this period, it was more likely to be Yale and Princeton undergraduates who attended either the graduate or one of the professional schools at Harvard—but there were occasionally more material manifestations of intercollegiate friendship. For example, in 1905, a Fellow of the Harvard Corporation and prominent Bostonian gave Yale a $10,000 fund, "whose income was to be used to promote good relations between the universities." The Yale Corporation decided to use this income to bring Harvard men to lecture at Yale, and Hadley invited President Eliot to give the first lecture. A letter which Hadley wrote some years later to the donor, Major Henry Lee Higginson, illustrated the essential friendliness between the two institutions.

The fund you gave as a means of promoting closer relations between Harvard and Yale is working splendidly. While we use some of it for lectures, its chief use is to bring younger Harvard Graduates and professors down here to visits of many days, when they can make real acquaintances and do real teaching. I think that our experience with this fund is going to be of more value in shaping the plans of interchange of ideas between American and English universities (which the British

Educational Mission is now taking up) than almost anything which has been done on either side of the water. Upon giving a similar gift of $10,000 to Princeton, Major Higginson wrote that any reciprocation should bear no mention of his name. "The names of our great universities have great value and will last forever, mine has none, nor should it last." In 1909, Cleveland H. Dodge '79, former classmate of Woodrow Wilson and Princeton Trustee, wrote Higginson that he would give $10,000 to Harvard for a Princeton Fellowship. And to reciprocate the Princeton Scholarship established at Yale by the Princeton Club of New York, Charles C. Paulding '99, gave $15,000 in 1931 for a Yale Scholarship at Princeton.31

In 1928, Elizabeth Lowell Putnam, sister of President Lowell, established as a memorial to her husband, William Lowell Putnam, Harvard '82, a $100,000 trust fund, the income of which would go to the victor of an Harvard-Yale Competition in English literature. After grading the

common general examination, a committee of three professors from Princeton, Brown, and Cornell Universities judged that Harvard's English Department had won the $5,000 prize for purchasing books, "by a 'score' of 93 to 117." Of the twenty contestants, Harvard men finished in the following order: 1, 2, 6-8, 10-12, 16, and 20. In first place was Nathan M. Pusey, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, who would succeed James B. Conant as President of Harvard in 1953. President Lowell attributed Harvard's success "to more effective training - in other words, to the system of general examinations and tutors." He hoped that Yale would adopt the same system as well as continuing the competitive examination in English. But President Angell believed that "year in and year out the Yale group would be materially handicapped if attempting to compete on the basis of comprehensive examinations," since the College Faculty, in spite of his advocacy, had not provided "adequate facilities for training to meet such a test." He also questioned in part the way the papers were rated. Angell was unwilling "to permit Yale to be put in a position of inequality in any public competition."32

In their relationships, the Big Three have been

32Yale University News Statement, June 1, 1928, on the results of the Harvard-Yale competition in English Literature; A Lawrence Lowell to President James R. Angell, June 26, 1928; and Angell to Lowell, June 27, 1928, Records of the President, JRA, Box HARD-HARV, folder Harvard University.
more competitive than cooperative, because the stakes were high: alumni loyalty and endowments, students, and prestige. Before 1900, each derived prestige primarily from its standing as a regional institution, but since then, each has sought to enhance its national reputation. Scholarships and other financial aids have thus become increasingly important in Big Three competition to attract able and deserving students from different parts of the country. The earliest sources of financial support to these and other "private" colleges had been provided by state legislatures. And the earliest form of scholarship aid was the remission of tuition to sons of clergymen, later offered to any able student of inadequate precuniary resources. But as the colleges sought national representation, so they "further undermined the old partnership that, for example, had existed when the president of Harvard was paid by an annual appropriation of the Massachusetts General Court." In 1823, Harvard had received its last financial support from the Commonwealth.33

Wealthy business men or their widows began to give large sums of money, either individually or through foundations, to private universities: Andrew Carnegie, Mrs. Collis P. Huntington, J. P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller,

Mrs. Russell Sage, the Vanderbilts, and the Whitneys. And as the sons and grandsons of these men of great wealth attended one or more of the Big Three, these universities became dependent upon their continuing good will. Each of the Big Three had its share of wealthy alumni, and sometimes competed with one another for sons and funds from the same family.

In addition to such Boston Brahmin families as the Lawrences, Lowells, and Major Henry L. Higginson, 1882 hon. (who gave both funds for the Harvard Union, an undergraduate social center, and Soldiers Field for athletics), Harvard also had Lamonts, Stillmans, and Wideners. Perhaps the greatest single benefactor was Gordon MacKay (inventor of shoe machinery and mining tycoon), whose 1903 bequest, it was estimated, would ultimately bring Harvard well over $23,000,000, for furthering education in the applied sciences. As a result of such gifts, Harvard's endowment increased almost fivefold during Lowell's administration: from $22,716,759.24 to $128,520,539.58. In addition to the millions from the Harknesses and John W. Sterling, who built most of Yale in the 1920's and 1930's, that University would receive $5,000,000 in 1952 from Paul Mellon '29 for Sophomore discussion courses and other undergraduate educational programs. And Yale counted upon wealthy non-graduates, like Henry Ford II, for contributions. During President Angell's administration, it endowment quadrupled: from $25,677,000
to $107,585,000. Scions of big business and banking were also to be found among Princeton's moneyed men: Junius S. Morgan '88; Childs Frick, B.S. '05 (from Henry Clay Frick's bequest, publicized in 1919 as being worth $15,000,000, Princeton had realized only $5,932,593.52 by 1932); Firestones (a new University Library); McCormicks; and Rockefeller. In 1911-1912, Princeton's endowment had been a relatively modest $5,194,861; twenty years later, it totaled $24,679,436.34

Most of the big donors were Protestants, because Harvard and Yale had been founded by the Congregationalists and Princeton by the Presbyterians. But as numbers of Catholic and Jewish students began to attend these colleges in the late nineteenth century, some of them also became loyal alumni. Harvard had the most Catholic and Jewish alumni, and hence donors, because it was the first of the Big Three to cut ties with its sectarian past. For example, in 1925, the widow of Charles Joseph Bonaparte '71, who had been Harvard's first Catholic Overseer, 1891-1903, endowed a scholarship in her husband's memory, to be awarded to the

---

outstanding Junior concentrating in Government. Bonaparte, the grandson of Napoleon's brother Jerome, had been a successful Baltimore lawyer, before becoming Theodore Roosevelt's Secretary of the Navy and then his Attorney General. Three graduates of Irish descent became generous donors during the same period. James Byrne '77, the first Catholic Fellow of the Harvard Corporation, 1920-1926, endowed a Professorship of Administrative Law as well as giving substantial sums for various other purposes. 35

Another Irishman was William Stanislaus Murphy '85, who left his entire estate of more than $53,000 to be used as a scholarship fund "'for the collegiate education of any young man or men named Murphy who in the judgment of the faculty should prove deserving of this kind of encouragement.'" The son of a Boston harness maker, Murphy had lived at home during his four years at Harvard. He then worked for almost thirty years as a clerk in the surveyor's office of the Boston customhouse until his death in 1916. A quiet bachelor who faithfully attended Harvard reunions, he chose this means to perpetuate his name. According to an editorial in the Harvard Alumni Bulletin, the bequest "was a fine, impersonal, yet tribal wish . . . worthy of all honor."

35 See sketch on Charles Joseph Bonaparte in Harvard College, Class of 1871, Fiftieth Anniversary Report, XI (June, 1921); also newspaper clippings and obituary notices in his Quinquennial File. For gifts given to Harvard by Bonaparte and Byrne, see Annual Report of the Treasurer of Harvard College (hereafter cited as Harvard Treasurer's
Murphy's gift was only one of many—including Harvard's first scholarship, endowed in 1643 by Lady Ann Mowlson of London—which gave preference to kinsmen or to applicants from a particular place or area. As of 1935, Murphy Scholarships or Murphy Aid had been awarded to 45 men of that name for one or more years. "Although this gift may possibly give the Murphys at Harvard a slight advantage over the less fortunate Cabots and Lowells," said the Boston Herald, it did "not prevent the faculty from teaching the truth to the Murphys, Cabots, and Lowells."\(^{36}\)

One of Harvard's more generous benefactors was George Smith '53, who left his alma mater about one quarter of a million dollars for the construction of three dormitories. His real father had been an Irish porter named Connelly, an employee of Smith & Partridge, St. Louis merchants. Orphaned at a young age, George had been informally adopted by the senior partner and his wife, James and Persis Smith, a childless middle-aged couple. Sent to Harvard,

\(^{36}\) See the accounts of William Stanislaus Murphy's life in Harvard College, Class of 1885, Thirtieth Anniversary Report, VIII (1915-16), pp. 94-97, which quoted the editorial from Harvard Alumni Bulletin, January 19, 1916; Fortieth Anniversary Report, IX (1915-1925), pp. 115-116; Fiftieth Anniversary Report, X (1925-1935), pp. 172-174. Harvard University Catalogue, 1930-31, pp. 389-400. He was the first Murphy to receive a Harvard B.A., although the University had granted its first degree to a Murphy in 1874.
young Smith offended his Eastern classmates by Western mannerisms, particularly his wearing long curly hair in the style of Buffalo Bill. He was forced to cut his hair, however, after classmates covered it with molasses and applied a sandblast while he was sleeping. Smith also wrote a letter challenging Dr. James Walker, president of Harvard 1853-1860, to a duel. Such behavior may have explained why his benefactors, the Smiths, virtually disowned him after he graduated from Harvard. For the next twenty years, he traveled around the country working at various jobs. After James Smith died, his widow made peace with her foster son and named him heir. But her death in 1891 led to a ten-year contest with relatives over the will. George Smith's claim was upheld, but he became an eccentric recluse—eating at the table with his cats—until his death in 1902. Harvard men were asked to be pallbearers at his funeral at which no clergyman officiated. Except for a few small bequests, Smith left the greater part of his estate to Harvard, which, after it accumulated to $450,000, was to be spent for the construction of three residence halls, named, respectively, after James Smith, Persis Smith, and George Smith.

The Smith Halls, along with Standish (the gift of Mrs. Russell Sage) and Gore (built by alumni subscriptions) were opened in 1914 as the Freshman Halls. With the addition of McKinlock Hall in 1926 (given by parents in memory of their son killed in World War I), the four quadrangles provided on-campus housing for most Freshmen. Probably the misanthropic George Smith did not foresee the kind of social mixing and companionship which the Freshman Halls promoted. More likely, he left the money to Harvard because it was the one institution which had meaning for him, and the bequest would thwart the heirs with whom he had battled for so long. But had the Halls been named "Connelly," an alumnus commented to President Lowell in 1914, "it might have helped to increase our prestige with the Irish, who seem to be the coming over-lords of Massachusetts." Nevertheless, "the clan of Smith" was "well worth going after." 38

Jewish alumni also began to give generously to Harvard, although its first major Jewish benefactor, Jacob H. Schiff, had not attended college. He had entered the brokerage business before he was of legal age, and then had joined Kuhn, Loeb & Company in his mid-twenties. By his forties, Schiff was wealthy enough to donate large sums of

38Yeomans, Lowell, pp. 170-174, 220-221. V. Mott Porter to President A. Lawrence Lowell, October 20, 1914, and November 18, 1914; and Lowell to Porter, October 27, 1914, ALLP, 1914-1917, #70 Freshman Halls. For Porter's biographical sketch on George Smith, see Harvard Graduates Magazine, X, 594.
money to Harvard and Columbia. In 1889, he had founded the Semitic Museum at Harvard, and gave about $275,000 to its construction and its activities (which included purchase of specimens, explorations in Palestine, and publications), before his death in 1920. His son, Mortimer L. Schiff, contributed $50,000 in 1923-1924 to the Division of Fine Arts of Harvard's Campaign to Extend the National Service of the University. The following year, Julius Rosenwald gave $100,000 to the same campaign. 39

Like the Schiffs and Rosenwald, most of Harvard's wealthy Jewish alumni were from German-Jewish families, who had become well established in banking and commerce. In addition to the Lehmans (Arthur Lehman '94) and Strauses (Jesse Isidor '93, Percy S. '97, and Herbert N. Straus '03), who donated money for the construction of halls in Harvard Yard, there were the Goldmans, the Sachsces, the Loebs, the Littauers, the Warburgs, and the Wertheims. The Goldmans gave to the Germanic Museum (as did the German-American brewer Adolphus Busch and his son-in-law, Hugo Reisinger, after both of whom the Museum was later named), while the

Sachses contributed substantial sums to the Fogg Art Museum as well as loaning works of art for exhibition. Paul Sachs '00, who had become a Unitarian, was an Associate Professor of Fine Arts and Assistant Director of the Museum. Both the Strauses and the Goldman, Sachs and Company gave, appropriately, to the School of Business Administration during the Campaign to Extend the National Service of the University. 40

Morris Loeb '83 and his brother James '88, sons of Solomon Loeb of Kuhn, Loeb & Company and brothers-in-law of Jacob Schiff, were generous donors. While Morris Loeb left $500,000 to Harvard, subject to certain life interests, James Loeb endowed the Charles Eliot Norton Professorship, the Charles Eliot Norton Fellowship in Greek Studies, and the Ricardo Prize Scholarship as well as buying labor periodicals for the Library and art works for the Fogg Museum. And together James and Morris Loeb gave $50,000 toward the chemical laboratory (1913) named for Professor Wolcott Gibbs. Felix M. and Paul M. Warburg, who inter-

married, respectively, with the Schiffs and Loeb, gave hundreds of thousands of dollars to Harvard, chiefly to the Division of Fine Arts during the Campaign to Extend the National Service of the University. The Wertheims, cigar manufacturers who became bankers, endowed a research fellowship in industrial cooperation. Lucius Littauer chose, however, to strengthen the study of Jewish Literature and Philosophy at Harvard by endowing both the Lucius N. Littauer Research Fellowship and the Nathan Littauer Professorship, in memory of his father, and by giving thousands of volumes of Hebrew books to the Library.  

Harvard was pleased, of course, to accept the gifts of men known as the "Jewish Grand Dukes," but some of the administrators and Faculty resented the increasing number of sons of Russian-Jewish immigrants who applied for scholarship aid. Sons of immigrants were able to attend Harvard, if they lived at home, and/or worked part-time, and secured financial support: one of six Daniel A. Buckley (1907) and several Cambridge (1914) scholarships for graduates of the

city's public schools; one of ten Price Greenleaf (1887); one of several Boston (Harvard Club, 1909) for Freshmen who had graduated from a public high or Latin School within a twenty mile radius of the State House; or the Somerville (Harvard Club, 1913) for a Freshman entering from the city high school. There were also other Harvard Club scholarships for high school graduates from a particular city (Milwaukee and New York City), state (the Chicago, Delaware, Minnesota, and Rhode Island), or region. As of the late 1920's, the average scholarship ranged from $300 to $500, although some offered from $525 to $975. In addition, smaller amounts of financial assistance—from $50 to $300—were available through the Beneficiary, Loan, and Aid Funds (Price Greenleaf, Buckley, Cambridge, Stoughton, Murphy, World War Memorial Aids, or for B.S. candidates, the Samuel C. Cobb Tuition Fund). The total amount of available financial aid was about $210,000, of which the $24,000 income of the Price Greenleaf Fund was allotted to A.B. candidates among Freshmen and first year transfer students. But the tuition, which had been $150 in the early 1900's, had risen to $250 by 1920 and to $400 by 1930. Whereas tuition, medical fees, and room and board had cost a minimum of $324 in 1909-1910, they cost (together with estimates for clothes, transportation books, laundry, and miscellaneous) $1,100 in 1929-1930. Student expenses had risen, according to Seymour E. Harris, The Economics of Harvard, 240 percent from 1910 to 1930.
exceptionally able student might supplement his scholarship by winning prizes.  

In reviewing the needy cases which presented themselves in his office, one Harvard Dean commented in 1907:

The cases that appeal most to me—and they are abundant—are what I call 'the old-fashioned College cases'—sons of families that have been American for generations,—farmers and ministers, and most of all those of families with traditions of refinement and liberal education. Usually this last sort of case is the son of a widow who, used to surroundings of comfort and refinement, finds herself, on the death of her husband, with almost no support. There is another—and increasing class—also interesting,—that is, the foreigners, and especially the Russian Jews. They, however, as a rule accept help with a readiness which cannot but lessen one's interest in them, in comparison with that American spirit which seeks to conceal need.

Clearly the genteel poverty of native-American stock was more appealing to the Dean than the poverty of ambitious ghetto youths. Furthermore, the struggling sons of Jewish immigrants did not temper their tremendous eagerness to succeed with proper New England restraint.

Interestingly enough, the Dean was more sympathetic toward needy students of Welsh or Irish stock. He recalled

---


43 B. S. Hurlbut to Joseph Warren, October 16, 1907, and Jerome D. Greene to Hurlbut, CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 221, folder Hurlbut, Byron Satterlee.
a Welshman, who as a boy had supported his family by jobs in the Pennsylvania coal mines. Although he did not learn to read until his teens, he showed promise at Harvard of becoming a talented journalist. In spite of the fact that he had to work his way through the College and had developed an occasional "'miner's cough,'" the Welshman was "jolly, full of fun, cheerful in the darkest days." But finally the Dean forced him to take a loan so that he would have enough money for food. To match the Welshman's story was that of an Irish mother, who was "one of the 'brave.'" Deserted by her husband, she labored long hours in the mills to support her family. The son, "a cheerful Irishman," worked as a policeman during the summer. His grades were not good enough for a scholarship, yet he attained "fair rank." The Dean thought that the young man would "some day be heard from in politics" and hoped that "his Harvard education will help him to stand for what is right."

Harvard's rivals also provided scholarship aid for needy students. Yale was, Professor Pierson said, "a place where a poor boy could go and make his way, financially as well as socially and athletically." Not only did the University maintain its tuition at $155 a year from 1888 to 1914 (then increased just $5), but its Bureau of Appointments helped students to find part-time jobs. Both the University

---

\[44\] Ibid.
and the Alumni clubs financed scholarships to bring deserving, poor boys to Yale. "'To strengthen'" its "'connection with the schools of Connecticut,'" the Yale Corporation voted in 1911 that freshman-tuition scholarships be offered to the State's public high school graduates, fifteen to Connecticut as a whole and two additional ones to New Haven. The number of scholarships was increased substantially in the 1920's, when $1,001,741 from the Sterling bequest was used to endow Freshman tuition scholarships and scholarships for graduates of New Haven and Connecticut public schools. Believing in geographical balance, Yale established in 1928 "special" University Regional Scholarships for the South Atlantic, Southwest, and Far West (adding the Middle West in 1934). By 1936-1937, about thirty students a year from six non-Eastern regions were selected to come to Yale, by criteria similar to those of the Rhodes Scholarship. 45

In spite of these gains, Yale was facing serious competition from Princeton as well as Harvard. As of 1912, Princeton had 88 university and general scholarships. But in 1919, the University launched an Endowment Campaign, one purpose of which was to fund regional and memorial scholarships. By 1921, it had 294 scholarships: 10 and 20 university for students, respectively, of first and second

45 Pierson, Yale, I, 411-413; Yale, II, 599-600, 489-490.
group standing; 61 general; 22 regional; 51 War Memorial; and 120 Memorial Prize scholarships. The latter, which paid $200 per annum, were apportioned thirty to each entering Freshman Class in such a way that fifteen different regional districts received at least one apiece. Harvard's challenge was more threatening, however, because of its greater resources. Under President James Bryant Conant, Harvard offered National Scholarships with stipends of $1,000 to bright high school graduates. Although the Big Three eventually agreed to set a similar maximum on scholarship awards, Harvard really won the competition. According to Professor Pierson,

Harvard College had more scholarships of all sorts to offer, and benefited so greatly in its regional representation that in the thirties, for the first time in a hundred and fifty years, its constituency became as national as Yale's. For its National Scholarships Harvard continued to insist on high academic standing, and to the distress of the Yale faculty it captured more than its share of the really bright students. In this way Harvard secured and Yale lost an opportunity for intellectual leadership.

Competition among the Big Three had been a boon to many enterprising high school graduates, especially to those from the West. 46

As the following table on geographical distribution

of students showed, Harvard was stronger than Yale in the North Atlantic region by 1926, but yielded to its major rival in both the North Central and Western States. In the same year, Princeton was the strongest in the South Atlantic and South Central regions, while having a hair's-breadth advantage over Harvard in the North Central States. Harvard and Yale, of course, had unquestioned dominion in their respective home states of Massachusetts and Connecticut, while Princeton had a sizable lead over its rivals in New Jersey.

TABLE 1

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION BY RESIDENCE OF HARVARD, YALE, AND PRINCETON UNDERGRADUATES IN 1915-16 AND IN MAY, 1926

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States by Geographical Divisions</th>
<th>1915-1916</th>
<th>May, 1926</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Atlantic Total</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td>2321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States by Geographical Divisions</td>
<td>1915-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Total</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States by Geographical Divisions</th>
<th>1915-16</th>
<th>May, 1926</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States by Geographical Divisions</td>
<td>1915-16</td>
<td>May, 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>3168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* Discrepancies existed between the totals obtained by adding up the numbers and the totals given in the sources (in brackets).)

Sources: Map of "Princeton Harvard Yale Undergraduate Geographical Distribution 1915-16," Subject File Administration-Statistics, Geographical Distribution, PUA; and table and map of "Geographical Distribution According To Residence Harvard, Princeton, And Yale Undergraduates Classes Of 1926-29, Inclusive" (figures compiled May 1926), Records of the President, JRA, Box 2 and folder Board of Admissions, YUA. See also Harvard, Yale, and Princeton Alumni Directories.
The Beginning of Restrictive Admissions

Not only did World War I encourage a reassessment of admission and curriculum requirements, but it also precipitated a "crisis" of numbers in higher education. In 1919-1920, for example, 597,880 students were degree candidates in 1,041 colleges and universities; by 1929-1930, there were 1,100,737 in 1,409 institutions. No longer was higher education the privilege of well-to-do and middle-class youths; it had become the opportunity for lower-middle-class children, many of whom were born of immigrant parents. Although some of the newcomers gained access to the Big Three, the majority of students continued to be old stock Americans, who for another decade or so, "protected by countless caste barriers from the rest of the people, had everything more or less their own way."47

The answer to why increasing numbers of Jews sought admission to Ivy League schools, at least to Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Yale, was complex. First, Jews did not find denominational colleges anywhere near the extent of the Catholics or even of the Protestants. Perhaps they looked more to the home and synagogue for religious training than to educational institutions. Whereas Catholics often

felt that religious training was an integral part of education itself, Jews largely separated the former from the function of the latter. Hence there was little or no opposition from rabbis against Jewish boys seeking education in Protestant colleges. But sons of wealthy Catholics, wrote Stephen Birmingham in *Real Lace*, were sent to such Catholic boarding schools as Canterbury or Portsmouth Priory (later Abbey), after which they were "'supposed' to go to Georgetown University in Washington, run by the Jesuits." It was their best socially.  

Secondly, Jews, like other immigrant groups, were often forced by financial circumstances to attend the nearest college to their home. It was so much the better, in their estimation, if the local college was Harvard or Yale. They were among the best colleges in the country, and Jewish students appreciated a good education. As President James R. Angell of Yale perceived, the development of an all-Jewish university would not "solve the problem," although it would doubtless be helpful, inasmuch as a good many Jewish students are quite as eager for what they consider the social prestige of membership in existing institutions, as for education merely as such. Neither they nor their families would be likely to look upon a Jewish university as satisfactorily meeting their requirements, unless it were notably more

---

liberally endowed, staffed and equipped than other existing institutions.\textsuperscript{49}

According to the following table, based upon a survey of the Bureau of Jewish Social Research published in the \textit{American Jewish Year Book}, 17 out of the 106 institutions studied had 10 percent or more Jewish enrollment by the late teens.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textbf{College} & \textbf{Number} & \textbf{Percent} \\
City College, New York & 1544 & 78.7 \\
New York University & 2113 & 47.5 \\
Hunter College & 502 & 38.7 \\
St. Lawrence University & 133 & 31.7 \\
Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn & 97 & 29.4 \\
Fordham University & 286 & 23.2 \\
Columbia University & 1226 & 21.2 \\
Tufts College, Boston & 291 & 18.9 \\
University of Chicago & 571 & 18.5 \\
Johns Hopkins, Baltimore & 283 & 16.2 \\
Armour Institute, Chicago & 95 & 15.7 \\
\end{tabular}
\caption{Percentage of Jewish Students at Seventeen Colleges and Universities, 1918-1919}
\end{table}

## TABLE 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University, Philadelphia</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi College, Brooklyn</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College, Hartford</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although Jewish students constituted 9.7 percent overall, or 14,837 of a total enrollment of 153,085, the heaviest concentrations were almost invariably in Eastern urban institutions.

Although Columbia University, Barnard College, and New York University were the first to adopt a quota system against Jewish students, the endowed, private men's colleges and universities of New England were not far behind. Prior to the institution of quotas, in 1919-1920, college administrators began to consider the necessity of such restrictions. Their attitudes were revealed in the list of topics for discussion and the minutes of meetings of the Association of New England Deans or the Association of Administrative Officers in New England. For example, at a meeting of the former at Princeton University, May 9th and 10th, 1918,
the following comments were recorded:

Dean Wren [Frank G., Tufts College]

I find that more and more the foreign element is creeping in and now, because of the enlistments, the American boys are getting less and less. We now have more new students than old at the end of the year and about twenty per cent of them are Cubans. How can we get the boys of American parentage to come to college?

Dean Sills [Kenneth Charles Morton, Acting President of Bowdoin College, 1917-1918]

We do not like to have boys of Jewish parentage.

Dean Randall [Otis E., Brown University]

They tried to establish a Jewish fraternity at Brown.

Q. Does Brown feel the effects of Jewish students?
A. Yes.

Dean Jones [Frederick S., Yale University]

I think we shall have to change our views in regard to the Jewish element. We should do something to improve them. They are getting there rapidly. If we do not educate them, they will overrun us. We have got to change our policies and get them into shape. A few years ago every single scholarship of any value was won by a Jew. I took it up with the Committee and said that we could not allow that to go on. We must put a ban on the Jews. We decided not to give them any scholarships but to extend aid to them in the way of tuition.

Dean Burton [Alfred Edgar, Massachusetts Institute of Technology]

We always ask of our Jewish students whether or not they will be obliged to leave college if they do not receive assistance. In every case
Dean Burton

they say they will, but we have found by experience that such is not the case.

Deans Burton, Jones, Randall, and Sills expressed, implicitly or explicitly, a dislike of Jewish students. In particular, Dean Jones saw them as a threat to those whom he identified as "us." There was no evidence that the deans made any collective resolutions in regard to the Jews. 50

But before the 1920 meeting of the Association of Administrative Officers in New England, held at Middletown, Connecticut, Dean Randall proposed for discussion the "limitation in the enrollment of Jews and Negroes." And at subsequent meetings during the 1920's, limitation of enrollment and of size of freshman class were frequently discussed. When the deans returned to their respective campuses, they were armed with various proposals and methods of selecting applicants for admission. Among them was the psychological test, a method of selection employed by Columbia in 1919. Some contemporary writers on higher education believed that Columbia's "use of psychological tests in selecting candidates for admission" would "be of even greater importance" than Harvard's New Plan. To determine "the general mental ability" of candidates for

50 Minutes of Meeting of Association New England Deans Held In Princeton, 9th and 10th of May [1918], pp. 21-22, Records of the Deans, FSJ, Box 6, fol der War, YUA.
the Students' Army Training Corps in 1918, Columbia gave them the Thorndike Tests for Mental Alertness. These tests apparently selected the more able students from the group of candidates. About the same time, the United States Army developed standardized tests—known as Alpha and Beta—which were then taken by 1,726,966 officers and men. Their success in classifying the soldiers was "irresistibly suggestive" to colleges and universities faced with a rapidly growing number of applicants. In 1919, Columbia began to allow candidates with satisfactory school records to take "the intelligence examination" in place of the entrance examinations. Fitness for college work would be determined by record of preparation, "character and promise," health, and intelligence.51

Evidence suggested that Columbia used the so-called psychological or intelligence test to reduce the number of Jewish students within the University. Even before World War I, Frederick P. Keppel, Dean of the College, had to answer those who asked: "Isn't Columbia overrun with

European Jews, who are most unpleasant persons socially?"

Although he personally believed that "by far the majority of the Jewish students who do come to Columbia are desirable students in every way," others, like President Nicholas Murray Butler, did not. And Herbert E. Hawkes, Keppel's successor, argued that psychological tests provided a "rational" means of selection. In 1922, Admissions Director Corwin reported to Yale's Committee on Limitation of Numbers that the Dean of Columbia College states that the proportion of Jews in Columbia has been reduced from about forty percent to about twenty, chiefly through the application of the psychological tests. In explanation of this result he states that most Jews, especially those of the more objectionable type, have not had the home experiences which enable them to pass these tests as successfully as the average native American boy.

The tests were designed to favor native-born, middle class Americans at the expense of those from poor, immigrant families. The belief prevailed, continued Corwin, "among some not connected with Columbia, that these tests, by enabling the Board of Admissions to review again the records of all candidates, may in some cases be arbitrarily made to serve the end desired." Columbia College cut its Jewish enrollment in order to regain its former status as an elite institution for native American sons of local business and professional men, its clientele prior to the move to Morningside Heights.  

52 Frederick Paul Keppel, *Columbia, American College and University Series* (New York: Oxford University Press,
During the early 1920's, most of the prestigious Eastern colleges adopted various methods of limiting and selecting the number of students admitted. Although colleges like Amherst, Dartmouth, and Williams had "no pressing Jewish problem" because it was "generally conceded that the difficulty of this problem" was "in direct ratio to the number of local Jewish inhabitants," they did become more selective. Given such a pervasive climate of opinion, it was inevitable that sooner or later Harvard, Yale, and Princeton would begin to reexamine their own admission policies.53

1914), pp. 179-181. H. E. Hawkes to Robert N. Corwin, October 16 and 20, 1922, and Corwin to Hawkes, October 18, 1922; and [Robert N. Corwin], Limitation of Numbers, one of two 2 page memoranda, Freshman Office Records-Ex-1926-1927 (3) Student Folders Van Camp-Budd, folder Com. on Limitation of Numbers, 1922. The College of Physicians and Surgeons also cut Jewish enrollment from about 40 to 18-20 percent. Every Jewish doctor allegedly took a position away from a native American doctor. Since medical training cost many times more than the tuition fees, every Jewish applicant admitted to medical school meant another expensively subsidized competitor of the native-born American.

53 Memorandum on Limitation of Numbers; and George Edwin Howes, Dean of Williams College, to Robert N. Corwin, October 16 and December 26, 1922, Com. on Limitation of Numbers, 1922. This folder contains exchanges of letters between Corwin and other colleges or universities during the fall of 1922: Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Princeton, Vassar, and Williams.
CHAPTER IV

PORTRAITS OF TWO HARVARD PRESIDENTS: CHARLES W. ELIOT AND A. LAWRENCE LOWELL—THEIR EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIAL PHILOSOPHIES

I have known well four generations of Lowells, beginning with John Amory Lowell, who was for forty years a member of the Corporation. To no member of the whole family of these four generations should I apply the word 'disingenuous.' In every generation they have shown themselves resolute, eager to win in any controversy upon which they entered, credulous in regard to alleged facts which go their way, and incredulous with regard to alleged facts which do not go their way, often sudden in making decisions, and then ingenious, though abrupt, in justifying those decisions.

—Charles W. Eliot to Jerome D. Greene, 7 June 1922.

President Abbott Lawrence Lowell led the movement for restrictive admissions at Harvard College. Although a very substantial proportion of the Faculty and an even larger number of the alumni endorsed his efforts, Lowell's role was crucial. The so-called 'Jewish problem' could, and perhaps would, have emerged at Harvard, whoever was president, but Lawrence Lowell initially determined the direction which the controversy took. And because of his "errors" in leadership, wrote President-Emeritus Charles W. Eliot, the Corporation and Board of Overseers had to "keep incessant watch against his defects of judgment and good feeling." But Eliot's sharp criticisms of Lowell went
beyond opposition to his successor's attempted imposition of a Jewish quota at Harvard. Lowell had not been Eliot's choice as successor when he stepped down after forty years as President of Harvard University in 1909. He would have preferred Jerome Davis Greene, '96, his former secretary, later the first Secretary to the Corporation, and Overseer (1911-1913, 1917-1923). Lowell's temperament, educational objectives, and social philosophy were very much unlike Eliot's, even though both men came from similar backgrounds. A comparison between them may suggest why "Boston Brahmins" of different generations came to hold such different interpretations of Harvard's educational role and responded in opposite ways to problems posed by ethnic diversification within both the College and the country as a whole.

Family Background and Personality

Eliot and Lowell were descended from old Yankee stock. By the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the Lowells and Lawrences, on the one hand, and the

---

Eliots and Lymans, on the other, had become established merchant princes. Financial success was allied with social eminence and also with a record of substantial contributions to culture, education, military service, philanthropy, and politics. Lawrence Lowell's great-great-grandfather, Judge John Lowell, for example, had served in the Massachusetts Legislature and Congress during the late eighteenth century; his maternal grandfather, Abbott Lawrence, had been an influential New England Whig in Congress and Minister to the Court of Saint James. Charles W. Eliot's father, Samuel A. Eliot, and his uncle, Theodore Lyman, had been mayors of Boston during the 1830's. The former also served in the State Legislature and Congress. When eventually the time came that men of inherited wealth and social prominence could no longer control elective offices, the Lowell and Eliot families redoubled their endeavors in the realm of culture and philanthropy. The Lowells founded and directed the Lowell Institute, which brought many distinguished scholars to Boston. Lawrence Lowell's father, Augustus Lowell, was a prominent member of the corporation and executive committee of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Samuel A. Eliot, president of the Boston Academy of Music, was also a pioneer of prison reform.2

Harvard College was the most important recipient of the benefactions of the Lowells and probably of the Eliots. Just as "the Lowells felt almost a family responsibility for the welfare of Harvard College," so also "Harvard and its policies and affairs seemed to be quite naturally matters of concern to the Eliot family." Lawrence Lowell especially had what amounted to a proprietary interest in Harvard. He was the sixth generation of Lowells to attend Harvard College; three of his family had previously served on the Harvard Corporation; his relatives had given generously to Harvard, including $100,000 for the founding of its Lawrence Scientific School. Lowell had great admiration for his paternal grandfather, John Amory Lowell (A.B. 1815 and LL.D. 1851), who had served for forty years as a Fellow of the Harvard Corporation under seven presidents. He was Senior Fellow when Charles W. Eliot was elected president in 1869. The Eliots on their side presented a similar story. Grandfather Samuel Eliot anonymously gave $20,000 to establish a Greek professorship in Harvard College, while father Samuel A. Eliot, Treasurer and a Fellow of the Corporation, helped raise money for the Harvard Observatory. Clearly, family tradition strongly reinforced in both Lowell and Eliot a love for Harvard and a vision of its leadership role for general information on Eliot's family background and pp. 26-28 for specific details. During Lyman's mayoralty, 1834-1835, anti-Catholic rioters burned the Ursuline Convent; Lyman himself saved William Lloyd Garrison from an anti-Abolitionist mob. Samuel A. Eliot, mayor from 1837 to 1839, called out Lancers during the Broad Street riots.
in American higher education.  

By the middle of the 19th century and, in fact, even earlier, Harvard was largely liberated from the inhibiting spirit of Puritanism, as were Eliot and, to a lesser extent, Lowell. Far more militant in his religious beliefs than Lowell, the older man declared:

I am a Unitarian by birthright and environment, and have never accepted any of the common creeds, dogmas, and catechisms, or believed in the God they describe; but life would look intolerable to me if I lost faith in the God that Jesus describes in the first three Gospels, or in the Creator of a boundless universe of order and beauty.

Not only was Eliot's uncle, Andrews Norton, the prominent Unitarian and Professor of Sacred Literature at Harvard, but his father, Samuel A. Eliot, had even written a book for the religious guidance of his children. In it he argued in good Unitarian fashion that reason should be relied upon in interpreting the Bible. In this book, later published under the title "Observations on the Bible," the older Eliot asserted that "God had chosen the Hebrew people as instruments through which to teach men, and that the authors of the Bible were therefore essentially though not literally inspired. . . ." Although denying or expressing skepticism with regard to the doctrines of the Trinity, total depravity, 

3Yeomans, Lowell, pp. 12, 27, 15, 6-9. John Lowell, born 1704, was the first Lowell to graduate from Harvard; he became a minister in Newbury. "Hon. and Judge John" Lowell, A.B. 1760 and LL. D. 1792, served as the family's first Harvard Fellow for eighteen years. James, Eliot, 1, 29, 7.
the Atonement, and justification by faith, Eliot, like most Unitarians, believed in the Resurrection and in miracles. Religious observance was strict among the Eliots. The family attended two services on Sunday in King's Chapel, where Samuel A. Eliot was a warden and sang in its volunteer choir.  

From his family background, then, Charles W. Eliot inherited a militant faith. He respected other creeds and applauded:

every federation of churches, no matter how incomplete, and every combination of different denominations in charitable and educational work, and every merging of portions of different churches in a single community church; because these movements tend toward the invention of a universal church which can greatly serve families and schools in the near future.

On the other hand, his distrust of religious ritual and superstition revealed itself starkly during a two-year sojourn in Europe, 1863-1865, when a alien culture totally confronted his Yankee and Unitarian way of life. He appreciated architectural beauty, but wrote:

'Cathedrals are bad things—-they are infinitely costly, they inspire feelings of superstitious awe in ignorant minds, they are magnificent theatres for the ceremonies of Catholicism, and when a people abandon this idolatry, these huge temples are of no use for rational worship, being adapted only for performances which address the eye, not the ear.'

4Charles W. Eliot to Dr. A. C. McCrea, 7 March 1921, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 387: 1921, M-Z. James, Eliot, I, 34, 29-31, 22-23.
Architecturally inspiring cathedrals did not appeal to the intellect, but to the emotions. Catholicism was "'much more abhorrent'" after he had "'seen the manner in which it has cursed and is cursing humanity.'" In particular, it limited freedom of thought, the touchstone of Unitarianism. Judaism, with its denial of the Trinity and the Christian doctrines of sin, was in some respects intellectually less objectionable to Eliot than Catholicism. "Institutional Christianity," Protestant as well as the Roman Catholic, "can still be very un-Christlike," he wrote.  

As President of Harvard, Eliot consistently advocated toleration of all creeds. In 1886, Harvard abolished compulsory chapel. Instead of having one College pastor, a board of five preachers from different denominations shared the services in the College Chapel with the professor of Christian Morals. Although Harvard continued to preserve a broadly Protestant religious orientation, Eliot refused gifts with denominational strings attached. A prospective donor of a bell tower made his gift conditional

on required attendance at religious instruction. In refusal Eliot replied that it was "the unanimous opinion" of the President and Fellows "that it was no longer practicable to require religious instruction in any form at Harvard University." On the other hand, he welcomed a proposed endowment of a College Chapel by George Wigglesworth because it could establish the principle of educating ministers and "conducting religious services in a manner free from denominational control or bias— in the only manner, in short, in which a modern university can either teach theology or maintain religious services." Lack of denominationalism encouraged the attendance of non-Protestants at Harvard. By the early twentieth century, Catholics and Jews had their own religious organizations: the St. Paul's Catholic Club (1893), with a growing membership; and the smaller Menorah Society (1906), which sponsored a prize established by Jacob H. Schiff, for the best undergraduate essay on "the work and achievements of the Jewish people."  

In contrast to Eliot's militant Unitarianism, Lawrence Lowell's religious beliefs were less precisely

---

defined. Although second cousin William Lawrence was an Episcopal Bishop, Lowell himself seems to have been a non-denominational Protestant. He worshipped at several different churches and read the Bible regularly. If he had any affiliation, it was probably Unitarian. For some time he had been Treasurer of King's Chapel, a Unitarian Church in Boston. According to his biographer, Henry Aaron Yeomans, a contemporary professor of Government and dean of Harvard College, Lowell "respected any sincere creed, but he did not admire a creed to which he could not subscribe nor could he admire another's subscribing to it." There were limits to Lowell's toleration, but he was no religious fanatic. 7

As President of Harvard, Lowell occasionally had to explain the College's policies in regard to the teaching of evolution or chapel attendance. For example, he defended the policy of professors presenting "the facts of evolution as they do any other facts in science..." Conflicts between the theory of evolution and the account of creation in Genesis did not undermine essential religious beliefs, he maintained, although it may have altered considerably the world view of many people. Lowell did not accept a literal interpretation of the Bible; his religious beliefs allowed ample room for broader perspectives introduced by scientific discoveries. In short, teaching the facts of evolution at Harvard was not "injurious to the esteem in which the Bible

7 Yeomans, Lowell, p. 17.
is held; not do I find that students are more or less Christian on that account." Lowell also argued against compulsory chapel attendance for Harvard freshmen. The majority of the faculty was against such compulsion, and Lowell, himself, felt "that after childhood the motives for attending any religious service had better be religious, not disciplinary." Sunday attendance, moreover, had remained very good, although week day attendance was small. Like Eliot, Lowell defended non-compulsory chapel. Yet it was during Lowell's administration that a ruling was established barring non-Christian private services in Memorial Church, which had been erected in memory of Harvard men who had died in World War I. This policy remained unchanged until 1958.  

Family traditions, Harvard associations, and religious outlook molded the personalities of the two presidents. To these influences may be added the accidents of history and traits of temperament. Eliot, born in 1834, came to majority during the height of the New England Renaissance. Yankee orators, reformers and writers of this era were generally confident of their own powers and equally optimistic

---

with regard to mankind's capacity for progress. Such optimism, however, was not a denial that problems existed; the very multitude of reformers and their causes—abolition, education, prison conditions, temperance, and women's rights—were proof of social evils. The confidence that all problems could be handled and ultimately solved was characteristic and perhaps unique to the period.

The Eliots, too, had their problems. Eliot himself had to develop the confidence and aloofness to overcome embarrassment caused by a birthmark—a large liver-colored welt on the right side of his face. His family also had lost its fortune during the Panic of 1857, when a business association not only bankrupted his father but his mother as well. Eliot assumed financial supervision of the family's affairs; he housed his parents and three unmarried sisters. Shortly thereafter he was promoted to assistant professor of mathematics and chemistry at Harvard. At a comparatively early age, he had learned to cope with adversity and to shoulder responsibility. This seasoning prepared him for later battles at Harvard. During his forty-year presidency of the University, he confronted many administrative and educational challenges. But he was always confident that almost any problem could be solved, because by temperament and by nurture he believed in "democracy, utilitarianism, and the scientific method." His unshakable inner stability enabled him to accept and deal effectively with change and
diversity. In Eliot the confidence of an age united with the natural optimism of a personality.\(^9\)

Lawrence Lowell's first twenty-one years spanned the era of the Civil War and Reconstruction. Born in 1856, Lowell grew up in a period of intense national strife and painful reunion. Three of his relatives, nephews of James Russell Lowell, were killed in action fighting for the Union. But according to Eliot, President Lowell had "never seemed to take any interest in Robert Gould Shaw or any of his like, or in the meaning and purpose of Memorial Hall." Contrariwise, he believed in reconciliation with the South, and criticized Northern philanthropists for what he considered their mistaken reconstruction policy in regard to the Negro.\(^10\)

As he grew older, Lowell also witnessed the rapid industrial growth of the United States, with its attendant economic and social conflicts. Among other things, massive immigration from eastern and southern Europe began to change the complexion of the American character, to erode it, many were convinced. No longer was immigration preponderantly from northern Europe, the wellspring of white Anglo-Saxon Protestants; it had become increasingly Catholic and Jewish.

\(^9\)James, Eliot, I, 34, 31-35, 12-14, 73-75.

\(^{10}\)Yeomans, Lowell, pp. 22-23, 28. Charles W. Eliot to President Charles F. Thwing of Western Reserve University, 31 January 1923, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 389; 1923, M-Z.
The new America and the new Americans raised questions of national purpose and destiny. Lawrence Lowell was uneasy with the changes that he saw and feared the future they portended. Finally, the years of his presidency of Harvard, like those of his youth, paralleled times of national crisis: World War I and its aftermath. History itself had challenged the cultural values which he shared with other old-stock Americans. The preservation and endurance of these values, Lowell believed, depended on the ability of the United States to retain its original and essential homogeneity.

Charles W. Eliot succinctly portrayed his successor as aloof, strong willed, and self-righteousness. Eliot himself was detached, decisive and outspoken. Neither as president courted the affection of students. But Eliot's strength was tempered by a capacity to listen. He got the facts by asking direct questions and by allowing people, especially his faculty, the freedom to talk. His toleration of professorial digressions was little short of remarkable: "'The Faculty,'" he wrote, "'is a ruminating animal, chewing a cud a long time, slowly bringing it into a digestible condition; then comes the process of assimilation which is gradual and invisible, so that by-standers do not perceive the growth and expansion of the animal.'" In contrast, when Lawrence Lowell once decided on a course of action, he rarely brooked further discussion or hesitation. Somehow he could
not understand why what he himself saw so clearly was not self-evident to everyone else. According to Jerome D. Greene, Lowell, not Eliot, as has been alleged, used "autocratic methods." Eliot, he wrote:

always regarded himself as the servant of the Faculty and of the Corporation and felt bound to carry out their wishes. In this respect he differed from his successor, who had a way of brushing aside objections and securing an apparent acquiescence that sometimes fell short of conviction. One of President Eliot's outstanding qualities was a capacity to hold his judgment on any issue in suspense until, often with extraordinary patience, he had weighed the merits of conflicting views. Even those who disagreed with him retained their confidence in his fairness.

Lowell was a gentleman, a scholar, and an autocrat; Eliot, equally an educated gentleman, was nonetheless a "constitutional monarch."¹¹

Educational Philosophy

Both presidents respected academic excellence and demanded of Harvard the role of educational leader. In his love for Harvard, Lowell had no peer; but his conception of the College was that of a homogeneous society of elites. Eliot also wanted Harvard to train elites, but under his administration its student composition began to diversify significantly. He did not believe in a Harvard "type." In building up the graduate and professional schools, some

charged that Eliot neglected the College. And because he considered undergraduates as potential graduate students, he introduced the elective system in the College. The major purpose of the elective system was to educate individuals according to their particular areas of interest. On the other hand, Lowell believed that a certain kind of person benefited from an Harvard education more than another. He advocated a structured and largely prescribed undergraduate curriculum as a way to reinvigorate intellectually "the descendants of old, well-to-do American families" whose continued leadership was required in order to avert disaster from both the College and the nation.\textsuperscript{12}

The two men also differed over the social role the College should play in the lives of its students. For Eliot, Harvard was preëminently an educational institution, little concerned with social relations. In their capacity as students, the University treated them all equally. Students were admitted on an equal basis to lecture halls, laboratories, and to such large associations as the Harvard Union. But social relations were a different matter. Eliot did speak out occasionally, as in 1906, against segregation by classes in the dormitories on the grounds that students of similar interests, although of different ages should be allowed to live together. Unlike Lowell, however, Eliot

\textsuperscript{12}Yeoman, Lowell, p. 68.
did not occupy himself with problems of residential dispersion among freshmen or the existence of living quarters for the wealthy, known as the "Gold Coast." Social distinctions, like the natural law of supply and demand, would always exist:

Membership in the societies and clubs of Harvard is determined entirely by social selection—this social selection being made on the basis of similar tastes, habits and ambitions. There have been a few cases at Harvard in which negroes were taken into athletic organizations on account of their remarkable athletic merit. With this exception, I have never heard of negroes being admitted to the fraternities or clubs at Harvard, and I should think such admission extremely unlikely. Japanese students have been admitted at Harvard to desirable clubs, but distinctly on the ground of the identity of their manners and habits with those of the other members of the club.

The fact that Negroes were excluded from social clubs was not Harvard's concern, because "the university, like the state, leaves its members completely free to do their own social sorting." Harvard owed its students equality of intellectual opportunity, while the state owed its citizens equal protection of the laws. Neither had the obligation to effect social equality.\(^\text{13}\)

Lowell, in contrast, felt that Harvard, especially

the College, had a positive social role to play in undergraduate life. His interest in social as well as academic life began during his early years as professor at Harvard. He served on various committees to improve academic standards and social welfare. For example, he had been a leading member of the Committee of 1902-1903 which inquired into ways to improve the quality of work done for the Bachelor of Arts degree. Answers to questionnaires sent to faculty and students showed the committee that little work was done on the average and that the amount varied considerably from course to course. The committee made several important recommendations: that all courses require approximately equivalent amounts of work, that each subject be related to the purpose of a liberal education, and that able students be urged to undertake honors work. At this same time, he was also a member of a committee which advised the Corporation on methods of assigning college rooms. Lowell, who drafted the report, was disturbed by the polarization among students. The rich lived on Mount Auburn Street's "Gold Coast," the poor in off-campus private rooms, and the Jews in Walter Hastings Hall, nicknamed "Little Jerusalem." In a letter to President Eliot, he expressed fear that with the loss of that democratic feeling which ought to lie at the basis of university life, we are liable to lose our moral hold upon a large part of the students, and that this feeling can be maintained only when a considerable portion of every section of students is living within the walls.
The College could not fulfill its function of training character unless students lived in a community.14

As long as Eliot sat in the president's chair, Lowell had to bide his time, while extending his influence. He was a leading member of the Committee on the award of degrees with distinction, whose report was adopted in 1904. In the future the two highest grades of distinction would be granted only for advanced work; high scholarship would be recognized by placing students' names on the "Dean's List" and by granting them certain academic privileges. Four years later, Lowell chaired a "Committee appointed to Consider how Tests for Rank in College may be made a more Generally Recognized Measure of Intellectual Power." Submitted to the Faculty just two weeks after Eliot resigned the presidency, the report modified the elective system by requiring both "concentration and distribution" in undergraduate studies.15

14Yeomans, Lowell, pp. 65-77. Lowell's attack on the problem of raising academic standards was three-pronged: "(1) The length of the college course; (2) The choice of studies; (3) The inducements to excel." Lowell wanted the college course to be four years in length, rather than being reduced to three. See also Ibid., pp. 69, 165-169. In 1895, Eliot did concern himself with the poor medical students by recommending that they have a dormitory and an inexpensive place to eat. A. Lawrence Lowell to President Eliot, April 2, 1902, CWEP, 1893-1903, Box 114, folder Lowell, A. Lawrence.

15Yeomans, Lowell, pp. 77-82, 123-135.
As soon as Lowell became president, he was in position to achieve most of his major academic and social ideals. His Inaugural Address epitomized his educational philosophy by concentrating entirely on the College. Whereas his predecessor had never considered the subject of "college life" during his administration, Lowell insisted in his Inaugural that Harvard College should "produce an intellectual and social cohesion, at least among large groups of students, and points of contact among them all." College should be a total experience for the young men who came to Harvard, not merely intellectual training. Virtually every measure which Lowell instituted during his presidency was aimed at creating this educational totality. Echoing the words of Woodrow Wilson, Lowell asserted "the importance of treating the student as the unit in education, as the real object to be considered, in short as an end in himself. . . ." Like Wilson, the Harvard president believed in a liberal education. Accordingly, he wrote, "no man ought to be given a degree, certifying a liberal education, who has not in college read some good literature, and learned something of history, of the conceptions of modern science and of methods of abstract thought."16

Lowell's campaign to restore "liberal culture" at

Harvard was supported by a number of professors—notably, by Le Baron Russell Briggs, professor of English and Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Lowell and Briggs had become disenchanted, wrote historian Laurence R. Veysey, with "Eliot's tireless insistence upon rational individualism, unmitigated diversity, and curricular do-as-you-please." "Intellectual cohesion" would be fostered by requiring undergraduates to take two-fifths of their courses in one field, as well as studying several broad disciplines. The natural consequence of systematic studies was the creation of general examinations to test scope and depth of knowledge. First begun for the Class of 1917 in the Division of History and Political Science, general examinations were adopted by most departments outside of mathematics and natural sciences for the Class of 1922. Then, influenced by Woodrow Wilson's Preceptorial System at Princeton, Lowell established Harvard's tutorial system to unify a student's course work as well as to prepare him for the general examination. Finally, a three week reading period was provided at the end of each semester to encourage self-education and to relieve the burden on tutors and instructors. Although Lowell's innovations and reforms have continued, with some changes, until the present day, they were criticized by President-Emeritus Eliot. Among other changes, he never approved the tutorial system. And Jerome D. Greene maintained that even though the reforms actually tried to make
the best use of the elective principle, "President Lowell tended to identify the needs of the minority of undergraduates who came from socially privileged families and schools with the needs of Harvard College as a whole." Yet a large "proportion of students, especially those who came from the public schools, had a serious purpose and maturity of judgment that led them to base their selection of courses very largely on considerations of what are now called concentration and distribution." Sons of the well-to-do, according to Greene, needed more prodding and intellectual direction than boys from less affluent families.17

Promotion of "social cohesion" was as important to Lowell as improvement of undergraduate scholarship. As early as 1887, Lowell envisioned a residential college system for Harvard. The first step was the opening of Freshman Halls in 1914. By intermingling most freshmen in these halls, Lowell hoped to prevent the formation of cliques based upon economic and geographic distinctions. But to

Eliot, "President Lowell's practice of segregating Freshmen" was "much the worst happening at Harvard since 1909." Not only was it "contrary to all English practice at Oxford and Cambridge," he complained, but it also went against "the dictates of common sense in family, school, and College management."\(^{18}\)

In contrast to Eliot's critical attitude toward his successor's educational goals was Woodrow Wilson's warm praise. On the occasion of his visit to Harvard to deliver the Phi Beta Kappa oration in 1909, Princeton's president found

> The whole atmosphere of Harvard seems to us changed by the change of presidents. Mr. Lowell is of an absolutely different type from Mr. Eliot, cordial, natural, friendly, open to all ideas, and very democratic indeed. He has brought Harvard back already into connection with the rest of the academic world. The two days I spent there, therefore, seemed spent among friends, not among strangers.

The affinity between Wilson and Lowell dated from their days as young professors. They were both strong Anglophiles, and not only did they enjoy each other's company socially—the Wilsons took away with them "a very delightful impression of their whole circle"—but they also shared certain educational goals. Like Lowell, Wilson was opposed to Eliot's elective system and indifference toward the quality

\(^{18}\)Yeomans, Lowell, pp. 175-179, 198; Charles W. Eliot to Jerome D. Greene, 22 January 1923, JGDP, Box 6, folder 1922-1923 the Jewish question—and Negro question.
of undergraduate social life. Because Lowell wanted to reduce the influence of the "Gold Coast" and develop a feeling of community at Harvard through "compulsory" residence in the Freshman Halls and by uniting the three upper-classes in residential units, Wilson considered him "very democratic indeed." And Lowell thoroughly sympathized with the aims of Wilson's Quadrangle Plan. He acknowledged Wilson's influence and felt that their ideas were "very much alike." They were "on the eve of a very great advance in university and especially college organization." Although the problem had not yet been solved, Wilson had "taken some long strides towards it."\(^{19}\)

Keenly aware of Wilson's problems with graduate members of the upper-class eating clubs at Princeton, Lowell proceeded cautiously with plans for an extension of a hall system to the three upperclasses at Harvard. As early as December, 1914, he wrote that "it would be far better to have the whole college housed in halls of this kind, with the classes intermingled," but he was sensitive to the "grave difficulty, which Wilson encountered at Princeton."

Lowell had no intention of antagonizing Harvard's clubmen by being too far in advance of alumni and undergraduate opinion. The next step toward his goal of a complete undergraduate education was the introduction, in September, 1919, of required physical training for all Freshmen. The same year, he expressed the philosophy which a decade later became embodied in the House Plan:

Direct personal contact of an intimate character is not possible with a large number of students enjoying the freedom of college life....To influence a large number of men they must form a community, with common sentiments, aspirations, and interest. In short, they must have a strong consciousness of being bound together by common ties. They must have esprit de corps....with traditions strong enough for permanent moral effect,...they should be housed in college halls, with an opportunity, at least, to take their meals together....At Harvard we believe that compulsion should be as small as possible, and there is no suggestion of extending it in the matter of residence beyond the Freshman year; but it would be a great benefit to have sufficient college dormitories so ordered as to attract the rest of the undergraduates.

Thus he presented his ideal of "social cohesion" for the whole College. 20

Although Lowell's rationale was very similar to Wilson's, his method of achieving this goal was more circum-spect. But was the Harvard House Plan really "a Princeton idea made possible by Yale money," as some have maintained? Edward S. Harkness, who offered the money "first to Yale

and then to Harvard and finally to Yale again," told historian Henry W. Bragdon that "he had not been inspired by Wilson's efforts at Princeton." Actually, many people seem to have been thinking for some years about the value of smaller residential units. For example, in 1926, the Harvard Student Council recommended that the student body be divided into such units; and two years later, its report on the clubs suggested that some of their bad effects could be remedied by the Houses. After putting the various factors into perspective, Bragdon decided that "the Quad Plan helped to create a favorable climate of opinion making it easier for President Lowell to introduce the House Plan in 1929."

Dunster and Lowell Houses were opened in 1930-1931; five more Houses followed. Thus Lowell's hopes of overcoming segregation along economic and geographical lines were, for the most part, realized by the Freshman Halls and the House Plan. But his solution to the problem of racial segregation, recognized in his 1902 report on methods of assigning college rooms, was not satisfactory to the minorities themselves: exclusion of Negroes from the Freshman Halls and a quota for Jewish students in the College. Those who allegedly did not or could not assimilate threatened the success of his policy of "social cohesion," which depended upon a fairly homogeneous student body.  

---

Social Philosophy: Free or Restricted Immigration?

A close connection existed between the educational and social philosophies of Eliot and Lowell. Of particular importance were the ways in which Eliot and Lowell dealt with ethnic diversity within Harvard College and within the United States as a whole. Their opinions on a wide range of subjects, among others, minority groups and immigration restriction, were frequently expressed in their voluminous presidential correspondence. As university leaders, they did not live an ivy tower; they knew what was happening. But their approval or disapproval of reasons and events was essentially determined by personal values. Today Eliot's image is that of an educator generally more liberal than his times. His correspondence supported this image very well. He consistently rejected anti-democratic and racist attitudes and maintained that considerable ethnic diversity was compatible with democratic government and the advancement of civilization. In contrast, Lowell was more restrained; at times the very lack of comment in his letters created a certain ambiguity about his personal feelings.

November 3, 1925 letter to Henry James, Lowell wrote that "the question of dividing Harvard College into separate groups, or colleges, . . . has been in my mind and that of others for the last twenty years, but until very recently it has not been ripe for discussion." The changes "made in the College in the last fifteen years" paved the way for such a plan. And Lowell felt that "for two or three years now . . . opinion had sufficiently matured to make a step in that direction possible," and he was "looking for resources to begin," ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers.
Professor Yeomans wrote that "the poor, hard-working student, native-born or immigrant, Gentile or Jew, white or black, never had a warmer friend, although many excellent persons criticized at times his way of showing friendship." But the weight of evidence showed that Lowell interpreted the meaning of friendship quite differently than did Harvard's immigrant, Jewish, and black students. A homogeneous society, based on Yankee-Protestant values had to be preserved, and ethnic groups were accepted only if they could be assimilated. Lawrence Lowell spoke for most Brahmins in the 1920's when he urged the continued predominance and hegemony of British stock within the College and the country.  

Free immigration, which had pumped new blood into the Nation's population for almost three centuries, came under attack in the late nineteenth century. Foremost among the critics of America's open door were members of the Immigration Restriction League founded in Boston in the spring of 1894. The key promoters were Harvard-educated Bostonians Prescott F. Hall '89, Robert DeCourcy Ward '89, Joseph Lee '83, Charles Warren '89, and Richards M. Bradley '82. They soon attracted to the League many

prominent college presidents and professors, among them William De Witt Hyde of Bowdoin, David Starr Jordan of Stanford University, and John R. Commons and Edward A. Ross, professors at the University of Wisconsin. The League had a small core of dedicated votaries in the Harvard family. In addition to Ward, a professor of climatology from 1900 to 1931, and Lee, a lecturer on education and an Overseer (1918-1921, 1928-1934), there were about a dozen other Harvardians who supported the League in one way or another. Four Overseers and two Fellows contributed to its success: John Fiske (1879-1891, 1899-1901); Henry Cabot Lodge (1884-1890, 1911-1917, 1918-1924); Charles Warren (1934-1940); Owen Wister (1912-1918, 1919-1925); Henry Lee Higginson (1893-1919), and John Farwell Moors (1918-1931). In addition, the League claimed the support of such well known faculty as Thomas Nixon Carver (political economy, 1900-1932), A. Lawrence Lowell (government, 1900-1909), William Z. Ripley (political economy, 1902-1933), and Nathaniel Southgate Shaler (geology, 1888-1906 and Dean of the Lawrence Scientific School, 1891-1906). Lawrence Lowell became a national vice-president of the League three years after he became President of Harvard University. Significantly, eight of the aforementioned members of the Harvard establishment were active and influential during the 1920's when the University debated the issue of restrictive admissions
for Harvard College.23

Lawrence Lowell's opposition to the continued large-scale immigration of "alien races" was rooted in his firm conviction that American political and social institutions could not survive in a heterogeneous society. In 1918, he declined to join Sidney L. Gulick's League for Constructive Immigration:

Having started life prejudiced concerning the restriction against Chinese immigration, I long ago came to the conclusion that no democracy could be successful unless it was tolerably homogeneous; and that the presence of different races which did not intermingle was unfortunate, as indeed it has been in the case of the negro.

Lowell was absolutely certain that some Europeans could not be easily assimilated into American life; the same was true, of course, of the Chinese and the Negro. His study of government reinforced this attitude. In some cases, such as Switzerland, a degree of ethnic diversity was compatible with democracy, he noted. Although that tiny country had three "races" and two religious creeds, its population shared certain common aims and ideals. But countries like

23Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants, pp. 101-102, 104-106, 118-130, 134-135, 138-143, 150-151, 204. Three other supporters of the League were one-time lecturers at Harvard: Davis Rich Dewey (economics, 1909-1910); Jeremiah W. Jenks (trusts or industrial combinations, 1899-1900); and Robert A. Woods (social ethics, 1906-1907). Professor Albert Bushnell Hart (history, 1887-1910, and government, 1910-1926) supported the literacy bill sponsored by Henry Cabot Lodge in 1895.
Austria-Hungary and Ireland which lacked the homogeneity to create an accepted and effective communal psychology faced increasing ethnic and nationality tensions. The United States had no choice than to ponder the problems posed by ethnic diversity. "If," wrote Lowell

the huge masses of immigrants coming yearly to the United States can be assimilated within a couple of generations so as to be an indistinguishable part of the population, well and good; if not, the peril to popular institutions is real, for without homogeneity a nation may be great, but it can hardly be a successful democracy.

Immigrants had to shed their distinguishing characteristics and conform to the existing pattern of American life and government, a pattern established by the earlier Anglo-Saxon immigrants. Refusing to acknowledge any positive contributions of the newer immigrants to the "melting pot," Lowell focused on their differences in customs, language, and values— all of which constituted a threat to native-born Americans until neutralized by the assimilative process.  

To be sure, continued, unrestricted immigration posed problems to assimilation. Without some national homogeneity and political consensus, a country might break apart in civil war. And Lowell and other believers in

immigration restriction clearly perceived the depth of the antagonisms towards blacks, Orientals and some European ethnic groups within the United States. It was sentimental optimism, they felt, to ignore such tensions, hoping that they would disappear. But was their solution—a quota system for immigrants—justifiable? Whereas their initial observations might have been objective, their solution was partially determined by subjective values.

Two letters which Lowell wrote to Rhode Island Senator LeBaron B. Colt, chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, revealed the Harvard president's bias. Lowell previously had known Colt when he himself had been a practicing lawyer and the Senator a United States Circuit Court Judge. The first letter was written on March 31, 1922, at the suggestion of Robert DeC. Ward, who in the previous summer had published an article in support of a permanent percentage limitation of immigrants. Lowell, too, urged that the Senate concur in a House resolution extending the Three Per Cent Immigration Law for one year, or preferably "until otherwise ordered by Congress." "In old times," Lowell wrote, "the immigrants from Europe were energetic and adventurous people who sought to improve themselves." But "now they are much more than formerly people who do not succeed at home, who are gathered up by shipping companies, and with the desire of great corporations seeking to get cheap labor here." Assuming that the newer immigrants
from eastern and southern Europe were less worthy of admission than earlier ones from the British Isles and northern Europe, he vested in the first comers the right to shut the door. Accordingly, he wrote to Senator Colt two years later:

The essential thing about any nation is its population, and it seems to me that every nation is entitled to decide what additions from outside to its population it will receive. Indeed, a nation subject to immigration in large quantities is lacking in duty to its posterity if it does not so select the stock that it will admit.25

In order to preserve the existing population balance in the United States, Lowell endorsed, at the instigation of Richards M. Bradley, a quota based on the foreign-born population in 1890, a more restrictive measure in terms of the newer immigrants than the Three Per Cent Law, which had been based on the 1910 Census. The Reed Bill, one of several measures then before Congress, was "very sensible," according to Lowell, because it took "into account the older stocks in distributing the number of immigrants" and set a 300,000 total limit. Such a quota system should be strictly enforced: close relatives of naturalized citizens might be given preference in admission, but should be considered

25Robert DeC. Ward, Corresponding Secretary pro tem, Immigration Restriction League, to A. Lawrence Lowell, March 30, 1922, enclosing a reprint of his article on "Immigration and the Three Per Cent Restrictive Law," Journal of Heredity, XII (August-September, 1921), 319-325; A. Lawrence Lowell to the Honorable LeBaron B. Colt, March 31, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1077 Immigration Restriction.
within the quota for each nationality group.  

Senator Colt opposed using the Census of 1890 as a base, rather than the 1910 Census, because it discriminated too much against Southern and Eastern European immigrants. Nonetheless, the Johnson-Reed Act, based on quotas of two percent of each foreign-born nationality resident in the United States as of 1890, became law in 1924. Three years later, the total quota admitted was reduced to 150,000, according to the national origins of the white population in 1920. Lowell's role in effecting this momentous change in American immigration policy cannot be precisely defined. Unquestionably he lent his prestige as President of Harvard to furthering the work of the Immigration Restriction League. And the principles of the League triumphed in the 1920's. Moreover, Lowell received in return both implicit and explicit support from certain League members for his proposal to place Harvard College admissions on an equally restrictive and selective basis. During the 1920's he tried to achieve at Harvard what Richards M. Bradley had suggested—a student body of predominantly British and Northern European origin. As a scholar seeking to enhance Harvard's intellectual prestige, Lowell favored admitting foreign students and

professors as non-quota immigrants. But since foreign students composed between a mere one and two percent of the undergraduate body during the 1920's they hardly threatened the native-born in the College. Lowell, however, was to be considerably less successful than the Immigration Restriction League in his attempt to enact an academic quota system.²⁷

While Lowell was predisposed to accept the assumptions on "race" then prevalent among many of his fellow New England Brahmins, Eliot had resisted them until the day he died. Eliot's natural optimism withstood almost all the forebodings and alarms of the Immigration Restriction League.

²⁷Le Baron B. Colt to A. Lawrence Lowell, March 28, 1924, enclosing "Objections To Going Back To The Census Of 1890 As A Quota Basis," 68th Congress, 1st Session, Senate Committee Print [Printed for the Use of the Committee on Immigration]; R. M. Bradley to A. Lawrence Lowell, March 18, 1924; Lowell to Bradley, March 19, 1924, ALLP, 1922-1925, #592-C Immigration. See "Immigration Of College Professors Hearings Before A Sub-committee On Immigration and Naturalization," House of Representatives, 70th Cong., 1st Sess., on S. 2450 and H.R. 9284, May 9, 1928, Hearing No. 70.1.7 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1928), p. 13, for a reprint of Lowell's letter to Hon. Bird J. Vincent, May 1, 1928. He urged passage of Senate Bill 2450, which would allow foreign teachers employed by Harvard and other institutions to enter the United States. He did not believe it would impede the operation of the immigration act, in which he was "'an ardent believer,'" and it would enable American universities to obtain "'excellent young men...for special subjects,'" whom "'it might be hard to get...later.'" According to page 22 of the same document, Harvard had an enrollment of 8,025 students, a faculty of 751, and 25 alien teachers. The Senate passed Bill No. S.2450, as amended (Cong. Rec., February 23, 1928, Vol. 69, No. 55, p. 3540). For these and other documents relating to the problem of foreign teachers employed by American universities, see the Records of the President, James Rowland Angell, Box HUN-I, folder I, YUA.
Although occasionally he expressed concern over the growing political power of alien groups in Boston and New York City, such unease never became a gnawing resentment. He always believed, of course, that temperament and training had endowed those of Anglo-Saxon heritage with the necessary qualities for political leadership. And on the international plane, "a firm union of all the English-speaking peoples" was the "best hope of the world." But these were only occasionally expressed sentiments. On the other side of the scale were dozen of statements, some published and widely circulated, affirming a vibrant faith in the capacity of the United States to assimilate immigrants without obliterating their individuality.

Eliot's attitude toward immigrants was always generous. But even more important, his outlook broadened as the opposition to unrestricted immigration increased. An early view was revealed by his reply, in November, 1892, to an inquiry from The Home Journal. He argued that for five good reasons all immigrants should be admitted except "criminals, paupers and diseased persons." First, the United States was not overpopulated and could use "every healthy and honest laborer" and his family. Second, immigration restriction by the present inhabitants was "a peculiarly

ungenerous and ungrateful proposal," because they themselves were descended from a similar class of mechanics and farmers. Eliot slyly pointed out that even those who claimed English ancestry were actually descended from "a mixed people made up of Danes, Norwegians, Dutch, Germans, Normans and Saxons—a veritable ethnological conglomerate very like that which is now forming on a larger scale in the United States." Third, he argued against the charge of misuse of the suffrage by recently naturalized immigrants. Exercising the right to vote was in itself an educational process, a better remedy, on the whole, than changing the naturalization laws. Fourth, in sharp contradiction to those who maintained that the newer immigrants were biologically, mentally and morally inferior to those who had come earlier, Eliot asserted that the future immigrants might "present a constantly higher average of intelligence, skill and education," because of improved school systems and freer political institutions in Europe. His fifth reason revealed that he drew the line on the assimilation of colored races. Here he was in accord with the Immigration Restriction League. Negroes, Chinese, and Japanese presented the "real difficulty," while all the Europeans seemed "capable of complete assimilation under the influence of free schools, free churches, equal laws, and democratic social mobility." But it should be noted that Eliot often applied the term "race" uncritically to Italians,
Jews, and other European racial groups, even though he realized that the so-called English race was "a mixed people." 29

In 1906, Eliot forcefully expressed to Richards M. Bradley his disagreement with the policies of the Immigration Restriction League. While favoring legislation regulating steamship accommodations for steerage passengers and a better system of inspection among these passengers to eliminate "paupers, criminals, and diseased persons," he opposed "further restrictive legislation, as, for instance, head taxes, educational tests, property qualifications, and all exclusion on the ground of race." "In general," he declared "the attitude of the Immigration Restriction League has struck me as vicious,—economically, politically, and sentimentally." In closing his letter, Eliot regretted his disagreement with Bradley and such men as John Farwell Moors and Joseph Lee, because he "should feel safer" in agreeing with them, "but it seems to be a real case of different faiths and expectations." 30

29 Charles W. Eliot to The Home Journal, Nov. 21, 1892, CWE Letter Book 91, pp. 36a, 36b.

30 Charles W. Eliot to Richards M. Bradley, February 7, 1906, CWE Letter Book 95, p. 133-1/2. In a letter to David A. Ellis, June 19, 1906, CWE Letter Book 95, p. 156-1/2, Eliot wrote: "We need them whether they are Jews or Gentiles, Greeks or barbarians, literate or illiterate, skilled or unskilled, children or adults; and all restrictive or forbidding legislation is, in my opinion, foolish and ungenerous." In 1906, Eliot was a member of the Immigration Department of the National Civic Federation, Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants, p. 188.
One of Eliot's most widely circulated statements against immigration restriction was contained in his letter of January 10, 1911 to Edward Lauterbach, President of the National Liberal Immigration League, with headquarters in New York City. Eliot was a member of both the League's General and Educational Committees. The letter, which was subsequently read in the House of Representatives, advanced several arguments against further restrictions. The United States, Eliot began, lacked a sufficient supply of both skilled and unskilled labor. And an educational test was "no proof of either health or character." American had an historic obligation as a refuge for the oppressed. "It is the mission of the United States to spread freedom and democracy throughout the world," he said, "by teaching as many men and women as possible in freedom's largest home how to use freedom rightly through practice in liberty under the law."31

Eliot vigorously defended newer and especially

31Charles W. Eliot to Edward Lauterbach, Esq., January 10, 1911, CWEP, Special Boxes, Box 413 National Liberal Immigration League 1910-1912. Eliot's 1910 letter to Boston Congressman O'Connell was reprinted for distribution (Christian Advocate, June 2, 1910), and his longer January 10, 1911 letter--six pages--was widely distributed for several years (Springfield Republican, January 22, 1911). He saw no reason to amend it four years later. See also N. Behar, Managing Director of N.L.I.L., to Charles W. Eliot, January 5, 1911 and Eliot's reply, January 6, 1911 for the activities of the restrictionists; and Charles W. Eliot to Manuel F. Behar, acting manager of N.L.I.L., February 24, 1914, Box 413, National Liberal Immigration League.
Catholic immigrants. To those who said that these newcomers would become ghetto dwellers rather than the prototypes of the assimilated farmers of an earlier time, Eliot replied that very little amalgamation had taken place between the two during the nineteenth century. His denial of the so-called "melting pot" thesis and recognition that persons of socially separated nationalities and races "all produce in time good citizens of the Republic," represented a significant change in his earlier beliefs. In 1900, for example, he had written that neither the native American stock nor the foreign born should make special efforts to prevent intermingling. It was "very undesirable" for foreigners to "make conscious efforts to preserve their native languages and their separate churches, schools, and clubs," because they hindered the "natural course" of assimilation. During the next eleven years, Eliot came to believe that "amalgamation, or blending of races through intermarriage, is not only extraordinarily slow, but of doubtful issue as to the strength and viability of the offspring." The preservation of ethnic differences among the population might even be a blessing. What he wrote during the 1920's in regard to the Italians could apply to all immigrant groups:

> It is not desirable that they more than the Irish or the Jews should lose their racial characteristics here. The Italians have something very precious to give to the unfortunate descendants of the Puritans, who would not have any music to speak of in their own churches, namely the love of music.

Eliot also praised Italian immigrants for their labor and
skill, the "physical health and vigor" of their women, the
careful upbringing Italian mothers gave their daughters,
and "the principles of the Cavour-Mazzini-Garibaldi move-
ment for Italian unification" which made for "patriotic
and conservative citizens of the United States." Every
immigrant group could make a distinctive contribution to
American society. And to those who raised the bugbear of
the Catholic Church's gaining excessive power in the United
States, Eliot replied that "whatever gains the Catholic
church may make in this way under a regime of religious
toleration, that church is fairly entitled to." The Catholic
Church might grow in the United States, but its undesirable
aspects--its medieval characteristics--would be modified
in the process by "the effects of democracy." In short,
neither religious differences nor racial distinctions were
valid objections to further European immigration.  

32 Eliot to Lauterbach, January 10, 1911. Charles
W. Eliot to E. S. Richards, December 29, 1905, CWE Letter
Book 95, p. 125-1/2 on the patriotism of the immigrant.
Charles W. Eliot to William T. Forbes, April 10th, 1900, CWE
Letter Book 92, p. 57a, for his earlier view of assimilation.
On the Italians, see Ernesto G. Fabbri, president of The
Society For Italian Immigrants, to Charles W. Eliot, Janu-
ary 11th, 1907 and Eliot's January 15, 1907 reply, CWEP,
1903-1909, Box 247 Society for Italian Immigrants; Charles
W. Eliot to Vittorio Orlandini, 17 May 1922, CWEP, 1909-1926,
Box 388: 1922, M-Z; Mrs. Jessie L. Gardner to Charles W.
Eliot December 18th, 1924 and Eliot's 23 December 1924 reply,
CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 390: 1924 D-J. For Eliot's later view
denying the existence of the melting pot, see his letter to
F. H. Newell, 3 November 1924 CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 391:
1924, A-0. He felt that the main reason why different immi-
grant groups remained separate was racial, not religious:
the Irish did not mingle with the Italians, even though
they shared the same religion.
Just as Eliot modified his earlier beliefs with regard to the assimilation of European immigrants, so he also became more optimistic about the presence of the supposedly "non-assimilable" Orientals in the United States. Eliot may well have been influenced by his secretary, the Japan-born Jerome Davis Greene, whose father, Rev. D. Crosby Greene, and mother were the first missionaries sent to Japan by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. The Reverend Greene, one of those who translated the Bible into Japanese, was honored by the Emperor for his educational work. From his parents Greene inherited an affection for and an appreciation of the Japanese. Socially as well as officially, he became the friend and advocate of Oriental students at Harvard. He belonged to such organizations as the American Asiatic Association, the Japan Society, the East Asiatic Society of Boston, and Harvard's Cosmopolitan Club. Equally if not more important, his appointments as Harvard's first Secretary to the Corporation, with a seat in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, to the University Council, and to the College's Committee on Admission put him in a position to help liberalize Harvard's admission requirements for Oriental students. And Eliot's presidential papers revealed that Greene handled most of the correspondence with Orientals. For example, he answered one inquiry about Japanese immigration, by arguing forcefully against the exclusion of Oriental labor, as was demanded by
the trade unions. Japanese laborers, in particular, said Greene, adapted quite readily to American conditions and became useful members of society.33

Eliot, too, argued against Oriental exclusion. Laws excluding the Chinese were "a consequence of our ignorant contempt . . . and of the intense desire of the Trade Unions to obtain a monopoly of labor each in its own field." Until the influx of Orientals reached "undesirable proportions," no restrictive measures should be undertaken. While he could not "admit the doctrine that the United States should be reserved for the white race, "he believed that provisions should be made for different "races" to live separately within the United States, but "beside each other in the same territory, at peace and under just industrial conditions."

Eliot added: "That is what we must do for the Africans, and

what we ought to do for the Indians; and ... we might do it also for a few Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos." In time, his conception of the role of Orientals in the United States became even more positive.  

Several years later, Eliot argued that the American merchant marine needed Oriental labor. It would be "quite impossible," he wrote, "to restore the American merchant marine so long as we maintain a protective tariff, and try to compel the employment of white men in American vessels." The major remedy lay in making the tariff into a purely revenue measure and in breaking trade union control over hiring policies for the merchant marine. Having seen the "evils" of migratory labor during his journey to the Orient in 1911-1912, for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, he advocated that the percentage of males "should never exceed five per cent" of the females in any incoming group. If most immigrants were family members rather than single men, the main objection to contract labor ought to be eliminated. Eliot was certainly not advocating the importation of coolie labor into the United States.  

Oriental laborers, no less than Eastern and Southern European immigrants, were needed, according to Eliot, because

---


35 Charles W. Eliot to N. Behar, August 23, 1912 and February 6, 1913, Box 413 National Liberal Immigration League.
"the American stock has decided for itself and its descendants that they will not engage in hard labor if they can help it." Eugenic legislation should not be aimed at cutting off immigration, as its proponents urged, but rather at attacking the "evils" of prostitution and alcoholism, which sapped the willingness of American men to work hard and American women to bear children. To counteract those evils, he wrote Yale Professor Irving Fisher, various civic and religious groups should cooperate "in informing public opinion" and legislators, while schools should teach "universal physical training" and "personal and community hygiene." But neither the Three Percent Law nor Japanese exclusion were justifiable. The former was "arbitrary and unscientific," the latter selfish and inconsiderate.36

36 Charles W. Eliot to Professor Irving Fisher, 20 November 1923; Charles W. Eliot to Carl U. Osborne, Chairman of Committee on Immigration and Emigration, The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, 4 December 1923, in reply to Osborne's letter of November 26, 1923, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 389: 1923, folder Interesting. In general, Eliot approved of a National Immigration Commission, but he did not agree that it should establish yearly quotas, although he thought that immigration legislation should take into account America's economic conditions. And he would improve the system of inspecting prospective immigrants. To prevent the separation of families, however, Eliot urged that "able-bodied" parents be permitted to bring in "aged, defective, or invalid members of their families." Finally, immigrants should be registered at port of entry and place of residence and be observed for five years by a National Commission on Immigration, appointed by Secretary of Commerce to aid in their Americanization and naturalization. Eliot's letter of 4 December 1923 was circulated with some others by The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. See also Charles W. Eliot to The Engineers' Club of Philadelphia, 29 February 1924, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 390: 1924, D-J.
During the 1920's, Eliot publicly criticized the act banning all Japanese immigrants to the United States. Upon receiving a telegram on April 20, 1924, from Baron Shibusawa, Chairman of the Japanese American Relations Committee in Tokyo, Eliot sent the following message to the Japanese Embassy in Washington, D. C.: "'Japanese exclusion flies in the face of the historical good fellowship between America and Japan and of every American tradition concerning glad hospitality toward other peoples.'" It was "'a policy of selfishness and panic.'" He understood the "'painful shock'" expressed by the Baron, who strongly urged that the exclusion measure not become law. Within a few months, Eliot and nearly thirty other heads or Presidents Emeriti of American colleges and universities signed a cablegram to Baron Shidehara, the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs. J. B. Millet of Boston initiated this protest against revocation of the "gentleman's agreement" with Japan by persuading Eliot to draft the cablegram and then by securing other signatures and comments. The cablegram called on Japanese graduates of American educational institutions "'to interpret correctly to the Japanese public the inconsiderate action of the American Congress, which does not represent the sentiments of the American people toward Japan.'" It also praised Japan's progress in Westernization. Americans likewise understood "'the fine physical and moral quality of Japanese labor at home and
abroad." Most of the signers were representatives of the better known private institutions. The cablegram may have assuaged the resentment of the Japanese, but it did not change the law. 37

Early in the following year, Eliot expressed his continuing sympathy and understanding in a personal letter to Viscount Kentaro Kaneko. The Viscount was so crushed by the Japanese exclusion law that he resigned as president of the America-Japan Society. Eliot believed this action "inexpedient and unnecessary," but was pleased that the Viscount would remain as Honorary President. Americans still cared for the Japanese; some were raising contributions in Boston and other cities for the victims of Japan's recent earthquake and fires. Eliot also mentioned Harvard's progress and endowment campaign—and reminded the Viscount that, as "the first Japanese graduate at Harvard University

37 Charles W. Eliot to Rev. Sidney L. Gulick, 29 April 1924, and J. B. Millet, handwritten letter to Eliot, July 5, '24, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 391: 1924 K-Z, folder A-0. Eliot declined to write either President Calvin Coolidge or his Congressmen. He had already written Coolidge a letter on April 7, 1924, which dealt in part with his arguments against immigration restriction. See also "College Heads Express Friendship to Japanese," New York Times, Sunday, July 6, 1924, clipping in CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 390: 1924, D-J. Among the signers of the cablegram were the presidents of all the "Seven Sisters" except Barnard and five from the "Ivy League," excluding Harvard, Columbia, and Yale. President Lowell preferred to sign the Peace Foundation's cable of "sympathy" instead, while President Nicholas Murray Butler did not want to commit himself. Other Presidents Emeriti who joined Eliot in signing were William F. Slocum of Colorado College, David Starr Jordan of Stanford, and Charles F. Thwing of Western Reserve University.
Law School," he had "a certain responsibility to Harvard University." The President Emeritus did not want the present rupture in Japanese-American friendship to injure the relationship between Harvard and its Japanese students and graduates.\(^{38}\)

Both men hoped someday for the restitution of friendly relations between the two countries. Eventually, Eliot believed, Americans would recognize their need for Japanese laborers—in the California fruit fields and orchards, on the merchant marine, and in factories. Moreover, they would "learn that alien immigrants should not be made as like as possible to Americans but should preserve their own peculiar gifts and merits as contributions to American life." By saying that "each of the alien stocks has something to give to America as well as much to accept from America," Eliot showed the distance he had traveled since the early 1890's.\(^{39}\)

In summation, inspection of immigrants was, of course, quite justifiable. Accordingly, Eliot wrote Senator

\(^{38}\)Charles W. Eliot to Viscount Kentaro Kaneko, 17 February 1925, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 392: 1925-1926, folder 1925 Interesting. Eliot told Viscount Kaneko that he was correct "in thinking that the California objection to the Japanese is racial, not religious or political." Although Californian opposition to the Japanese was not united, it was based largely on fear of competition from laborers and their families who worked longer hours than white people would.

\(^{39}\)Ibid. and Eliot to J. B. Millet, 28 July 1925, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 392: 1926-1926, folder 1925 Interesting.
Thomas Sterling of South Dakota, a member of the Senate Committee on Immigration, commending several regulatory features of the immigration bill which the latter had introduced: "a Federal Immigration Board with carefully defined duties and powers"; "the scientific distribution of immigration" in relation to "economic conditions in each State" and "local experience as to the assimilation of each people"; examination of prospective immigrants; and "high standards of naturalization and citizenship for all who qualify." Americanization involved four essentials, Eliot wrote The Engineers' Club of Philadelphia: foremost, to learn English; to be educated in American schools; to understand "why democracy is the best form of government--because it leaves every citizen free" to choose his occupation, and consequently "free to do his best for the public welfare"; and finally, to gain knowledge of "the workings of natural law in industries, including the law of supply and demand and the principles of getting ahead."  

But Americanization did not mean to Eliot what it signified to Lowell: assimilation and amalgamation. Instead he justified both non-assimilation and non-amalgamation. The first provided the basis for a creative give and take relationship between immigrants and native-born, while the second preserved the health and vigor of each by maintaining nationality and racial distinctness. He had solved the problem he saw in 1892—the non-assimilation of Africans and Orientals—by realizing that the different European peoples did not amalgamate. If the principle which he had once applied only to some peoples, was extended to all groups, the United States could benefit from almost infinite diversity as "a country of many races, many religions, and many varieties of human nature, forming one liberty-loving, stable democracy." When Madison Grant, author of The Passing of The Great Race, misconstruing the meaning of his denial of the "melting pot," welcomed him to the ranks of restrictionists, Eliot promptly enlightened him. 41

A letter Eliot wrote in 1914 to Manuel F. Behar of the National Liberal Immigration League perhaps best

revealed his unconquerable faith in the United States and in the immigrants who wanted to find a new life within it. At the end of his letter, he quoted the poet James Russell Lowell, a very different Lowell than his much younger kinsman, Lawrence. Commending the country's historical role as a refuge, Eliot asked: Was "this generation of Americans to be frightened out of this noble policy by any industrial, racial, political, or religious bogies?" Had they "forgotten or never heard Lowell's description of "Oh Beautiful! My Country! Ours once more' in his Commemo-
ration Ode written at the close of the Civil War -

'She that lifts up the manhood of the peer,
She of the open soul and open door,
With room about her hearth for all mankind!'

But by 1921, as he wrote to Frances Kellor, Vice-chairman of the Committee for Immigrants in America, "the panicky and credulous state of mind of the American people" was yielding to the arguments of the restrictionists.42

42 Charles W. Eliot to Manuel F. Behar, February 24, 1914, CWEP, Box 431 National Liberal Immigration League. Barbara Miller Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants, pp. 6-19. says that James Russell Lowell was neither a nativist nor an anti-Semite. Eliot to Frances Kellor, 28 January 1921. Eliot gave Miss Kellor permission to use his name in "endorsing" a proposal to have a Senatorial sub-committee appointed to inquire into immigration and draft a bill for the special session that April.

Eliot's work on behalf of continued immigration was largely through the National Liberal Immigration League. See Charles W. Eliot to N. Behar, 21 February 1921, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 387: 1921, A-L, in which Eliot endorsed the work of this League, especially its educational efforts. He urged the League to focus its activities on problems
relating to immigration and to avoid such other issues as the minimum wage (Eliot to N. Behar, December 3, 1912, CWEP, Box 413 National Liberal Immigration League) and compulsory military drill in public schools (Herbert F. Sherwood to Eliot, July 13, 1908; Eliot to Sherwood, July 16, 1908; Eliot to Edward Lauterbach, Esq., July 16, 1908; Eliot to N. Behar, November 17, 1908, CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 234, folder National Liberal Immigration League). Eliot felt that mass meetings merely encouraged the restrictionists to hold ones of their own (Eliot to Edward Lauterbach, Esq., January 17, 1913, Box 413 National Liberal Immigration League). Eliot declined membership in other immigration organizations which solicited his support, for example, the Selective Immigrant Aid Society. It was "opposed to the admission of immigrants who" were "obviously unassimilable and detrimental to our country, . . . ." L. S. Gottlieb, Vice President, to Eliot, April 9, 1924. See also Eliot's reply of 1 August 1924, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 390: 1924, D-J.
CHAPTER V

PORTRAITS OF TWO PRESIDENTS: CHARLES W. ELIOT AND A. LAWRENCE LOWELL—CULTURAL AND RACIAL DIVERSITY WITHIN HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The University recognizes among its officers and students neither class, caste, race, sect nor political party. Officially it treats all races, religions and parties exactly alike. If a colored person, Chinese, Japanese, African, Hindoo, West Indian, or Indian can pass the admission examinations to the University he will be received as a student, and treated precisely like every other student. If a member of any of these foreign races accomplishes the course of study in Harvard College, the Scientific School, or in one of the Professional Schools, and passes the graduation examinations he will receive the degree without the least regard to his racial quality or religious or political opinions.

--Letter from Charles W. Eliot to Bruce L. Keenan, Esq., August 9, 1907.¹

The beliefs of Eliot and Lowell on immigration restriction shaped their attitudes toward racial diversity within Harvard University. Because the University like the country confronted problems of cultural assimilation, such interaction was virtually inevitable. Yet neither president saw Harvard as a microcosm of the United States; it was the academe for the nation's elites, not a cross-section of its

population. Given Harvard's self-designated educational role, the issue of racial diversity among the student body loomed hardly less important to both men than the question of national immigration restriction. Just as Lawrence Lowell thought that American democracy required a fairly, homogeneous population in order to survive, so he also believed that Harvard could best fulfill its academic mission by educating an assimilated student body. On the contrary, Eliot maintained that just as the country could profit from unassimilated peoples and races living side by side in harmony, so Harvard could benefit by educating students of diverse backgrounds, talents, and interests. During Eliot's administration, Harvard not only opened its doors to students from all races and many ethnic groups, but it also became a truly cosmopolitan university by encouraging professorial exchanges with European universities and American colleges and by educating the larger community through its extension courses and summer school.

The degree to which Harvard's student body had diversified during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was indicated by the Report of the Immigration Commission on Children of Immigrants in Schools: Higher Educational Institutions, based upon data collected in the autumn of 1908. Of the 2,196 Harvard academic students reporting, 1,783 were native-born of native father; all
were white, except for five Negroes. The total number of native-born of foreign father was 281, of which 106, or 37.7 per cent, were either Jewish or Irish. Of the 132 foreign-born students, Jews numbered 39, or 29.5 per cent. Counting both native-born of foreign father and foreign-born, Jews numbered 95 students, whereas the other ethnic groups trailed far behind: Irish, 54; Germans, 53; English, 49; and Canadians (other than French), 49. Totals for Germans, Jews, Irish, and other groups would have been higher had those of the third generation been subtracted from the native-born of native father group. By the third generation Germans, Irish, and Jews may have classified themselves as native-born of native father, while most English and English-speaking Canadians had probably amalgamated with native white Anglo-Saxon Protestant stock.2

2Harvard was among the 85 higher educational institutions which provided data to the United States Immigration Commission on 32,882 students enrolled in the fall of 1908 in these departments or schools: academic, engineering and technological, medicine, law, postgraduate, pharmacy, theology, dentistry, and veterinary. Students were asked to complete at registration the special educational inquiry blanks sent by the Immigration Commission to the cooperating institutions. The following information was requested: name, sex, age at last birthday, country of birth, years in the United States, year in course of study, and father and mother's country of birth and race. After tabulating the information gathered on public and parochial school children and public kindergarten and elementary school teachers as well as students in higher education, the Commission then published its results: U.S., Congress, Senate, Reports of the Immigration Commission, Children of Immigrants in Schools (5 vols. S. Doc. 749, 61st Cong., 3rd sess., 1910-1911, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911),
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General nativity and race of student</th>
<th>Under 18 years</th>
<th>18 to 20 years</th>
<th>21 to 24 years</th>
<th>25 years or over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native-born of native father:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born of foreign father, by race of father:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian, French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian, Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, German</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Polish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Roumanian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Russian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian (not specified)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magyar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General nativity and race of student</th>
<th>Under 18 years</th>
<th>18 to 20 years</th>
<th>21 to 24 years</th>
<th>25 years or over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruthenian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total native-born</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Foreign-born:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Under 18 years</th>
<th>18 to 20 years</th>
<th>21 to 24 years</th>
<th>25 years or over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian (other than French)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Polish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Roumanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Russian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General nativity and race of student</td>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>18 to 20 years</td>
<td>21 to 24 years</td>
<td>25 years or over</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian (not specified)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto Rican</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total foreign-born</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2,196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of Irish Catholics, Jews, Negroes, Chinese and Japanese, and other foreign students in the "Yard" was a sign of Yankee willingness to share Harvard's educational advantages with outsiders. Eliot helped to open the gates by emphasizing education for qualified individuals. Although Lowell believed that Harvard should continue to educate some outsiders, he felt that the trends begun under Eliot could not go unchecked without baneful consequences for the University and especially for the College.

Irish Catholics

Beginning in the 1870's, Irish Catholics were the first of the minority groups to enter Harvard University in substantial numbers. But relations between Catholics and Protestants remained highly sensitive, if not somewhat hostile. Some Catholics were quick to take offense at unintentional slights by Protestants, while certain Protestants exacerbated the problem by allegations of papal plots. During the 1880's, for example, Harvard students expressed in speeches and themes strong distaste for Irish peasants.

and distrust of Irish politicians.  

Understandably, the Irish in Cambridge were suspicious of Yankee professions of friendship, especially those tinged with noblesse oblige. For example, in 1903, an address by a Harvard senior in Boston's Park Street Church on the Harvard Christian Association's work in East Cambridge, as reported in the Boston Herald, angered the Clergy of the Sacred Heart Church. They distributed at all Masses 10,000 free copies of a pamphlet entitled, "Is East Cambridge a 'Whitechapel' Town," denouncing the Harvard senior's address on "Student Religious Work." He had made the mistake of describing East Cambridge as "the most neglected district within a radius of ten miles of Boston, and the class of people there" was "such that the rest of Cambridge" would "have nothing to do with them." Editorial notes and comments in the pamphlet, printed by The Sacred Heart Review, were defensive and abusive. "'Thank God,'" wrote Father John O'Brien, "'our boys and girls, our men and women, are decent, Christian people, who like their Saviour, know how to bear calumny and if

3 Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants, pp. 98-99. The charges made by one Scott F. Hershey, Ph.D., in 1894, against "Papal Harvard" probably found a number of receptive listeners among undergraduates. Harvard had become "a papal training ground" because Overseer Charles J. Bonaparte had lectured on the "Catholic Church in the United States" in Sanders's Hall. Hershey wrote from Boston in an unidentified magazine, published in Chicago, No. 18 (Month 3, 1894), CWEP, 1893-1903, Box 135, folder 1080 Roman Catholic Church.
need be, to turn the other cheek." Reverend O'Brien interpreted the work of the hundred Harvard volunteers in East Cambridge—running clubs for young people—as college men's snobbery, since the religious needs of Catholic people in East Cambridge were already being served by their own organizations. The Catholic clergy saw Harvard students, "outside of college bounds, whether on a lark in the city or playing reformer in East Cambridge," as "a nuisance and a menace to peace and order." President Eliot, moreover, "should advise" his students to withdraw, since it was "not fair to ask the people of East Cambridge to lick the hand that thrashes them." Town and gown and Irish Catholic and Harvard Yankee were poles apart.  

Yet overt anti-Irish prejudice in Massachusetts had began to bow to political expediency. Beginning in 1891, Henry Cabot Lodge, Harvard 1872, praised Irish contributions to American life. His former contempt was replaced by a recognition of Irish virtues, largely derived, he thought, from their centuries' long association with the English. And compared to the newer immigrants, the Irish were no longer aliens. Two years later, Lodge began a long career

---

4 "Is East Cambridge a 'Whitechapel' Town?" ([Cambridge?], Feb. 14, 1903), issued by the Clergy of the Sacred Heart Church, East Cambridge, and published by The Sacred Heart Review (East Cambridge, Mass.), CWEP, 1893-1903, Box 135, folder 1080 Roman Catholic Church. The Harvard senior was Phillip Endicott Osgood '03.
Politically, however, Charles W. Eliot had his differences with Irish politicians, and he regretted loss of political power by the Yankees. In a letter to Mayor James M. Curley, he recalled his father's role as Mayor of Boston, 1837-1839. His father had read the riot act to stop a throng of Americans from attacking the city's Irish inhabitants. And like him, Eliot believed in fair play. He condemned even handedly violence by Americans against minority groups and use of similar tactics by Irish-Americans. Eliot complained to James Bryce in 1922 that the Irish in America "have organized and now defend violence on the part of labor unions, and have promoted corruption and inefficiency in our municipal governments, including New York, Boston, Cambridge, and most of the larger Eastern cities." Because of widespread corruption among Boston and Cambridge Democrats, Eliot supported an Independent candidate for Mayor of Cambridge although voting the Democratic ticket in national elections. In 1923, Eliot and Judge Robert Walcott endorsed the candidacy of Godfrey L. Cabot, who ran as Independent Home Rule candidate against the six-year incumbent, Mayor Edward W. Quinn. The latter's administration was responsible, Eliot believed, for the poor condition

---

5 Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants, pp. 112-118, 153-155.
of city schools, streets, and public services.  

In his general capacity as an educator, Eliot also occasionally disagreed with the Catholic hierarchy over parochial schools. On the one hand, he criticized separate schools for Catholic children, because he felt that youths of different backgrounds should intermingle. Yet on the other, he believed that the Catholic hierarchy ought to maintain schools in a democratic country; it was a good experience. Moreover, parochial schools had to compete with public schools for the financial support of Catholic families; in Massachusetts, he observed, the majority of Catholic families preferred "the free schools for their children." When Catholics won control of school committees in cities where they were a majority of voters, their committee members demonstrated "a real interest in the development and improvement of the free schools." Nevertheless, Eliot had expressed strong distrust of the Boston School Committee, which was then appointed by the Mayor of Boston, a man most likely to be a Roman Catholic and in all probability under the hierarchy's control. To check the latter's

---

influence, Eliot favored popular election of the school committee. But Eliot had also allied with some Catholic leaders in a common cause. According Hugh Hawkins, Between Harvard and America, Eliot had argued in the 1870's, that all property used for educational and religious institutions should be tax exempt. He was motivated both by the need "to protect Harvard from state fiscal policies" and by his sincere belief in religious toleration.7

The academic qualifications of Jesuit College graduates was the one major educational controversy between Eliot and Roman Catholics and the only issue which directly involved him in his capacity as President of Harvard University. Although some Catholics attended the College, others preferred to enter the University's professional schools after graduating from Catholic Colleges, notably those under Jesuit control. After all, Harvard was still a Protestant, rather than a non-denominational, College. Jesuit colleges provided the best moral instruction for Catholic

undergraduates, while Harvard University offered the best opportunities for professional training. A conflict developed during the 1890's, however, between Harvard and a number of Jesuit colleges over the qualifications required for admission to the professional schools. In a June 20, 1893 letter published in the *Pilot*, Eliot maintained that studies in Catholic colleges were not the academic equivalent of those in other undergraduate institutions. Highly incensed, the President of Georgetown College, J. Havens Richards, S.J., urged Eliot to retract publicly his letter after studying his college's catalogue and examination papers. Upon further consideration, Eliot agreed that Georgetown, Boston College, and Holy Cross might be included in the Harvard Law School list, which exempted graduates of those colleges from entrance examinations. 8

But the issue was not settled, inasmuch as five

years later Fordham argued for similar privilege. As a result the academic merits of all Catholic colleges were re-examined. When a Faculty Committee on the admission to Harvard College found that Boston College graduates were not even qualified for Junior Class status at Harvard, the Law Faculty removed from its list all Catholic colleges except Georgetown. While the Law Faculty professed to be interested in graduates of Massachusetts Catholic colleges, it found "that the graduates of these colleges who have come to the Law School do not make good records as a rule." Given the delicateness of the situation, Eliot expressed a willingness to discuss the problem with the presidents of Catholic colleges in Massachusetts. In response to a letter from Reverend W. G. Read Mullan, S.J., President of Boston College, citing the Law School records of nine of his institutions graduates, Eliot replied that in all instances they were close to the lower borderline within each grade category. Unfortunately, examination of the Jesuit colleges from the Law School list stirred up a "fruitless public onslaught." Eliot refused to reply publicly to the critics, although he answered privately a number of letters from both Catholic clergy and laymen. The more understanding among them appreciated that religious prejudice, as such, had no part in the Law Faculty's decision.9

9 Charles W. Eliot to Rt. Rev. Monsignor Thomas J.
At the very time that this controversy was occurring, the Rev. Timothy Brosnahan, S.J., of Woodstock College in Maryland, took strong issue with Eliot's article on "Recent Changes in Secondary Education" appearing in the October, 1899 Atlantic Monthly. The article focused on arguments for extending the elective system to secondary schools. But Eliot also had referred briefly, by way of contrast, to the prescribed curriculum of Jesuit and Moslem schools. "Another instance of uniform prescribed education," he wrote, "may be found in the curriculum of the Jesuit colleges, which has remained almost unchanged for four hundred years, disregarding some trifling concessions made to natural science." In a reply in The Sacred Heart Review entitled "President Eliot and Jesuit Colleges: A Defence," Rev. Brosnahan vigorously attacked Eliot's statement. Using Georgetown University as an example of changes in Jesuit curriculum, Brosnahan noted that "instead of one hundred percent of this time being given to Latin and Greek as in the schools of the seventeenth century, only about fifty-three percent." was devoted "to those studies today." The remaining forty-

seven percent was "conceded" to English, mathematics, modern languages and natural sciences. In counterattack, Brosnahan pointed out that a student could graduate from Harvard College without taking any natural science. Finally, he observed that Harvard's elective system was in effect for only fifteen years. By extolling individual differences, the elective system ignored, according to Brosnahan, the similarities among students and their need for intellectual guidance. Father Brosnahan's rebuttal scored a few points and won adherents, notably in the Catholic press. Although the Rev. John O'Brien, editor of The Sacred Heart Review, invited Eliot to publish in detail his objections to Jesuit instruction, the Harvard president declined on the grounds "that it was not for a Protestant to make a public statement concerning the inferiority of the Jesuit colleges in both programme and method."¹⁰

Many informal Catholics were indeed well aware of the inferiority of Jesuit colleges, and few, if anyone believed Eliot had "'determined to crush out Catholic education.'" Eliot was later pleased to learn that

representatives of the Jesuit colleges had conferred about broadening their programmes and introducing laboratory work. Such changes would help deal with the difficulties which their graduates were having in the Medical as well as the Law School. Over the years, hundreds of Catholics were welcomed as students at Harvard and treated fairly "without the slightest interference with their religious beliefs and practices." Numbering "about three hundred in 1894," Catholic students soon formed their own religious and social clubs. By 1911-1912, St. Paul's Catholic Club had 250 members, only 50 less than the Episcopalian St. Paul's Society.11

11Charles W. Eliot to Rev. W. G. Read Mullan, S.J., June 2nd, 1900, CWE Letter Book 92, p. 69a; Eliot to Professor Walter B. Cannon, February 26, 1908, CWE Letter Book 97, Oct. 26, 1907 to July 16, 1908, p. 93; and Eliot to John Duff, February 8, 1907, CWE Letter Book 96, p. 401/2. Eliot wrote Duff that the Catholic Club, for which the Bishop had appointed a spiritual adviser, had "more than 350 members." Harvard President's Report 1911-12, "Appleton Chapel and Phillips Brooks House," p. 172. See Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, n. 55, p. 281, for 1881 poll of religious affiliations among 972 Harvard undergraduates and Law School students: "Episcopalian, 275; Unitarian, 214; Congregational, 173; Baptist, 42; Roman Catholic, 33; Presbyterian, 27; Swedenborgian, 20; Universalist, 18; Methodist, 16; Jewish, 10; Christian, Quaker, and Dutch Reformed, 2 each; Lutheran and 'Chinese,' 1 each. In addition, 97 men listed themselves as 'non-sectarian'; 6 were unrecorded." The pool also revealed that there were "only 26 committed agnostics and 7 atheists." Interestingly enough, Episcopalians were the largest Protestant denomination at a University which had been a stronghold of Unitarianism earlier in the century. The number of Roman Catholic respondents was small, about 3.4 percent of the total.
Even though Eliot's differences with the Catholic hierarchy, Jesuit college presidents, and Irish Catholic politicians were frequently sharp, they did not affect his attitude toward Irish Catholic students at Harvard University. Nor did he ever oppose election of Catholics to the Governing Boards of the University. His relations with Overseer Charles J. Bonaparte were cordial. And when the first Irish Catholic, James Byrne, was elected a Fellow of the Corporation in 1920, Eliot expressed his approval to Jerome Greene: "The advent of a rational [italics mine] Catholic to the Corporation may have various good consequences," because "it thoroughly illustrates the genuine liberality of the characteristic Harvard spirit."12

Eliot's attitude toward Catholicism and Irish Catholics blended a militant Unitarian's hostility to religious hierarchy, a Brahmin's dislike of corrupt

12 Charles J. Bonaparte to Charles W. Eliot, November 2nd and 9, 1903, CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 203, folder Bonaparte, Charles J., an interesting discussion about securing a Roman Catholic scholar for the third Dudleian lecture. Bonaparte agreed with Eliot's decision to give up this attempt and questioned whether anyone should deliver it, since the four lectures had been "founded at a time when Harvard was a distinctly denominational institution and when Catholics were hardly considered Christians in all New England." Chief Justice Paul Dudley, Harvard 1690, the donor, wanted the third lecture to unmask "the Idolatry of the Romanish Church," its heresies, "and other crying Wickednesses in their high Places." In 1890, Roman Catholic Bishop John Joseph Keane, Harvard LL.D., 1891, gave the second lecture on revealed religion. Hawkins, Between Harvard and America, pp. 185-186. See Quinquennial File on Bonaparte, Charles Joseph, 1871, HUA. Also Charles W. Eliot to Jerome D. Greene, 5 April 1920, JDGP, Box 6, folder 1920.
politicians, a democrat's belief in religious and cultural pluralism, and an optimist's faith in American society's survival capacity. In the 1920's, A. Lawrence Lowell's attitude with respect to Irish Catholics ultimately was more favorable because he believed that they, unlike newer immigrant groups, were capable of, and indeed had made, considerable progress in cultural assimilation. But in the Forum of 1887, Lowell had written of the increasing difficulty in naturalizing Irish and other immigrant groups. These foreigners, he insisted, had to become "so merged in the American people that they cannot be distinguished as a class, by opinion or sentiment on any subject, from the mass of the population of which they form a part." At this time, the Irish were the most recalcitrant of all immigrant groups in preserving their distinctive characteristics. Accounting for their social defiance were racial feeling, clannishness, Roman Catholicism, and poverty. Politics especially drew the Irish together, with Lowell noting that they were "much addicted to politics," and had "a natural talent for it." The effects of the Home Rule Bill in the British Parliament were particularly bad on the Irish in America, Lowell argued, because "it licensed, so to speak, Irish agitation in America, and gave it a standing which it had never possessed before." With a new "boldness," the Irish had even tried to prevent Boston's Faneuil Hall from being used to celebrate Queen Victoria's
Jubilee. Anti-Irish or "Know-nothing feeling" which came in response only aggravated the problem. "What we need," wrote Lowell, "is not to dominate the Irish but to absorb them." Moreover, "we want them to become rich, and send their sons to our colleges, to share our prosperity and our sentiments," rather than feeling that they were "among us and yet not really a part of us."13

By the 1920's Irish Catholics generally met Lowell's criteria for true Americans. In a revealing letter written to John Pierpont Morgan, Harvard A.B. 1889 and Overseer (1909-1915, 1916-1922), Lowell defended James Byrne's election to the seven-member Corporation. Morgan had preferred to restrict membership on that body to "Protestant Christians." He assured Morgan that "of a Jew there is no suggestion at the present time." The Corporation's choice of Byrne, a New York lawyer, was an acknowledgement of the importance of maintaining good relations with Catholics, who composed "a large percentage of the population of the United States, and nearly half the population

13 A. Lawrence Lowell, "Irish Agitation in America," The Forum, IV (December, 1887), 397-407, especially, 400-402, 404-405, 407; Yeomans, Lowell, p. 214. Twelve years later, Lowell argued that "the theory of universal political equality does not apply to tribal Indians, to Chinese, or to negroes under all conditions," but "only to our own race, and to those people whom we can assimilate rapidly" ("The Colonial Expansion of the United States," The Atlantic Monthly, LXXXIII (February, 1899), 152, 145-154).
of Massachusetts." Then he asked:

Can a university be great which does not purport to welcome all classes of people to the benefits of its instruction, and can it do this if it takes the ground that the members of a great religious communion are unfit to be entrusted with a share in its management? Harvard has always been in the focus of religious dissensions, and has always emerged eventually on the broader side.  

Religious toleration found here an eloquent spokesman. Lowell recalled that during his youth there was opposition to electing anyone except a Unitarian to the Corporation. He was glad that this "principle" was no longer followed. And he asked:

Would it not be a grave misfortune for our country if our institutions of higher learning were divided in such a way that part were only attended by Protestants and the rest only by Roman Catholics? At present we have a large number of Roman Catholic students and graduates, and,-unless we are to furnish aid to Cardinal O'Connell in attempting to prevent Roman Catholics from entering Harvard,—we surely cannot take the ground that a Roman Catholic is, in the nature of things, unfit to be a member of the Corporation. In the particular case of James Byrne, we have a man who will certainly not be under the domination of his church in his relations with the University.

14 A. Lawrence Lowell to J. P. Morgan, March 3, 1920; Lowell to James Byrne, February 13, 1920; and J. P. Morgan to Lowell, March 2 and 4, 1920, ALLP, 1919-1922, #448. "The fact that you are Catholic by religion," Lowell wrote his friend, was "a very distinct advantage; for something like half the population of Massachusetts" was "now of that religion, and it" was "eminently proper that we should have a broad-minded Catholic like yourself on the Corporation." In spite of Morgan's objections—he did not think that the Governing Boards should be as cosmopolitan as the student body and felt that the most important Overseers should be consulted by the Fellows before selection of a successor to Henry Lee Higginson--James Byrne was confirmed and served as a Fellow from 1920 to 1926.
Lowell's convictions were sincere, and he had clearly risked the imperious Morgan's displeasure.  

Jews

What Lowell saw so clearly in regard to Harvard's relationship with Roman Catholics, he did not apply to Jews. When discussing Harvard's obligation toward a populous and influential Catholic minority, Lowell had linked a university's greatness to its welcoming of "all classes of people." When Jews were the minority, the welcome was considerably restrained. Although biographer, Henry Yeomans, maintained that "thirty-five years after Lowell's article appeared in the Forum he might have been willing to substitute 'Jew' for 'Irish,' 'Palestine' for 'Ireland,' and let the writing stand," the parallel could not be sustained. The Irish Catholics had always a greater potentiality for the assimilation which Lowell demanded: they were Christians and ethnically and culturally similar to other Britons, the stock from which Yankees descended. Lowell's concept of assimilation had little flexibility when applied to people who differed ethnically and culturally from Anglo-Saxons. Such people, especially the Jews, were to be excluded from America's elite institutions, if not from the country itself.  


As the number of Jewish students increased at Harvard around the turn of the century, problems arose over their treatment. In July 1901, President Eliot wrote to Professor George A. Bartlett that he saw no method of dealing with the Hebrew difficulty. It is doubtless true that Jews are better off at Harvard than at any other American college; and they are, therefore, likely to resort to it. As yet they are reasonably distributed through our buildings, Hastings being the only hall where there is an undesirable proportion of them.

Eliot thus recognized that a concentration of Jewish students in particular halls might pose a problem to some people.

Prior to the 1890's and early 1900's most Jewish students at Harvard were of German background and followers of Reform Judaism. Their parents and grandparents usually had emigrated to the United States during the middle decades of the nineteenth century. But their ranks were swelled by Jews from Eastern Europe, particularly by those from Russia, who numbered 71 out of the 95 Jewish Academic students in 1908, counting both sons of immigrants and the foreign-born (Table 3). In contrast to the German Jews, the Russian Jews observed the stricter and very traditional Orthodox faith.¹⁷

Conflicts developed between the German-Jewish

¹⁷Charles W. Eliot to Professor George A. Bartlett 22 July, 1901, CWE Letter Book 92, p. 123. As Table 3 indicated, most—78.9 per cent—of the Jewish Academic students were under twenty-one years of age, proportionately slightly younger than their Gentile classmates.
students and these newcomers. Early in November, 1901, Rabbi Charles Fleischer of Temple Adath Israel of Boston talked with President Eliot about the Corporation's providing religious instruction for Jewish students. Eliot replied that if Jewish students organized and asked "of the Corporation a convenient room for the conduct of religious services," he had "no doubt" that it would be provided. But Professor Francis Greenwood Peabody, Eliot's brother-in-law, and Professor George Herbert Palmer were keenly aware of

a deep division among the Jewish students, and they thought that the Synagogue Jews could not be brought to associate in a religious service with the Temple Jews. Professor Palmer spoke particularly of his experience with certain Russian Jews - very able men - who last year united in a service every morning in the room of one of their number. Professor Peabody, too, has been much impressed with the zeal and exclusiveness of some of the Synagogue Jews. My own attention has never been distinctly drawn to this division among Jewish students.

Like most Gentiles, Eliot was not particularly sensitive to the deep cultural and religious differences separating the Reform and Orthodox Jews. But he followed the advice of Professors Peabody and Palmer to let the Jewish students themselves choose their own religious organization. As far as the rest of the student body was concerned, religious services were provided in Appleton Chapel for different Protestant denominations, and the University hired seats in neighboring churches for both Catholics and Protestants until the end of 1903-04 (a practice which had originated
during the days of active Unitarianism on campus). 18

German-Jewish students for their part had mixed quite well in their social relationships—John Weiss, A.B. 1837, a Jewish barber's son from Worcester, was a member of the Institute of 1770, Phi Beta Kappa, and secretary and poet of the Hasty Pudding. Other German-Jewish students received similar social recognition, at least until the last quarter of the nineteenth-century when the process began of excluding Jews from clubs and similar social organizations. Russian Jews rarely, if ever, received a cordial welcome. For one thing, they had begun to emigrate in large numbers at a time when many Americans were beginning to question the benefit of Eastern and Southern European immigrants. Moreover, Russian Jews were far more culturally exclusive and generally poorer than the German Jews. 19

As the number of Jewish students increased on campus, their relationship with the Gentile majority became somewhat strained. Probably parental attitudes were largely responsible for social anti-Semitism on campus, with


students reflecting the value judgments of their elders. Occasionally, however, a few students acted independently of parental wishes as the following incident illustrated. In the autumn of 1915, President Lowell received a letter from "a man complaining that his son has been assigned a Jew as a chum." The father and an aunt complained that the assignment could not be "a congenial one" and that their boy would lose his friends as a consequence. Lowell reported to the father that "great care" was taken in the selection of roommates. Moreover, the "Jewish" roommate was an alumni son and Roman Catholic in religion, while his father was considered "an agreeable person socially." The protesting father was also informed that his son was given the choice of another "chum," but that he stated his satisfaction with the existing arrangement. Apparently, the son felt that he would have less time to study if he changed roommates. Interestingly enough, this was the only extant complaint of its kind. Either Harvard students were relatively tolerant or officials carefully selected roommates in the Freshman Halls.20

20 A. Lawrence Lowell to E. D. Brandegee, October 7, 1915, with enclosure; Brandegee to Lowell, October 14 and 25, 1915, ALLP, 1914-1917, #70a Freshman Halls. The "Jewish" student in question left College before graduating; he entered the infantry and died as a result of wounds in France, September, 1918.
But. President Lowell himself was not tolerant of religious differences among Harvard students when they conflicted with the University calendar. He took a hard line against requests from Rabbi Harry Levi of Temple Israel, Boston, that Harvard reschedule for Jewish students its September, 1915, entrance examinations. He suggested instead that Jewish students who had scruples against writing examinations on the Day of Atonement dictate their answers. The Rabbi replied that proper religious observance required all day attendance at the synagogue. Although admitting that Lowell should have been informed earlier of the dates of the Jewish holidays, he pointed out that both Boston and Tufts Universities had allowed Jewish students to be examined on other days. But Lowell countered that the setting of entrance examinations presented special problems; Harvard afforded only two opportunities to pass them, in June and September. Third opportunities were not granted, even for students who were ill. Jewish applicants could be examined in June if they did not want to run the risk of having to take a September examination scheduled on a religious holiday. Although Lowell argued that he was applying a general rule to all students equally (he would not offer a third opportunity to Catholics and Episcopalians should one of the examinations be scheduled on Good Friday), his opposition to greater flexibility was based upon other grounds. "I suspect that the real object
of the protest," he said, "is not any hardship on individuals, but a desire for recognition of the Jewish religion by Harvard University." 21

Lowell's argument to the effect that rescheduling of examinations for Jewish students involved a "special recognition" of Judaism was far-fetched. In subsequent years, Harvard may have sought to avoid these conflicts. But in 1916, Lowell received a letter protesting the scheduling of the first day of course enrollment on the Jewish New Year. In reply, he questioned whether there was "anything in the nature of a sacrilege or a violation or religious duty for a man to enroll himself in a course on that day?" 22

This same unsubtle and unyielding attitude was apparent in Lowell's opposition to Louis D. Brandeis's confirmation as a justice to the United States Supreme Court. That Lowell was only one of the more than fifty

---


22A. Lawrence Lowell to William Atkinson, September 17, 1915; and Lowell to Coleman Silbert, October 3, 1916, ALLP, 1914-1917, #780 Jewish Holidays: Protests about examinations on.
prominent Boston lawyers who sent to the President of the Senate a protest against the confirmation should not disguise his anti-Semitism. Nor would it be necessary to discuss why other lawyers opposed Brandeis. Lowell insisted that his opposition was based upon Brandeis' "untrustworthy" character, not upon his economic and social views. The question of religion was, of course, not even mentioned:

The objection relates to his professional reputation for integrity. I believe strongly myself that no man ought to be put on the Supreme Bench of the United States who has been unscrupulous in his legal practice; and that Mr Brandeis has that reputation among the more honorable members of the Suffolk Bar is undoubted. According to Lowell, Brandeis' dissenting opinions "should very properly be represented in the Supreme Court." Indeed in defense of dissent, Lowell claimed such a right for himself in voicing his opposition to Brandeis. Yet Brandeis' Jewishness was his primary concern.²³

In contrast to Lowell, Charles W. Eliot trusted Jews and numbered several of them among his friends. One was banker Jacob Schiff, a summer neighbor at Mount Desert Island, Maine, and a substantial Harvard benefactor. Eliot was also on cordial terms with other Jewish benefactors, James Loeb '88 and Jesse Isidor Straus '93. He treated

them as he would any cultivated gentlemen. Although Eliot was personally free of the anti-Semitic prejudices of many of his Brahmin class, he once had to quash a rumor that anti-Semitism had kept a prominent Jew from being nominated for the Harvard Board of Overseers. 24

On the whole, Eliot believed it best that Christians and Jews not intermarry, although he was not greatly influenced by the eugenicists, especially since most of them tended to urge immigration restriction. If Christians married Jews, the latter might well dominate, since Jews were "the most resistant and prepotent race in the world." Yet Eliot noted the occurrence of intermarriage between Jews and old New England families, even within his own family. To the Honorable Nathan Matthews, he wrote:

Jewish strains appear in a good many so-called old New England families, often getting in from the material side. Thus the Nathan Appletons of Boston exhibited very clearly a Jewish strain. So did the children of George W. Lyman by his second wife, whose father was an English Jew who had a fine house and garden on Summer Street...Andrews Norton, who married one of my father's sisters, had undoubtedly a Jewish strain in him; for this strain appears in the physiognomies of some of his children, and very strongly in some of his grandchildren. You see that my grounds for imagining a Jewish strain in you do not lie in the region of determined fact. They belong to the region of natural probabilities, or probable but not sure inferences.

24 Jacob H. Schiff to Charles W. Eliot, January 2d, 1906, handwritten; Schiff to Eliot, November 5th, 1908; Eliot to Schiff, August 16, 1907 and November 6, 1908; CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 245, folder Schiff, Jacob H. See also Eliot to Schiff, December 15, 1899, CWE Letter Book 92, p. 46a, and Eliot to Schiff, December 13, 1907, CWE Letter Book 97, p. 32-1/2. Hawkins, Between Harvard and America, p. 190.
Eliot's identified this "Jewish strain" by facial characteristics; consequently such identification was more a surmise than a fact. But at least one famous New Englander discussed his "Jewish strain" openly. James Russell Lowell told Eliot "that he was sure he had Hebrew blood in his veins through the Russells; and he decidedly liked to testify to that fact."25

In spite of his generally generous attitude toward Jews, Eliot on occasion criticized them. He not only agreed with Mr. Isaac N. Seligman's opposition to a bill introduced in the New York legislature to allow the operation of Jewish businesses on Sunday, but even suggested that Jews shift their Sabbath twenty-four hours. He also did not approve "the present control by Jews of news agencies, newspapers, moving pictures, baseball games, banking houses, and the great department houses." But he felt that Gentiles were at least partly responsible for

25 Charles W. Eliot, Foreword to Samuel Walker McCall, Patriotism of the American Jew (New York, 1924), p. 13. Charles W. Eliot to Dr. E. M. East, 17 December, 1924, Box 390: 1924, A-C; Eliot to the Hon. Nathan Matthews, 19 September 1922, Box 388: 1922, M-Z; and Eliot to John J. Chapman, 23 June 1923, Box 389: 1923, A-L, CWEP, 1909-1926. See also Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants, pp. 17-19. According to Solomon, James Russell Lowell was somewhat ambivalent toward the Jews: "Fascination with the Jew on three different levels—as the ancient Hebrew of the Bible, as the European scapegoat, and as the emancipated citizen—was mingled with resistance to these outsiders."
this state of affairs: "The Jews use their new freedom in
the British Empire and the United States with an intelli-
gence and an industry which give them control." Yet the
English competed with them "more successfully than the
Americans," he noted. Eliot did not believe, as some did,
that Jews were responsible for the Bolshevik Revolution.
And he actively opposed such anti-Semitic trash as Henry
Ford's articles in the Dearborn Independent:

It is feeble, but mischievous among ignorant Americans;
and it seems formidable to many of the American Jews
whether rabbis or bankers. In consequence I have had
several interviews with leading Jews from New York on
the subject of effective answers to the articles in
the 'Dearborn Independent' and to the so-called
'Protocols'. The men that have been to see me protest
vigorously that the Jews are not chiefly responsible
for what has occurred in Russia. They seem to believe
that many of the Jews who have served the Bolshevik
administration have done so to save their own skins.\(^2\)

Although Eliot believed that Jews lacked the gift
of the English and their descendants "in the practice of
liberty and in the English method of slowly improving
political and social conditions under party government and
by long discussion followed by compromise," he considered
American Jews to be "trustworthy in regard to the theory
of political liberty." The word "trustworthy" clearly

\(^2\) Charles W. Eliot to Isaac N. Seligman, June 14,
1908; Seligman to Eliot, June 16, 1908; and clipping,
"The Sunday Bill," The American Hebrew, March 27, 1908,
CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 246, Folder Seligman, Isaac N. Eliot
to Hon. Charles R. Crane, 10 March 1921, CWEP, 1909-1926,
Box 387: 1921, A-L.
delineated the different attitudes of Eliot and Lowell. Eliot was very aware of Jewish contributions to civilization, as was indicated in his Foreword to Samuel Walker McCall's *Patriotism of the American Jew* (1924). In 1922, Lowell, too, acknowledged that "mankind can never forget what it owes to the Jewish race, - among other things Christianity." But his praise was considerably more muted than Eliot's. In regard to these two non-Protestant ethnic groups, Irish Catholics and Jews, Lowell was somewhat more favorable to the former, while Eliot was definitely more friendly to the latter. Another major Catholic group in Massachusetts, the Italians, who numbered over 60,000 in Greater Boston around 1920, were hardly even represented at Harvard. In 1908-1909, the total of Italo-Americans and Italians at the College was 8 out of almost 2200 students; there also were 5 others, 1 each in engineering, medicine, and postgraduate work and 2 in law. More Italians attended Syracuse University, where they founded a fraternity, Alpha Phi Delta, in 1914; another chapter was established at Columbia University the following year.

But the number of Italians at Harvard remained small. There were only 6 Italians in the Harvard Class of 1926 out of a roster of over 750 men. Four were born in Massachusetts, one in Rhode Island, and one in Italy.28

Negroes

Size was not the only factor affecting a group's relationship to the University. Although the number of Negroes at Harvard was small, they became the center of a major controversy in 1922-1923. Although blacks had begun to enter the University before Eliot's administration, most came after about 1880. The first Negro to enter any Harvard department was Martin R. Delaney, who matriculated as a medical student in 1849. During the Civil War, he served as a major in the United States volunteers in Louisiana. The first Negro to enter and graduate from the College was Richard Theodore Greener of Philadelphia, who previously

28 See supra, n. 2, pp. 227, 231 and Table 3, pp. 228-230. For the efforts of Italo-American businessmen in the Boston area to interest their sons and daughters in a college education, see George F. La Piana, President, Boston Branch of Instituto per la Propaganda della Cultura Italiana, to President A. Lawrence Lowell, March 31, 1920, with enclosure, ALLP, 1919-1922, #298 Americanization. The Columbian, MCMXXIX, LXV (New York: Published by The Senior Class of Columbia College, 1929); and The Columbian MCMXXVIII, LXIV (1928), on Circolo Italiano, pp. 382-383. See also Harvard College Class Album 1926 (Cambridge, Mass., 1926) and Twenty-fifth Anniversary Report (Cambridge, Mass., 1951). For the attitude of an Harvard undergraduate, see John De Raismes Storey, "The Italian in America," Disquisition, Harvard College Class of 1905, Secretary's First Report (1905), pp. 241-244.
attended Phillips Andover Academy and Oberlin College. After graduation in 1870, Greener, winner of first Bowdoin Prize senior year, taught Philosophy and Logic at the University of South Carolina from 1873 and 1877. There he received his law degree, before becoming Dean of the Howard Law School, 1877-1880. He later served as chief examiner of New York City and County Civil Service and was appointed by President William McKinley as United States representative first in Siberia, then in China. The Chinese Government bestowed the order of Double Dragon on him for his assistance to Chinese merchants during the Shansi famine.  

While Greener's career was remarkable, the most famous black to graduate from the College during this period was W.E. Burghardt Du Bois '90. In Dusk of Dawn (1940), Du Bois described his life at Harvard. Accepting the fact of social segregation from his white classmates, he devoted his energy to study and reading. Moreover, he enjoyed the friendship of William James and Alfred Bushnell Hart. Du Bois placed second in the Boylston Oratorical Contest behind another Negro, Clement Morgan,

who broke a long standing WASP tradition when a revolt among classmates resulted in his election as the first black Class Orator. Du Bois, however, delivered one of the commencement speeches. After receiving his Ph.D. in history from Harvard, he began his career as an author and editor on behalf of the black men. In this capacity, he took a far more militant position than did Booker T. Washington, who was the first Negro to receive an honorary degree from Harvard, an M.A., in 1896.\(^{30}\)

The records of Harvard's black graduates were above the average. Of the approximately 160 blacks who matriculated in Harvard College between 1890 and 1940, about half received their degrees and a number had distinguished academic and athletic careers. In his survey of the Negro at Harvard during this fifty-year span, Paul D. Davis '40, a former member of Varsity Track Squad, wrote:

Included in the colored athletes have been an All-American football center; two varsity baseball players; two holders of Harvard track records (broadjump and hammer throw). Of the thirteen now in the College eight are on various athletic squads. There have been members and officers of the undergraduate publications, presidents and members of the debating councils, president of political clubs, class day speakers, class day officers, class orators, recipients of various departmental honors and scholarships, eight Phi Beta Kappas, members of Houses.

William Henry Lewis, Harvard Law 1895 and an All-American football player, was credited with inventing the "roving

\(^{30}\)Ibid., pp. 29-30. Washington was elected an honorary member of Phi Beta Kappa in 1904.
Another of these graduates, William Augustus Hinton, '05 and the Medical School, 1912, became an Instructor in Preventive Medicine and Hygiene, Bacteriology, and Immunology in 1918. Two other blacks held teaching positions at Harvard. George Franklin Grant, a graduate of the Dental School in 1870, was first a demonstrator and then an instructor from 1878 to 1889; he also became President of the Harvard Dental Association. And Abram Molineaux Hewlitt, who did not attend Harvard, served as the College's first gymnastics teacher from 1860 to 1871.  

Harvard thus offered special opportunities to a number of blacks. But its record was not without blemishes. As Du Bois and others were well aware, blacks, with a few exceptions, were usually socially segregated by white students. During the first half of the twentieth-century, two major controversies involved black students at Harvard: the playing of blacks on intercollegiate athletic teams and the residency of blacks in the Freshman Halls.

Ibid., pp. 29-31. As of 1940, some 165 blacks, a majority from the South, had entered the College and about 500 attended the graduate or professional schools: around 40 in the Law School, 20 in the Medical School, 25 in the Divinity School, and most of the others in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Thirteen Ph.D.'s and almost 100 Masters degrees were conferred on Negroes. In September, 1941, a Negro entered the Medical School for the first time in a decade. See "Negro Question Clippings (P. D. Davis) 1941," HUA, on "benching of Lucien V. Alexis, Jr. of Lacrosse Team by Harvard University at insistence of Navy," especially Paul Daniel Davis, "Harvard Students Blast Navy Jim-Crowism," The Afro-American, April 19, 1941, p. 19.
On the first issue, according to Davis, the University and Harvard men generally took a positive stand. When a Virginia team insisted in 1903 that Harvard bench "star third baseman," William Clarence Matthews '05, the University decided against playing baseball with that school. Eight years later, some protest arose over sending shot putter Theodore Cable '13 to the Oxford-Cambridge Track meet, but it was "immediately checked by graduate pressure." Not until many years later, however, did the Corporation take an official stand against racial discrimination in intercollegiate athletics. This decision was reached only after Harvard had bowed to pressure from the lily-white United States Naval Academy at Annapolis. On April 5, 1941, Harvard benched Lucien V. Alexis, Jr. '42, a midfield player, from a lacrosse game with Navy. Harvard lost 12 to 0. During its southern trip, Alexis had previously played against the Universities of Pennsylvania and Maryland. Initially, University of Maryland officials had tried to stop him from playing, but ultimately he participated because none of the Maryland players objected. At Annapolis, Superintendent Rear Admiral Russell Willson offered the Harvard team three choices: first, Navy would bench a player to compensate for the benching of Alexis; second, Navy would forfeit the game; or third, Cambridge would be phoned for a decision. The third course was
followed. After asserting that Alexis should be allowed to play, Harvard Athletic Director William J. Bingham later reversed his stand. Alexis did not play against Navy, but the issue stayed alive. After spring vacation, the Harvard Crimson criticized Bingham's decision. Students petitioned the Athletic Director to explain his stand and to give assurances that it would not be repeated. Shortly thereafter, the Corporation "suggested that the Athletic Committee 'should make it plain to other institutions with whom we are competing that it is Harvard's principle that there should be no racial discrimination among our students.'"

On the second issue—the housing of black students in the Freshman Halls—Harvard also reversed its position, but only after a long and painful public controversy. Prior to the opening of the Freshman Halls in 1914, the Faculty had voted that all first-year students be required

32 Davis, "Fair Harvard," pp. 28, 31. Davis, "Harvard Students Blast Navy Jim-Crowism," p. 19; and other articles in The Afro-American, April 19, 1941. Lucien Alexis, Jr., whose father, Harvard 1918, was a high school principal in New Orleans, prepared at Phillips Exeter Academy. See also Howard T. Ball to A. Lawrence Lowell, January 13, 1923, commending Harvard's stand "two years ago in refusing to compete with the United States Naval Academy and the University of Virginia," because they requested that it "withdraw from competition in scheduled field and track meets with those institutions, her two colored athletes Jourdain and Gourdin" (ALLP, 1922-1925, #42 Negroes).
to reside in them, "except those who are permitted by the Assistant Dean of Harvard College to live elsewhere."

Black students were "persuaded" to seek other accommodations. By accident, two black students were assigned to the Halls during World War I. Although apparently there had been no protest, Harvard officials decided to prevent a similar reoccurrence. As a consequence, Cecil Blue and William Knox, Jr. were excluded from the Halls in 1921. Knox had been assigned a room in Standish Hall, but was told, after appearing for the June examinations, to return his registration card since all rooms had been assigned.

In December, 1922, Roscoe Conkling Bruce, a black Phi Beta Kappa and magna cum laude graduate of the Class of 1902, applied for a room in the Halls on behalf of his son, who planned to enter the Class of 1930. Since Bruce, Jr., the grandson of a former United States Senator, Blanche K. Bruce of Mississippi, would not graduate from Phillips Exeter Academy until 1926, his father may well have intended to make this application a test case. Since he himself had achieved such a distinguished record at Harvard as well as success in his career as an educator, it would be impossible on objective grounds to justify the exclusion of his son from the Halls. Not only had Bruce held several scholarships at Harvard, but he had also won both the Pasteur Medal and Coolidge Debating Prize and delivered the Class Oration. If merit had any meaning, what justification
was there in excluding the well-qualified son of a distinguished black alumnus? Moreover, both Bruce and his son had become accustomed to associating with middle and upper middle class whites through their preparatory school training. And although they claimed their Negro identity with pride, both were light skinned.33

Obviously, Harvard had placed itself in an untenable position. But President Lowell stood by it when he personally turned down Bruce's application. In January 1923, Bruce and Lowell exchanged letters, which were subsequently published in the Boston Transcript and the New York World. Bruce expressed his shock and said that he had believe culture, not race was "the basis of sound nationality." He put his argument succinctly:

Few words in the English language, I submit, are susceptible of more poignant abuse than the two you have seen fit to employ. The first is 'race'; the second, 'necessity'. As the one is often nothing more than a term of social convenience, so the other is

33See Dean of Harvard College--Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27), #29 Freshman Halls Committee 1913-1916, for December 2, 1913, Faculty vote. A. Lawrence Lowell to John B. Olmstead, January 20, 1923, ALLP, 1922-1925, #42 Negroes; "Harvard Men Here Fight Ban Against Negro," New York Sun, June 16, 1922, clipping on the Memorial circulated among Harvard alumni in New York, protesting the exclusion of blacks from the Freshman Halls, ALLP, 1919-1922, #981 Freshman Dormitories. For Bruce's career, see Secretary's Reports for the Class of 1902, especially the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Report, VIII (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), pp. 86-87. Bruce listed his occupation as writer, although most of his career since graduation had been in education: assistant superintendent "'in sole charge'" of public schools for Negroes in Washington, D. C., 1907-1921; and district school principal in Kimball, West Virginia, 1921-1923.
Lowell's reply revealed his firm belief in the "reasonableness" of exclusion:

It is not a departure from the past to refuse to compel white and colored men to room in the same building. We owe to the colored man the same opportunities for education that we do to the white man; but we do not owe to him to force him and the white man into social relations that are not, or may not be, mutually congenial. We give him freely opportunities for room and board wherever it is voluntary: but it seems to me that for the colored man to claim that he is entitled to have the white man compelled to live with him is a very unfortunate innovation which, far from doing him good, would increase a prejudice that, as you and I will thoroughly agree, is most unfortunate, and probably growing.

Lowell's statement, of course, was a variation of the principle, "separate but equal." Blacks might enjoy an equal educational opportunity, even though they could not associate with white students outside the classrooms or during the other twelve hours in the day. Lowell argued from the principle of "the greatest good for the greatest number." The social benefits of the Halls for the great majority of students, he held, should not be jeopardized:

On the other hand, to maintain that compulsory residence in the Freshman Dormitories, which has proved a great benefit in breaking up the social cliques, that did much injury to the College - should not be established for 99-1/2% of the students because the remaining one half of one percent could not properly be included, seems to me an untenable position.

The minority--the blacks--had no rights in this matter. Lowell, sensitive toward the feelings of white Southerners and those who shared their prejudices, showed less concern
about the reactions of the black freshmen.\textsuperscript{34}

Not only did Lowell fear that integrated Halls would cause a decline in white Southern patronage, but he seems to have believed that such a policy "would cause a revulsion and reprisals in a good many places" against Negroes. After all, the previous twenty years had witnessed the highwater mark in Jim Crow laws and lynchings in the South. Yet such a stand was largely vitiated by the fact that blacks were permitted to room in dormitories and eat in dining halls open to upperclassmen. Lowell's weak, if not specious, argument was that residency in the Freshman Halls was compulsory to the extent that white freshmen were usually not free to live elsewhere. He justified exclusion of blacks on the grounds that "no one has a right to live in any one of the Freshman Dormitories." His application of "compulsory residence" was admittedly "arbitrary." Lowell's whole position rested upon the assumption that the principle of compulsory residence for most Freshmen rendered "untenable" the integration of a handful of blacks in each Freshman class. Both the argument itself and its application were inherently weak, since there were not enough rooms in the Halls to

\textsuperscript{34} A. Lawrence Lowell to Roscoe Conkling Bruce, December 14, 1922 and January 6, 1923; Bruce to Lowell, January 1923; and clippings from the Boston Transcript, January 11, 1923, and New York World, January 12, 1923, ALLP, 1922-1925, #42 Negroes.
accommodate all Freshmen. A number of whites, probably mostly local boys, were allowed to live off-campus.35

Lowell's reasoning was based largely on his views of Reconstruction and on Booker T. Washington's interpretation of the needs of the Negro. The following statement from a letter, written in March, 1923, is revealing:

The ill-treatment of the negro in the South, and in some ways the almost harder treatment of him in the North, seems to me largely due to the fact that philanthropic people in the North have been wholly unwilling to face the negro problem as a problem, but have insisted that the color line ought to be wholly disregarded. The result was the blunders of reconstruction, followed by the treatment of the negro by the Southerner as he pleased, without rational influence by Northern thought, and the pretense in the North that the negro was treated just like the white man, when in fact he was shut out from all but a few employments.

Reconstruction, then, failed because it ignored the fact of racial differences between whites and blacks. In its wake, the Negro was left at the mercy of Southern whites. Misguided philanthropy worsened the Negro's position. To buttress his argument, Lowell drew upon the writings of historian James Ford Rhodes and educator Booker T. Washington. Lowell's decision in regard to Roscoe Conkling Bruce's son already had brought down upon his head a storm

35 A. Lawrence Lowell to Charles K. Bolton, January 16, 1923, ALLP, 1922-1925, #42 Negroes; Lowell to Professor A. B. Hart, December 2, 1921, ALLP, 1919-1922, #981 Freshman Dormitories; and Lowell to Jerome D. Greene, January 15, 1923, JDGP, Box 1 Harvard: Memorial Church Controversy; Presidents Lowell, Conant, and Pusey, folder Lowell, Lawrence.
of protest from a number of Harvard alumni. In January, 1923, he wrote to Rhodes that he felt like "'Saint Sebastian, stuck full of arrows which people are firing at me.'" The historian reassured Lowell that his interpretation of Reconstruction was supported by volumes VI and VII of his History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850. In fact, Rhodes was far more disparaging than Lowell of the Negro, who could "never be elevated to a social level with the whites; he is a million years behind in civilization." Another ally was Booker T. Washington, whom Lowell considered "the wisest guide the colored man ever had in this country," because he did not urge social equality. The views of Harvard-educated W.E.B. Du Bois were, he implied, less reliable. Lowell referred to the following extract from Up From Slavery:

'The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing.'

Washington, believed Lowell, "felt that the important thing was to train the men of his race in character and efficiency, believing that when this was accomplished the question of their rights would present less difficulty." And Lowell quite correctly recognized the existence of prejudice in the North as well as in the South. In his chapter on "Race" in Conflicts of Principle, he noted
Northern hypocrisy:

Although almost all opportunities for bettering his condition are practically withheld from the negro in the North, the people there believe firmly in the principle that there should be no discrimination between the races by law or official action; while the South, dreading the danger of a mixed race, clings to the principle not only that social segregation should exist, but that it should be made compulsory by statute.

In short, the North did little or nothing to make its principle of racial equality work. The South practiced what it preached but at the same time offered more opportunities for Negro employment. 36

But for all of Lowell's ratiocinations the crucial question remained whether Harvard's policy helped or hindered Negro progress. Lowell insisted ad hominem that Harvard would lose its influence in the South, just as the North had after Reconstruction, if it tried to enforce social equality. But this parallel had little validity, largely because there had been so few blacks in the College: 165 between 1870 and 1940. And Harvard would have to pay a price for any influence in the South it tried to obtain

in this way. Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, Eaton Professor of the Science of Government, told the President, whom he could address as "My dear Lowell," that it was "a very serious matter for us in the North to take responsibility for the prejudices of the Southern people." Although Hart believed in the inferiority of the Negro race and opposed racial mixing, he doubted "whether any southern student in the last forty years has stayed away from Harvard because he knew there were some negro students here." Since "Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, Indians and rather dark Latin Americans are received without comment," Hart said that the exclusion of black freshmen from the Halls was "an unnecessary discrimination."37

From his experience Hart found Harvard students to be relatively tolerant in their treatment of black classmates. On the one hand, they did not associate with blacks socially, but, on the other, few objected to eating with them in the same restaurant or dining hall, or even to rooming next door to "a respectable colored student."

True some Southerners, an alumnus recalled, described one of

37 Albert Bushnell Hart to A. Lawrence Lowell, January 18, 1923, ALLP, 1922-1925, #42-A Negroes; Hart to Lowell, November 29, 1921, ALLP, 1919-1922 #981 Freshman Dormitories. Albert Bushnell Hart to Charles W. Eliot, Sept. 10, 1907, handwritten letter, CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 217, folder Hart, Albert Bushnell. Hart spent four months of a sabbatical year in the South, during which he traveled for two months through the Black Belt. His studies, first delivered as Lowell Lectures, were published as The Southern South (1910).
the entrances of Hollis Hall as a "nest of negroes." But when William Henry Lewis LL.B. '95, a varsity and All-American football player, was refused service by a Harvard Square barber, the students boycotted his shop. In contrast, black players did not fare as well in contests with other college teams. Black baseball players were frequently targets for the spikes of opposing base runners. At Harvard itself, there was an acceptance of blacks in competition for extra-curricular activities, even among Southerners. One white Southerner welcomed the challenge of a Negro candidate for a University debating team, "because the only way he could get on the team ahead of the negro was to show his superior quality." Undergraduate treatment of blacks at Harvard was certainly no worse and, on the whole, perhaps a great deal better than what the majority of Negroes received outside University gates. 38

Lowell, of course, could unearth at least one student whom Harvard lost by admitting Negroes; a professor in Medical School had chosen Johns Hopkins over Harvard for his medical training. But Hart's argument could not be dismissed. Why should Harvard maintain Southern racial prejudice particularly when the South never reciprocated in regard to Northerners living below the Mason-Dixon Line?

38 Hart to Lowell, November 29, 1921; W. F. Low '07 to A. Lawrence Lowell, January 16, 1923, ALLP, 1922-1925, #42-A Negroes.
Far better to allow whites who objected to integrated dormitories to live elsewhere. Hart, a Trustee of Howard University, also reminded Lowell of the Abolitionist heritage which both shared. In short, "the color distinction" in the Freshman Halls filled Hart with "pain and apprehension." 39

Hart was not the only prominent Harvardian to question President Lowell's policy. His predecessor had never sanctioned an official policy of racial discrimination. Although according to the memory of one alumnus, Charles W. Eliot may have considered the possibility of segregating blacks at Harvard if their number continued to increase, he denied saying that he ever "entertained that idea, and had no occasion to; for Harvard College has never had any alarm or apprehension on that subject." There was no evidence that Eliot ever departed from the principle he stated in 1907: "The University recognizes among its officers and students neither class, caste, race, sect nor political party." But Lowell seemed to reason that "the loss of a few negro students would be more expedient than the loss of a few white." Of course, the impact of his policy was hard to measure. The number of Southern white students was small, and it was difficult to determine how many

39 A. Lawrence Lowell to A. B. Hart, December 2, 1921, and Hart to Lowell, November 29, 1921, ALLP, 1919-1922, #981 Freshman Dormitories; Hart to Lowell, January 8, 1923.
Northern students favored such racial segregation. Ultimately in the spring of 1923, alumni pressure, not acceptance of the principle of equal treatment, would effect a modification in Lowell's position.  

Although Eliot's official attitude toward black students at Harvard was more liberal than Lowell's, this should not obscure the fact that in personal attitudes they were not very far apart. Both men generally accepted Booker T. Washington as the spokesman for American Negroes and tacitly supported the policy of Jim Crowism. But whereas Lowell imposed segregation on a handful of blacks, Eliot refused to consider such a course until the proportion of blacks became substantial. Conferring an honorary Master's degree on Washington gave Eliot "profound satisfaction," but he expressed "concern" over the attitude of black leaders who had migrated from the South to the North in the early 1920's. They seemed to "to abandon the methods of Hampton and Tuskegee in favor of more combative or violent methods."

In two letters written in 1909 to W. Monroe Trotter '95 and M.A. '96, editor of The Guardian, Eliot summarized his views on the social segregation. While he did not believe

---

libraries and parks should exclude Negroes, he suggested that if their number became large, "it might be more convenient to provide in libraries separate tables or desks for colored people." Again, Eliot had "no theoretical objection to the separate car laws of the South," if both races and "equally good accommodations." Laws against racial intermarriage received his warm approval. Segregation certainly was not "necessary" at this time in the Cambridge and Boston public schools. But if "in any Northern state the proportion of negroes should become large," said Eliot, "I should approve of separate schools for negro children." In short, he accepted some segregation as necessary to protect whites from too close association with a large number of Negroes, most of whom he considered several generations behind white people in civilization. But he also believed Negroes "should have access to all trades and professions," and be able to vote if they, like the whites, met "an educational qualification" and paid the poll tax.  

On important issues, Eliot differed decisively from Southern racial extremists: lynch law, the economic  

enslavement of blacks, and the denial of their political rights. During the course of an extensive correspondence with Frederick George Bromberg, Harvard 1858 and a Liberal Republican and lawyer from Mobile, Alabama, Eliot maintained that political equality for blacks did not confer social equality, which was a matter of "similar tastes and habits." As a New England aristocrat, Eliot chose his intimate associates on the basis of their culture, education, and common interests. "It would never occur to me," he wrote, "not to invite to my house an educated Chinaman or Japanese because their skin is yellow or brownish, or to avoid asking a negro to my table if he were an intelligent, refined and interesting person." On the same basis, he took an interest in the career of Roscoe Conkling Bruce and viewed with approval President Roosevelt's invitation

42 For Eliot's correspondence with and about Roscoe Conkling Bruce, see CWEP: 1903-1909, Box 204, folder Bruce, Roscoe Conkling; and Eliot to Professor P. H. Hanus, 19 March 1921, 1909-1926, Box 387: 1921, A-L. Also Eliot to Jerome D. Greene, 13 January 1923, JDGP, Box 6, folder 1922-1923 the Jewish question—and Negro question. Eliot was disturbed to learn that Bruce was "driven out" of his post as assistant superintendent of public schools for Negroes in Washington, D. C., because it did "great injustice to Bruce" and "hurt the policy of separate schools for colored children." On a personal level, Eliot advised Bruce "to get the best education chance" for his son and that was "to fit him for Harvard College at Phillips Exeter Academy" (Eliot to Bruce, 7 March 1922, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 388: 1922, A-L).
to Booker T. Washington. 43

But Southerners were outraged that the President had invited a Negro to dine at the White House, because it implied social equality. Any act which conferred or inferred social equality was forbidden because it might lead to miscegenation. Since full political equality was a door to social access, Southern whites were simply loath to open public or civic positions of power to Negroes. (Because Southern whites would not participate in a bi-racial organization, the Republican party in the South soon became "lily white.") Race, not natural ability and educational level, was the real barrier to Negro advancement. Bromberg expressed the view of most Southerners when he implied that the Negro problem would not disappear until the Negro himself did. His solution would be a scientific discovery to bleach the Negro's skin and remove the kinks

---

43Charles W. Eliot to Frederick G. Bromberg, 14 June, 1901, p. 116, and 6 December, 1901, p. 139a; and Eliot to Rev. S. A. Steel, 25 October, 1901, p. 132, CWE Letter Book 92. For biographical sketch on Frederick George Bromberg, see Harvard College, Class of 1858, Report Prepared for the Fortieth Anniversary of Its Graduation (Boston, 1898), pp. 15-18. The New York-born and Harvard-educated Bromberg held city offices in Mobile, served as a State Senator, 1868-1872, and was elected as a Liberal Republican to the Forty-third Congress. He was defeated for re-election in 1874 by the administration candidate, a black man. President Eliot recommended Bromberg for the District Attorneyship of Southern Alabama (Eliot to Hon. Philander C. Knox, January 7, 1904, CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 204, folder Bromberg, Frederick G.).
from his hair.\footnote{\textsuperscript{44}}

Eliot's remedy was not drastic, but based upon conditions that he found in Bermuda, where he spent the winter of 1900-1901. Ten thousand blacks and six thousand whites seemingly lived on the island in harmony under "the absolute justice of the laws concerning education, trades and suffrage." Since the abolition of slavery two generations earlier, the blacks earned their livelihood in the trades and their children attended the schools. Suffrage for both races depended upon the same qualifications, sixty pounds of real or personal property. But no "social equality" prevailed between the races. Whites, of course, controlled the government, but "the situation of the blacks" was "the best" that Eliot had "ever seen for that race."\footnote{\textsuperscript{45}}

Eliot and Lowell were men of reason. They believed that racial tension would be decreased if Negroes and whites lived as separate entities under equal protection of the laws. They probably mirrored the racial views of the Eastern academic establishment. On the other hand, since the American Indian already lived separately from

\footnote{\textsuperscript{44} Frederick G. Bromberg to Charles W. Eliot, June 17, Oct. 29, and December 27th, 1901; and January 15th, 1902, CWFP, 1893-1903, Box 123, folder 407 Bromberg, Frederick G. Bromberg to Eliot, February 26th, 1904, Box 204, folder Bromberg, Frederick G.; Box 234, folder Negro Problem in the Southern States; and Box 240, folder "Race," CWEP, 1903-1909.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{45} Eliot to Bromberg, 6 December, 1901.
whites, Eliot and Lowell opposed the infringement of his rights.  

Harvard and the other Eastern private colleges which admitted black students were undoubtedly more progressive than the mainstream of American opinion. They educated a significant number of black educators and a handful of black professional men. But their concern for the education of the Negro was limited to those few talented blacks who were brought to their attention by educators and ministers. No Eastern private college or university had, as yet, thought of recruiting black students as part of its educational policy.

Foreign Student Enrollment

In regard to the admission of students from foreign countries, the Lowell administration continued, but did not expand substantially the policies and practices of its

46 There were few, if any, American Indians at Harvard. But both Eliot and Lowell wrote Massachusetts Congressman Frederick W. Dallinger in 1922 on behalf of several Indian tribes. Eliot pleaded for a school for Navajo and other Indian children and later urged the speedy enactment of Senate Bill 966 "for the protection of the interests of the Pima Indians of Arizona" (Charles W. Eliot to Hon. Frederick W. Dallinger, 13 July 1922, Box 388: 1922, A-L; and Eliot to Dallinger 10 May 1924, and Dallinger to Eliot, 4 June 1924, Box 390: 1924, A-C, CWEP, 1909-1926). President Lowell wrote Dallinger in opposition to the Bursum Indian Land Bill (Senate 3855), because it did "a very gross injustice to the Pueblo Indians, whose land" was "taken away" (Lowell to Hon. Frederick W. Dallinger, November 22, 1922, ALLP, 1922-1925, #141 Indians).
predecessor. President Eliot had made Harvard a more cosmopolitan university in four ways: by encouraging qualified foreigners to study at Harvard; by providing university extension courses for the community, especially for school teachers; by educating Cuban and Porto Rican school teachers at Harvard Summer School; and by promoting exchange professorships with certain European universities and Western United States colleges. Harvard became one

\[\textit{For University Extension, see Harvard President's Report, 1909-10, pp. 19-21, 240-245; and A. Lawrence Lowell to [Professor Charles H.] Haskins, June 28, 1907, and Memorandum for the President, CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 227, folder Lowell, Abbott Lawrence. The Lowell family had sponsored evening lectures through the Lowell Institute, founded in 1836; and in 1907-1908, the Institute began free evening collegiate courses taught by Harvard instructors. In January, 1910, Harvard joined with seven other Boston area colleges and institutions in establishing the "Commission on Extension Courses" through whose programs adults, chiefly school teachers, could earn an Associate in Arts degree at Harvard, Radcliffe, Tufts, and Wellesley. The costs were to be met by students' fees, private gifts, and the Lowell Institute.}

\[\textit{To President Eliot belonged the distinction of encouraging Cuban and Porto Rican school teachers to study at Harvard. As George W. Pierson commented: "Harvard also manufactured supporters by its Summer School course for teachers. The education of Cuban teachers at Cambridge was an excellent advertisement." In 1900, some 1,450 Cuban school teachers came to Harvard for the six week summer session; 353 Porto Rican school teachers were brought to Cambridge in the summer of 1904 (Pierson, Yale, I, 239; Harvard President's Report, 1900-01, pp. 42-43; and 1903-04, pp. 36-41. and Appendix, pp. 337-340; A. L. Pitcher, A.M., "Porto Ricans At School," Boston Evening Transcript, August 10, 1904, p. 14; and the half a dozen letters relating to the Porto Rican teachers in CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 238, folder Porto Rico).}

\[\textit{Although the Lowell Institute had brought over foreign lecturers and famous Europeans had visited Harvard} \]
of the leaders among the American universities which opened their doors to foreign students and professors.

From the turn of the century until World War I, the enrollment of foreign students at American universities steadily, and in some cases dramatically, increased. In 1908-1909, for example, Harvard ranked fourth among American universities in terms of the total number of foreign students during the nineteenth century, the first formal exchange with foreign universities—with Germany—began in 1905-1906. Professor Francis Greenwood Peabody lectured on the Ethics of the Social Questions at the University of Berlin, while Dr. Wilhelm Ostwald of the University of Leipzig lectured on the Philosophy of Natural Science and on subjects in Chemistry at Harvard. Professorial exchanges with France evolved more slowly, but survived the outbreak of World War I. Due to the generosity of James Hazen Hyde, Harvard or one of the other American universities began sending in 1904-1905 a professor to lecture a half year at the University of Paris and a half year at six of the provincial universities. A Frenchman, on the Cercle Français Foundation, delivered a course of six public lectures at Harvard. But because Harvard wanted the benefit of a full semester's instruction, it proposed to the French government, in 1910-11, that professors be exchanged every two years (Harvard President's Report, 1904-05, pp. 45-47 and Appendix, p. 346; 1905-06, pp. 42-43; 1910-11, pp. 20-21; 1912-13, p. 6; 1913-14, p. 6; 1914-15, pp. 26-27; and 1915-16, p. 26; also Jerome D. Greene, "The Interchange of Professors in Universities: The Experience of Harvard University," March 8, 1906, JDGP, Box 3 Harvard: Miscellaneous, folder Harvard [1 of 2]; and Greene, Memorandum For Mr. Warren, CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 212, folder Exchange Professorship). In 1910-1911, Harvard began a half-year annual exchange with four Western colleges—Knox, Beloit, Grinnell, and Colorado—to which Carleton and Pomona were subsequently added (Harvard President's Report, 1910-11, pp. 21-22; 1912-13, pp. 6-7; 1913-14, p. 6; 1914-15, pp. 26-27; 1915-16, p. 26; also Wendell S. Brooks, Yale '08, Assistant Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Northwestern University, "Exchange Professorships, Suggestions for a Closer Relationship between Yale and the Middle West," YAW, XXXIII (November 30, 1923), 279).
students enrolled. The University of Pennsylvania was the clear leader with 225, followed by Columbia with 166, Cornell with 157, and Harvard with 147. Far behind them came Yale (86), California (76), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (72), Northwestern (71), Michigan (69), and Illinois (62). Princeton had only 13 foreign students. As Table 4 showed, Pennsylvania led in the British Dominions and Latin America, while Cornell, which came in a close second in Latin America, led in the Far East. Harvard edged Columbia in Canada and had twice as many Chinese, but drew less than 10 from Japan. Two years later the total figures were Pennsylvania (205), Columbia (191), Cornell (161), Harvard (154), Yale (89), and Princeton (21). Foreign student enrollment was largely determined by the advantages offered by the different graduate and professional schools, since this was the kind of training most eagerly sought by foreigners. Pennsylvania's Dental School, for example, was a major reason why this university led in the enrollment of foreign students. In contrast, at Harvard, the College accounted for almost 40 percent of the foreign student enrollment and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences for almost 30 percent. 50

50 Rudolf Tombo, Jr., "The Geographical Distribution of the Student Body at a Number of Universities and Colleges," Science, N.S., XXX (October 1, 1909), 427-435, for 34 leading private and state institutions; and Tombo, "College Student Geography," Boston Evening Transcript, October 5, 1912, p. 3. See also Benjamin Rand, "Canadian Students in
### TABLE 4

FOREIGN STUDENTS AT PENNSYLVANIA, COLUMBIA, CORNELL AND HARVARD, 1908-1909 (COUNTRIES SENDING 10 OR MORE STUDENTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
<th></th>
<th>Columbia</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Great Britain and Ireland</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cornell</th>
<th></th>
<th>Harvard</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentine Republic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Great Britain and Ireland</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foreign students at Harvard ranged from the most familiar—Canadians—to the most exotic—Chinese, Japanese, and Siamese. According to Table 5 on foreign student representation in the University, the total number enrolled rose from 80 to 147 between 1900 and 1911.

Foreign students were a selected group in that they had to meet Harvard's academic qualifications, though educated abroad, and secure substantial financial support, including travel costs. Undergraduate scholarships were limited in number and open to all students who chose to compete; only a few were restricted to competition by selected individuals or groups. Hence most foreign students were supported either by well-to-do parents or by their government's generosity. In addition, both Harvard and certain American donors made it possible for small numbers of foreign students to study at the University. To foster German-American cultural contacts and to repay the hospitality once extended by German universities to many American students, the Harvard Corporation authorized President Eliot to offer the Prussian Minister of Education a ten-year agreement, beginning in September 1, 1908. Upon his recommendation, up to five German advanced students annually "should be exempted from the payment of the regular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1900-01</th>
<th>1904-05</th>
<th>1905-06</th>
<th>1906-07</th>
<th>1907-08</th>
<th>1908-09</th>
<th>1909-10</th>
<th>1910-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentine Republic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Minor</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria-Hungary</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British West Indies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Guiana</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. Brit. &amp; Ireland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>1900-01</td>
<td>1904-05</td>
<td>1905-06</td>
<td>1906-07</td>
<td>1907-08</td>
<td>1908-09</td>
<td>1909-10</td>
<td>1910-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roumania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Empire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Foreign</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependencies

<p>| Country       | 1900-01 | 1904-05 | 1905-06 | 1906-07 | 1907-08 | 1908-09 | 1909-10 | 1910-11 |
|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Hawaii        | 10      | 6       | 8       | 9       | 6       | 8       | 10      | .       |
| Porto Rico    | 0       | 1       | 3       | 3       | 3       | 4       | 5       | .       |
| Philippines   | 0       | 2       | 0       | 1       | 1       | 1       | 1       | .       |
| <strong>Total Dependencies</strong> | 10      | 9       | 11      | 13      | 10      | 13      | 16      | .       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1900-01</th>
<th>1904-05</th>
<th>1905-06</th>
<th>1906-07</th>
<th>1907-08</th>
<th>1908-09</th>
<th>1909-10</th>
<th>1910-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Foreign and Dependencies</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total University Enrollment</td>
<td>4314</td>
<td>4192</td>
<td>4009</td>
<td>4149</td>
<td>4065</td>
<td>3918</td>
<td>4213</td>
<td>4123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Harvard College Scrap Book Registration, Geographical Distribution, HUA; and Harvard University Catalogues, 1900-1911. Different sources gave slightly different figures.
tuition fee in any department of the University." This arrangement continued until the outbreak of World War I.51

The war affected the admission of foreign students to Harvard, and to other American institutions, in several ways: it decreased the total number of foreign students coming to the United States; it cut off almost entirely students from the Central Powers; and it fostered scholarship aid for students from Allied countries. After the war, several scholarships were established to bring British students to Harvard and send Harvard students to England: [Ambassador] Joseph Hodges Choate ['52] Memorial Fellowship (1919); and [ Lieutenan t] Charles Henry Fiske, 3d ['19], Scholarship for Study at the University of Cambridge, England (1919), and the Associated Harvard Clubs' Lionel de Jersey Harvard ['15] Studentship at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, England (1924). French students could apply for another scholarship established in memory of Lieutenant Fiske by his parents (1919) or for the Victor Emmanuel Chapman ['13] Memorial Fellowship (1917), founded by friends. To strengthen these ties, the Comité France-Amérique of Paris began in 1918 the award of a medal as the prize in an annual declamation on French civilization, to be delivered in French, called the "Concours oratoire pour la Médaille

51 Charles W. Eliot to Dr. Geheimrat F. Schmidt, July 17, 1908, CWE Letter Book 98, July 16, 1908 to June 4, 1909, p. 2-1/2.
France-Amérique."

Nor were Russian Allies forgotten. In the autumn of 1918, the Harvard Corporation granted free tuition to the sons of General Georges Daniloff, former 2nd Chief of Staff of Grand Duke Nicholas. The General had been a prominent military officer and wealthy landowner under the Czarist regime. When the Bolsheviks seized control of the government in November, 1917, the sons, Michel and Serge Daniloff, left Russia and were among those exiles brought to the United States by the American Council on Education. Because they impressed the Harvard Faculty by their honor work in Mechanical Engineering as well as by their diligence and personalities, President Lowell recommended that the Corporation again grant them free tuition for 1919-1920.53

Oriental Students

Of all the foreign students to come to the United


53H. J. Hughes to F. W. Hunnewell, April 28 and June 17, 1919; and "Russian Students Wishing To Enter American Universities, Pioneer Party, Serge Daniloff, Michel Daniloff," ALLP, 1917-1919, #366 American Council on Education—Russian Students.
States, those from the Orient were the most exotic. The admission of Chinese and Japanese students presented no racial problem in the Eastern United States, because the percentage of American-born Orientals living in that region was very small and because almost all the Oriental students at Harvard were foreign nationals. The admission of these Oriental students could hardly be interpreted as an example of the "Yellow Peril." Instead the education of Orientals appealed to American altruism and concept of the "white man's burden." Some Chinese, however, especially those among the nobility, decided to send their sons to European, rather than American universities, because of the Chinese Exclusion Acts. 54

Chinese students had attended Harvard in the late nineteenth century; its first professor of Chinese, Ko K'yun-hua, 1879-1882, had been brought to the University by Boston businessmen in the China trade. Although the number of Chinese students declined around the turn of the twentieth century, well over a hundred were enrolled during the five year period from 1906-1911. And Harvard was only one of some twenty colleges and universities which enrolled Chinese students. In 1908-1909, China, with 193 students, surpassed Japan's 158, and thereby became second to Canada.

242, in sending the largest number of students to the United States. This increase in numbers was due to a combination of factors: edicts of the Chinese Government recommending that sons of the nobility receive their education abroad; the progress made by Western missionary schools and colleges in preparing Chinese students; and the remission of the Boxer Indemnity funds by the United States. This money was to be used to educate 100 Chinese students a year for five years in the United States, and then fifty students annually for twenty-nine years. In addition, sympathetic colleges and universities as well as generous individuals provided additional scholarship funds.55

Harvard hoped that China would follow Japan's example in sending their best upper class students, men who would do for China what four Japanese graduates of Harvard University had done for their country, "namely, absorb, modify, adapt, and improve western ideas for eastern use."

55 For a brief sketch of Professor Ko K'un-hua (died 1882), poet and scholar of the Chinese Classics, who began the University's East Asian library, see Harvard Today, October, 1973, p. 73. George Marvin, "The American Spirit in Chinese Education," The Outlook, XC (November 23, 1908), 667-672. In 1872 the first group of Chinese students were sent to American educational institutions. After ten to twelve years, they were recalled before receiving their university degrees. In 1907-1908, there were 155 students in American schools, colleges, and universities supported by either the Imperial or one of the Provincial Governments, as well as about 200 other Chinese sent at their family's expense to study in the United States.
Count Jutaro Komura '77 Law School; Viscount Kentaro Kaneko '78 L.S., Mr. Shinichiro Kurino '81 A.B., Minister to Russia and later Ambassador to France; and Baron Tanetaro Megata '74 L.S., former Financial Administrator of Korea, were among the architects of modern Japan. For the education of China's future elite, Harvard offered to Sir Chentung Liang Cheng, His Imperial Chinese Majesty's Minister Plenipotentiary, to give such students (1) special terms of admission, (2) the services of a special adviser, (3) free tuition for those Chinese students who should need such aid, and (4) additional help towards board and lodging to an amount which would for the present be limited to $10,000, but might be enlarged as need should appear.

A fund of $10,000 was raised through subscription by Major Henry L. Higginson, one of Harvard's leading benefactors. At the time, this sum was the largest raised on behalf of any group of foreign students.  

Those Chinese students, who had prepared at Pei Yang University in Tientsin, Chihli Province, were placed

---

under the charge of Dr. Charles D. Tenney in 1906, in accordance with the request of the Provincial Viceroy, Yuan Shih-kai. Dr. Tenney was eminently qualified for the position of Director of Chinese Government Students, having graduated from Harvard before undertaking his career as a missionary and educator in China. He became president of Pei Yang University, a technical school, and also served as Chinese interpreter with the Allied forces during the campaign to subdue the Boxers. When he left his charges in Cambridge, Massachusetts in 1908 to become the Chinese secretary of the American Ministry at Peking, his duties were assumed by Mr. H. F. Merrill, former Commissioner of Customs at Tientsin. During the first year of this Chinese educational mission to America and England, the government sent abroad thirty-four students, who were joined by ten others paying their own way. Thereafter the Chinese government would send over an additional twenty each year indefinitely, half to Great Britain and half to the United States. The Chinese received training in law, engineering, scientific agriculture, or medicine.

In July, 1906, Dr. Tenney brought over some forty Chinese students to Harvard Summer School before distributing them to other colleges throughout the country. They studied English, German, and French in preparation for the Harvard entrance examinations. In September, fifteen of the group enrolled at Harvard, which impressed upon Dr. Tenney that in selecting students for the University he "send here at least an equal number of students who are of independent means." Harvard did not want to attract "an undue proportion of the poorer students" because it was already offering more beneficiary aid than other colleges. Fifteen of Tenney's Chinese students, perhaps about three-fourths of those Chinese enrolled in 1906-1907, received full tuition scholarships from Major Higginson's fund. With the exception of one freshman and one medical student, the remaining thirteen were admitted as College sophomores, eight of whom were in the Bachelor of Science program. For the academic year, the fifteen Chinese students earned more "C's" than "B's", but also more "A's" than "D's". The following year not only did all the Chinese students—twenty-six in number—pass their requirements, but several received honors. A Mr. Fen Ch'in won a first group stand, by earning mostly "A's". Some of the Chinese even had time for extracurricular activities: Mr. Ta Ch'ien Yeh was elected Vice-President of Harvard's Cosmopolitan Club his senior year and served on several class committees. At this time,
China was sending better students to Harvard than Japan.58

As far as social relations with other undergraduates were concerned, the Chinese, like the Japanese, were probably accepted on their own merits, as a Harvard dean observed:

I think that people in Japan can be assured that the right kind of Japanese youth will be greeted cordially by our undergraduates. Unquestionably, our students in general are provincial and regard with too much amusement and disfavor people who are very different from themselves, but the Harvard undergraduates who are worth knowing have, I think, a proper appreciation of likable youth of every kind of nation, and I think that really first-rate Japanese boys would have no more difficulty in forming desirable friendships, making desirable clubs, and so forth than any other youth would have.

Race was, then, a less important factor in undergraduate evaluation of Orientals than culture and social status. And student attitude was bound to be favorably influenced by the welcome the University extended to Orientals.59

In addition to providing scholarship assistance, the University liberalized its admission policies in regard to

58 Harvard President's Report, 1905-06, pp. 40-42; Marvin, "The American Spirit in Chinese Education," p. 672; Charles W. Eliot to Dr. Charles D. Tenney, January 30, 1907, CWE Letter Book 97, p. 28-1/2. See also CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 207, folder Chinese Students, for a number of letters pertaining to Dr. Tenney and his Chinese students; and Jerome D. Greene to Z. T. Toyosaki, December 16, 1907, Box 223, folder Japanese.

59 C. N. Greenough to A. Lawrence Lowell, June 15, 1923, Dean of Harvard College-Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27), #37 President Lowell 1922-27.
Chinese and Japanese students. One of the main impediments to their admission were the language requirements. While Orientals had to speak and write English quite well in order to complete degree requirements, it was hardly reasonable to require that they know Greek and Latin as well as the classics of their own literature. Although individual exceptions had been allowed years earlier, it was not until 1908 that Jerome D. Greene was asked by the Committee on Admission to propose revisions in the rules governing the admission of Oriental students. After consulting with Dr. Tenney, Greene proposed that the Chinese and Japanese Classics be accorded equal recognition and rated eight points in Ancient Languages. Secondly, in view of the study involved in learning both the Oriental Classics and English, he proposed that Oriental students be exempted from offering French or German for admission, although they would have to take one of these modern languages for their degree. The Faculty accepted the principles of Greene's proposals, and consequently Chinese and Japanese students found it less difficult, but not easy, to enter Harvard.  

60 Jerome D. Greene to Dr. Charles D. Tenney, Febr. 20, 1908, and Tenney to Greene, Feby. 25, 1908, handwritten, Box 252, folder on Tenney; Greene to Committee on Admission, J. G. Hart, Chairman, July 30, 1908, Box 208, folder Committee on Admission; "Proposal Concerning The Admission of Japanese and Chinese Students," Oct. 27, 1908, Box 223, folder Japanese; and "Voted to recommend to the
Harvard's interests in its Oriental students did not end with their admission and graduation. Cordial relations between the University and the Orient, especially Japan, were promoted and maintained in several ways: by the Harvard Clubs of Japan and China and by the Japan and Cosmopolitan clubs of Harvard University; by the work of the Harvard Medical School in China beginning in Shanghai 1911-12; by President Eliot's and Jerome D. Greene's correspondence with such distinguished Japanese alumni as Viscount Kentaro Kaneko; by long exhibitions of Japanese art to the United States; and by the awards of honorary Doctor of Laws degrees to Barons Kaneko and Komura. And Greene also tried to interest prominent Japanese in either supporting a Japanese lecturership or in endowing a professorship of Oriental civilization at Harvard as well as in increasing the library's collection of books on Far Eastern history and civilization. From 1913 to 1915, Masaharu Anesaki of the University of Tokyo served as a professor of Japanese Literature and Life at Harvard. Good will tours of Japanese officials to the United States and of American educators to the Orient also enhanced the relationship between Harvard and its Oriental students. For example, Baron Takahira, Imperial Japanese Ambassador,
Viscount Kentaro Kaneko, and General Baron Kuroki were among the distinguished Japanese who visited the United States and conferred with leading American officials. Among the Americans visiting the Orient were two prominent Harvardians: Professor Albert Bushnell Hart in 1908-1909 and President-Emeritus Charles W. Eliot in 1912. Both men subsequently published their observations: Hart's *The Obvious Orient* in 1911, and Eliot's *Some Roads towards Peace*, a report for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in 1914. They urged Americans to take an intelligent and sympathetic interest in China and Japan.\(^{61}\)

On the other hand, A. Lawrence Lowell never shared the enthusiastic interest of Charles W. Eliot and Jerome D. Greene in Oriental students. In fact, he had long believed in restricting Oriental immigration to the United States. Although Lowell once mentioned the importance of maintaining good will among the Chinese students, some of whom might become China's "future leaders," no additional funds

\(^{61}\) Jerome D. Greene to Rev. Tokutaro Sakai, May 16, 1905; Greene to O. Matsukata, December 27, 1906, September 27, 1907, and January 14, 1908; Greene to S. Morimoto, March 12 and 14, 1908; Secretary to the Corporation to Baron Komura, March 26, 1906; Kentaro Kaneko to Greene, July 21st, 1905, handwritten, and Mar. 26, 1908; and Shintaro Morimoto to Greene, March 13, 1903, CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 223, folder Japanese. Also Greene to Baron Kaneko, May 11, 1905, and August 27, 1906, CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 224, folder Kaneko, Baron Kentaro, Albert Bushnell Hart to Charles W. Eliot, December 17, 1908, and January 18, 1909, CWEP, 1903-1909, Box 217, folder Hart, Albert Bushnell.
were subscribed during his administration for their education at Harvard. In 1918, it was decided to use the $107 which remained of the $10,000 fund as small loans to Chinese students in the College. 62

When A. Lawrence Lowell assumed the presidency of Harvard University, he inherited an institution committed to cosmopolitanism and scholarship. Not only was the undergraduate body attracting sons of immigrants and other minority groups, but its graduate school had international representation and reputation. Professors from great European institutions of learning as well as school teachers from Cuba and Porto Rico came to Harvard; the first to instruct, the latter to learn. And Harvard also assumed an educational affiliation with several Western Colleges. Harvard had opened its doors.

Lowell kept the doors open by continuing the professorial exchanges and extension courses and by vigorously defending his professors' right to freedom of speech during and after World War I. But at the same time, he wanted to guard Harvard College from the ethnic challenge. The

results of Professor Albert Bushnell Hart's survey of the ethnic origins of students in Government 13b showed that the challenge had become serious. In February, 1922, Hart assigned a class room paper on "Personal Race and Descent," which was to cover four major points: "Territorial Relations and Immigration"; "Family Tree"; "Status and Services of the Family"; and education of family members and reasons for coming to Harvard. "Surprised" by the findings, Hart wrote Lowell that there were

only a fifth of those reporting as from the English colonial stock, and a fourth from Scotch and Scotch Irish, who register more men than the English stock. Of the forty-two men reporting, fifty-two percent are outside the element from which the college has been chiefly recruited for three hundred years.

The forty-two students were classified into seven groups:
9 English Colonial Stock; 11 Scotch and Scotch Irish; 4 Irish; 5 Continental (Dane, Norwegian, Swede, Polish Catholic, and Swiss); 8 Jewish (4 from Germany, Austria, or Hungary; 2 from Russia; and 2 intermarried with Protestants); 3 Africans; and 2 Asians (Chinese). One of the Chinese had the longest lineage—to 700 A.D.\(^{63}\)

Although educational advantages, prestige, and proximity were the three main reasons why students attended Harvard, there were some interesting variations in the

\(^{63}\)Albert Bushnell Hart to A. Lawrence Lowell, May 11, 1922, with enclosures: Government 13b People of the United States, Class Room Paper No. 1, "Personal Race and Descent"; tabulation on "Family and Race History"; and 42 student papers, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews.
answers given by the different groups. Three young men of English Colonial stock replied, respectively: "Harvard is in my blood, so to speak"; "Always wanted to come here as it appealed to me more than any other college, even when it was just the colors that I thought of"; and "I followed the tide of my friends in quest of further education."

One of the Negro students was attracted by Harvard's "heralded democracy and efficient curriculum;" while another, who served in France during World War I, came because he "saw the need of higher education for the Negro race," which prejudice made "impossible" for him to obtain in the South. The latter felt that "by going to a mixed school and coming in contact with different races would help" him "to try to solve the problem of" his "own race."\(^{64}\)

But President Lowell feared that so many ethnic and racial contacts would undermine the position of old stock Americans in the College. The diversity which might be tolerable in the University threatened College traditions. Whereas Eliot had tried to bring the University into the College, Lowell wanted to protect the College from the cosmopolitanism of the University. That was why he advocated both a quota for Jewish students and a limitation on the Freshman Class to 1,000 during the 1920's.

\(^{64}\) Ibid., 42 student papers.
CHAPTER VI

HARVARD: RESTRICTION DEBATED, 1922

'The President stated that there could be no doubt that the primary object in appointing a special Committee was to consider the question of the Jews and that if any member of the Faculty doubted this, let him now speak or forever after hold his peace.'

--President A. Lawrence Lowell to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, June 2, 1922.

Anti-Semitism, politely described as the "principles and methods for more effective sifting of candidates for admission to the University," was hotly debated in Harvard faculty meetings, private gatherings, personal correspondence, and the public press in 1922-1923. Growing Jewish enrollment, combined with several decades of festering anti-Semitic feeling in the nation, precipitated Harvard's crisis. Within a few months, the University community divided itself into two opposing camps, the one based upon principle and the other on prejudice and expediency. It was a minor Dreyfus Affair, during which the resentment of some Anglo-

---

1 President A. Lawrence Lowell to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University, June 2, 1922, Records, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, XI (1918), 236 (Office of the Secretary, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, University Hall); dictated statement from President Lowell to George W. Cram, June 2, 1923 [1922], to be incorporated in the Minutes of the Faculty Meeting of June 2, 1922, R and P 312, Faculty of Arts and Sciences Reports and Papers, XI (1918), HUA.
Saxon Harvardians toward the admission of Jewish students to the "Yard" almost matched that of the French military caste toward the promotion of Captain Alfred Dreyfus to the General Staff. In both cases, the established families resented the encroachment of the talented newcomer and assumed a proprietary control over their institution.

President Lowell led Harvard's "caste establishment" in attempting to halt what it considered a Semitic invasion. He was motivated by expediency probably as much as by personal conviction. Although repeatedly denying anti-Semitic feeling, he agreed substantially with the criticism of rising Jewish enrollment voiced by certain Harvard alumni. According to President-Emeritus Eliot, Lowell's proposal to limit Jewish admissions developed in response to pressures from Harvard graduates in New York City, Louisiana, and Texas in January, 1922. That spring Lowell himself "while travelling through Western cities" heard "that one reason why the Harvard Clubs have difficulty in getting students is because Harvard has the reputation of having so many Jews." He also learned that "the same talk" was "heard in the great preparatory schools." An alumnus of the Harvard Club of Southern California asked whether Harvard was considering any plans "which would leave our University free of this plague," which was "enveloping Yale" and had "completely submerged Columbia." Given this sentiment, it was perhaps expedient for President Lowell to
pacify influential alumni, since the Endowment Committee had launched a campaign to raise $15,000,000 in 1919-1920. 

First Inquiries

Apparently, President Lowell first inquired into the number of Jews in Harvard College in February 1920, after receiving a letter from an influential Harvardian. In reply to Lowell's inquiry, the Dean's Office noted the difficulty of determining the exact number of Jewish students because of their tendency to change names. But "the impression of those in the Dean's office" was "that the number of Jews this year" was "about what it always has been here and that during the war the percentage of Jews was larger than it had been before." Lowell did not immediately take any steps to effect a change in admissions policy, but during the next two years the conviction apparently grew in his mind that there were too many Jews in the College. In January 1922, the Dean's Office observed that

Mr. Lowell feels pretty strongly that of the scholarships controlled by us the percentage allotted to Jews in their first year in Harvard College should not exceed the percentage of Jews in the Freshman Class. I understand that to be about fifteen percent.

A quota on the number of scholarships open to Jewish students would tend to limit the number of Jews admitted to the College since higher education for a poor boy depended upon financial assistance. The Committee on Scholarships and Other Aids for Undergraduates pointed out to President Lowell that the present announced terms for the award of scholarships made it difficult to reject scholastically qualified applicants. Thus the Committee voted in April, after consultation with Lowell, that Harvard College and Engineering School scholarships be awarded primarily on the basis of high scholarship, but only to men of approved character and promise, and that stipendiary scholarships be awarded only to students who are in need of money, except in the case of a few special scholarships which, in accordance with the wishes of their founders, are administered as prizes without regard to the financial need of the applicant.

The new terms obviously extended the discretionary authority of the Committee, but they were published in the University Catalogue. 3

These discussions within the administration came to the attention of Julian W. Mack, LL.B. '87, Judge of the United States Circuit Court, New York, and the first Jewish

3Author of letter unidentified, but referred to in Dean C. N. Greenough's Memorandum for President Lowell, February 17, 1920; see also Memorandum for Mr. Greenough, February 16, 1920; Greenough to Lowell, April 6 and 28, 1922, #36 President Lowell, Feb. 1919-1922; and Greenough to Assistant Dean K. B. Murdock, January, 1922, #42 Mr. K. B. Murdock 1919-1927, Dean of Harvard College-Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27).
member of the Board of Overseers. In March and April of 1922, Judge Mack, past president of the first American Jewish Congress (1918-1919) and former head of the Zionist Organization of America (1918-1921), conferred with President Lowell, who explained:

It is the duty of Harvard to receive just as many boys who have come, or whose parents have come, to this country without our background as it can effectively educate: including in education the imparting, not only of book knowledge, but of the ideas and traditions of our people. Experience seems to place that proportion at about 15%.

Immigrant sons of Russian Jews, Armenian Christians and Russian Slavs in particular, implied Lowell, so resisted Harvard's benign tutorial influences that the College had to work extra hard to educate them effectively. In order to limit the percentage of these students, especially Jews, who were about 20 per cent in the present Freshman Class, Lowell proposed that the College exercise its discretionary authority more strictly in regard to provisional Freshmen, to transfer students, and to line cases admitted under the New Plan examinations. A high percentage of Jewish students was found in the first two categories. Consequently, the President estimated in regard to the current Freshman Class that

if we excluded all but the clearly desirable Jews who came from other colleges or who had not fully passed the examinations under the new plan, the percentage would have been reduced to 15%. It seems to us that to do this would be preferable to putting any limit upon the number of any class of boys who are admitted through the regular entrance examinations. Being an exercise of discretion already possessed by the committee, it would require no further action by any of the
governing bodies; nor would it involve what Harvard cannot do, - that is, purporting to have entrance examinations open to everyone, and really excluding certain boys whom the examinations show to be intellectually qualified for admission.

According to this letter, the methods by which Lowell proposed to eliminate the academically weaker applicants seemed reasonable. What was arbitrary was the fact that he singled out the Jews among the provisional Freshmen, transfer students, and line cases. Undoubtedly, a number of Gentile students in these same categories of admission were equally bad risks. But Lowell's objective was to reduce the percentage of Jewish students in the College; the obvious target was the academically weaker Jewish applicants.4

Judge Mack was quick to point out to President Lowell that he had shifted the focus of his proposed limitation from the immigrant classes to Jews per se. "By what test," the Judge inquired, "do you determine which Jews or which immigrant Jews or which individuals, of the immigrant classes, are 'clearly desirable'?" Moreover, he found Lowell's method "as substantially as much of a subterfuge as Columbia's psychological test,—a test that you said had cut the

4 Julian W. Mack to A. Lawrence Lowell, March 27 and 30, 1922; and Lowell to Mack, March 29, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews. See Judge Mack's obituary in the New York Times, August 6, 1943 and other clippings in his Quinquennial File in HUA.
percentage of Jews from 40 to 16, and as you and I believed, aimed primarily, if not solely, at this result." In his reply to Mack, Lowell defended his proposed methods of limitation. Although the same objection "applies to the other immigrant classes who lack in the same way American traditions," it was "natural to speak of the Jews in this way, because they are the only immigrants in this condition who come to us in large numbers." Hence the terms "Jew" and "immigrant" ostensibly were interchangeable in Lowell's mind. Whereas Columbia's psychological test excluded a large number of academically qualified students, said Lowell, Harvard proposed to question an applicant's "desirability as a member of the College" only if he did not seek admission by achieving a satisfactory grade on the regular entrance examination.\footnote{Mack to Lowell, March 30, 1922; and Lowell to Mack, March 31, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews.}

Judge Mack, however, asked the Dean's Office for statistics on the scholarship stand of Jewish students. He wanted the test of desirability to be based upon academic performance. But President Lowell argued:

The question that troubles us is the discipline for offenses of a moral nature, dishonesty, etc.; where the difference of background, of foreign standards, etc., counts heavily. The cases where discipline is imposed for such causes are not numerous, but they are an important indication of character, because the instances where the offense is discovered and punished are only a part of those where the offense is committed,
many others not being discovered. Lowell apparently believed that the amount of student or rather Jewish student wrongdoing was in the nature of an iceberg: the largest part remained undetected. In pursuit of his iceberg, Lowell dispatched the following memorandum to the Dean's Office:

You have basely gone back on me. Somebody told me that of the fourteen men dismissed last year for cheating and lying about it, thirteen were Jews. Now you make out that there were twelve of them, of whom only five were Jews. Please produce at once six more!

The memorandum displayed Lowell's rather heavy-handed sense of humor as well as his predisposition to act on insufficient evidence in such a matter. During the same period in which he became more and more convinced that the proportion of Jews in the College had to be limited, he wrote Senator Le Baron B. Colt in support of a joint resolution passed by the House of Representatives extending the Three Per Cent Immigration Law.6

But Judge Mack was not to be appeased by material and statistics prepared by the Dean's Office and approved in advance by President Lowell. And by April, 1922, several other Overseers also became concerned over what they sensed was a change in policy. Jerome D. Greene, formerly Secretary

6 A. Lawrence Lowell to Julian W. Mack, April 4, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews; Memorandum From President Lowell, April 6, 1922, and C. N. Greenough to President Lowell, April 6, 1922, # 36 President Lowell Feb. 1919-1922, Dean of Harvard College-Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27).
to President Eliot and Secretary to the Corporation, represented in large measure Eliot's point of view on the Board of Overseers. Or rather, both men thought alike on matters involving Harvard's traditional admission policy. Following a meeting of the Overseers' Committee on Harvard College, during which he and the other members of the Committee conferred with Dean Chester N. Greenough and Admission Director Henry Pennypacker, Greene presented his views to Lowell. His analysis of the problem differed markedly from the President's:

The real kernel of this problem seemed to consist not in any question of the relative delinquency of the class of students in question as to either scholarship or conduct, but in the actual disinclination, whether justified or not, on the part of non-Jewish students to be thrown in contact with so large a proportion of Jewish undergraduates.

To alleviate the so-called "Jewish problem" which originated as much as, if not more, in the minds and attitudes of non-Jews as in the personal characteristics of the Jews, Greene, speaking on behalf of the Overseers' Committee, suggested that the Corporation authorize a Faculty study of the entrance examination system as well as other methods of admission. The object would be to devise a method of selection "whereby numbers would be kept down or reduced, and the student body limited to the most promising individuals without reference to any question of race or religion." The effect of such a method "would undoubtedly be to reduce materially the number of those Jews who are of
objectionable personality and manners, but it ought not to exclude any Jews, as such, and it ought to admit the sort who are of unquestionable character and all-round promise."

Unlike President Lowell, Greene did not want to limit the number of Jews in the College because they were Jews; he did realize that Harvard would have to become more selective as the number of applicants increased. But his criteria of selection was based more on academic accomplishment than on the subjective attributes of character. Moreover, Greene and his Committee counselled delay and further study of the admissions problem; President Lowell wanted an immediate change of policy.  

In fact, by April 14th, the day before Greene wrote his letter to Lowell, the President had sent two propositions, aimed specifically against Jewish applicants, to the Committee on Admission:

'(a) That Hebrews applying for admission to Harvard College and the Harvard Engineering School by transfer from other colleges and technical schools be rejected except such applicants be possessed of extraordinary intellectual capacity together with character above criticism.

'(b) That in determining questions of admission under the New Plan all doubtful or line cases shall be investigated with the nicest care, and that such of this number as belong to the Hebrew race shall be rejected except in unusual and special cases.'

7Jerome D. Greene to A. Lawrence Lowell, April 15, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews.
In presenting these propositions, Lowell was acting in stealth as well as in haste. If the Committee on Admission had accepted them, he would have succeeded in by-passing both the Overseers and the Faculty in effecting a reactionary change in Harvard's admission policies. The object, of course, was to weed out the less qualified Jewish applicants and to reject almost all Jews who sought admission by transfer by special, subjective admissions tests of intellect and character.  

But Chairman Henry Pennypacker, speaking for a unanimous Committee on Admission, told President Lowell that

the action proposed involved a departure from a practice of long standing well known and understood by the Faculty, of which this Committee is merely the administrative servant. It was therefore felt that the Committee should not practice discrimination without the knowledge and assent of the Faculty. To practice such discrimination, in the opinion of the Committee, would be to make material alteration in the requirements for admission to Harvard College and the Harvard Engineering School as ordered by the Faculty - action which the Committee does not feel authorized to take without the Faculty's direction.

The Committee's vote revealed, first, a clear-cut recognition that the two proposals involved discrimination against Jews, although it also expressed "some concern" over the increasing number of Jewish students. Secondly, the Committee considered itself the "administrative servant" of the Faculty, not of the President. And thirdly, it pointed out to

8 Henry Pennypacker to A. Lawrence Lowell, May 3, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews.
Lowell that the Faculty voted upon admissions requirements at Harvard; therefore it must be consulted before any changes in these requirements could be effected. At the heart of the growing controversy over Jewish admissions at Harvard was the genesis of a conflict over authority between a strong-willed President and an essentially timid, yet generally enlightened, Faculty.9

About a week after Pennypacker's reply to Lowell, he addressed the Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences on May 9, 1922. According to the proposal on the docket, "'The Committee on Admission will consult the Faculty about delegating to the Committee a larger measure of discretion in the selection of candidates for admission to the College.'" Since the discussion which followed was of a general nature and did not lead to a vote, it was unlikely that the Faculty as a whole knew, at this time, what issues were at stake. Only 88 members out of a possible total of 193 professors and administrative officers were present. Of this number, all were eligible to vote, except the President himself.10

The next Faculty meeting on May 16, however, was attended by 98 members. Attention focused exclusively on

9Ibid.

10Harvard University, Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Meeting of May 9, 1922, Records, XI (1918), 226; R and P 309, Faculty of Arts and Sciences Reports And Papers, XI (1918).
the proposal introduced at the previous meeting. During the ensuing discussion, several Faculty members introduced significant resolutions. The first, by Arthur Norman Holcombe, Chairman of the Department of Government, stated that the Faculty had "'heretofore approved the policy of including in the educational process at Harvard College due care for the moral development and social discipline of the students,'" an object which was to be achieved by residence in the University dormitories. He, then, resolved that no transfers or line cases be admitted unless they had "'the moral character and social capacity to profit by and duly contribute to the serviceability'" of a Harvard education.\(^{11}\)

Two other professors proposed to delay immediate action. Albert Bushnell Hart (Eaton Professor of the Science of Government) "'moved that the Committee on Admission be instructed to report such changes in the conditions of admission as in its judgment are now desirable.'" Such a report would, of course, be open to Faculty discussion. And William Ernest Hocking (Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity) made the motion which would ultimately be carried at a later meeting: "'That a special committee be appointed by the President to consider principles and methods for more effectively sifting

\(^{11}\)Harvard University, Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Science, Meeting of May 16, 1922, Records, XI (1918), 228.
candidates for admission in respect to character." This meeting was adjourned, however, without a vote being taken.\textsuperscript{12}

Impatient with the slowness of Faculty deliberations, Lowell was busy building his case for a Jewish quota. He collected from the different schools within Harvard University statistics on the percentage of Jews in each class, the percentage of Jews subject to disciplinary action, and the percentage of Jews in each group on the Rank List and among those earning Degrees with Distinction. Such figures were hardly conclusive, because of the difficulty in determining accurately who was Jewish. At the Law School, for example, two members of the staff relied on their personal recollections over a twenty-two year period. The Medical School said the only means it had to determine whether a student was Jewish was his name, until the spring of 1922 when applicants were required to submit photographs. In spite of these limitations, Lowell believed that the statistics would ultimately convince most of the Faculty of the need for a Jewish quota.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p. 229.

\textsuperscript{13} Professor Edward H. Warren, Law School, to A. Lawrence Lowell, with page of statistics, 12th May 1922; Elizabeth C. Putnam, Medical School, to Lowell, May 12, 1922; Students of Hebrew Nationality, one page, from the Business School; Percentage of Jews in Various Departments of the University, 1921-22; Enrollment of Jewish Students 1921-22; Students Under Discipline, April 1, 1922; Connections Severed, 1921-22; Connections Severed for Improper Conduct, 1916-17 to 1920-21, two tables; Distribution of Students by Rank
During May 1922, Lowell also presented his views in writing to some members of the Faculty. One of his most interesting exchanges was with William Ernest Hocking. In a letter of May 18, Professor Hocking recognized the difficulty of the problem and referred to the practice adopted by Williams College whereby certain Jewish alumni screened out the "less desirable" among the Jewish applicants. In general, older Jews were more likely than younger ones to acknowledge that a "'Jewish problem'" existed and to cooperate in seeking a satisfactory solution. As far as Harvard was concerned, Hocking pointed to a confusion in the minds of the Faculty over the specific object of limitation: Was it Jews per se or just those Jews who were "undesirable." "This difference," wrote Hocking, "creates

List Groups, Mid-years, 1921-22; Degrees with Distinction, 1920 and 1921; and A. B. Hart to Lowell, May 27, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews. While Jewish enrollment in the University had increased substantially since the beginning of the century, Jewish students were still a minority. In 1921-1922, Jews constituted the following percentages in the various departments: 19.2 in the College; 18.0 in Engineering School; 8.4 in Business School; 21.4 in Dental School; 14.0 in Medical School; 16.5 in Law School; and 9.8 in Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Jewish students ranked high on the Honor List and in the number of Degrees earned with Distinction. And some of the best of these had been transfer students. Although 43 Jewish students, or 11.2 percent of the total, were under discipline as of April 1, 1922, none of these students ranked above Group IV, and 21 of them were in the bottom group, VII. Percentages were deceptive, however, because according to the table on Connections Severed 1921-22, 100 percent of all students charged with offenses at the Library were Jewish. But only one student was involved.
a further and rather explosive difference as to whether a
given course is 'candid' or not." He thought that "if the
'undesirable Jews' were eliminated the question of the pro-
portion of Jews would automatically disappear," because
their "presence . . . casts a spot-light on all . . . com-
patriots and makes them conspicuous." If Harvard was con-
cerned with their numbers, it would need the cooperation of
the Jews themselves, since they were "the only ones who can
help us without raising the cry of racial discrimination."
But if Harvard wanted to exclude just those of poor quality,
Hocking believed that "the combined efforts of our Jewish
alumni and of additional tests on our own part would make,
. . ., a prompt impression." One possibility for such
sifting would be the still imperfect psychological tests.14

President Lowell's reply to Hocking revealed that
his animus went beyond opposition to any increase in the
number of "undesirable" individual Jews to any increase in
the number of Jews per se. According to Lowell:

The main problem caused by the increase in the
number of Jews comes, I take it, not from the fact
that they are individually undesirable, but from the
fact that they form a distinct body, and cling, or
are driven, together, apart from the great mass of
the undergraduates.

He, then, presented an implied analogy between Jews at Har-
vard College and Jews driving away Gentiles from a summer

14 William Ernest Hocking to A. Lawrence Lowell,
May 18, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews.
hotel, from a private school run by one of his friends in New York City, and from Columbia College. He did not want Harvard to suffer the same fate. In other words, Jews were a blight not because they had bad characters, but because they drove away Gentiles. "Therefore," reasoned Lowell, "any tests of character in the ordinary sense of the word afford no remedy," because "the number of men who could be rejected by any such process is very small, and would not, I think, touch the real problem." Not only had Lowell departed from objective academic tests in measuring the qualifications of Jewish applicants, but he now went further in refusing to be bound by the usual character tests. The reason was simple: not enough Jews could be excluded by reasonable tests of any nature. But it "would be wholly wrong," be added, for a college to refuse to admit any Jews, like many summer hotels. Instead he extended to the Jews what he considered to be a generous offer: "We must take as many as we can benefit, but if we take more, we shall not benefit them and shall ruin the college."15

Lowell proposed several ways to limit the number of Jewish students: first, a percentage system which could be applied to any group of men who did not mingle indistinguishably with the general stream, - let us say Orientals, colored men, and perhaps I can imagine French Canadians, if they did not speak English and

15A. Lawrence Lowell to Professor William E. Hocking, May 19, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews.
kept themselves apart; or we might limit them by making the fact that men do not so mingle one of the causes for rejection above a certain percentage. This would apply to almost all, but not all, Jews; possibly, but not probably, to other people.

Congeniality was thus made a factor in admission policy. The implication was clear: most Jews were not, in Lowell's view, congenial. Possibly this same standard might be applied to certain other minority groups, chiefly to persons of color or to the non-English speaking. Lowell placed the burden of being congenial and of mingling upon the minorities, when, in fact, such a process was a two-way street. But for the time being, Lowell would apply this subjective standard to all transfer students and marginal candidates, while a committee studied the situation and prepared a report to be presented the following year.¹⁶

For his own part, Lowell preferred "to state frankly that we thought we could do the most good by not admitting more than a certain proportion of men in a group that did not intermingle with the rest, and give our reasons for it to the public." He expected "some protest," yet believed that "reasonable people" would recognize it as "the wise and generous thing." But he realized that the Faculty and the Governing Boards would prefer the more subtle method of enlarging the discretionary authority of the Committee on Admission. An example of this sentiment was the motion introducted by Professor Arthur N. Holcombe at the May 16th

¹⁶Ibid.
Faculty Meeting. As Lowell interpreted this motion, Holcombe "did not want it to be supposed that the Jews were excluded simply because they were Jews, but because they possessed the qualities common to Jews, although not absolutely universal." This was, of course, Lowell's circuitous way of saying that Jews should be excluded because of their Jewish qualities.\(^{17}\)

In closing his letter to Professor Hocking, President Lowell made it clear that he did not want any euphemistically phrased Faculty resolutions to obscure the issue at stake. It was, Lowell wrote,

> of greatest importance...that the Faculty should understand perfectly well what they are doing, and that any vote passed with the intent of limiting the number of Jews should not be supposed by anyone to be passed as a measurement of character really applicable to Jew and Gentile alike.

Again Lowell insisted upon a double standard in evaluating Jewish and Gentile students.\(^{18}\)

He explained his justification for such a standard in a similar letter to Rufus S. Tucker, instructor in the Department of Economics: "The fact is that the theories on which we have been proceeding - that all men are born free and equal, etc. - are not absolutely true, but true within

\(^{17}\)Ibid.  
\(^{18}\)Ibid.
certain limits." Having rejected this tenet of the liberal creed, it was easy for Lowell to take the next step and deny that Jews should be treated as individuals. In an earlier, homogeneous society, one "could consider only the qualities of the individual." But "we are now faced by an actual group segregation, in which the important factor is not the quality of the individual, but of the group." Lowell believed that he was approaching the problem as a scholar and man of science examining "group psychology," but the implication was frightening.19

Faculty Meetings of May 23 and June 2, 1922

During the remainder of 1922, Lowell would continue to correspond with the Harvard Faculty, among them Professor Hart and Hocking, George Lyman Kittredge (Gurney Professor of English Literature) and George Foot Moore (Frothingham Professor of the History of Religion). The next Faculty meeting generated further correspondence. For example, the May 23 meeting, which followed three days of debate, was probably one of the most heated in Harvard's annals. The resolutions and votes of this meeting revealed a confusion in the minds of many Faculty, 109 of whom were present. First, the three resolutions of May 16 were

reintroduced. Then Lowell's brother-in-law and "intimate friend," James Hardy Ropes (Hollis Professor of Divinity and Dexter Lecturer on Biblical Literature) made a three-part motion, which would become the subject of intense debate at this and at a subsequent, special Faculty meeting. In considering the admission of transfer students and marginal candidates, the Committee on Admission, he said, should be 'convinced that their presence as members of the College will positively contribute to the general advantage of the College.

'2. ...instructed to take into account the resulting proportionate size of racial and national groups in the membership of Harvard College.

'3. That in the opinion of this Faculty it is not desirable that the number of students in any group which is not easily assimilated into the common life of the College should exceed fifteen per cent of the whole College.'

This motion, whether by previous agreement with the President or by coincidence, embodied Lowell's views. Not only did Ropes urge the Committee on Admission to consider the size of racial groups in admitting transfer students and marginal candidates, but he also wanted the Faculty to agree to a general fifteen per cent limitation of minority groups. The words, "'not easily assimilated,'" of course, were a thinly veiled reference to Jews. This measure would be voted upon and passed, in part, by the Faculty on May 23rd. 20

20 Harvard University, Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Meeting of May 23, 1922, Records XI (1918), 230-231. A. Lawrence Lowell to Professor William E. Hocking, June 1, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews. Eliot to Straus, 21 December 1922.
Before this motion was passed, however, several others were made. David Gordon Lyon (Hancock Professor Hebrew and other Oriental Languages and Curator of the Semitic Museum), moved that a Faculty committee be appointed to confer with "'representative Jews, and others, among whom shall be graduates of the College, with the object of finding some solution acceptable to all interests concerned, and consistent with the liberal, democratic spirit of the University.'" To bring order to this series of proposals, Mathematics professor Julian Lowell Coolidge moved that they vote first on the May 23 motions of the Professor Ropes instead of on Professor Holcombe's of May 16. The Faculty agreed. Ropes's motion was then subjected to several amendments, which revealed the degree to which individual Faculty members wanted to deal bluntly with the issues. For example, Charles Jesse Bullock (George F. Baker Professor of Economics) moved that a third class of students be subjected to the special scrutiny of the Admission Committee—those not intending to live in the Freshman dormitories. It was rejected. Another professor of Mathematics, George David Birkhoff, moved that the less definite words "'should not be increased substantially'" replace the specific limitation of "'fifteen per cent'" in the third paragraph of Ropes's motion. Obviously, a number of professors were disturbed by the bluntness of this paragraph, because the Faculty voted, upon the motion of George Lyman
Kittredge to strike it out.  

Then Edmund Ezra Day, professor of Economics, asked that Ropes's motion be so divided that its remaining two sections could be considered separately. The President ruled that this be done. After other amendments were voted down, the professor of Divinity moved that the first section of his motion, with amendments, be adopted:

'That from the following groups of candidates for admission to Harvard College
(a) Candidates for admission by transfer from other colleges and technical schools;
(b) Candidates for admission by examination who have not adequately satisfied all the requirements; the Committee on Admission be instructed to admit, for the academic year 1922-23, only applicants concerning whom the Committee is not merely satisfied (as at present) as to their mental attainments and moral character, but, in addition, is convinced that their presence as members of the College will positively contribute to the general advantage of the College.'

The motion was adopted without a recording of the affirmative and negative votes.  

This was not the case, however, with the second paragraph of the motion. One of the professors asked that the ayes and nays be recorded when the motion, concerning "'racial and national'" proportions in the College, came to a vote. Henry Wyman Holmes, Dean of the Graduate School of Education, moved to substitute a specific statement on keeping "'the Jewish group . . . , at its present relative

21 Faculty Meeting, May 23, 1922, pp. 231-232.

22 Ibid., p. 232.
position," but this amendment lost. After two other amendments were accepted, the Faculty voted on the motion, which now read:

"That, pending further action by this Faculty, the Committee be instructed, in making its decision in these cases, to take into account the resulting proportionate size of racial and national groups in the membership of Harvard College."

It was carried 56 to 44, with two, one of whom was Jewish (Leo Wiener, Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures), not voting. The fact that many moderate and even liberal men, including one Jew, voted in favor of the motion, and that one or two of those who favored a more explicit measure voted against it showed that it was a basically unsatisfactory measure about which many had grave doubts. The implications of the motion, it would appear, were not immediately recognized by those voting in its favor.  

23

The Faculty next considered the motion made by Professor Lyon about the appointment of a Faculty committee to confer with "'representative Jews, and others.'" Since this motion also stated that "'the recent, rapid increase of Jewish students . . . , has excited apprehension in many minds,'" the Faculty voted, 50 to 37, to replace it with the briefer May 16 motion of Professor Hocking, as amended by Professor Hart:

'That a special committee be appointed by the President to consider principles and methods for more effectively sifting candidates for admission.'

23 Ibid., pp. 232-233.
Shortly thereafter, the meeting adjourned, having approved the third important measure in regard to the "Jewish problem." 24

During the next five days, the Faculty awoke to the implications of its actions and circulated two similar petitions addressed to President Lowell, requesting that he call a special Faculty meeting to reconsider the votes. The petitions recognized "that the action of the Faculty relating to controlling the percentage of Jews in Harvard College is a radical departure from the spirit and practice of the College, and so precipitate that fair notice" could not be extended to candidates for the fall of 1922. The signers, moreover, believed "that racial considerations should not influence the Committee on Admission before a careful and deliberate study of the whole question of the Jews shall have been made by the Faculty." Of the thirty-one petitioners, nineteen had voted against the second paragraph or part of Professor Ropes's motion, four had voted for it, and the remainder had apparently been absent from the meeting. Few of Harvard's big names in the humanities signed the petitions; the exceptions were Charles H. McIlwain (Professor of History and Government), Byron S. Hurlbut (Professor of English and former Dean of the

24 Ibid., pp. 233-234.
College), Edward C. Moore (Parkman Professor of Theology and Plummer Professor of Christian Morals), and David G. Lyon. The following professors also signed: William F. Osgood (Mathematics), William McDougall (Psychology), Edmund E. Day and Allyn A. Young (Economics), John A. Walz (German), Arthur B. Lamb (Director of the Chemical Laboratory), G. W. Pierce (Director of the Cruft Memorial Laboratory), George G. Wilson (International Law), and Messrs. Rufus S. Tucker (Economics) and A. C. Hanford (Government and later Dean of the College). Of course, many may have been unwilling to sign a petition for a variety of reasons unconnected with their personal feelings about Jews. 25

One major Harvard figure, who had voted for the controversial second paragraph and who did not sign the petition, had, nevertheless serious doubts about the measure. Le Baron Russell Briggs (Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory and Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences) sympathized with the petitioners, but thought it more appropriate to express his dissatisfaction in a letter to the President, a man with whom he was on friendly terms:

This dissatisfaction, so far as I can judge, springs not from a feeling that nothing should be done but from

---

25 Four petitions dated May 28 and 29, 1922, signed by various members of the Faculty, requesting President Lowell to call a special meeting of the Faculty to reconsider the step it had taken on May 23, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews. McDougall, author of Is America Safe for Democracy? (1921), voted for the restrictive measures of May 23 and June 2, 1922.
a feeling that we are taking one of the most important steps ever taken in the history of the college and are taking it without knowing thoroughly the ground we step on. A petition is in circulation requesting another meeting of the Faculty this week for further discussion of what, in the opinion of some members, went through pretty quickly after all, with a minority vote that was uncomfortably large and with a majority vote from which no sure inference may be drawn as to the feelings of the individual voters.

The vote had been too close—only a dozen more in the affirmative than in the negative—to justify a new departure in admission policy. Moreover, many Faculty members did not really know for what they had voted. As Briggs related to Lowell, he had been told by Professor Lyon of

two men who voted against the first motion and for the second, voting for the second, as I understand it merely because they were unwilling to leave the first unexplained by the second, although they were opposed to both. As I myself was in a similar position, I think there may be still more of the majority who voted as they did for similar reasons.

Briggs, then, voted against the first, but for the second motion, "to avoid camouflage" of the issue. 26

The Faculty's dilemma was painful: many agreed that something had to be done, but did not exactly know what should be done. The contemplated "change of policy," said Briggs, "seems contrary to the best Harvard traditions; yet, paradoxically, without a change of policy the best Harvard

26 L. B. R. Briggs to A. Lawrence Lowell, May 29, 1922, pp. 146-147, and Briggs to Professor F. W. C. Lieder, May 31, 1922, p. 150, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Correspondence (L. B. R. Briggs 1902-1925), Letters from April 3, 1922-July 26, 1923.
traditions may be destroyed." But he acknowledged that Harvard's "responsibility to the Jews who have given us money is pretty serious. As he subsequently wrote Judge Mack, he and several other Faculty members wanted the President to confer first with a number of prominent Jews. Because of the dangers of mishandling the problem as well as the need to find a plan behind which the Faculty should unite, Briggs counseled delay and the calling of another Faculty meeting to reconsider the business of the last. 27

Meanwhile Harry Wolfson, Assistant Professor of Jewish Literature and Philosophy, was meeting with his friends on the Harvard Faculty to prepare a strong statement against those members who favored a quota on Jewish students. Professor Wolfson and Dr. Henry M. Sheffer, Lecturer on Philosophy, had, of course, voted against the second part of Ropes' motion. Although Wolfson never formally presented his paper to the Faculty, because that body rescinded its controversial vote on June 2, 1922, it was an effective counterattack. The Lithuanian-born Wolfson well knew what quotas meant to Jews in Russia; he did not want to see them imposed at Harvard. "You assume," he said to proponents of restriction,

27 Briggs to Lowell, May 29, 1922; and Briggs to Julian W. Mack, June 2, 1922, pp. 153-154, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Correspondence (Briggs), 1922-1923.
that Jewish students coming to the University bring with them ideals and loyalties different from those of other students, that they are still to go through the so-called process of assimilation and be made over into good Americans, that assimilation is not complete until no two Jews are ever seen to walk together in the College Yard, and that the assimilation of Jews beyond a certain percentage is impossible. I say that all this should be made a subject of thorough study and investigation.

Referring to statistics on Jewish students to forecast their future behavior, Professor Wolfson asserted that there were "many among us who believe neither in old-fashioned fatalism nor in new-fashioned statistical pre-ordination." And personal interviews with local committees of Harvard graduates were also unreliable. "It may be readily admitted," he said, "that outward appearance is a proper test for selecting book agents, bond salesmen, social secretaries and guests for a week-end party," but he "hardly" thought "this to be a proper test for the selection of future scholars, thinkers, scientists, and men of letters." 28

Professor Wolfson's statement was temperate. To be sure, he called attention to the questionable basis underlying arguments for a Jewish quota, but he was not a militant. He gave Lowell credit for saying that he would "take the best scholars" among the Jewish applicants, "irrespective of their social backgrounds." The President would not accept "only the

28 Harry Austryn Wolfson, "Remarks on proposed changes in admission policy in Harvard University," May or June 1922. Typewritten. (Estate of David Gordon Lyon, Jr.), HUA.
sons of the rich Jews" under a quota, but would admit "the best Jews, even of the poorest families." President Lowell treated him well and approved of his promotions. In 1924–1925, with money for his chair provided by Jews outside the University, Wolfson became the Nathan Littauer Professor of Jewish Literature and Philosophy.29

As might be expected, President Lowell was not pleased with these developments among the Faculty. In his view, the Faculty voted to limit the number of Jewish students when it passed the first motion by such a margin that no one even called for a show of hands. But then some questioned whether the Committee on Admission had the power to limit Jews under the first motion. According to Lowell, to have rejected the second motion would have left the Committee in a hopelessly unfair situation. They would have been given power for a definite purpose, and then the Faculty would have refused to vote that it was in favor of the purpose. It is obvious that many members of the Faculty, in spite of the debate for three days, were not clear in their own minds what, in each case, they were voting for.

At the very least, Lowell wanted to keep intact the first of the votes, although he showed some signs of yielding temporarily in regard to the purpose of the second vote.30


30 Lowell to Hocking, June 1, 1922; Briggs to Mack, June 2, 1922.
Lowell received another candid letter from Professor Hocking, who had voted against Ropes's second motion, but was not certain whether he should sign the petition. He mentioned to the President a plan suggested by Drs. Harry A. Wolfson and Henry M. Sheffer for limiting the admission of Jews through Jewish agencies and pointed to "a remote analogy" with the Japanese government's limitation on emigrants. Like many other Harvardians, Hocking wanted to preserve the character of the College. He had "no desire to see the undergraduate body become a Cosmopolitan Club," although he took "pride in the cosmopolitan character of our Graduate School." Yet he could not "work up any alarm at the emergency" and wanted a less radical measure than the one enacted by the second vote of May 23rd.31

Lowell agreed with Hocking that Harvard should cooperate with prominent Jews and said that several had been consulted before the Faculty became involved in the discussions. But it was debatable whether Lowell "found a general feeling that it was for their interest, as well as that of the College, that the number of Jews should be limited." Judge Mack certainly did not agree with what seemed to him to be an arbitrary limitation. But President Lowell tended, in certain matters, to choose facts which

fitted his thesis. He pointed to the growth of anti-Semitic feeling in the country and among Harvard undergraduates. Such animosity was caused by the Jews themselves. "If," as Lowell later wrote to Professor George F. Moore, "all the Jews who come to Harvard College should retain their characteristics, but on admission be overcome with an oblivion of the fact that they were Jews, even though all the Gentiles were perfectly aware that they were Jews, more than half the difficulty would be overcome." If the Jews could not forget that they were Jews, however, their numbers would have to be limited to reduce anti-Semitic feeling. Although Lowell did not object to postponing final action until a committee of investigation had reported, he told Hocking that "the Committee on Admission should use their powers under the first of the votes passed the other day in such a way that there should be no substantial change in the composition of the student body in the coming year." But he had not counted upon either the strength of the growing Faculty revolt or the opposition of "a large majority" of the Board of Overseers.32

32 Lowell to Hocking, June 1, 1922; A. Lawrence Lowell to George F. Moore, October 3, 1922, ALLP, 1922-1925, #8 Jews. Eliot to Straus, 21 December 1922. Apparently, the Board of Overseers met following the May 23 Faculty Meeting and many of them so disagreed with Lowell's conclusions about increasing Jewish enrollment that they influenced Faculty members to call for a special meeting in which to rescind their controversial votes.
Lowell agreed to call a special meeting of the Faculty for Friday evening, June 2, 1922. Present were 111 members, including the President and Dean Briggs. The article in the Docket was on the "'Further consideration of the votes passed on Professor Ropes's motions at the meeting of May 23, 1922.'" Professor Edmund E. Day, who had voted against the second motion and who subsequently signed the petition, moved that these votes--both sections of Ropes's motion--be rescinded. But Lawrence Joseph Henderson, Professor of Biological Chemistry, introduced a substitute motion for the same two votes: "'That the Committee on Admission be instructed, pending the report of the special committee to keep the proportion of Jews in Harvard College what it is at present.'" Such a measure would, in fact, fulfill Lowell's objectives. The issue at stake was clear: would the Faculty accept any measure specifically limiting the admission of Jews?33

Meanwhile three professors: Briggs, William McDougall (Professor of Psychology), and Paul Joseph Sachs (promoted to Associate Professor of Fine Acts in 1922), gave their reasons for voting affirmatively on the second motion of May 23rd. In a letter which he read to the Faculty, Sachs

33 Harvard University, Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Special Meeting of June 2, 1922, Records, XI (1918), 235-236.
explained that he voted against the first motion, but for the second, in order to make clear the purpose behind the first. Had the motions been presented as a whole, rather than being divided into three separate parts, Sachs would have cast one negative vote. Because the Faculty applauded Sachs' statement, Lowell asked him shortly thereafter to serve on the investigating committee.34

After hearing the three professors, the Faculty voted to consider Henderson's substitute motion before Day's motion to rescind. But, in what was probably the first reliable index of Faculty sentiment on these issues, the Faculty rejected Henderson's motion by a vote of 64 negative to 41 affirmative. Although a majority was clearly against any specific limitation on Jews until after the investigating committee had reported—a defeat for President Lowell—a number of big Harvard names, past, present, and future, supported restriction prior to the report. But the day was carried by the liberals and moderates when, by a show of hands, 69 for to 25 against, the Faculty rescinded the first two votes of May 23rd, leaving only the third vote extant—regarding the appointment of a special committee "to consider principles and methods for more

---

34 Ibid., p. 235; Paul J. Sachs to G. W. Cram, May 31, 1922, R and P 311, Faculty of Arts and Sciences Reports and Papers, XI (1918); and A. Lawrence Lowell to Paul J. Sachs, June 3, 1923, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews.
effectively sifting candidates for admission."  

But Professor Charles J. Bullock argued that if publicity was given to the activities of this committee, President Lowell should then state that its purpose was indeed "'to consider the matter of the increasing number of Jews applying for admission to the College.'" Nothing came of this motion. The next morning, however, President Lowell dictated to George W. Cram, Secretary of Faculty of Arts and Sciences, a statement to be incorporated into the minutes of the June 2nd meeting: "'The primary object in appointing a special Committee was to consider the question of the Jews.'" And if any Faculty member still did not understand this, Lowell said: "'Let him now speak or forever after hold his peace.'"  

Privately, Lowell told George Lyman Kittredge that he was at least partially satisfied with the results of the meeting, because the Faculty now understood that it was

---

35 Special Faculty Meeting, June 2, 1922, pp. 235-236. The following were among those voting against Henderson's motion: Professors Briggs, Wiener, G. G. Wilson, Hurlbut, McIlwain, Lyon, Greenough, Sachs, Hocking, Holmes, Day, Langfeld, Holcombe, Graustein, and Wolfson, and Messrs. Cram, Merk, Phoutrides, Tucker, and Hanford. Among those voting for the motion were Professors Hart, Kittredge, Bullock, Cabot, Ropes, Ward, Carver, McDougall, J. L. Coolidge, Merriman, Henderson, Birkhoff, and Conant, and Mr. Pennypacker.

36 Ibid., 236-237; dictated statement from Lowell to Cram, June 3, 1923 [1922], R and P 312.
confronted with "a Jew problem." Realizing that "the majority of the Faculty clearly did not want to restrict the number of Jews pending the investigation," Lowell "did not see any object in being a 'die hard.'" He believed, moreover, that the Faculty would accept a restriction on Jews if the Committee reported it to be necessary. And in his own mind, Lowell was convinced that the Committee would see the facts as he saw them: "I have no doubt that they will so report, because I think I know the situation well enough to be persuaded that there is no other solution." 37

Appointment of the Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates for Admission

The first step was to secure approval from the thirty member Board of Overseers for the appointment of a special Committee. An official copy of the record of this June 5 meeting, by Secretary Winthrop H. Wade, was terse. After Lowell's presentation of the three votes of May 23rd and the rescinding action of June 2nd, there was some "debate," followed by a vote of the Board:

That a Committee drawn from the Faculties of the University be appointed by the President of the University to consider and report to the Governing Boards principles and methods for more effective sifting of candidates for admission to the University, of which the committee authorized by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall be a part.

37A. Lawrence Lowell to George L. Kittredge, June 3, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews.
In other words, the Overseers voted to expand both the representation and scope of the Committee from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to include the whole University. The Committee would focus, however, on the admission requirements to the College, since the Graduate and professional schools had their own specialized prerequisites. But the University would also be affected by whatever general admission principles it endorsed for the College. 38

Because of the far-reaching and sensitive nature of the Committee's task, all Faculties of the University were represented. Of the original thirteen men whom Lowell asked to serve, eleven agreed. The two who could or would not, for whatever reason, were Archibald Cary Coolidge (Professor of History and Director of the University Library) and Oscar Menderson Schloss (Professor of Pediatrics, 1921-1923). Instead Professors Rosenau and Lyman joined the other eleven members on the Committee, whose Chairman was Charles H. Grandgent '83 (Professor of Romance Languages).

38 Record of a Meeting of the Board of Overseers of Harvard College in Cambridge, Winthrop H. Wade, Secretary, June 5, 1922, ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers; Harvard University, Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Meeting of June 6, 1922, Records, XI (1918), 238; "Report of the Committee Appointed 'To Consider And Report To The Governing Boards Principles And Methods For More Effective Sifting Of Candidates For Admission To The University," April 11, 1923, 6 pages printed, p. 1 (hereafter cited as "Report of The Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates"), ALLP, 1922-1925, #387 Admission to Harvard College: Report of Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates (hereafter shortened to #387 Admission to Harvard College).
These members were, in the order listed: Samuel Williston '82 (Dane Professor of Law); Milton J. Rosenau, hon. '14, (Charles Wilder Professor of Preventive Medicine and Hygiene); Harry E. Clifford (Gordon McKay Professor of Electrical Engineering); Henry Pennypacker '88 (Chairman of Committee on Admission); Theodore Lyman '97 (Professor of Physics and Director of Jefferson Physical Laboratory); Wallace B. Donham '98 (Professor of Business Economics and Dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration); Chester N. Greenough '98 (Professor of English and Dean of Harvard College); Lawrence J. Henderson '98 (Professor of Biological Chemistry); Paul J. Sachs '00 (Associate Professor of Fine Arts and Assistant Director of the Fogg Art Museum); Roger I. Lee '02 (Henry K. Oliver Professor of Hygiene); Henry W. Holmes '03 (Professor of Education and Dean of the Graduate School of Education); and Harry A. Wolfson '12 (Instructor in Jewish Literature and Philosophy). The Faculty of Arts and Sciences was represented by seven men, Medicine by two, and Business Administration, Education, Engineering, and Law, by one each.  

Lowell's appointments were interesting both because of whom they included and whom they did not include. For

example, there were three Jews: Rosenau, Sachs, and Wolfson, but the militant Felix Frankfurter, Byrne Professor of Administrative Law, was conspicuously absent. Also on the Committee were at least two or more representatives of President Lowell's point of view: Henderson and Donham, definitely, and probably Lee and Pennypacker as well. But there were also impartial men like Greenough, who had voted "nay" on both motions, and was an obvious choice as Dean of the College. On the whole, the Committee represented the various points of view on the issues as well as the different Faculties within the University. 40

Underneath the surface calm, dissatisfaction was widespread among the Harvard family. The June 5th Overseers's meeting was far from tranquil, although apparently ending on a "satisfactory" note. Jerome D. Greene wrote Lowell several days later to explain his "position of apparent antagonism to your views at the last meeting," since they were "both aiming at the same end, which included both the best interests of Harvard College and the best interests of

40 Jerome D. Greene to Charles W. Eliot, June 10, 1922; and Eliot to Greene, 13 January 1923, JDGP, Box 6, folder 1922-1923 the Jewish question--and Negro question. Le Baron Russell Briggs to T. F. Taylor, July 17, 1922, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Correspondence (Briggs), 1922-1923, p. 236. Briggs felt that the "Jew question . . . had been somewhat mismanaged, though the management is on the right track now in forming a committee with some Jews in it." He considered Paul Sachs to be an excellent choice.
the Jews." Although Greene did not rule out the possibility that the Committee might agree with Lowell, he did not want it to focus its attention narrowly on the Jews. He felt that a careful selection of Jews, as of other candidates for admission, based on evidences of their all-round promise, will result in a much better body of students than can be obtained by reliance merely on the present examinations, and that whether the resulting ratio be five, ten or fifteen percent., or whatever it may be, the effect will be both to mitigate present evils and, what is more important, to do a greater service to the country by encouraging the best elements and fitting them for leadership.

A better system of selecting all students, as Greene saw it, would benefit the College and diminish the "Jewish problem," by eliminating the weaker Jewish students.41

In fact, the Overseers had approved a broad interpretation of the Committee's scope, according to both Greene and Judge Mack. But the direction which any committee took was largely determined by its personnel. It was essential, the Judge wrote Lowell, that

This Committee must have men on it who thoroughly appreciate the point of view that Jerome Greene and I emphasized and that the Overseers adopted, namely, that while the question of the larger number of Jews now going to the College has provoked this inquiry, the problem

41 Charles W. Eliot to Jerome D. Greene, 7 June 1922, JDGP, Box 6, folder 1922-1923 the Jewish question--and Negro question; Jerome D. Greene to A. Lawrence Lowell, June 10, 1922, Dean of Harvard College Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27), #16 Sub-committee on Sifting of Candidates for Admission, 1922-23.
to be considered by the Committee is a very much broader one,...This involves fundamentally a consideration of the place and the obligations of Harvard College and Harvard University in the life of the American people at this time and in the future.

Although some of Lowell's appointments to the Committee were satisfactory, Mack wanted men like Felix Frankfurter, or Roscoe Pound (Carter Professor of General Jurisprudence and Dean of the Faculty of Law), or David Linn Edsall (Jackson Professor of Clinical Medicine and Dean of both the Faculty of Medicine and the Medical School). Frankfurter, of all the Jewish Faculty members, he told Lowell, would be the best possible choice. Not only did he have the legal training, but he was a Vienna-born German Jew who was well acquainted with East European Jews. He would be able to evaluate fairly the problem created in part by the East European Jewish applicants, whose numbers were increasing in the College, but whose fitness for a Harvard education was being called into question. On the other hand, Paul J. Sachs, whom Lowell appointed to the Committee, was "far removed from the element that you have in mind as coming particularly within the scope of that part of the inquiry which you deem most important." Sachs, a member of the committee to raise $10,000,000 in 1924, was connected with the German Jewish elite in the United States. And while Harry Wolfson understood "all classes of Jewish students," he was "such a scholar pure and simple" that when he sought Mack's counsel, the Judge advised him to decline the
appointment. Although Mack was expressing his own opinions, he was also the spokesman for a number of prominent Jews, one of whom was Louis Marshall, president of the American Jewish Committee. Moreover, a friend had authorized him, in the event the Corporation lacked sufficient funds for the investigation, "to defray not less than one-fourth of the expense, in the expectation that the total expense will not exceed $10,000."\(^2\)

Lowell was cool to the Judge's proposals. He did not anticipate that the expenses of the investigation would be high. Dean Pound was unavailable since he was in Europe and, as for Professor Frankfurter, Lowell did not believe him suitable for service on the Committee. Frankfurter, like Brandeis in 1916, was not trustworthy:

All the members of the Committee ought, if possible, to be persons in whom all Harvard men feel confidence, and you know that there are many people—including many on the Governing Boards of the University—who have not that feeling towards Professor Frankfurter. Their sentiment may be unjust, but it is real; and the very fact that it exists would have an unfortunate effect. Many people with a high opinion of Professor Frankfurter's ability do not trust the solidity of his judgment.

True enough, Frankfurter had some critics on the Governing

Boards but Mack did not surrender easily. Contacting Lowell again by letters and telegram, he pointed out that Dean Pound was returning from Europe in June and reiterated his confidence in Frankfurter.\textsuperscript{43}

Judge Mack also visited President-Emeritus Eliot to recount the Overseers's meeting and to discuss his reactions to the situation at Harvard. On two occasions he brought with him Professor Frankfurter and a Jewish student at the Harvard Medical School. All were critical of and unhappy about the recent developments at Harvard. Mack implied that Lowell was "'disingenuous'" in both word and deed and described those Faculty members who voted with the President at the May 23rd meeting as "'mentally confused, or in a foolish panic, or ... 'disingenuous.'" And Frankfurter believed that Lowell was "not only disingenuous, but tricky, in discussion and executive action." The young man "was so depressed about his own experiences as a Jew in the Harvard Medical School, that he contributed nothing to the talk at either meeting, except sadness and hopelessness." Eliot had no intention of making public statements about the situation, but he expressed "a grave disappointment and astonishment ... that so considerable a proportion of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences lost their heads, even temporarily, on

\textsuperscript{43}A. Lawrence Lowell to Julian W. Mack, June 7 and 14, 1922; Mack to Lowell, June 9 and 13, 1922; and telegram, Mack to Lowell, June 15, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews.
these fundamental questions in Harvard policy." As for President Lowell, Eliot questioned whether he was in fact "'disingenuous'"; sadly he described his successor as a man who was "resolute," even tactless, in his pursuit of what he believed to be the truth, yet "ingenious, though abrupt, in justifying those decisions." Because Eliot was temperamentally so different from Lowell, he became the rallying point for all those opposing the latter's campaign to change Harvard's admission policy. Though staying in the background, Eliot, even at eighty-eight years of age, could not remain silent during the ensuing months.

Alumni, Undergraduate, and Public Reaction

In spite of efforts by Eliot, Mack, and others to keep the controversy from the public domain, the mere hint that Harvard was considering a new departure in admission policy was sufficient to arouse the press, which generally catered to its readers' prejudices by labeling the University as undemocratic. And Lowell himself announced at Commencement the appointment of the Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates for Admission. Once the alumni got wind of the situation, moreover, they began to write letters to Eliot and Lowell. As might be expected, those who wrote Eliot condemned the new developments, while many of those

44 Charles W. Eliot to Jerome D. Greene, 7 June 1922, JDGP, Box 6, folder the Jewish question—and Negro question.
writing Lowell favored some limitation on Jews. The volume of correspondence was further swelled by the growing alumni awareness in June, 1922 that Harvard excluded Negro students from the Freshman Halls. And the time lapse between May, 1922, when news of the Jewish controversy first spread beyond the confines of the Yard, and April, 1923, when the Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates for Admission released its report, contributed to public rumors and private suspicions. But in March and April, 1923, Harvard would report momentous decisions in regard to both the Jewish and Negro questions, decisions which would allay, for the most part, both rumors and suspicions.

The reaction of both Gentile and Jewish students and alumni as well as the newspaper reports of the controversy cast light upon the depth of ethnic and racial prejudice in America of the 1920's. Jews might come to Harvard, but that did not mean they were accepted as equals by their WASP classmates. Lowell's attack on the Jews had been motivated in large measure by alumni criticism of increasing Jewish enrollment. He was confident that this vocal opposition represented the vast majority of alumni opinion. Eliot, for his part, hoped that the contrary was true. Although Eliot declined to write an article explaining Harvard's admission policy for the Harvard Graduates' Magazine, he spoke briefly to a meeting of the Associated Harvard Clubs in Sanders Theatre on June 16, 1922. After his talk,
which was well received, Eliot had to make some impromptu remarks to head off "a row in the meeting over the Jewish question." An altercation, provoked by the demand of President Clarence C. Little of the University of Maine and former Secretary to the Harvard Corporation, that Harvard disavow any intended discrimination in admissions, could only lead to unfavorable publicity. But Lowell and the investigating Committee had to be persuaded that "a decided majority of the Alumni and of the students themselves are strongly opposed to any such departure from the traditional policy of Harvard College." The best vehicle of alumni opinion would be editorials and letters in the Harvard Graduates' Magazine or the Harvard Alumni Bulletin. Strong statements against racial quotas would be fairly and widely publicized by the newspapers. While the alumni made its influence felt in this way, Eliot would quietly confer with the members of the investigating Committee. 45

But the debate could not be kept within the Harvard family or even within the limits of newspaper reporting. The first anonymous leak to the newspapers came on May 30th or 31st, in the Boston Post, whose headline blared: "Jewish

Ban Is Opposed At Harvard," followed by "Leaders of Students Body Organized to Fight Propaganda Started Outside Ranks of University--Believe in Equal Opportunity," and by "Some Think Agitation Is Scheme Fostered by Henry Ford." Since this was a misrepresentation of student reaction and of what actually happened, Harry Starr '21, President of the Harvard Menorah Society, wrote an article entitled "The Affair at Harvard, What the Students Did," which was published in the October issue of The Menorah Journal. Student concern over growing anti-Semitism preceded, in fact, the Faculty debates of May and early June. David Stoffer, Chairman of the Jewish War Relief Drive, was told in "a casual conversation" with "a leading Christian undergraduate" that there was "a growing prejudice against the Jew in the University." Stoffer talked with Starr, and they both consulted Professor Harry A. Wolfson about choosing four or five student representatives to meet with the same number of non-Jews. In addition to Stoffer and Starr, three others were selected: Max Fredrick Goldberg, President of Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity; Paul Harmel of Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity and member of the Harvard Debating Council; and Richard J. Mack of the Argo Club. Before meeting with their Gentile counterparts, the young men conferred with their Faculty advisers, Professor Wolfson and Dr. Henry M. Sheffer. The Jewish students went to the first conference, held April 12th at the Harvard Crimson building, "determined
to stand with dignity upon the unqualified right of the Jews to be at college regardless of the occasional disciplinary infractions of some or the willingness of others to sacrifice extra-curricular glory for academic distinction."

They met with three campus leaders: R. R. Higgins, football player and Student Council member; J. Corliss Lamont, a Harvard Crimson editor, "whose father is renowned among America's financiers for his economic liberalism, and who himself represented the best type of fresh American boyhood, combined with much Yankee 'horse sense'"; and B. Del Nash, secretary to the editorial board of the Harvard Lampoon. Also present was a Faculty member and prominent Bostonian, "who, in that manner peculiar to New England, reveres the democratic ideal while not relaxing his faith in the destiny of his own kind." Although the conversation became more relaxed as the afternoon progressed, the Jewish students found that they were dealing with misconceptions and stereotypes of themselves as Jews. A Jew, for instance, was considered as a Jew when trying out for the athletic teams and other extra-curricular activities, but was "given

46 Boston Post, marked 5/31 in HUA file on "Clippings on the Race Question, 1922"; Harry Starr, "The Affair at Harvard, What the Students Did," The Menorah Journal, VIII (October, 1922), 263-264. Without the "scoop" in the Boston Post, the whole matter might have been settled quietly within Harvard (Professor Harry A. Wolfson, interviews, July 30, and 31, 1973).
fair treatment." Indeed Jews captained three sports, although Arnold Horween, former Varsity football captain, changed his name from Horwitz. And though Jews were excluded from social clubs so were many Christians. After the meeting ended, the Jewish committee talked with Dean Greenough, who supported their fact-finding endeavors, but also told them "with admirable honesty . . . how puzzled he had been to find a way of allaying a growing undergraduate feeling that there were too many Jews." This was the essential fact which the Jewish students learned from their several conferences. Starr wrote that

while we had entered them believing that the existent feeling came from the dislike of certain Jews, we learned that it was numbers that mattered; bad or good, too many Jews were not liked. Rich or poor, brilliant or dull, polished or crude—too many Jews, the fear of a new Jerusalem at Harvard, the 'City College' fear.47

The second conference, on May 8th, came to an impasse. The Gentile students felt that "a few good Jews were quite delightful at the club, or at the hotel—but that they must not 'for their own sake' accumulate, even though that accumulation be induced by the worthy feeling that Harvard was the best place in the world." Unconvinced, the Jewish students continued to oppose any limitation of their numbers. After hearing of the Faculty discussions on this subject, they went to Dean Greenough and insisted that "the vast

majority of self-respecting Jews stood on their absolute right to be at Harvard." They considered themselves first and foremost "Americans."^48

On the advice of Professor Wolfson, the five Jewish students wrote a strongly stated letter to Dean Greenough just before the May 23rd Faculty Meeting. As representatives of the Menorah Society, the major Jewish organization on campus, they rejected any limitation upon the admission of Jewish students and any categorization of some Jews as "'undesirable.'" Although they, themselves, could not estimate the letter's effect on the Faculty, they did meet with several members who expressed opposition to limitation. They were especially appreciative of "Professor David Gordon Lyon's leadership at trying moments, his logical forceful arguments, his firmness," in persuading Faculty members against limitation. Professor Lyon had voted against the two racially discriminatory motions of May 23rd and June 2nd.49

48 Starr, "The Affair at Harvard," pp. 266-268. President Lowell reinforced undergraduate anti-Semitism. According to Victor Kramer '18, Lowell told him, during a Christmas Eve train ride to New York, that the Jews must totally assimilate, that he planned to limit the proportion of Jewish students at Harvard to 15 per cent, and that irrespective of their individual merits, "'too many Jews at Harvard were to be feared.'" It was surprising that this conversation took place since Lowell did not, as a rule, give interviews. Although he said that Kramer "'grossly misrepresented his views,'" Lowell make similar statements in his letters (Boston Herald, Jan. 16, 1923, "Clippings on the Race Question, 1922").

As good Harvard men, the five Jewish students were indignant over the sensationalist newspaper accounts. Not only did such stories fill the air with suspicion and alarm the alumni, but they also brought criticisms from the Cambridge City Council and a threat of investigation from the State Legislature. For the most part, the Jewish students believed that the newspaper charges of discrimination against Jews in athletics, clubs, and dormitories were exaggerated. They were "incensed at what was now the dirtiest piece of muck-raking to which Harvard had been exposed." And they were also concerned about "the general feeling among students that some Jewish men had conspired to 'squeal.'" The Crimson attracted undergraduate attention on June 5th, when it quoted the statement which the Secretary to the Corporation, Frederick Lewis Allen, had issued to the press: It was "'natural that with a widespread discussion of this sort going on, there should be talk about the proportion of Jews at the College.'" And "'the whole problem of limitation of enrollment'" was and might continue to be "'in the stage of general discussion, . . . for a considerable time.'" This issue also included an unofficial letter from one of the Crimson sub-editors, Charlton MacVeagh '24, who blamed the Boston American's recent outburst against Harvard on false statements allegedly supplied by Jewish students. He refuted charges of discrimination and the allegation that Professor Roger B. Merriman (History),
assisted by Professor Richard C. Cabot (Clinical Medicine and Social Ethics), was "in charge of the drive of the faculty and corporation against the Jewish." MacVeagh branded the anonymous Jewish students as cowards, examples of the "'objectionable qualities'" shown by Jews—"'of slandering an innocent person behind his back and then running away.'"^50

This invective evoked from a number of Jewish undergraduates strong denials of any complicity with the leaks to the press. Writing unofficially on behalf of his committee, Harry Starr argued that it was "'unfair'" to assume that only Jewish students were involved in supplying information to the newspapers. He pointed out the rather obvious fact that the stories were pasted together from several sources and embellished by vivid reportorial imaginations. It was questionable whether the press was genuinely concerned with helping Jews or rather was merely interested in making good copy by attacking Harvard. On the whole, Starr felt

50Ibid., pp. 270-273; and New York Tribune, June 2, 1922, and Boston American, June 3, 1922, "Clippings on the Race Question, 1922." See also Dr. Richard C. Cabot to A. Lawrence Lowell, March 11, 1922, handwritten; and Lowell to Cabot, March 14, 1922, ALLP, 1919-1922, #1056 Jews. Both Cabot and Merriman voted affirmatively on the two restrictive measures of May 23 and June 2, 1922, but Lowell advised Cabot not to write an article for the Alumni Bulletin suggesting that Harvard follow national percentages in admitting those of immigrant stock. It would stir additional controversy at a time when they were already at work on a plan "for restricting the percentage of immigrant Jews in the College."
that MacVeagh spoke for only a minority of the Gentile students. He expected, too, that the recently appointed Committee on Sifting of Candidates for Admission would pursue its investigations impartially.  

The other side of the undergraduate story was revealed by the answers to a question given by Dr. Richard C. Cabot on a Social Ethics examination.

'Discuss as fairly as you can this question: For the good of all persons concerned, is a college ever ethically justified in limiting to a certain percentage the number of any particular race who are admitted to the freshmen class each year?'

Eighty-three men from the upper three classes responded, of whom "forty-one believed in the justice of a policy of race-limitation under certain circumstances." Thirty-four opposed any restriction, of whom seven were Jewish, while eight were undecided, including one Jew. Although "the restrictionists agreed that '...the endowed college' was "'a private corporation'" with "'a public function, recognized by the state,'" they believed that Harvard should maintain a racial balance. Since Harvard had been founded by Anglo-Saxons, they shuddered at the possibility that it would graduate so many Jewish alumni that control of the University would pass into their hands. The purpose of a college education, moreover, was to train future leaders: Jews were generally deficient, the restrictionists believed, in those traits of character and personality which were part

of leadership, even though many of them were able scholars. But some called the Jews mere grinds, who "'memorize their books!'"\textsuperscript{52}

There was a wide range of opinion among the restrictionists. Some distinguished between the exceptional Jewish students, who were truly cosmopolitan like the Chinese, and the less gifted, but "'arrogantly objectionable'" Jews. Others would extend the principle behind Oriental exclusion not only to Jews, but also to Irish, "'or what amounts to the same thing, the Catholics.'" One student wished that Jews would follow the example of Catholics, who "'long ago saw the folly of forcing themselves on the American college, and built institutions of their own,'" or Negroes who also attended their own colleges. While anti-restrictionists agreed that undesirable individuals should be excluded, they argued that a university should represent the intellectually able:

'To tell a Cohen, whose average on the college board examination was 90, that he cannot enter because there are too many Jews already, while a grade of 68 will pass a Murphy, or one of 62 a Morgan, hardly seems in line with the real interests of the college.'\textsuperscript{53}

The implication that Harvard was an institution for rich men's sons, but not for poor immigrant boys, was also part of a long-standing town-gown conflict. It was not mere

\textsuperscript{52}William T. Ham, "Harvard Student Opinion on the Jewish Question," \textit{The Nation}, CXV (September 6, 1922), 225-226.

\textsuperscript{53}Ibid., pp. 226-227.
coincidence that one of the two State Representatives calling for an investigation of Harvard was Stephen C. Sullivan of Ward 1, East Boston; the other was George Pearl Webster of Boxford. Representative Sullivan's order read in part:

'BE IT FURTHER ORDERED: That a special committee be appointed by the Legislature to investigate the necessity or desirability of permitting Harvard, should its plans to become a private and restricted institution be consummated, to enjoy exemption from taxation upon its realty and holdings.'

Although Harvard was within its legal rights to change its admission policies, President Lowell certainly did not want a confrontation with a hostile Legislature, especially since the University's tax-exempt status had always meant a higher tax rate for Cambridge property owners. On June 3, Lowell personally explained to House Speaker B. Loring Young that the only decision taken so far by the Faculty was to vote for the appointment of a special investigation committee. Indeed, Harvard was not without allies on Beacon Hill: more than 150 Harvard graduates sat in the State Legislature, including Speaker Loring. No formal investigation followed. ⁵⁴

Nevertheless, Harvard and Lowell had to endure criticisms from the press, politicians, and labor leaders. The Boston Telegram entitled its June 6 editorial: "Down Hill From Harvard To Lowell." The day before, the Telegram

headlined: "Harvard To Limit Number Of Its Irish." According to an unnamed "Harvard man," the Irish were "'the real problem at Harvard,'" because they shouldered aside the preparatory school boys in getting elected team captain. The University had had an "'Irish problem,'" for some time, but

'when Charles W. Eliot was president he blocked a solution because he was partial to the Irish, although he is very much criticised now because of his supposed antipathy to them. Men who watched him closely know that deep in his heart he thought the Irish added a lot to college life.'

One disgruntled prep school graduate complained of "'the air of a public school'" at Harvard and of the difficulty in knowing "'just who he can pick up with.'"55

This threat to the Irish as well as to other immigrant groups provided ammunition for Boston's Mayor James Michael Curley in his Bunker Hill speech:

'These people seek to bar men because of an accident of birth.... 'God gave them their parents and their race, as he has given me mine. All of us under the Constitution are guaranteed equality, without regard to race, creed or color. When Harvard loses sight of that fundamental we, who are not yet discriminated against, should assist those who are obtaining their equal rights as guaranteed them as American citizens. 'If the Jew is barred today, the Italian will be tomorrow, then the Spaniard and Pole, and at some future date the Irish.'

As a man whose immigrant Irish past was not too many generations behind him, Curley spoke on behalf of all immigrant

55Boston Telegram, June 5 and 6, 1922.
groups who might be excluded from a Harvard education by the WASP elite. And as if this were not enough, Lowell received a resolution from Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, opposing Harvard's alleged religious discrimination in admissions. 56

Jews, of course, spoke eloquently against restrictive admissions as in the well-publicized correspondence in June between Alfred A. Benesch '00, a Cleveland attorney, and President Lowell. Benesch argued that scholarship and character should be the only tests for admission and pointed out that many Jews, himself included, had contributed generously to Harvard. Lowell replied with his standard arguments about the growth of anti-Semitic feeling in the country and maintained that there was "'perhaps no body of men in the United States, mostly Gentiles, with so little anti-Semitic feeling as the instructing staff of Harvard University.'" Although Benesch hoped this to be true of the Faculty, he criticized anti-Semitic feeling among alumni. And he explained that the strong feeling of Jewishness was

"'the result rather than the cause'" of anti-Semitism. A University, he said, should try to lessen this antipathy by means other than excluding Jews. Benesch urged Lowell to call a conference of Jewish graduates, other concerned graduates and undergraduates, and members of the Corporation. But Lowell still insisted that the only alternative to the creation of ethnically separate universities was the controlled mixing of Gentiles and Jews within each university. One of the tasks of the recently appointed investigating Committee, he told Benesch, would be to contact leading Jews. 57

Although Harvard's Jewish alumni saw matters very much like Benesch, not all of them wanted to take Lowell on publicly. One of the "Jewish Grand Dukes," a leading retailer, with three generations of Harvard connections, had no "solution" to suggest, but heard that "the catastrophe" was caused by the increase in the number of Jewish students commuting from East Boston. As he confided to President-Emeritus Eliot, "there might have been found some less obnoxious method of discriminating against them." He had thought that anti-Semitism was waning in the United States until the recent outbursts of Henry Ford and the Ku Klux Klan

and "the anti-Semitic storm" at Harvard. During his own undergraduate years, he sensed no such attitude, but that was long ago. My son graduated in 1921, and he, so recently in college, encountered no prejudice. I am sending my younger son next autumn....These boys and my brother's son now a sophomore, are of the third generation of Harvard contacts, for you may recall that my father was for years on one of the visiting committees....my pride in Harvard was shocked by the recent publication of an un-Harvardian as well as an un-American policy. I share the conviction with many with whom I have discussed the matter, that in your day, no such thing could have transpired.

Like many alumni, he looked to Eliot as the guardian of Harvard's liberal principles.58

The writer did not feel that Jews should take "any formal steps as Jews." He was very cool to Zionism and saw Jews only as members of "a religious sect." But he did hope that the clouds of suspicion and rumor could be dispelled by "stating what the Protestants (for it appears to be largely they who are fomenting any anti-Semitic feeling) would have Americans of Jewish religion do." He also hoped that the Faculty investigating Committee could handle the problem without discriminating against any particular religious group. After all, the problem of assimilation involved more than the Jews; it was concerned with foreign students--Chinese, Japanese, Indian, and "Near Eastern-

58 Jesse Isidor Straus to Charles W. Eliot, December 18th [1922], handwritten, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 388: 1922, M-Z.
European"—and those who were native-born of immigrant stock. And the Faculty would have to decide how many of these could "be assimilated without affecting the traditional American atmosphere of the college." Although many Harvardians agreed with him that discrimination was wrong, very few believed that Jews were merely a religious sect. Not even Eliot believed that; he had been told by "medical friends" that amalgamation between Jews and non-Jews resulted in the domination of the "Hebrew type" within a few generations, "so that the descendants become all Jews." Eliot's acceptance of this highly tendentious medical theory was qualified by his realization that the ghetto environment played a considerable role in the creation of an ethnic "type."\(^59\)

Another prominent Jew who agreed that the more recent immigrants, not just Jews, of course, should be limited in the interests of assimilation was Dr. Felix Adler, founder and philosopher of the Ethical Culture movement. Speaking to the Boston Ethical Society on the "'Persistence of Prejudice,'" the Columbia University professor said that race prejudice was fostered by differences in religion and standards and by economic competition. The major conflict

---

\(^{59}\) Jesse Isidor Straus to Charles W. Eliot, February 28, 1923; and Eliot to Straus, 2 March 1923, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 389: 1923, M-Z.
within the colleges was

'between Anglo-Saxon standards and traditions and those of recent immigrants. Perhaps comparatively few students who have been in this country less than 10 years should be admitted to any one college. The Anglo-Saxon tradition should be the stock on which the best that other races can offer should be grafted.'

Adler thus believed that other races should conform to Anglo-Saxon traditions, rather than creating a truly pluralistic culture within American universities.60

Fear of the consequences united Jewish opinion against the proposed discriminatory admission policies. Well-educated upper class Jews might acquiesce, perhaps unwillingly and with a sense of guilt, in a discriminatory policy toward the uncouth applicants of immigrant stock, be they Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish. And perhaps these Jews sensed that some concession was necessary, given increasing anti-Semitism during the past quarter century. But the thought that Harvard might discriminate against all Jews must have hurt, since that university, among all others, had been a special symbol. It had stood for liberalism, cosmopolitanism, and opportunity. All American Jews must have shared Julian M. Drachman's sentiment when he wrote a poem entitled "You Too?":

You, too, John Harvard?...Will you add your name

To the long, crimson chronicle of shame,
You who forsook dear Stratford's hallowed sod
To seek new shrines where each might serve his God
In equal freedom? Do you turn at last
Re-entering black horrors of the past?

If you repeat what we have heard before,
And, like the rest, bar the half-opened door,
We'll take our staff in an accustomed hand
And wear old shoes to many a stranger land.

Kaiser and Tzar, who hated us, are down.
When we flee forth, the lustre leaves the crown,
Eyes fail, life's pulse wanes, tremulous and slow.

What all have tried, you may attempt anew,
But will you choose their destiny, you too?

Drachman, who had attended the City College of New York, had once visited Harvard and its Semitic Museum. He hoped that Harvard, his "ideal of an American university" would answer, "'not I,'" by deed as well as by word to the questions asked by his poem. 61

There was as much, if not more, diversity of opinion over restrictive admissions among non-Jews. One WASP, with alumni connections dating back to Colonial times, wrote President Lowell that immigrants, whether Catholics, Jews, or Protestants, "must be amalgamated into good Americans."

61 Julian M. Drachman, "You Too?," The American Hebrew, October 27, 1922, p. 626. Drachman enclosed a clipping of his poem (reprinted in The Nation, CXVI (January 24, 1923) in a letter to A. Lawrence Lowell, January 28, 1923, copies of both of which were given to press, ALLP, 1922-1925, # 8 Jews.
Harvard, where he first became well acquainted with Jews, "some of the finest men that I have ever met," should "encourage" Jewish students to attend. On the other hand, a Brooklyn attorney expressed full support for Lowell's views; he had had some unpleasant encounters with Jews or they with him:

I think it is perfectly safe to say that we Americans, (and my great grandfather was a Revolutionary soldier) are not prejudiced against the Jew on account of his race or religion, but that the prejudice is against his practices in business and in social life. I have within the past two or three years had some very disagreeable experiences with Jews who have been elevated to high positions, and only a month ago, one of them was boasting to me that within five years they would own the City of New York, which now is in entire control of a combination of Jews and foreigners that we cannot possibly dislodge.

This letter reflected the frustration and resentment felt toward Jews because of their economic success. Another New Yorker voiced the fear that his children, who "have been taught to be good rather than clever," could not "compete with the new element." Recalling the comment of Will Rogers on election night--"that the Republicans in Texas have about the same amount of prestige as the Gentiles have in New York City"--he decided to "go West" with his family. President Lowell tried to reassure the disgruntled father by telling him that "the Americans" could compete with the Hebrews....and win when they choose to do so; but a great part of our American boys from well-to-do families are brought up to believe that in their early years they should not work hard, but play rather than labor.

In pointing out that some of the native-born were lazy in
comparison with many of immigrant stock, Lowell unwittingly was echoing one of President-Emeritus Eliot's arguments for continued immigration. 62

While the debate at Harvard did not capture abroad anywhere near the same attention aroused by the Sacco-Vanzetti case, in which Lowell played a key role by upholding the guilt of the two convicted Italian radicals, the few foreign comments were significant. A graduate of both the College and the Law School, who was connected with Nan Kai College in Tientsin, China, sent Lowell a clipping from the August 15, 1922 North China Star, the local American Newspaper. Drawing upon the Chung Mei Foreign Service and the New York World, the article described in detail the functions of the investigating Committee. In the accompanying letter, the alumnus implied that Harvard might not be able to undo the damage already done by considering a limitation on Jews. "Articles like this will deter our Chinese students from coming to Harvard," he wrote, "and also make them feel that democracy is a failure in America." Moreover, "such an action could not be explained here." Harvard stood for educational opportunity and Yankee hospitality to many Chinese, but a restriction on Jews might well be extended to

other groups, especially to Orientals. 63

By the early autumn of 1922, Lowell was beginning to solidify a united alumni opposition to his discriminatory policies. In September, the columnist of "From a Graduate's Window" in the *Harvard Graduates' Magazine* argued that the addition of racial and religious requirements as tests for admission would have "mischievous results." Since scholarship alone was an inadequate method of weeding out the "undesirables," the addition of tests of "character, personality, and general mental ability" would be justifiable. But if Jews met these tests as well as the academic one, they should be admitted, no matter what the percentage. While the writer did not think that any racial group would have proportionally a larger number in the College than it had in the country as a whole, if such a group did prove itself worthy, "so abundantly as to acquire of right a dominating representation in Harvard University, that right must be accorded to it." In fact, he urged the investigating Committee to turn its attention away from consideration of racial groups and proportions within the University. If the Committee of the Faculty went so far as to recommend

the establishment of racial percentages, he said, the discriminatory policy "would be calamitous." Harvard dealt with individual applicants; hence the system of quotas applied to immigrants should not be used. Whether unintentionally or deliberately, he was disputing Lowell's argument that Jews should be treated as members of a group. The columnist also felt that the more the Committee and University officers discussed racial groups within Harvard, the more aggravated the issue would become. And finally, he doubted whether the Faculties, whose primary job was education, had the authority to make recommendations in this matter. If any official bodies of the University should deal with "problems of a quasi-political character," they should be the two governing boards, the Corporation and Overseers. The Faculty should devise methods of preventing "the undesirables of every group from getting into the University and they will have a sufficiently homogeneous and harmonious student body."64

64 "Racial groups at Harvard" as seen "From a Graduate's Window," Harvard Graduates' Magazine (hereafter abbreviated HGM), September, 1922, pp. 64-66; also pp. 71-72.
The Negro Question

In addition to this rebuke, Lowell received a petition the same month signed by 143 alumni opposing the exclusion of black students from the Freshman Halls. The President was expecting the petition because news of it had been leaked to the New York newspapers in June. The Memorial to the Corporation, with an accompanying letter, was sent to a "selected group of graduates" by a committee of seven: William Channing Gannett '60; Moorfield Storey '66, President of the NAACP; Charles C. Burlingham '79; Alfred Jaretzki '81; John Reynolds '07; Edward Eyre Hunt '10; and Robert C. Benchley '12. The Memorial argued that the exclusion of blacks from the Freshman Halls on racial grounds violated "the long and honorable tradition of Harvard College." As in the past, Southerners should be required to conform to Harvard's traditional customs in regard to Negroes—attending the same lecture halls, eating in the same dining room, albeit at separate tables, and sleeping in the same dormitory, although in different rooms. The Freshman Halls were spacious enough to accommodate black students without antagonizing Southerners. The originators of the Memorial urged the administration to desist from its "Jim Crow policy" and return to "the Alma Mater of Channing, of John Quincy Adams, of Sumner, of Robert Gould Shaw of the 54th Massachusetts Infantry . . . the tradition
of Harvard liberalism, tolerance, and justice."\(^{65}\)

Early in October, the petition was presented to the Corporation, which proposed that Lowell write the committee, offer to meet with them, and explain the Corporation's position. Several committee members indicated an interest in such a meeting, and Lowell did discuss the matter at the annual dinner of the New York City Harvard Club in early 1923. In addition to the committee, there were 136 other signers, whose classes ranged from 1850 to 1920. Among them were Francis G. Peabody '69, James Loeb '88, Herbert Croly '90, Oswald Garrison Villard '93, Heywood Broun '08, Samuel Eliot Morison '08, C. C. Little '10, and Walter Lippmann '10. As this list indicated, some of the signers also opposed discrimination against Jews: Broun, Lippmann, Little, and Loeb. While the committee had not intended to link the Jewish and Negro questions (they apologized for the leak to the press in June), the connection was inescapably there.\(^{66}\)


\(^{66}\)A. Lawrence Lowell to each member of the committee of seven, October 10, 1922; the reply of several members; and "Alumni Signing the Inclosed Memorial," ALLP, 1922-1925, #42 Negroes.
An administration which sanctioned discrimination against one class of students would be likely to sanction it against another. In Lowell's mind, both groups created their own situations of "social segregation." And in both cases, Lowell tried to present the discriminatory policy as "un fait accompli," in the words of Professor Hart. The President succeeded in regard to the black freshmen, because it was not until late 1921 that he began to hear protests about a policy instituted by the Corporation in 1914. He encountered far more opposition from the Committee on Admission, the Faculty, and the Overseers, when he tried push through a discriminatory admissions policy against Jews in the spring of 1922. Even though many who opposed discrimination against blacks might accept some limitation on Jewish students, Lowell's methods as well as his purposes tended to unite his opponents.67

But there was an important difference in the way in which the alumni reacted to the two discriminatory policies: the Negro question actually generated more alumni response, and perhaps a more sympathetic one. There was, of course, the difference in numbers. As Professor Hart wrote to

President Lowell:

You have heard me in the Faculty express the conviction that something ought to be done in the case of the Jews, because they were becoming so numerous and are so strongly and aggressively united. That argument does not, of course, apply to the negroes, who are few at Harvard, and not likely to be numerous, simply because the number of colored boys whose parents can find the money to send their sons to Harvard is limited. A handful of blacks in each class could hardly be considered a threat; but Jews constituted almost 20 percent of the Class of 1925. Also the type of discrimination applied to the blacks differed from that proposed against the Jews. The former would be discriminated against after admission; the latter faced discrimination before or during the admission process. It was one thing to keep a man out of the College altogether, but quite another to create a group of second class citizens within Harvard. Even a black had to be considered a "Harvard man" once admitted. And as Professor Hart pointed out, there might be pressures from prejudiced persons to extend second class status to Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Porto Rican, and Jewish students. Instead of excluding these students from the Freshman Halls, the solution would be to let the prejudiced find other accommodations. A final reason for alumni response to discrimination against the black student lay in the fact that there was no organized, official group within the University speaking on his behalf. In contrast, the University had already responded, in part, to the protests of those opposing a
restriction on Jews by creating the investigating Committee. Whereas most alumni were willing to leave the decision in the Jewish question to the Committee, many felt they must speak out against exclusion of the blacks from the Freshman Halls. Some signed the petition; others wrote letters to President Lowell or to the Harvard Alumni Bulletin or to one of several magazines or newspapers. 68

Opposition to discrimination was not confined to alumni from the Northeast, nor was bigotry the sole response of people from the South and Southwest. In fact, one of the most bigoted comments came from a Connecticut alumnus of the Class of 1901. He had returned, he said, to Cambridge for the Harvard-Yale game, but expressed shock at the number of "Kikes" in the Yard. His hostility mounted as he saw "two Jews and a negro, fraternizing." He implied, moreover, that Jews did not belong to the white race. He was particularly aggrieved that Jews could not be eliminated by raising academic qualifications, whereas by the same process of raising the standard 'white' boys ARE eliminated. And is this to go on?

68 Hart to Lowell, January 18, 1923. For Judge Mack's reaction to the exclusion of black freshmen from the Halls, see Julian W. Mack to Charles W. Eliot, January 31, 1923, handwritten letter, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 389: 1923, folder Interesting. Mack felt that the Roscoe Conkling Bruce—A. Lawrence Lowell correspondence seemed "to have redounded only to Harvard's good: it has stirred up the old Harvard spirit in many sections: so far as I have seen most of the expressions have been against Mr. Lowell's position."
Why the Psychology Test if not to bar those not wanted? Are the Overseers so lacking in genius that they can't devise a way to bring Harvard back to the position it always held as a 'white man's' college? Does the possible flare-up of such men as Villard and Storey frighten them? Why not come out into the open and take the 'gaff' of criticism for a year or so and save our University for our sons, grandsons and for our posterity?

The writer believed that his New England parentage and attendance at Harvard gave him a proprietary interest in the University and the right to denounce Jews and Negroes. And he threatened to send his son elsewhere. Hate letters of this sort, fortunately, were few in number. The majority of the alumni were temperate and rational. As Lowell confided in reply:

The flare-up of such men as Villard and Storey did frighten the alumni....there was a great outcry on the part - among others - of alumni, and the press was hot with denunciations of me from one end of the country to the other. Not one of the alumni, however, ventured to defend the policy publicly or at the meeting of the Associated Harvard Clubs in Sanders Theatre, where the attempt to limit the Jews was freely denounced.

The petitioners--Benchley, Storey, Villard, and the other 140--without question provided one of the vital sparks of alumni reaction to Lowell's exclusion policy.69

As was to be expected, a typical reaction came from the South opposing any form of social equality between the races. Neither a Harvard education, nor indeed an education

69 M. E. T. Brown to A. Lawrence Lowell, December 17th and 21st, 1925; and Lowell to Brown, December 18, 1925, ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers.
at any other Northern college or university necessarily eradicated the ingrained Southern fear of racial equality. From Beaufort, North Carolina, the Rev. George W. Lay, D.C.L., who had been educated at St. Paul's School in New Hampshire and at Yale '82, argued that Northern colleges must respect the race feeling of Southern whites, if they wanted to attract students from that region. A white Southerner who acted as the social equal of a Negro would lose his influence in the South; consequently the social barrier was never to be crossed. A former Mississippian, Harvard '98, began his letter by quoting a clause from his will, which bequeathed to Harvard an amount up to $50,000 to become "'a Scholarship Fund for the education of native born boys from the States that seceded from the Union.'" If Negroes roomed with white men in the Freshman Halls, intermarriage between white women and blacks would follow, he believed, because "social equality--marriageability, if you will -- is implied in sharing 'bed and board' with another." Eating at a separate table in a public restaurant was "allowable, but to -- well, 'sleep with a nigger' -- is a horse of another color." Although an alumnus from Chicago was more restrained in his language, he also insisted that blacks and whites be separated socially, in particular, black males and white females. Whether politely phrased or bluntly spoken, the message was always the same: any social contact which implied equality between the races
was or should be forbidden, and Negroes who sought such equality had overstepped their place. 70

But there were also thoughtful comments from many born in the South. Georgia-born George Foster Peabody, A.M. '03 hon., argued against exclusion on political, religious, and scientific grounds. The democratic principle was at stake, he declared, if blacks were excluded solely on racial grounds. Furthermore, both Christianity and "the most advanced scientific theory of the origin of man would seem to agree as to there being one original derivation of the human species." Peabody's freedom of expression may have owed to the fact that he no longer lived in the South but in New York State. Another Southerner, James C. Manry '14 also dissented from the exclusion policy. He had taught at Ewing Christian College in Allahabad, India, and had done a year's relief work for the Polish universities, in which he had worked to abolish racial discrimination. The alumnus had had his own eyes opened by his undergraduate experience at Harvard, where he made friends with a Negro. And he "learned much from him that has been of value ... ever since." He felt that it would be "better on the whole for

the negro throughout the country to have it understood that Harvard proposes to force negroes and white men to live in the same building and eat at the same table.\footnote{George Foster Peabody to A. Lawrence Lowell, January 13, 1923, and James C. Manry to Lowell, March 18, 1923, \#42 Negroes; and Manry to Lowell, January 25, 1923, \#42-A Freshman Halls: Negroes, ALLP, 1922-1925. Manry also expressed his views cogently in a letter to the Editor of the Harvard Alumni Bulletin (hereafter abbreviated as HAB), February 15, 1923, pp. 595-596.}

One Northern opponent of exclusion who did not sign the petition was Hamilton Fish, Jr. '10, former Crimson football captain and Republican Congressman from New York. The grandson of President Ulysses S. Grant's Secretary of State had also served in France during World War I as captain of Colored Infantry (15th New York Volunteers which became 369th Regiment Infantry). In his letter, which was given to the newspapers, he attacked the Jim Crow dormitory policy. "Harvard is not a private school," Fish noted, "but a great National University with its gates wide open to all who can comply with the entrance requirements, based on scholarship, not on race, color or creed." There were, of course, several other critical letters, both published and unpublished. According to Edward S. Drown '84, of the Episcopal Theological School, the issue was clear: Harvard must affirm "the principle of equal rights" for all students and reject "a narrow and partisan concept of social status." Another alumnus, in an unpublished letter,
reminded Lowell of a comment which he had made to two black students who had come to him to discuss the discriminatory practice of the steward in Memorial Hall:

you told them that they must not object to such treatment as they were Negroes and agitation of that point would not benefit any of the Negro students, and it might lead to their being prevented from attending Harvard entirely....In your conversations with colored students you have always stressed the point that they were so few in number that should discrimination occur their rights could not be considered.

Conceivably the alumnus had received a garbled account from the black student who had told him of the incident. Often Lowell laid himself open to misinterpretation by the blunt and tactless way in which he expressed himself. He may have said that black students should expect to encounter discrimination, a true, although unconsoling observation about life in the North as well as in the South.72

But his policy of excluding blacks from the Freshman Halls could not be explained simply as a misunderstanding. Lowell acted primarily on the basis of expediency--Southern whites were more valuable to Harvard than blacks--and, secondarily, because he probably thought he was "protecting"

black freshmen. Once aroused, however, it did not take the alumni long to realize that Lowell's exclusion policy was not only unfair, but also unnecessary. "The Civil War is on again," wrote George L. Paine '96, a student pastor, who proceeded to "fire ten shots on the side of those fighting for justice and brotherhood." Two of his "shots" were aimed at the small number of students, black and white, who were the subjects of this controversy:

'III. There are very few negroes in College, only seventeen in all, and only one in the freshman class. The majority, 25 in all, are in the graduate schools. As to their residence: last year, nine were in College dormitories, twenty-one in private houses, sixteen outside of Cambridge. This year the figures are respectively ten, twenty-two, and ten. Seven negroes live in Weld, two in Perkins, and one, if you please, in Claverly on the 'Gold Coast.' Last year there were also two in Walter Hastings. (Query, how many white men vacated these mixed dormitories?)'

The answer was, of course, none. And he found that

'IV. There are very few Southerners in College, the ones most likely to object to enforced contact, only 67 from the ten Southern states.'

Lowell would probably argue that this proved his point: Southern whites stayed away from Harvard on account of its liberal policy toward blacks. 73

Interestingly enough, at the June, 1922 Commencement a white senior from Atlanta, Georgia, delivered the Latin and Class Orations, while a black man from Charleston, Virginia, who was a resident graduate in the Divinity School,

73 George L. Paine '96 To the Editor of the Bulletin, HAB, February 15, 1923, pp. 590-592.
addressed the audience on "The Present Condition of the Negroes in the United States." Paine thought that "an extraordinary proportion" of Negroes had made their mark intellectually and athletically in terms of their numbers. But because of racial prejudice, white students were not to be "compelled" to live in the same freshman dormitory with Negroes, although each suite had its own bathroom, and the dining room had separate tables.  

Paine's letter effectively refuted Lowell's argument. A majority of the alumni agreed that Lowell or at least his policy of excluding blacks from the Freshman Halls was wrong, judging from editorials in both the Harvard Graduates' Magazine and the Harvard Alumni Bulletin and the volume of letters to the Editor of the Bulletin. "From a Graduate's Window" expressed "regret at the stand which President Lowell has taken with regard to colored students at Harvard" and praised the willingness of white athletes to participate with a black athlete: "to work with him, play with him, strip with him, go to the showers with him." According to the Bulletin, the issue was still open, and it invited comments from the alumni. Invoking the memory of Robert Gould Shaw, it argued that "for Harvard to deny to colored men a privilege" accorded to white students appeared "inevitably as a reversal of policy if not as positive disloyalty to a

principle for which the University has hitherto taken an open and unshaken stand." From mid-January to mid-March, 1923, almost sixty alumni wrote letters to the Editor of the Bulletin. Of this number, approximately two-thirds rejected the policy of racial exclusion, while somewhat under a third supported Lowell's stand; the remainder were either suspending judgment until all the facts were known or favored some form of discrimination—toward Jews, but not toward black freshmen. It was against this background of growing alumni protest that the Corporation would have to reconsider its decision in regard to the Freshman Halls. And this decision would be influenced, at least in part, by the work of the Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates for Admission. Harvard's traditional liberalism was on trial. The country, as well as alumni, Faculty, and students, awaited the verdicts.75

75"The color line" as seen "From a Graduate's Window," HGM, March, 1923, p. 372; "The Colored Student and the Freshmen Dormitories" in "News and Views," HAB, January 25, 1923, pp. 469-470. See also alumni letters to the Editor of HAB for January 18 and 25, February 1, 8, 15, and 22, and March 1, 8, and 15, 1923. See HAB, February 15, 1923, pp. 589-590, for Richards M. Bradley's letter generally supporting Lowell's position. Although Bradley did not see any reason why Negroes could not be allowed in "one of the Freshman Dormitories, while refraining in other dormitories from forcing such association upon students who do not wish it," he agreed that Lowell was "right in refusing to ignore the race question."
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History
CHAPTER VII

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON METHODS OF SIFTING CANDIDATES FOR ADMISSION, 1923

With regard to the Jew as a Harvard student, the following facts may be culled from the statistics. He is, on the average, a better scholar than the Gentile. In morals, he seems to be more prone to dishonesty and sexual offenses, but much less addicted to intemperance. About a third of the Hebrews are non-residents. In social club life, there has come to be almost complete separation of Jew and Gentile. In athletics, on the other hand, there is commingling, with the Jews in fair and increasing representation. Further meeting-ground--aside from lectures and other exercises--is offered by debates, music and dramatics.

—Letter accompanying the "Report" to President A. Lawrence Lowell, April 7, 1923¹

The "Report of Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates for Admission," especially the statistical report of one of its sub-committees, affirmed that Jewish students contributed substantially to both the academic and extra-curricular life of Harvard College. They participated in extra-curricular activities to the extent that they were permitted to do so by their Gentile classmates. Where individual merit was the test of acceptance as, for example,

¹Letter from the Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates for Admission to A. Lawrence Lowell, April 7, 1923, ALLP, 1922-1925, #387 Admission to Harvard College: Report of Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates (hereafter abbreviated as #387 Admission to Harvard College).
in athletics, debating, music, and dramatics, Jews made successful entry. But the same was not true of social life, where many Gentile students, like their elders, valued their companions on the basis of family background and future social connections. That Jewish students did participate in college activities, despite their large percentage among commuters, disproved one of President Lowell's major arguments: that Jewish students did not assimilate into the life of the College. This finding raised the question of whether Lowell was against Jews because he truly thought that they did not assimilate or because he feared they would assimilate too much. When Lowell finally realized the Committee's report would go against him, he expediently accepted the decision. However, he almost immediately launched another and more subtle scheme. His new tack was to argue that Harvard could educate effectively only a limited number of undergraduates and that consequently the Freshman Class should be limited to 1,000 students.

The Committee of Inquiry

The Committee of Inquiry had commenced its work in the summer of 1922. Its thirteen members were assigned to four Subcommittees. The first, directed by Deans Greenough, Donham, and Holmes, was to gather statistics about Jewish students within the University. The second, consisting of Professors Sachs, Henderson, and Wolfson, was to correspond or meet with alumni and prominent Jewish citizens; the
third, under Deans Holmes and Greenough, was to contact both other colleges and universities—to learn if they confronted a similar situation and if so, how they were handling it. It also was to sound out various headmasters on the advisability of admitting top secondary school students without entrance examinations. The fourth sub-committee was to sample undergraduate opinion during the fall semester. Since the primary function of the Committee and its subdivisions was to gather and evaluate information from a large number of people and sources, almost a year would pass before it was prepared to report. The Faculty having voted down Lowell's proposal for a quota the previous June, the Committee was to decide whether there was a Jewish problem, and if there was, to determine what means, short of a quota, should be used to handle it. ²

As was so often true in the past, President Emeritus Charles W. Eliot's correspondence casts light upon the workings of the Committee. His principal correspondents were Professor Charles H. Grandgent, Chairman of the

²Letter from the Committee to Lowell, April 7, 1923. C. H. Grandgent to C. N. Greenough, July 11, 1922, postcard, Dean of Harvard College--Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27), # 16 Sub-committee on Sifting of Candidates for Admission 1922-23 (hereafter abbreviated as #16 Sub-committee on Sifting), reminding Greenough of "the Committee's vote to the effect that each sub-committee shall agree upon a definition of its functions and submit the same--for distribution to all the members of the band." Professor Harry A. Wolfson, interviews, July 30 and 31, 1973.
Committee; Professor Milton J. Rosenau, one of the three Jewish members of the Committee; Overseers Jerome D. Greene and Judge Julian W. Mack; and Professor Felix Frankfurter. In July, 1922, Eliot visited Professor Grandgent to discuss the Committee's objectives, but he withheld written criticism until November. On October 2, the Committee of Inquiry or Grandgent Committee, as it has also been called, had its first meeting of the academic year. Between that date and its final meeting of March 29, 1923, the Committee met at least sixteen times, almost on weekly basis during the last three months. 3

Eliot sent the first of his major communications to Grandgent in early November. The President-Emeritus related to the Chairman several "representations" which he had received concerning the gathering of statistics, consultation with prominent Jews, undergraduate attitudes, and "a

3Charles W. Eliot to Jerome D. Greene, 15 and 21 July 1922; Greene to Eliot, July 18, 1922, JDGP, Box 6, folder 1922-1923 the Jewish question--and Negro question. Eliot and Greene and Eliot and Grandgent discussed the plan of sifting candidates employed by President Arthur E. Morgan of Antioch College, Ohio. Morgan tried to do most of the sifting himself the first year, but the number of applicants was too large to render entirely satisfactory results. He considered three things in making his selection: the high school certificate; a lengthy English composition; and a personal interview. Grandgent was not impressed by the Antioch students he saw. But Eliot wondered whether these methods of selection could "be applied on a large scale without discrimination as to race, color, or religion?" For notices of Committee meetings, see ALLP, 1922-1925, #8 Jews.
physical and moral testing" of candidates. According to Eliot, some argued that the Committee's report was being delayed by personal incompetency and faulty research methods used in the gathering of statistics. Second, prominent Jews were not agreed on an effective method of combating anti-Semitism in American life. Third, and most interestingly, was the wide difference of opinion among undergraduates on "the right means of excluding undesirable Jews." Probably "the better sort of college undergraduate" objected to the assignment of dormitory rooms "through a student committee which is instructed to segregate Jews, and to some extent Irishmen, in certain dormitories." They preferred assignments be by lot. Some undergraduates openly resented "being expected to make Jews admitted to Harvard College by the Harvard authorities uncomfortable . . . by treating them roughly or rudely in the Yard, the streets, and the eating-places." Finally, no "feasible" character or moral test had yet been proposed. Eliot clearly wanted to impress upon Grandgent the difficulty of finding easy solutions; he did not set forth his personal views, however, until after the Committee and Sub-Committees had finished "their preliminary work."  

Charles W. Eliot to Charles H. Grandgent, 10 November 1922, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 388: 1922, A-L.
Grandgent defended the gathering of statistical information on the grounds that such a large scale "investigation" at Harvard was "necessary to provide answers to questions sure to be asked, and support for whatever course we may select." Grandgent acknowledged the difficulty in finding suitable "physical and moral" tests, but questioned the existence of official discrimination in regard to room assignments as well as official encouragement of undergraduate harassment of Jewish students. There was no reason to question Grandgent's veracity, but the allegations revealed that alumni, undergraduates, and outsiders alike suspected the University's intentions and methods.5

Eliot's next approach to the Committee was a six page letter dated February 2, 1923. He was pleased that the Committee had "unanimously agreed that no racial discrimination should be applied or authorized by any College authority among candidates for admission to Harvard College or any other Department of the University," He likewise approved the Committee's decision that the "results" of any new admission procedure should be fully publicized. But the events of the previous spring and their unfavorable publicity had alarmed him. Eliot therefore urged that a certain "rule" be adopted as a "precaution":

that no administrative officer or officers..., no Administrative Board,...and no Faculty should announce or apply a new policy for the College or any other Department of the University which graduates or undergraduates could think to be a departure from Harvard traditions, until the proposed new policy had been laid before the appropriate Faculty or Faculties and the Governing Boards.

Moreover, Eliot continued, if under a new admission test, "rejections become more numerous than before, the distribution of the rejections geographically and genealogically should be published in the Departmental reports to the President of the following autumn." The President-Emeritus wanted to prevent the enactment of tests which discriminated surreptitiously against Jews. He was suspicious of proposals for "an oral, unrecorded, personal interview"; the "closing of the back road" to transfers from neighboring colleges; "easier terms" of admission for candidates living outside New England and the Middle States; and use of psychological tests. His insistence that the genealogy of rejected applicants be published was a discreet warning against official hanky panky and remarkable for this period. On the other hand, Eliot did not object to questions on the Harvard application form about the "genealogy, history, and background" of the candidate and his parents. And as for social relations among undergraduates, he would abolish compulsory residence for Freshmen and let all "sorting" be determined "automatically by the prices of the rooms in the various dormitories, new and old, and by the cost of
meals" in dining rooms or restaurants. The University should be neutral in regard to racial distinctions among its students.6

Eliot also took issue with a proposal which had Lowell's strong support: to limit the number of students admitted to the College and perhaps even to the graduate and professional departments. Such a proposal was a threat to the Harvard which Eliot had built during his presidency. Rather than limiting students, the University, he believed, should increase endowment funds and then appoint additional instructors. If classrooms became overcrowded, the decision of whether or not to attend should be left up to "every successful applicant for admission." The University had a public service to perform. Of course, there should be no lessening of intellectual requirements nor the substitution of non-academic standards.7

6Charles W. Eliot to C. H. Grandgent, 1 February 1923, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 389: 1923, A-L. See Eliot to Julian W. Mack, 3 February 1923, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 389: 1923 folder Interesting, for the Committee's receipt of Eliot's letters. "'My Committee is greatly obliged to you for your letter, which it has examined with care and to which it will often return,'" said Grandgent. The Committee had no objections to Eliot's giving copies of the letter to the two Overseers, Judge Mack and Ellery Sedgwick, who had requested them. It did "'not feel itself justified in putting '" Eliot '"to the trouble of attending one of its meetings.'" But "'should an occasion arise in which we should have special need of counsel,'" Grandgent would call on him. At the February 2, 1923 meeting, Eliot's and Rosenau's letters "were only read to the Committee in a rapid way by the Chairman," discussion of them being postponed until the next meeting.

7Eliot to Grandgent, 1 February 1923.
Eliot's strong stand against racial discrimination must have influenced the position ultimately taken by the Committee of Inquiry. Once having asserted his views on this matter, however, he confined subsequent correspondence with Grandgent to arguing against adoption of "admission on certificate," which would allow students with acceptable secondary school certificates to enter Harvard without taking the College's demanding entrance examinations. Although most American colleges accepted certificates from approved schools, Eliot believed their adoption would undermine Harvard's long effort to persuade secondary schools to raise their standards. Not only did he oppose admitting high school students on certificate, but he also would bar entry to prospective transfer students who previously had chosen to attend a college which accepted certificates. In reply Professor Grandgent maintained that the Committee was not considering the usual "certificate method," but one by which the Committee would offer admission to seniors standing in the "highest seventh" or top fifteen per cent of their class. Ultimately Eliot lost out because the "highest seventh" plan received substantial support both at Harvard and among schoolmasters. Hopefully the plan would bring students from schools which previously had sent few or no graduates to Harvard.  

8 Charles W. Eliot to C. H. Grandgent, 19 February, and 6 March and 19 March 1923; Grandgent to Eliot, hand-
On the Committee of Inquiry itself, only Dr. Rosenau and Henry Pennypacker, Chairman of the Committee on Admission, opposed admission by certificate. Actually, this was the only point in the "Report" on which the Committee of Inquiry had considerable difficulty in achieving unanimity. Rosenau also drafted a "memorandum of proposals: reaffirming the "traditional ideals of Harvard," its "adherence to the policy of the open door," and "equal opportunity and academic freedom." Admission requirements, Rosenau added, should rest on the "two basic principles" of "scholarship" and "character." It was presented to the Committee on February 2, 1923. A few weeks later, Rosenau offered a "motion to make a short report dealing chiefly with our unanimous decision that there shall be no discrimination so far as race or religion is concerned, omitting subsequent matters which seem to be largely details of academic administration." He also wanted to omit various proposed changes in admission policy, such as the "highest seventh" plan. But the Committee, believing that a more comprehensive report was needed, "decisively" voted down Rosenau's motion. While the professor of Medicine was pleased that the Committee ultimately would produce a report that "would satisfy fair-minded persons," he confided to Eliot his belief that President Lowell and the Committee on Admission to Harvard

written letters, March 5 and 7, 1923, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 389: 1923, A-L.
College "will exclude Jews all the same." Eliot did not think that could happen; "Chester Greenough would prevent it, if tried." Moreover signs in early 1923 indicated that President Lowell was yielding.9

Jerome D. Greene was one of those continuing to put pressure on Lowell. In January, 1923, Greene protested against the exclusion of blacks from Freshman Halls and said that, if Lowell did "not voluntarily call a special meeting of the Board" of Overseers, he, as Chairman of the Executive Committee, would seek to do so. But the President avoided a confrontation by sailing in mid-January "to secure two English tutors from either Oxford or Cambridge to live here

9Milton J. Rosenau to Charles W. Eliot, January 25, 1923, with enclosed "memorandum of proposals"; Rosenau to Eliot, March 2, 1923, enclosing a copy of his March 1st, 1923 letter to Professor Charles H. Grandgent; Rosenau to Eliot, March 14, 1923; and Eliot to Rosenau, 24 January, 1 February, and 15 March 1923, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 389: 1923, M-Z. See Eliot to Jerome D. Greene, 13 January 1923, JDGP, Box 6, folder 1922-1923 the Jewish question--and Negro question, for Rosenau's conversation with Eliot about Lowell's intentions. See Eliot to Julian W. Mack, 3 February 1923, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 389: 1923, folder Interesting, on Dr. Rosenau's "memorandum of proposals." Professor Frankfurter, Mr. Cohn, Mr. Louis E. Kirstein ("the leading Jew in Boston"), and David A. Ellis helped Rosenau draft his letter to the Committee of Inquiry. According to "Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee to Consider Proposals and Methods for Sifting Candidates for Admission to the University," March 22, 1923, Dean of Harvard College--Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27), #16 Sub-committee on Sifting, "Professor Rosenau stated that he should vote with the Committee on the proposal to accept without examination a certain proportion of graduates from good schools. Although not convinced of the desirability of this proposal he wished to meet the desires of the Committee that a unanimous report be submitted."
for half a year and show us how to conduct the new tutorial system." In addition, two Harvard tutors went to one of the two English universities for firsthand observation. Lowell was less "eager for a fight in the Board of Overseers" than Greene. There is no record of a special meeting of the Overseers taking place until mid-March, after Lowell's return from Europe. Before he left, however, the Corporation met on January 22nd, to consider "the negro question." Although the Corporation had supported the policy of exclusion during two previous discussions, its members must have shifted their ground, judging from the changed attitude observed in Lowell. The President, as Greene reported to Eliot, was

now taking an open-minded attitude. This is a good symptom for I have had some occasion to observe that when he becomes reasonably convinced that he cannot have his way he is apt to discover a graceful method of retreat. I think that this is as far as his open-mindedness goes.

By late January, Lowell agreed to "reverse" his stand on exclusion, but Eliot doubted that Lowell had found "a graceful method of retreat." His "withdrawals" had always "been extremely abrupt," he observed.10

10 Jerome D. Greene to Charles W. Eliot, January 12, 1922, enclosing copy of January 12, 1923 letter to A. Lawrence Lowell; Greene to Eliot, January 18, 20, and 24, 1923; and Eliot to Green, 13, 19, 22, and 25 January 1923, and 17 February 1923, JDGP, Box 6, folder 1922-1923 the Jewish question—and Negro question. Greene protested against the exclusion policy on his own initiative, without conferring with Moorfield Storey and "the negrophile group." See A. Lawrence Lowell to Jerome D. Greene, January 15, 1923,
Greene hoped that the report of the Committee of Inquiry would be sent directly to the Board of Overseers "without interference from the President, who," was "not likely to be in sympathy with the conclusions reached." What Harvard needed, he thought, was "some positive and clear affirmation of the ideals of the University" to counteract the unfavorable criticism, even though such a statement would be nothing less than "an implied rebuke of the President." Some feared that Lowell might resign as a consequence but Greene argued that the Committee's report should not be influenced by this consideration.\(^1\)

Eliot, however, was not convinced. Rather than affirming Harvard's liberal traditions, he preferred that the Committee "assume that the ideals of the University in that respect are of course to be maintained." Instead of protesting its liberalism, Harvard should assume as a matter of fact that its traditions were unchanged. Lowell would

---

\(^1\) Jerome D. Greene to Charles W. Eliot, February 9, 1923, JDGP, Box 6, folder 1922-1923 the Jewish question--and Negro question.
not resign, Eliot believed, because he had previously "reversed his policies in other important matters without feeling the least embarrassment about so doing." Yet Eliot was later to note that Lowell was badly shaken by opposition from within the Harvard family. Since returning from England in mid-March, Lowell had remained "silent" and had "become so nervous and agitated that he has been compelled to leave his work and go away for rest and quiet."12

Until the Overseers received the report, however, Greene did not feel that he should involve himself with the Committee's activities. Judge Mack also refrained from communicating with the Committee, because some of its members "would resent what they could plausibly call 'butting in' by an Overseer and that, too, by a Jew." To be sure, the Committee of Inquiry had officially invited either "visits or letters" from each Overseer as early as October, 1922, but Mack thought that Eliot's letter to Grandgent already had presented the issues effectively. Moreover,

12 Charles W. Eliot to Jerome D. Greene, 8 and 17 February 1923, JDGP, Box 6, folder 1922-1923 the Jewish question--and Negro question. Because of the important task of the Board of Overseers, Eliot, like several other alumni, thought that the views of the fifteen nominees for the Board should be known on "Jewish and negro exclusion." He also felt the same applied to candidates for Alumni Association Director. See Charles W. Eliot to Julian W. Mack, 14 April 1923, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 389: 1923 folder Interesting, for Lowell's state of mind.
Greene had strongly "urged" Mack "to keep in the background even at the Overseers' meeting & to leave the fight--if there is to be a fight--to him and others." The Judge agreed that Greene's counsel would be "the wiser course unless, indeed, it seems necessary to correct errors or to support those who may be contending for the things" that he and Eliot considered "essential." His faith in Eliot and Greene was not misplaced. In late March, Eliot could write him: "The state of opinion within the Board of Overseers" was "so clear and decided that there will be no need of your returning for their spring meetings." He hoped Mack would decide whether to "return solely on grounds of your own health and convenience." And in early April, Felix Frankfurter showed similar optimism. He expressed appreciation for Eliot's "leadership," and except for "one point"—probably the "highest seventh" proposal—called the Grandgent Report "a gratifying result."  

Racial Discrimination Denied

Within a period of fifteen days, between March 26 and April 9, 1923, both Lowell's policy of excluding blacks from the Freshman Halls and his proposed limitation on Jewish students received major setbacks, though not permanent defeats. On March 26, for example, the Corporation voted:

that up to the capacity of the Freshman Halls all members of the Freshman Class shall reside and board in the Freshman Halls, except those who are permitted by the Assistant Dean of Harvard College to live elsewhere. In the application of this rule men of the white and colored races shall not be compelled to live and eat together, nor shall any man be excluded by reason of his color.

An "explanatory statement" accompanied the publication of this vote:

While representatives of different races and different religions are under the rules compelled to meet in the common rooms of the Dormitory on the basis of common courtesy and equality, the question of the social intimacies or friendships the individual students shall form is left to the discretion or to the social customs of the individual.

The administration had no intention of "compelling" "social intimacies." And according to "the application of the rule," as explained in the Corporation's "Book of Understanding," "arrangements shall be made to have any negroes, who may be admitted to the Freshman Halls, assigned to some one of the halls." Harvard would continue its tender solicitude for the prejudices of white Southerners and Northerners by having
one "Jim Crow" Freshman dormitory.\textsuperscript{14}

An inter-office letter among the College deans, following a conversation with President Lowell, put the matter explicitly:

The general policy that he wants carried out is doing not a bit more or less for them than for other students. There will probably be very few,—perhaps only one or two. Send each one a special letter and keep a carbon of it. Indicate the prices of single rooms, double rooms, and so forth, and ask him which kind of room, if any, he wants. Of course, if a negro cannot afford our cheapest single room in Standish and cannot get any negro to room with him, he cannot live in Standish, and that means he cannot live in any of the Freshman Halls.

President Lowell was concerned about unfavorable publicity that might result in the future from any mishandling of the assignment of rooms to black freshmen. On the other hand, if a black student could not afford a single room or find another black freshman roommate, the college authorities "felt that they had no right to assign a colored man to room with a white man against his wishes." As a consequence, lack of money and the small number of available black roommates contributed to the maintenance of a quasi-"Jim Crow"  

\textsuperscript{14}Copies of the Corporation Records and the "Book of Understanding," March 26, 1923; on April 3, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences voted to request omission of "Assistant" before Dean, because of changes in the organization of the Dean's Office; and on April 9, the Board of Overseers unanimously concurred in the Corporation's vote, and it was released by the Office of the Secretary to the Corporation for publication the following day, ALLP, 1922-1925, \#42 Negroes. "Explanatory statement" in ALLP, \#42-A. See also Harvard President's Report, 1922-23, "Faculty of Arts and Sciences," p. 32.
system at Harvard. In a recent article, "Jim Crow at Harvard: 1923," Nell Painter claimed, on the basis of personal interviews with two black alumni, that black students were not permitted to reside in the Freshman Halls until the Class of 1957.\footnote{June 29, 1923 letter in Dean of Harvard College—Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27), #5 Mr. R. E. Bacon 1923-1934. F. W. Hunnewell, Secretary, to President Wallace W. Atwood of Clark University, July 12, 1926, ALLP, 1925-1928, #185 Negroes. Nell Painter, "Jim Crow at Harvard: 1923," The New England Quarterly, XLIV, No. 4 (1971), 627-634, especially 634, n. 26.}

Even though the Governing Boards had voted against the principle of exclusion, they permitted the administration a certain amount of discretionary authority in carrying out the decision. A certain amount of flexibility was also present in the guidelines set down by the Committee of Inquiry. On April 7, 1923, the Committee sent President Lowell its "Report," along with a "volume of statistics." In an accompanying letter, the Committee summarized its activities. Professor Sachs, for example, had devoted much of his time to conferring with "representative Hebrews"—"over eighty men were consulted; others offered counsel unasked; some presented long arguments in writing." Although suggesting different solutions, "virtually all" opposed a quota system of any kind. And nearly a hundred non-Jewish alumni "protested with earnestness, either emotionally or
argumentatively, against the principle of racial discrimi-
nation." Only "a few suggested indirect restriction," but
"hardly one favored frank limitation." 16

A letter from Judge Learned Hand, a graduate of both
the College and the Law School, was among the noteworthy
communications which the Committee received, because he
"took the trouble to consider the matter in all its aspects."
According to Irving Dilliard, compiler of Hand's papers and
addresses, the Judge's "strong letter, dated November 14,
1922, may well have been a factor in the decision against
establishing the clausus numerus at Harvard." The Judge
recognized, of course, that the ethnic composition of the
College had changed since his graduation thirty years be-
fore, but a limitation on Jews was not the solution:

If the Jew does not mix well with the Christian, it is
no answer to segregate him. Most of those qualities
which the Christian dislikes in him are, I believe,
the direct result of that very policy in the past.
Both Christian and Jew are here; they must in some way
learn to live on tolerable terms, and disabilities
have never proved tolerable....

But the proposal is not segregation or exclusion
but to limit the number of Jews. That, however, is
if anything worse. Those who are in fact shut out are
of course segregated; those who are let in are effec-
tively marked as racially undesirable. Intercourse
with them is with social inferiors; there can be no
other conceivable explanation for the limitation.

To the "argument" frequently advanced by Lowell that Jews
should be apportioned among several different colleges to

16 Letter from the Committee to Lowell, April 7,
1923.
prevent their "undesirable" concentration in a few, Hand countered with his "same objection." Since Jewish students would be "spread involuntarily," they would still be treated as "social inferiors." Consequently, until someone should "devise an honest test for character," the only valid test of selection was scholarship. "A college may gather together men of a common tradition," he concluded, "or it may put its faith in learning," as he did.  

Headmasters also gave the Committee "impressive advice" in regard to admission without examinations of "the best pupils of good schools." On the whole, Deans Holmes and Greenough found substantial support--"from mild approbation to enthusiastic advocacy, the latter far in the ascendant"--except from a few nearby schools. Under this and the other Committee proposals, the College would probably get a better grade of students than from stricter application of existing entrance standards.  

The Committee next estimated the number of Jews who would have been eliminated from among the successful candidates in 1921, if their "whole program" had been in

---


18 Letter from the Committee to Lowell, April 7, 1923.
operation:

It seems likely, on comparison of all the figures available, that there would be some 30 among the 80 debarred by stricter application of the rules; some 5 among the 30 shut out by increasing the requirement of C's; some 20 among the 40 refused transfer from the 'backdoor' colleges: a total of 55. If 15 should come to us among those taken in without examination, there would be a net loss of 40, or nearly a fifth of 210, the whole number of Jews admitted in 1921. It would be an exchange of 55 very bad scholars for 15 presumably good ones.

Since the percentage of Jews had increased during the previous five years under the Old and New Plans, the Committee's proposals offered some hope to Lowell and his supporters that the number of future Jewish freshmen could be reduced. Moreover, the new proposals, except for the "highest seventh" plan—which its authors hoped would attract more "country boys" from the South and the West—could be counted upon to cut off transfers from Boston and New York Colleges and to weed out candidates with weaker secondary preparation, as for example, in English composition. This meant, of course, students from the public high schools, which sent Harvard "about three-quarters" of its Jews, but "only about one-third of our Gentiles."

19 Ibid., and "Report of the Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates," p. 4. See three page memorandum from Dean W. B. Donham, prepared with the assistance of Professor Roger Lee, to A. Lawrence Lowell, April 9, 1923, "Possible 1924 situation if new rules administered strictly," ALLP, 1922-1925, #387 Admission to Harvard College. According to Donham and Lee's calculations, the "Possible Approximate Situation 1924" could be as few as 93 Jews, 11.8 per cent, of 832, instead of the 186 Jews, 22.4 per cent, of the 832 admitted in 1922. Also see "Report On Apparent Effect
President Lowell knew that the major conclusions and recommendations of the Report would win overwhelming approval from the Governing Boards. The first recommendation—"That in the administration of rules for admission Harvard College maintain its traditional policy of freedom from discrimination on grounds of race or religion"—would certainly be received with relief, if not enthusiasm. On April 9, therefore, Lowell presented the "Report," embodying the "unanimous conclusions" of the Committee, to the Board of Overseers. It was accepted, and the Board adopted three votes. First, it reaffirmed the Committee's recommendation against discrimination; then it voted:

That the Board commend the other recommendations of the report to the careful consideration of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, with the request that any changes in the methods of admission to Harvard College adopted by the Faculty be presented to the Governing Boards for approval.

And finally, upon President Lowell's motion, the Board "voted unanimously" that their Secretary convey both "gratitude and appreciation" to the Committee "for their valued services and report." Upon hearing of these resolutions, Charles W. Eliot termed them: "just right,"

Of Recommendations Of Sifting Committee," April 18, 1923, four pages, Dean of Harvard College--Correspondence, #16 Sub-committee on Sifting. If the proposals in regard to line cases, six C's requirement, and satisfactory English composition had been operative, the following numbers and percentages would have been denied admission: in 1921, 183 students or 25.5 per cent of the total, of which 42 would have been Jews (29.8 per cent of the Jews admitted); and in 1922, 162 students or 23.3 per cent of the total, of which 43 would have been Jews (28.7 of the Jews admitted).
although he believed the Board should have sent the "Report" to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences before releasing it to the newspapers.\textsuperscript{20}

By informing the newspapers on the same day, the Board of Overseers hoped to forestall the tongues of rumor and thereby counteract the unfavorable publicity, even abuse, which Harvard had received during the past year. And according to Judge Mack, "it was Mr. Lowell himself who advised that the entire report, and not merely the resolutions of the Board...be published." As a result, a substantial six page report, dated April 11, 1923, was printed and circulated. But both the interpretation of the proposed changes, as explained in the Committee's letter to Lowell, and the statistical tables were kept strictly confidential.\textsuperscript{21}

Response from the press was indeed gratifying. Boston, New York, and East Coast papers generally carried both editorials and a column or two summarizing the major provisions of the "Report" as well as the Corporation's vote on admitting blacks to the Freshman Halls. During the month that followed, glowing lines appeared in news

\textsuperscript{20}"Report of the Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates," p. 5; Winthrop H. Wade, Secretary, "a true copy of record" of the April 9, 1923 Meeting of the Board Overseers, ALLP, 1922-1925, #387 Admission to Harvard College. Charles W. Eliot to Julian W. Mack, 14 April 1923.

papers from all parts of the country: "Harvard Opens Portals Wide" (Times, Buffalo, New York); "Harvard Will Bar None For Race Or Sect" (Oklahoman, Oklahoma City); "Harvard's American Decision" (Virginian Pilot, Norfolk, Virginia); "Hats Off To Harvard" (Union Record, Seattle Washington); "Harvard Rings True" (News, New York); "Harvard Repents" (News, Jan Jose, California); "Harvard Will Open Doors Wide, Racial Discrimination Taboo" (Rocky Mt. Post, Denver, Colorado), and "Old-Fashioned Americanism" (Register, Sandusky, Ohio; News, Bangor, Maine; and Chronicle, Calexico, Press Democrat, Santa Rosa, and Independent, Stockton, all of California). Critical comments were few in number; one exception was the Milwaukee Leader of April 11: "Harvard Board Evades Issue of Admitting Jews." But then it reported only the Overseers' votes and not the text of the "Report."22


All newspapers cited are from scrapbook, "Comment Upon the Race Question 1923," in HUA: Buffalo Times, Milwaukee Leader, and Oklahoman, April 11, 1923; Virginian Pilot, April 12, 1923; Union Record, April 18, 1923; Sandusky Register, Calexico Chronicle, and Santa Rosa Press Democrat, April 19, 1923; San Jose News, April 20, 1923; Bangor News, Stockton Independent, and New York News, April 21, 1923; and Denver Rocky Mt. Post, May 11, 1923.
Hebrew Standard, was a thoughtful and sympathetic article. Dr. Newman called the "Report" a "document of true liberalism, vindicating pristine Harvard traditions of freedom of educational opportunity for all." Harvard's desire to be a "national university," he observed, did not threaten prospective Jewish applicants as did the "geographical" tests of Columbia, Dartmouth, and New York University. Columbia, for example, had sought "to balance the 50 per cent. metropolitan with the 50 per cent. non-metropolitan registration." Dartmouth, limiting its enrollment to 2,000 students, used Columbia's "'Personal Rating System,'" by which an alumnus and the preparatory school principal appraised applicants. And New York University was "said to give preference to students who can live on or near the campus, as opposed to applicants, largely from the East Side," who commuted. On the other hand, the Harvard "Report" explicitly repudiated "'even so rational a method as a personal conference or an intelligence test,'" and was "'opposed, also, under present conditions, to an arbitrary limitation of the number of students to be admitted.'"23

As the Rabbi interpreted Harvard's "Report," the new provisions would bring in "more Western and Southern applicants" without reducing the number of "metropolitan" students. He recognized, however, that Harvard would have to develop its educational facilities in order to accommodate an increasing student enrollment. Dr. Newman also hoped that Harvard would drop questions of race, religion, and name change from its admission form.²⁴ The Rabbi's optimism would be severely modified, once he learned of Harvard's intention to limit the size of its Freshmen Class. Such a limitation would again raise the specter of "proportional representation."²⁵

²⁴The following questions were added in the fall of 1922 to the "Application For Admission" to Harvard College: "4. Race and Color...," "5. Religious Preference...," "7. What change, if any, has been made since birth in your own name or that of your father? (Explain fully)...," "8. Maiden Name of Mother...," "10. Birthplace of Father..." (ALLP, 1922-1925, #8 Jews). The "Personal Record and Certificate of Honorable Dismissal," completed by either the high school principal or private school head, asked this question: "5. Will you please indicate by a check his religious preference so far as known...Protestant...Roman Catholic...Hebrew...Unknown" (Dean of Harvard College--Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27), #16 Sub-committee on Sifting).

²⁵Dr. Newman, "The Harvard Report: An Analysis," pp. 2, 21. A letter from Committee member Harry A. Wolfson fortified the Rabbi's faith in Harvard. Wolfson maintained that "'every Jewish boy in any part of the country,'" who stood in the "'highest seventh!'" of his senior class could be recommended by his principal for admission to Harvard "'without examination.'" Failing to qualify under these terms, he could still seek admission through regular entrance examinations. Wolfson found "'no ground for approaching the plan with suspicion.'"
In contrast to the Rabbi's reasoned analysis was the anti-Semitic viciousness in *La Vieille-France*, a copy and English translation of which had been sent to President Lowell by George Lyman Kittredge. "An American Disaster," as the article was entitled, drew upon the fabricated *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. "The great battle waged at Harvard University between Israel and the White Race," the commentary complained, "has ended in the defeat of the Aryans." Not only were "Jews and negroes... placed on exactly the same footing as the Whites without any qualification," but the way was opened for Jews to become "the majority," thereby transforming "Harvard, the American University par excellence, into a Hebraic and Asiatic University." Control of education was a major step toward the Jewish goal of "becoming themselves the entire ruling class in accordance with the Protocols, having relegated the Gentiles to the rank of helots." Such rabid allegations probably appalled President Lowell who considered "the idea of a Nordic race" to be "nonsense." Lowell had always insisted that he wanted to reduce anti-Semitism at Harvard, while *La Vieille-France* obviously fomented racial prejudices. On the other hand, this difference should not obscure the question of where anti-Semitism really begins—in "gentelmanly" exclusion or in the streets. 26

---

26 "An American Disaster," *La Vieille-France*, No. 327,
"Statistical Report of the Statisticians"

The unpublished volume of statistical tables, compiled under the direction of the "Subcommittee Appointed to Collect Statistics," revealed the degree to which racist concepts had permeated academic circles by the 1920's and provided a fascinating collective portrait of Jewish students at Harvard during the first twenty years of the century. The only prior study of ethnic groups at Harvard had been conducted under the auspices of the United States Immigration Commission in 1908. It differed from the later Harvard study because it collected information on all students in school, with particular emphasis on those of the various immigrant stocks. The Harvard statisticians—Edward R. Gay, an Assistant Dean of the College, and Dr. A. J. Hettinger, Jr., of the Graduate School of Business Administration—focused almost exclusively on the Jewish students. And instead of drawing only on cards completed by students at registration, they delved into a wide variety of sources: admission forms; parentage cards filled out at registration; records in the Bursar's Office; and Senior Class Albums. This extensive and intensive investigation

3-10, May, 1923; A. Lawrence Lowell to W. Schaumann, May 15, 1923, ALLP, 1922-1925, #8 Jews. "An American Disaster" also stated that "a former student and administrative officer of Harvard has shown us (No. 323) the unlimited consequences of this event, then dreaded and now an accomplished fact."
covered not only Jewish students in the College, but also those in the graduate and professional schools. Among other things, they traced the increase in Jewish enrollment throughout the University since 1900. Then they computed the percentages of Jews and non-Jews among each of the following: high school and preparatory school graduates; transfer students; line cases; recipients of degrees, both with and without distinction; ranking scholars and unsatisfactory students; disciplinary cases; participants in athletics and other extra-curricular activities; members of social clubs and the Harvard Union; commuters; recipients of financial assistance; and undergraduate fields of concentration. Vocational choices of Jewish graduates, along with the number among them entering Harvard's graduate and professional schools, were also tabulated. Virtually no aspect of the Jewish student's College career went unexamined. The methods employed probably gave "results as trustworthy as any can be," the Committee of Inquiry believed, "when the object of research" was "as undefined and undefinable as the Jew." 27

27"Statistical Report of the Statisticians to the Subcommittee Appointed to Collect Statistics: Dean Chester N. Greenough, Chairman, Dean Wallace B. Donham, Dean Henry W. Holmes" (hereafter abbreviated as "Statistical Report"), 100 pages, and letter from the Committee to A. Lawrence Lowell, April 7, 1923, ALLP, 1922-1925, #387 Admission to Harvard College. C. H. Grandgent to Charles W. Eliot, Nov. 11, 1922. According to a letter from A. J. Hettinger, Jr. to Dean Chester N. Greenough, December 21, 1922, Dean of Harvard College—Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough,
The reliability of their statistical tables depended, of course, in large measure upon the soundness of their methodology. Although the statisticians, under the supervision of Dean Greenough, the chairman, and Dean Donham and Holmes, did not avoid certain racist assumptions—the chief one being that Jews could be classified as a racial type—they did steer clear of certain pitfalls. For example, on Dr. Lee's suggestion, they wisely "omitted" the following line of inquiry, which had been proposed during the Subcommittee's June 21, 1922 meeting: "What Are The Significant Facts Concerning Jewish Students As Revealed By The Physical Examinations Of Freshmen And The Prescribed Freshman Physical Training?" There would be no measurements of skulls and other parts of the body. The Subcommittee also decided to omit another "undesirable" line of inquiry: "What Financial Support Do Jewish Graduates Give The University?" Even though the Subcommittee did not elaborate upon its decision, the reasons were obvious. Harvard received many benefactions from Jews, from non-alumni—notably, Jacob H. Schiff—as well as from alumni. During its endowment and building campaigns of the 1920's, the University planned to solicit funds—which

1916-27), #16 Sub-committee on Sifting: "Data have been gathered covering the number of Oriental students and the number of students coming from what might be termed, roughly, the races represented in Eastern and Southeastern Europe," but "the base involved" was "not large enough to give significant trends."
would be generously given—from the Lehmans, the Littauers, the Loebss, the Sachsces, the Strauses, and the Warburgs. A degree of practicality tempered the Subcommittee's investigation.28

Dr. Hettinger and Dean Gay submitted their report on December 21, 1923; it was followed at a later date by some supplementary tabulations on geographical distribution. Because the task of tabulating the material was great and time limited, they were aided by the Bureau of Business Research. But first Hettinger and Gay had to determine which students were Jewish and which were not in those years since 1900 chosen for study. Admission books, registration cards, and other "original records were examined twice, each time by one of the statisticians acting independently of the other." About 8,000 names were "selected for further study," by their "composite judgment." But Judge Mack complained about their methods when applied to the Law School. The statisticians "later rejected forty-five per cent" of the initially selected Law School records as belonging to Gentiles. In response to

28A. J. Hettinger, Jr. to Chester N. Greenough, December 21, 1922. During a meeting of the Subcommittee on June 21, 1921, seventeen topics in regard to Jewish students had been proposed for investigation. Except for the three later omitted (see supra, n. 27, on uncompleted study of "Oriental and Eastern European Races"), the others appeared in some form either in the final report or as supplementary statistics.
Mack's "suggestion" that well-informed representatives of each school be consulted in this work, the Committee of Inquiry replied that

it would be impracticable to employ any such special assistants unless we can get people who will not only safeguard us from the error of including as Jews people who are really not Jews, but who will also protect us from the error of leaving out Jews who should be included.29

The work of classification involved filling out a "Racial Classification" form on all students assumed to be Jewish. They relied upon a combination of factors for a positive identification: "1 Name...," "2 Birthplace...," "3 Father's Name...," "4 Father's Vocation...," "5 Mother's Name...,” "6 Bondsmen's Names...(1)...(2)...," "7 Admitted to Harvard from (a) Preparatory School... (b) College or University...," "8 Home Address...." According to the statisticians:

The student's name usually gave a clue, but there were a sufficient number of changes in name or instances of a name that might have been, for instance, either German or Jewish, to render it impossible to consider this

29C. N. Greenough to Dr. A. J. Hettinger, Jr., September 28 and December 22, 1922; Hettinger to Greenough, October 1 and December 21, 1922; and November 15, 1922 Greenough to Julian W. Mack, Dean of Harvard College--Correspondence, #16 Sub-committee on Sifting. Of those students selected for additional study, "somewhat over half... were, in fact, finally classed as non-Jews when all additional information was assembled" ("Statistical Report," pp. 2, 4).
as complete evidence. Changes in the father's name were less frequent. The mother's maiden name, very seldom altered, was of material help. Such items as birthplace, father's occupation and home address, when considered in light of the evidence as a whole possessed a value beyond that which could be ascribed to them as isolated facts.

And if the bondsmen had Jewish names, it was likely that the student was also Jewish. But "contrary to what might be expected," photographs in the Freshman Red Book and Senior Album "afforded practically no additional information."

Lastly, the biographical data in the Senior Album was checked before "the final classification of names was completed."

Having brought all this information together in one office, the statisticans divided "Jews" into three groups and labeled them: '"J1', 'J2', and 'J3'". These groups might also be defined, in order, as meaning "conclusively," indicatively, and possibly, but not probably, Jewish. Of the total number of College students admitted between

30"Statistical Report," pp. 1-4. For "Racial Classification" form, see Committee to Study Racial Distribution in the University, Report and Work Papers, Ca. 1922, HUA, There were eleven other items on the form: "9 College Address..." "10 Does student commute? Yes No...," "11 Assistance received from loan funds (a) Amounts received, with dates..., (b) Amounts repaid, with dates...," "12 Financial support given to the University...," "13 Professional schools attended after leaving College...," "14 Vocation after leaving Harvard...," "15 Department and Class...," "16 Department of Concentration at Harvard College...," "17 Disciplinary Record...," "18 Scholarship Record...," "19 Participation in undergraduate activities (a) Athletic..., (b) Non-athletic..., (c) Club membership..., Harvard Union membership, Yes No...."
1918-19 and 1922-23, 17 per cent on an average were placed in the "'J1'" category, and only 2.5 per cent each in "'J2'" and "'J3'". Since the first two categories together without the third, gave "the most probable estimate of the proportion of Jewish students" at Harvard, they based their statistics only "'J1'" and "'J2'". Although admitting the possibility of mistakes in classification, they felt "that the number of men wrongly classed as 'J1', or 'J2'" was "counterbalanced by the number of Jews considered as 'J3' or not discovered at all." In the case of Harvard College, which had the largest enrollment of any school within the University:

occasional errors in the work of the statisticians... would affect the percentages far less than in the case, say, of the Dental School, where...a change in the status of a single student admitted during the autumn of 1921 would have been sufficient to change the percentage of Jewish to total students admitted four per cent, so small was the entering class as a whole. In similar fashion throughout the statistical tables included in the report caution must be exercised in the use of percentages where the base upon which they are computed is too small to give stability to the results. 31

---

31 Hettinger to Greenough, October 1, 1922, "Statistical Report," pp. 3-6. Although the exact cost incurred by the Committee of Inquiry and its Subcommittees is unknown, several bills are found in Dean of Harvard College--Correspondence, #16 Sub-committee on Sifting: Dr. Hettinger, Assistant Dean Gay, and the Bureau of Business Research were paid collectively at least $2,066.89 (C. N. Greenough to C. H. Grandgent, December 23, 1922, January 29, and February 10, 1923; John L. Taylor, Auditor, to Greenough, January 26, 1923; A. J. Hettinger, Jr. to Greenough, February 5, 1923; and Greenough to Hettinger, June 5, 1923). In addition, there were the mailing expenses of the other Subcommittees and the cost of printing the "Report."
Tabulations for the World War I years, said the statisticians, should be treated with particular care, since enrollment during that time was unstable. The large enrollment in Harvard College provided the most reliable results. But even here, they admitted, tabulations based upon a small number of students, as in disciplinary cases, had to be analyzed cautiously. On the whole, their report had three virtues: painstaking research, uniform procedures, and acknowledgment of possible inaccuracies in both classification and results. 32

As Table 6 indicated, the enrollment of Jewish students at Harvard College had dramatically increased from 7 per cent in 1900 to 21.5 per cent in 1922. And by that later date, there were also substantial percentages of Jews in the Law School, 14.4 per cent, Medical School, 16.1 per cent, and Dental School, 12.5 per cent.

Much of the increase in the proportion of Jewish freshmen, regularly admitted, was due to their growing numbers in the Boston area high schools. For example, from 1918 through 1921, Boston Latin School sent, respectively, 19, 18, 23 and 23 Jewish students to Harvard College. The largest number of Jewish transfer students also came from the Boston area—-from Tufts College and Boston University. About one-third of the Jewish students commuted—twice as many proportionately as among Gentiles. Of

### Table 6

**Number and Percentage of Jewish Students to Total Number of Students Admitted to the Various Schools within Harvard University in Specified Years, 1900 - 1922**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Admitted</th>
<th>Total Number Harvard College Regulars</th>
<th>Number of Jews Among Harvard College Regulars</th>
<th>Percentage of Jews Among Harvard College Regulars</th>
<th>Total Number Harvard College Transfers</th>
<th>Number of Jews Among Harvard College Transfers</th>
<th>Percentage of Jews Among Harvard College Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1922</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note on Table I:**

"*1922 percentages, except in case of Harvard College, based on preliminary survey made early in October."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Admitted</th>
<th>Total Number Harvard College Special Students</th>
<th>Number of Jews Among Harvard College Special Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Jews Among Harvard College Special Students</th>
<th>Total Number Engineering School</th>
<th>Number of Jews in Engineering School</th>
<th>Percentage of Jews in Engineering School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1922</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on Table I:  
"*1922 percentages, except in case of Harvard College, based on preliminary survey made early in October."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Admitted</th>
<th>Total Number in Graduate School of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Number of Jews in Graduate School of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Percentage of Jews in Graduate School of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Total Number in Law School</th>
<th>Number of Jews in Law School</th>
<th>Percentage of Jews in Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1922</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on Table I:
"*1922 percentages, except in case of Harvard College, based on preliminary survey made early in October."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Admitted</th>
<th>MEDICAL SCHOOL</th>
<th>DENTAL SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number in Medical School</td>
<td>Number of Jews in Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1922</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on Table I: "*1922 percentages, except in case of Harvard College, based on preliminary survey made early in October."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Admitted</th>
<th>Total Number Graduate School of Business Administration</th>
<th>Number of Jews in Graduate School of Business Administration</th>
<th>Percentage of Jews in Graduate School of Business Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1922</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on Table I:
"*1922 percentages, except in case of Harvard College, based on preliminary survey made early in October."
the 210 Jewish students (transfers as well as regulars) admitted to the College in 1921, 83, or 39.5 per cent, were commuters. 33

Among those admitted between 1912 and 1918, about the same percentages of Jewish, 75.6, and Gentile, 76.3, regular students completed the College course and received a degree. But 10 per cent more Jewish transfer students graduated. And of the 958 Jewish students, regularly admitted between 1912 and 1921, only 148, or 15.5 per cent, were ever reported for unsatisfactory record. Although the proportion of Jewish transfer students so reported was 28 per cent, or 122 or 436, the percentages among Gentiles were even higher. Of the Gentiles students—5027 regular and 1315 transfer—admitted during these same years, 37.2 and 46.2 per cent, respectively, had unsatisfactory records. Proportionately, more than twice as many Jewish regular students—44.3 per cent—received degrees with distinction than Gentiles—19.5; the percentages for transfer students were, respectively, 23.1 and 15.7. While Jewish students numbered only about 15 per cent of the regular students, they earned about 28 per cent of the degrees with distinction (Table 7). Among transfers, Jewish students, 26 per cent of the total number, earned 34 per cent of the degrees with distinction. Finally, about 30 per cent of the First and Second Group

TABLE 7
"PROPORTION OF JEWS TO TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING DEGREE WITH DISTINCTION
(Data for students admitted 1912-1918)"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Distinction</th>
<th>Number of Students Receiving Degree with Kind of Distinction Specified</th>
<th>Percentage of Jews to Total Receiving Degree with Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Kinds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulars</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summa cum laude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulars</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magna cum laude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulars</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum laude in Special Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulars</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum laude in General Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulars</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on Table III: * Proportion of Jews to total obtaining degree:
Regulars 14.6
Transfers 25.7

Scholars were Jewish (Table 8).\textsuperscript{34} Even though the statisticians specifically stated that the base for the study of students under discipline was "too small for the results to receive the same weight, for instance, as in the study of admissions," the Committee's April 7, 1923 letter to President Lowell disregarded this caution. Instead the letter generalized that the Jewish student seemed "more prone to dishonesty and sexual offenses, but much less addicted to intemperance." This generalization was certainly open to question since only 4.7 per cent of all Jewish students and 3 per cent of all non-Jewish students were under discipline of any kind during the years 1912-13 to 1921-22 (Table 9). Except for "offenses involving dishonesty," less than one per cent of either Jews or Gentiles were guilty of drunkenness, improper conduct, or other offenses. In regard to dishonesty, 131 Gentiles or 2.0 per cent of their total number were disciplined and 52 or 3.7 per cent of the Jews. Apparently, some of the Committee of Inquiry believed that these almost insignificant figures indicated that Jews were proportionately almost twice as dishonest as Gentiles. But Table 10 revealed that only 2 non-Jews and 3 Jews were expelled for dishonesty.

\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., pp. 28-37.
### TABLE 8

"PROPORTION OF JEWS AMONG FIRST AND SECOND GROUP SCHOLARS - 1915-16 TO 1922-23"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First and Second Group Scholars</th>
<th>Percentage of Jews to Total First and Second Group Scholars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-16</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-17</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-18</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-19</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-21</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-22</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-23</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE 9

"PROPORTION OF JEWS TO TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS UNDER DISCIPLINE 1912-13 TO 1921-22, INCLUSIVE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Number of Students under discipline for indicated offenses</th>
<th>Percentage of Jews to total under discipline</th>
<th>Percentage of Students under discipline to total in group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Offenses</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses involving dishonesty</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Conduct</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Offenses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>All Offenses</th>
<th>Offenses Involving Dishonesty</th>
<th>Drunkenness</th>
<th>Improper Conduct</th>
<th>All Other Offenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gentiles</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>Gentiles</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>Gentiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Discipline</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Closed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required to Withdraw</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admonished</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Withheld</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)A higher percentage of Jewish students under discipline, 25.7, than Gentile students under discipline, 11.0, were "expelled or dismissed."

And only one Jewish student was expelled for "improper conduct."  

On the other hand, tables on athletic participation, based upon a larger number of students, were certainly more reliable. By 1918, for example, 30.3 per cent of Jews, admitted as regular students, participated in athletics; the percentage among Jewish transfer students was considerably less, but by no means insignificant—13.2 per cent—in that year. According to the 1922 Senior Album, 48.5 per cent of the Gentile and 25.0 per cent of the Jewish students "went out for" athletics. In the same class, about three times as many Gentile as Jewish students participated in non-athletic extracurricular activities: 33.6 to 11.3 per cent. During the years 1900-1918, Jewish students were

35"Statistical Report," pp. 38-47. The statisticians also added: "The length of time for which these figures are taken is, however, long enough to rule out the possibility of error due to particular conditions in a given year." Dr. Hettinger and Dean Gay felt that the records on loans and repayments were "not sufficiently reliable" to support significant generalizations. In 1912 Jewish students received $196.00, or 2.2 per cent of the $9026.40 loaned. From 1917 through 1920, they received about 20 to 22 per cent of the amounts loaned, sums ranging from $1841.94 in 1917 to $3997.40 in 1920. But in 1921, Jewish students received only $3050.09, or 17.8 per cent of the total $17,135.74 loaned. For the period 1912-1921, Jewish students received 16.3 per cent of the money loaned and made 11.7 per cent of the repayments. The statisticians cautioned, however, that since loans were repaid at a later time, "an increasing proportion of assignments to Jewish students might be a contributing factor in the smaller proportion of repayments shown by that group" ("Statistical Report," pp. 82-87).
most active in music and debating, and then in papers, class offices, dramatics, and social service (Table 11). Table 12, on the Class of 1922, showed Jewish students to be well represented in debating and music, but entirely unrepresented in dramatics.36

But Jewish students had to rely on each other for social companionship. In the Class of 1922, 40 out the 46 Jews belonging to social clubs, were members of Jewish fraternities. At that time, Harvard had six Jewish fraternities: Sigma Alpha Mu (1909), Argo Club (1911), Zeta Beta Tau (1912), and Kappa Nu, Tau Delta Phi, and Tau Epsilon Phi, all founded in 1918. The fact that chapters of three Jewish fraternities began at Harvard in one year suggested that as the percentage of Jewish students increased in the College, the proportion taken into the Gentile fraternities did not correspondingly increase. The Speaker's Club, which had accepted as many as 5 Jews from the Class of 1918, had none from the Class of 1922, although from the same class both the Institute of 1770 and Hasty Pudding had two Jews each. Of Harvard's ten "final" clubs, only four--Owl, Delta Upsilon, Phoenix, and Iroquois--took any Jewish members from the classes admitted between

36"Statistical Report," pp. 48-60. The percentages derived from the 1922 Class Album were based upon 168 of the 190 Jewish and upon 536 of the 628 Gentile students admitted in 1918.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Admission</th>
<th>Total Number of Jewish Students Admitted</th>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Dramatics</th>
<th>Musical</th>
<th>Debating</th>
<th>Class Office</th>
<th>Social Service Phillips Brooks House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent of Total</td>
<td>Per Cent of Total</td>
<td>Per Cent of Total</td>
<td>Per Cent of Total</td>
<td>Per Cent of Total</td>
<td>Per Cent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Athletic Activities</th>
<th>Number of Students Participating in Non-Athletics Activities</th>
<th>Percentage of Jews to Total Participating in Non-Athletic Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debating</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Office</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Phillips Brooks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Senior Album did not include 22 of the 190 Jewish and 92 of the 628 Gentile students admitted in 1918.

1912 and 1918. Owl, ranked sixth in Harvard's hierarchy of clubs, admitted three Jews from the Class of 1920. Delta Upsilon, Phoenix, and Iroquois, ranked, respectively, eighth, ninth, and tenth, accepted eight other Jewish members: D. U. took two from the Class of 1918 and one from 1922; Phoenix admitted one each from 1917, 1919, and 1920; and Iroquois admitted two from 1920. All of the Jewish members were regular students; none had transferred to Harvard from another college. Of the Jewish students listed in the 1922 Senior Album 27.4 per cent belonged to social clubs, but only 3.6 per cent of them were members of Gentile clubs. In contrast, 58.6 per cent (314) of the Gentiles listed in the Album were club members.37

In terms of undergraduate fields of concentration, Jewish and Gentile students tended to share similar interests. Among Jewish students admitted in 1921, the following fields attracted the largest percentages: Chemistry, 13.4; Economics, 24.8; English, 15.7; History and Literature, 10.5; and Mathematics, 5.2; 15.2 were still deciding. Among Gentiles the percentages were, respectively: Chemistry, 4.6; Economics, 13.1; English, 27.0; History and Literature, 9.0; Mathematics, 3.3; and undecided 17.3.

After graduating from the College, a fair number of Jewish students entered one of the Harvard graduate and professional schools: 50 out of 190 in 1922. In order of preference, they choose first the Law School, then the Medical School, followed by the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Business School, and School of Engineering. Of the Jewish graduates (from selected classes admitted between 1900 and 1918) whose vocational choices were known, 30 per cent entered mercantile businesses, 15 per cent law, and 11 per cent manufacturing. According statistics compiled from the secretary's reports for the Classes of 1896, 1901, 1906, 1911, 1916, and 1921, growing numbers of Harvard graduates had entered business occupations. Whereas 35 per cent of the Class of 1896 had gone into business, over 55 per cent of the Class of 1916 chose commercial and industrial occupations. Such an increase was "made in part at the expense of medicine, but chiefly of law and education, each of which in the course of the twenty years fell about nine per cent." About 11 and 8 per cent, respectively, of the Class of 1916 became lawyers and educators. (And the number entering the ministry continued.

---

38 For detailed tables on "Percentage of Students Concentrating in Indicated Fields," 1918-1921, and "Percentage of Jews (J1 and J2) to Total Number of Students Concentrating in Indicated Fields," 1918-1921, see four unnumbered pages at end of "Statistical Report."
its two hundred year decline "until it has nearly reached the vanishing point." Comparison of these two sets of statistics indicated that a majority of Harvard graduates became businessmen, but that almost three times as many Jewish alumni engaged in mercantile pursuits as in manufacturing. 39

The Faculty and the Committee of Inquiry's "Report"

Despite reservations in regard to the validity of some of the tables, reservations which the statisticians themselves acknowledged, their report assembled an impressive amount of date. And the weight of evidence showed that Jewish students were constructive citizens of the Harvard community, not an alien body. But few people outside the Committee of Inquiry and some of the members of the Governing Boards ever saw this statistical data. Yet the intention of the printed "Report" was clearly stated: reject racial and religious discrimination in admission, eliminate weaker students, and attract more applicants from the South and West. The Faculty, although feeling slightly snubbed because the "Report" was released to the press before they saw it, adopted the proposals "without much discussion," as Grandgent predicted to Eliot. And

Eliot decided that if the Faculty did not object to the proposals he disliked—specifically, the "highest seventh" plan—he would withhold his own objections. Thus after almost a year of controversy, the "Report" was accepted by the Harvard community with comparatively few dissenting voices. 40

On April 10, Professor Grandgent presented the "Report" to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and moved that it be voted upon two weeks hence. Accordingly, at a special meeting on April 24, President Lowell informed the Faculty that on the previous day the Corporation had voted "'to accept the report as a whole,'" if such action seemed

40 Eliot to Mack, 14 April 1923, related Grandgent's thoughts on the Faculty's reaction to the "report." For the Faculty's feeling of being slighted by the release of the "report," see Jerome D. Greene to Dean L. B. R. Briggs, April 12, 1923 (a copy of which was sent to Dean Greenough), Dean of Harvard College—Correspondence, #16 Sub-committee on Sifting; Mack to Eliot, April 17, 1923; and Briggs to Greene, April 13, 1923, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Correspondence (L. B. R. Briggs 1902-1925), pp. 745-746. Greene told Briggs that "certainly no discourtesy" was "intended," but that the Overseers had "taken over" the Committee from the Faculty and made it "a Committee of the Board." And the Overseers adopted the first of the Committee's recommendations, because it related directly to University policy; the others were referred to the Faculty. "As the framer and mover of the votes" of the Board, Greene tried to forestall "immediate discussion" of the other recommendations and "to protect rather than to hurt the dignity of the Faculty." Briggs, like Greene, rejoiced in Harvard's stand and was pleased with the favorable publicity which the "masterly document" received. But he thought that publicizing that part of the report dealing with admission examinations before presenting it to the Faculty was "theoretically wrong and likely to make some persons feel sore."
"wise" to the Faculty. Although Professor Grandgent moved that the nine changes in admission policy, recommended in Section 8, be adopted as a whole, Frank W. Taussig, professor of Economics, insisted that the Faculty vote upon each recommendation singly. No opposition was raised to recommendations (a) through (h):

(a) That in the administration of rules for admission Harvard College maintain its traditional policy of freedom from discrimination on grounds of race or religion.
(b) That, as a general policy, transfer of students from other Colleges be confined to such candidates as have lacked opportunity to prepare themselves for admission by the usual methods.
(c) That insistence be stricter on full compliance with the published requirements for admission.
(d) That no candidate be admitted whose examination in English composition is not passable. This rule is not to apply to candidates for whom English is a foreign tongue.
(e) That the number of satisfactory grades under the Old Plan be raised from five to six, announcement being made that a greater increase is likely in the near future.
(f) That the question of discontinuing the Old Plan be raised after the above regulations shall have been in force long enough to permit study of their results.
(g) That Italian be recognized as an admission subject on a par with Spanish.
(h) That Botany and Zoology be added to the list of elective subjects under the New Plan.

Clifford H. Moore, professor of Latin, asked that the votes be recorded on the ninth and final recommendation. By a vote of 73 ayes to 20 nays, out of 100 present, the Faculty adopted the "highest seventh" plan, the most "radical" of the proposals:

(i) That, as an experiment, the following modification be introduced in the published
requirements for admission:—Pupils who have satisfactorily completed an approved school course such as is outlined in the description of the New Plan, and whose scholastic rank places them in the highest seventh of the boys of their graduating class, may, if recommended by their school, be admitted to College without examination.

This method of admission is intended to facilitate access to College by capable boys from schools which do not ordinarily prepare their pupils for college examinations.

The college records of students thus admitted will be scrutinized with a view to determining the expediency of extending, restricting, or abolishing the practice.

Since the Faculty had now accepted all the recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry, Professor Grandgent moved the adoption of "his original motion." It "was carried unanimously." 41

On May 8, Henry Pennypacker submitted the report of the Committee on Admission "as to the proper administration of the new regulations for admission." The Governing Board had adopted the first recommendation (a) and the second (b) was already being practiced. The "highest seventh plan" (i) would be implemented in June, 1923, and

41 Harvard University, Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Meetings of April 10, and 24, 1923, Records, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, XII (1922), 32-36. Among those voting against the "highest seventh" proposal were Professors Kittredge, Haskins, C. H. Moore, Merriman, and Mr. Pennypacker. "Report of the Committee on Methods of Sifting Candidates," pp. 5-6. In his report to the President as Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard President's Report, 1922-23, pp. 32-33, Briggs referred briefly to the adoption of "important and somewhat radical recommendations of the Committee on Admission."
four other recommendations (c, d, e, and h) would go into effect a year later. Recommendation (g) would become operative when the CEEB offered an Italian examination. No immediate action was taken on (f). Finally, the Committee on Admission voted that the grade in English composition be recorded separately. The Faculty then recommended to the Governing Boards that the report be approved. Put to the test of experience, would the new measures work to the satisfaction of all concerned? 42

Limiting the Number of Students in Harvard College

Hardly had the Faculty and Governing Boards adopted the "Report" and approved its implementation, when President Lowell proposed another scheme of limitation. He was dissatisfied with the results of the Committee of Inquiry, yet aware that his approach had stiffened opposition to a

42 Harvard University, Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Meetings of May 1 and 8, 1923, Records XII (1922), 37, 39-40. An official copy of the Committee on Admission's report and the Faculty's vote of May 8 was sent by George W. Cram to F. W. Hunnewell, Secretary to the Corporation, along with a copy of the Engineering School Faculty's May 7 vote recommending to the Governing Boards the adoption of the nine proposals in Section 8 of the Committee of Inquiry's "Report." See ALLP, 1922-1925, #387 Admission to Harvard College. On April 30, the President and Fellows voted that the nine proposals in Section 8 "be accepted and put into effect, the consent of the Overseers having been first obtained." On May 14, President Lowell conveyed the Corporation's vote to the Overseers, who "voted to consent to said vote" (Winthrop H. Wade, Secretary, "a true copy of record" of the May 14, 1923 Meeting of the Board of Overseers, ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers).
Jewish quota. In May, 1923, Lowell wrote President Alexander Meiklejohn of Amherst College about Harvard's recent decisions on "the race question." Said Lowell: "We have dealt with it in both cases by compromise, which was the only possible thing at the time, though it can hardly be said to be fully satisfactory to anyone." He added that "perhaps" this was "the way questions of this kind must be settled." But in December, 1925, Lowell assured those alumni, who were concerned over the increase of Jewish students at Harvard, that they "need not doubt that the matter is thoroughly understood by the authorities here." Alumni letters had convinced the President that he "was not wholly wrong three years ago in trying to limit the proportion of Jews." However, in a postscript, he admitted: "My plan was crude, and its method was very probably unwise." 43

On the other hand, a proposal to limit the enrollment of students to a number which Harvard could effectively educate was far more reasonable. On June 20, 1923, the President and Fellows voted:

43 A. Lawrence Lowell to President Alexander Meiklejohn, May 2, 1923; Laurence McKinney, Secretary of the Harvard Association of Eastern New York to Prof. R. B. Merriman, April 23, 1923, reporting the vote of confidence in Lowell passed at its Annual Dinner; and Lowell to Merriman, April 25, 1923, saying that the vote was "delightful and extremely encouraging" to him, ALLP, 1922-1925, #42-A Freshman Halls: Negros. A. Lawrence Lowell to Cyrus Brewer, December 1, 1925, and Lowell to M. E. T. Brown, December 18, 1925, ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers.
that the President be requested to consult the Faculty of Arts and Sciences whether in their opinion it is possible to teach effectively a much larger number of undergraduates than at present, and whether it might be wise to limit the number of students admitted to the Freshman class to one thousand or such other number as the Faculty may deem proper.

And in October, Lowell presented this vote to the Faculty, which discussed and debated the matter during two one-hour meetings. At the second meeting, on October 9, Dean Holmes "moved that the President appoint a special committee of this Faculty to consider and report on the problem of the limitation of numbers." To this Committee, Lowell appointed four members of the former Committee of Inquiry—Grandgent, Greenough, Lyman, and Pennypacker—and five new ones. In addition to Chairman Clifford H. Moore were Frank W. Taussig, George H. Parker, professor of Zoology, William B. Munro, professor of Municipal Government, and James Bryant Conant, assistant professor of Chemistry. 44

The Committee produced a relatively brief report, which was adopted by the Faculty on December 18, 1923. Considering "the question of the limitation of numbers...as an educational rather than a financial problem," the Committee

44 Vote of the President and Fellows of Harvard College, June 20, 1923 and Lowell's memorandum appointing the Committee, October 11, 1923, ALLP, 1922-1925, #76 Admission, Committee on, September 1922-December 1923. Harvard University, Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Meetings of October 2 and 9, 1923, Records, XII (1922), 67, 69. James Bryant Conant '14, who succeeded Lowell as President of Harvard, voted in favor of the controversial motions of May 23 and June 2, 1922.
made four recommendations which were to become operative in June, 1924. Most importantly, "the Freshman Class of Harvard College shall be so restricted as not to exceed the possibility of adequate instruction." And "for the present, the number shall be limited to one thousand." In determining who should be selected, the Committee on Admission should divide the candidates into two groups. First, those who were on a level of academic and "intellectual equality with undergraduates in the first four groups of the Rank List" should be admitted. The rest of the "quota" would be filled by "those who, having satisfied the minimum requirements for admission, in the judgment of the Committee have best proved their competence." Both "the aptitude and character" of these candidates should be evaluated with the aid of letters of recommendation and a personal interview. "All candidates" were, however, to "be admitted free from any condition." None of the proposals, they said, were "in conflict" with the votes of April and May, 1923, in regard to admission policy.  

With an amendment by the Faculty of the Engineering School to include first-year Engineering students within the 1,000 total, "exclusive of dropped Freshmen" in both the  

45 "Report of the Committee on the Limitation of Students" (Adopted by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at its meeting, December 18, 1923), ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers.
College and the School, the report and votes were presented to the Corporation. On January 14, 1924, the President and Fellows, "substituting Engineering for dropped Freshmen," adopted "for the present in all other respects the vote of the Faculty as the rule of admission." This vote was then related to the Overseers, who submitted it to their Committee to Visit Harvard College.\(^4\)

Chairman of this Committee was Henry James, Jr., son of philosopher William James. Jerome D. Greene having completed his term of Overseer, Henry James emerged as one of the few critics on the Board other than Judge Mack. In addition to his service on various Overseers' committees, James was to contribute greatly to the history of Harvard by his Pulitzer-prize winning two volumes on Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard University, 1869-1909 (1930).\(^5\)

Although recognizing that Harvard's instructional

\(^4\)F. W. Hunnewell, Secretary, "a true copy of record" of the January 14, 1924 Meeting of the President and Fellows, ALLP, 1922-1925, #76-A Admission, Committee on, January--February 1924; Winthrop H. Wade, Secretary, "a true copy of record" of the January 14, 1924 Meeting of the Board of Overseers, ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers. The Faculty of the Engineering School voted on January 7, 1924 to accept the report with amendment.

halls and dormitory rooms were filled almost to capacity, the Committee pointed to a statement from President Lowell's recent report: "The idea of limiting the number of students in the College is not agreeable and no one would propose it as a finality or suggest that there is here some permanent size of maximum usefulness.'" The Committee's report, presented on February 25, 1924, endorsed a "temporary" limitation of the size of the Freshman Class, while urging that the problem be studied in depth, including the possibility of another fund-raising campaign. The Board of Overseers voted to accept it and to adopt the Committee's recommendations: first, that the Board "consent" to the Corporation's vote approving "a limit of size for the Freshman class 'for the present,'" but that it "be reconsidered at the earliest possible time." And second, the President of the Board should appoint "a Special Committee...to report in a year's time on numbers in relation to equipment, personnel, standards, and the scope and function of the College, with the suggestion,...,that it should be composed of officers of the University, and might include members of the Corporation and Faculty as well as this Board." As a result, two months later, the following were appointed to the Special Committee on the Limitation of the Size of the Freshman Class: President Lowell and James Byrne of the Corporation; Overseers Dr. William S. Thayer and Henry James, Chairman; Professors Clifford
H. Moore and Chester N. Greenough of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; and Comfort A. Adams of the Faculty of the School of Engineering. 48

The Overseers, especially Henry James, had wanted to restrict the policy of limitation to a two year period. But President Lowell had argued that this was too short a period to test such an "experimental" proposal. "If the Overseers modify the plan for limitation prepared by the Faculty and accepted by the Corporation," he wrote James, they would have to "assume the responsibility for refusing measures that the bodies directly concerned with the administration deem essential." The case for limitation prevailed easily at the Overseers's Meeting of February 25: "Nobody voted against the whole proposition; although Judge Mack had come all the way from Florida to oppose it." 49

48 "Report to the Overseers From the Committee to Visit the College On the Proposal to Limit Numbers in the Freshman Class," by Henry James, Chairman, and by Grenville Clark, Richard S. Derby, Langdon Marvin, Ellery Sedgwick, and Elliot Wadsworth (Mr. Drury was in Europe), presented at the February 25, 1924 Meeting of the Board of Overseers, and "a true copy of record" of that meeting, Winthrop H. Wade, Secretary, ALLP, 1922-1925, #76-A Admission, Committee on, January—February 1924. Winthrop H. Wade, Secretary, "a true copy of record," of the April 14, 1924 Meeting of the Board of Overseers, ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers. For a concise summary of these votes as well as a copy of the "Report of the Committee on the Limitation of Students," see report of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard President's Report, 1923-24, pp. 35-38.

49 A. Lawrence Lowell to Henry James, February 18, 1924, and Lowell to Dr. E. H. Bradford, February 27, 1924, ALLP 1922-1925, #76-A Admission, Committee on, January—February 1924.
Thus "gratified," Lowell informed Admission Director Pennypacker that the Governing Boards had approved the changes in admission policy recommended by the Arts and Sciences and Engineering School Faculties. In regard to the "highest seventh" plan, Lowell pointed out that the Faculty vote was "not mandatory," but merely gave the Committee "power to admit this class of applicants in its discretion." The Committee on Admission consequently had "no obligation to apply it to any school if it does not think it best so to do, and is clearly at liberty to withdraw the privilege from any school whose students do not achieve in College the rank to be expected from students so admitted." Significantly, Lowell instructed the Dean's Office to keep a count of the Jewish students admitted under the "highest seventh" plan. In June, 1923, for example, Jews constituted 32.1 per cent of the 134 applicants admitted "without examination on the basis of their school records" and were largely from the Middle Atlantic states, especially from New England. The statistics compiled at Lowell's request in the autumn of 1925 must have been even less encouraging. The Dean's Office "made a rough estimate of the number of Jews among the new students regularly admitted this year to the Freshman Class," by checking through parentage cards. It found 243 Jewish students classified as "J1 and J2," out of 880 "New Freshmen." The percentage of Jewish students had risen from 21.5 in 1922.
to 27.6 within three years. The estimate did not include, moreover, the 38 students, another 4.3 per cent, who were "placed in the J3 category." Interestingly, 115 or 41.7 per cent of the 276 successful "highest seventh" (now called "Honor Plan") candidates were Jewish. Again, most of these Jewish Honor candidates—about 80 per cent—came from New England and the Middle Atlantic states. And 12 of the 18 Jewish freshmen awarded aid from the Price Greenleaf and Parmenter funds were admitted under the Honor Plan.

Jewish students constituted 25 per cent of those receiving "Freshman Aid," roughly in proportion to their percentage within the class. But these statistics must have convinced President Lowell that the Committee on Admission would have to exercise even more discretionary authority, if the percentage of Jews were not to increase with each class. He moved more cautiously, however, than he had in 1922.50

For one thing, President-Emeritus Eliot, although ninety, was still vigorously objecting to any change in

50 A. Lawrence Lowell to Henry Pennypacker, March 24, 1924, ALLP, 1922-1925, #76-A Admission, Committee on, January--February 1924; Edward R. Cay to Lowell, June 12, 1923, with two tables compiled June 9, 1923, ALLP, 1922-1925, #76 Admission, Committee on, September 1922--December 1923; Dean's Office to Lowell, October 25, 1925. November 9, 1925, and six tables dated either November 23 or 24, 1925, ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Jews. The tables were based upon 246 "J1 & J2" or 27.9 per cent of the 880 "New Freshmen" and 116 Jews or 42 per cent of the 276 admitted under the Honor Plan. A later count probably reclassified several from the "J3" category.
Harvard's "open door" policy for all qualified candidates. He believed that the proposed "limitation very injurious to Harvard College and the professional schools," as its application in the Medical School had already shown. Instead, said Eliot, the College should seek more endowment funds, as Dean David L. Edsall was doing for the Medical School. Limitation could very well lead to racial discrimination, because "a minority" of the Faculty anticipated that once the number of candidates exceeded one thousand, the Committee on Admission would be authorized "to reject arbitrarily persons regarded as 'undesirable.'" He was likewise disturbed that Overseer Langdon P. Marvin, Franklin D. Roosevelt's law partner and past President of the Associated Harvard Clubs, was not at all concerned about the possible use of a character test to reduce the percentage of Jews in the College. As Eliot wrote to Jerome D. Greene:

The Jews are of course alarmed at the revival of the limitation idea. Some of them have been directly to President Lowell to inquire insistently if the present limitation movement is directed against Jews; and he has assured them that it is not. Meantime there is nobody in the Board of Overseers who can at all take your place in the impending discussion. Marvin seems to be concerned himself about the number of Jews in Harvard.

Eliot was also highly critical of "the voluntary use by the Committee on Admission of the personal interview with candidates to determine rejection, and also admission under exceptional circumstances." And he thought that the proposed
limitation would affect Harvard's recently launched campaign to raise $10,000,000 for Chemistry laboratories, a Business School plant, and an additional building for Fine Arts.51

During January and February, 1924, Eliot wrote Marvin several letters in which he outlined ways to meet increasing enrollment without adopting a policy of limitation; naturally he insisted that "no exclusions based on race, color, or religion, direct or indirect, should be thought of." At the same time, Eliot kept in touch with Dr. Rosenau, Professor Frankfurter, and Judge Mack. As in the past, Rosenau was worried about the use of subjective tests for admission in place of "raising the standard of scholarship." And Frankfurter drew up a memorandum objecting to a proposed "scheme of dormitories" for the Law School, because he was "frankly apprehensive of the subtle introduction via dormitories of those racial and social problems which so seriously raised their head in the College two years ago." Judge Mack, visiting Cambridge for the Overseers's Meeting of February 25, met with Eliot. Mack preferred that the campaign for $10,000,000 be either

51 Charles W. Eliot to Henry P. Wolcott, M.D., 26 December 1923; Eliot to Langdon P. Marvin, 26 December 1923; Marvin to Eliot, 4 June, and 28 December 1923, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 389: 1923, M-Z. Eliot to Jerome D. Greene, 12 February 1924, JDGP, Box 6, folder 1924.
"postponed" or "enlarged" in order to raise "whatever funds Harvard College may need," rather "than to see Harvard adopt the principle of limitation, especially" one based upon subjective as well as objective standards. But Mack decided not to oppose temporary limitation, at least pending the report of the Special Committee on the Limitation of the Size of the Freshman Class. Upon hearing that Eliot wished to present his "views" to this Committee, Lowell inquired when it would be convenient for the Committee to meet with him at his home.\textsuperscript{52}

Except for a few ripples, harmony seemingly prevailed in the Harvard community as Lowell worked assiduously to achieve the objective he had failed to accomplish three years before. In November, 1925, he wrote two persuasive letters to Henry James, Chairman of the Special Committee. While Lowell thought much of the report could be published, the problem of increasing Jewish enrollment had to be handled with extreme care. New methods were

necessary, he said, because "the measures adopted at the
time of the previous inquiry to remedy the situation" had
"produced no effect, either because they affected so small
a number of candidates, or because they did not have the
effect that was anticipated." Limitation of the size of
the Freshman Class would allow the Committee on Admission
to select the "best" candidates:

To prevent a dangerous increase in the proportion of
Jews, I know at present only one way which is at the
same time straightforward and effective, and that is
a selection by a personal estimate of character on
the part of the Admission authorities, based upon the
probable value to the candidate, to the College and
to the community of his admission....If there is no
limit, it is impossible to reject a candidate who
passes the admission examinations without proof of
defective character, which practically cannot be
obtained. The only way to make a selection is to
limit the numbers, accepting those who appear to be
the best.

Lowell insisted that he was not proposing "a racial dis-
crimination, but a discrimination among individuals," al-
though "a very large proportion of the less desirable, upon
this basis, are at the present time Jews." Having stated
his case, he gave the Overseers three choices: "They must
either assume the responsibility for the increase in the
percentage of Jews, or they must assume the responsibility
of saying what should be done about it, or they must leave
the administrative officers of the University free to deal
with it." 53

53 A. Lawrence Lowell to Henry James, November 3 and
6, 1925, ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers.
Henry James yielded partially and with great reluctance to Lowell's point of view. "Everything in my education and bringing up makes me shrink from a proposal to begin a racial discrimination at Harvard—there's no use my pretending that that isn't the case," he wrote the President. On the other hand, James believed that Lowell was "quite right in saying that a situation which contains serious and unfortunate elements ought to be faced again, and I shall certainly endeavor to bring an open mind to its consideration and not to follow my predisposition blindly." In short, James could support "'discrimination among individuals'" and thought that "such a discrimination would inevitably eliminate most of the Jewish element which is making trouble." He, himself, was "not afraid of any competition" from Jews, although he felt their intellectual "precocity" gave them "a head start." By late 1925, however, he acknowledged a growing sentiment among the Overseers for a limitation on Jewish students:

the motion proposed at the autumn meeting of the Overseers named the Jews and was on its face a racial discrimination; and a good many of the men who share your concern about the increasing numbers are advocating what they call a candid regulation excluding all but so many or such a proportion of 'Jews.'

One way "to exclude objectionable or unpromising freshmen," suggested by the Committee on Relations with the Alumni through Langdon P. Marvin, was to include the "'dropped' freshmen" within the 1,000 limitation.\(^5^4\)

\(^5^4\)Henry James to A. Lawrence Lowell, November 4, 1925.
Thus after many discussions and meetings over almost a two-year period, the Special Committee on the Limitation of the Size of the Freshman Class Presented its thirty-two page printed report. Replete with eighteen pages of tables and graphs, the report pointed out that Harvard's enrollment had dramatically increased since 1870-71. In that year, the College had 608 students and the University, 1316; by 1924-25, the figures were 3041 for the College—a 400.16 per cent increase—and 7075 for the University—a 437.61 per cent increase. Harvard's total enrollment was larger than any of the other private Eastern colleges and universities, except for Columbia and Pennsylvania. Moreover, nine of these institutions—Amherst, Bowdoin, Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Princeton, Williams, and Yale—had adopted or were considering some limitation on undergraduates, even if only on an informal basis.55

Yet up to 1925, freshman enrollment had not "exceeded or even reached" its 1,000 "quota." When it

and 30, 1925, ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers; and James to Lowell, October 31, 1925, Dean of Harvard College—Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27) #15 Committee on Limitation of Numbers 1923-26. Permission to quote from the letters of Henry James, Jr. to President Lowell was granted to Marcia G. Synnott by Alexander R. James, August 17, 1971.

55"Report of the Special Committee Appointed to Consider the Limitation of Numbers" (hereafter cited as "Report of the Special Committee") [dated by hand, Dec. 1925], pp. 18-19, 22, in ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers.
became necessary to apply more selective standards, the Committee believed it would be "neither feasible nor desirable to raise the standards of the College so high that none but brilliant scholars can enter and remain in regular standing." But while "the standards ought never to be too high for serious and ambitious students of average intelligence," they would not object "if it became somewhat harder for a student to enter" Harvard than other colleges. At present, the academic demands were not "too difficult for such men...in spite of certain complaints which have recently been heard." 56

On January 11, 1926, Henry James submitted the report of his Committee to the Board of Overseers, which accepted it, after amending the Committee's two proposals and adding a third:

1. That, during the next three years, 1926-27 to 1928-29, the limit of 1,000 Freshmen shall include dropped Freshmen as well as those newly admitted to the College and Engineering School, but not thereafter, save with the approval of the Governing Boards.

2. That the application of the rule concerning candidates from the first seventh of their schools be discretionary both as to schools and candidates with the Committee on Admission.

3. That the rules for the admission of candidates be amended to lay greater emphasis on selection based on character and fitness and the promise of the greatest usefulness in the future as a result of a Harvard education.

Although phrased in reasonable terms, the Board of Overseers

56 Ibid., pp. 11-12.
implicitly agreed to subjective admission standards, which very easily could be used to exclude Jews. The report, with their recommendations, was sent to the appropriate Faculties.57

On January 19, 1926, the Faculty voted to accept the first proposal as it stood, to amend the second and third, and to add one of their own. The latter (which became the second regulation of the four ultimately adopted by Harvard's Governing Boards) provided that

all candidates shall be admitted whose examinations and school records, in the judgment of the Committee on Admission, place them upon an equality with Harvard undergraduates in the first four groups of the Rank List. This category will include all those whose examination average is unquestionably good.

The best students would be admitted, whether or not they were Jewish. Since the second and third of the Overseers' recommendations would grant considerable discretionary authority to the Committee on Admission, the Faculty voted in favor of two changes, one major and one minor. The application of the "first seventh" rule would "be discretionary" only "as to schools," not to candidates within

57 Winthrop H. Wade, Secretary, "A true copy of record" of the January 11, 1926 Meeting of the Board of Overseers, Dean of Harvard College--Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27), #15 Committee on Limitation of Numbers 1923-26. See also Wade's copy of record of the September 29, 1925 Meeting of the Board of Overseers, ALLP, 1925-1928, #184 Limitation of Numbers.
the same school. But the Committee on Admission could withdraw its offer of the "highest seventh" plan from a particular school or from all schools within certain localities. In the third recommendation the words "so administered as to lay emphasis on..." were substituted for "amended to lay greater emphasis on selection based on...."

To obtain information on "character and fitness and the promise of the greatest usefulness in the future as a result of a Harvard education," Chairman Pennypacker would interview many applicants, individually and in groups, during his visits to private preparatory and public high schools. "For purposes of identification and for later use by the Dean's office, a recent photograph of each candidate, preferably of passport size" was subsequently "required as an essential part of the application for admission."58

58 Henry Pennypacker, Chairman, report of "The Committee on Admission," Appendix to the Harvard President's Report 1925-26, pp. 297-298, 299-304. George W. Cram, Secretary, docket for the Faculty Meeting of January 19, 1926, Dean of Harvard College--Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27), #26 Faculty, Dockets etc., 1916-27. See also R and P 274, R and P 275, and R and P 276, Faculty of Arts and Sciences Reports and Papers, XII (1922), for the report and for the votes of the Overseers, January 11, 1926, as sent to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; and for motions made by Faculty members, January 19, 1926. Anne MacDonald, Assistant to the Chairman, Richard M. Gummere, The Committee on Admission, Harvard College, to Radcliffe Heermance, March 7, 1936, President's Office, Correspondence of Harold Willis Dodds, 1935-1936, folder Admissions--Statistics on, PUA.
At the January 19, 1926 Faculty Meeting, President Lowell announced that Professor Robert DeCourcy Ward and Dr. Kenneth B. Murdock had been appointed to the Committee on Admission, replacing Professors Charles H. Grandgent and George S. Forbes, who had resigned. Since Professor Ward had been one of the leaders of the Immigration Restriction League, it was more than likely that he brought the same assumptions about immigrant groups to his work on the Committee on Admission. And he agreed with Lowell that the number of Jewish students should be restricted. 59

Statistics showed that the Committee on Admission began to use its discretionary authority to exclude candidates, especially from New England and the Middle Atlantic states:

Of the 225 men rejected in 1927, 16 had admitting records (3 from New York, 1 from Connecticut, and 12 from Massachusetts).

Of the 215 men rejected in 1928, 56 had admitting records (11 from New York, 2 from Ohio, 2 from New Jersey, 2 from Connecticut, 1 from Rhode Island, 1 from Pennsylvania, and 37 from Massachusetts).

Although the ethnic origin of these rejected applicants was not given, one may guess that a high percentage was

59 Harvard University, Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Meeting of January 19, 1926, Records, XII (1922), 206. Robert DeCourcy Ward, who had voted in favor of the two controversial motions of May 23 and June 2, 1922, served on the Committee on Admission from 1925-26 through 1931-32.
Jewish. Well into the 1930's, the "Application for Admission" to Harvard College included questions on ethnic identity and religious affiliation, while the secondary school principal or master was asked to check the applicant's religious preference on the "Personal Record and Certificate of Honorable Dismissal." And Clarence W. Mendell, who visited Harvard in December, 1926, during his first year as Dean of Yale College, learned from Chairman Pennypacker that Harvard was now going to limit the Freshman Class to 1,000 including dropped and rated which means about 850 new men. After this year they are going to discontinue - for the East at least - the 'first seventh' arrangement which is bringing in as high as 40% Jews. They are also going to reduce their 25% Hebrew total to

60"Applications for Admission from Secondary Schools"; and "Recommendations from the Committee on Admission and the Committee on Instruction adopted by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences October 16, 1928 and ordered to be transmitted to the Governing Boards of the University," ALLP, 1928-1930, #111, Admission: Committee on.

61 For the specific racial and religious questions on admission applications, see supra, n. 24, p. 406. One member of the Dean's Office said that he was "very agreeably surprised by the truthfulness of the statements on the admission blanks this year." And he added that "you would catch over 90% of the Jews in this way, and it might be a much safer method." Additional information on successful applicants was supplied by the Freshman Dormitory blanks (Letter to C. N. Greenough, July 15, 1923, #30 Mr. E. R. Gay; and Greenough to A. Lawrence Lowell, April 17, 1923, #37 President Lowell 1922-27, Dean of Harvard College--Correspondence (Yeomans & Greenough, 1916-27)).
15% or less by simply rejecting without detailed explanation. They are giving no details to any candidate any longer. They are getting small representation from the West and none from the South and have no plan for improving the situation....

By the mid-1920's, Harvard had yielded to a selective system of admissions, which, with no apologies, aimed at reducing the percentage of Jews in the College. This system certainly continued throughout Lowell's presidency, because he believed that it should operate without time limit until the "problem" was corrected. And it may well have persisted into the administration of James Bryant Conant, since he favored a limitation of students within the College. Symbolic of Lowell's victory at Harvard was the death of Charles W. Eliot on August 22, 1926.

[Dean Clarence W. Mendell], report on "Harvard," stamped "Dec 8 - 1926 Rec'd," Records of the President, James R. Angell, file on Clarence W. Mendell, YUA.

In 1934, shortly after Conant became president, the Harvard Corporation received and declined an offer of a $1,000 traveling scholarship from Dr. Ernst F. Sedgwick Hanfstaengl '09. Conant's reply to Hitler's friend and Nazi Party Foreign Press Chief, stated that Harvard was "unwilling to accept a gift from one who has been so closely associated with the leadership of a political party which has inflicted damage on the universities of Germany through measures which have struck at principles we believe to be fundamental to universities throughout the world.'" (James B. Conant, My Several Lives, Memoirs of a Social Inventor (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970), pp. 140-145; and The Jewish Advocate, October 5, 1934, pp. 1-2).
I am urging him because he is Dean of the Yale Medical School, and as Dean should naturally be invited to become a member of the Club, unless there is stronger objection to him than that which is based on the fear that the Hebrew element in the Club may become too large.

This, of course, does not mean that the Club ought to elect a man on account of his relations to Yale if they feel that he will be objectionable to his fellow members, but I think it does make it very unfortunate that it should adopt a policy of race discrimination, which it has not always practiced, at a time when it will exceptionally effect the Yale Medical School and create an unusual necessity for public discussion of the Committee's action.

--President Arthur Twining Hadley to Professor Frederick B. Luquiens, November 25, 1920.

Though of "'unimpressive face and figure,'" President Arthur Twining Hadley of Yale was a gentleman of sound principles and strong convictions. Born in 1856, the same year as Lawrence Lowell of Harvard and Woodrow Wilson of Princeton, President Hadley was a descendent of an old New England farming family, which in recent generations had entered the educational and legal professions. His grandfather had gone to Dartmouth, but Hadley and his father, James, were Yale College graduates. Both were to become

---

1Arthur T. Hadley to Professor Frederick B. Luquiens, November 25, 1920, MSS Letters from Pres. Hadley, Book 36, p. 393.
professors in the College, the father in Greek and the son in Political Economy. Arthur Hadley achieved unqualified academic and social success at Yale. He was class valedictorian and held prestigious scholarships throughout his years of undergraduate and postgraduate study. He also was a member of the Junior Fraternity, Delta Kappa Epsilon, and the Senior Society, Skull & Bones. An additional measure of the esteem in which he was held was his election as class secretary his senior year.²

In many ways, Hadley was a choice example of the ideal "Yale man," combining in his person the virtues of the Christian gentleman, the scholar, and the public servant. He was of the frugal, hardworking Yankee stock that placed great store on education. His religious faith, while strong, was not fanatical, and in this respect, he was well suited to become Yale's first lay president. Preferring membership in a non-sectarian Protestant organization to affiliation with an established denomination, Hadley belonged to the Church of Christ in Yale College. He believed that Yale's president should participate in religious services which drew together many denominations.

In addition to his professorial duties, Hadley was Commissioner of Labor Statistics of the State of Connecticut from 1885 to 1887. His correspondence as president showed an active concern for many of the issues of the day, although his replies were usually brief, due to the pressure of his regular work. In his commitment to "God, country, and Yale," Hadley merited the praise lavished on him by Charles Seymour, a later Yale president: "'With all his brilliance, with all his fame, we thought of him always simply as the truest Yale man of all.'"

The Yale Faculty

Hadley administered Yale as a "moderator" or "mediator rather than master," and according to Yale's historian, George W. Pierson, this presidency was best described as "The Consulship of Hadley." His reluctance to dictate policy allowed conflicts to develop within the Faculty at the University, and these, in turn, sometimes forced him to reverse his previous decisions. He accepted, moreover, the custom which allowed the Permanent Officers of Yale College far more independence in running their own

---

affairs than that permitted the Faculty at Harvard and Princeton. In 1908, the Yale Faculty exercised its prerogative of choosing a successor to Henry P. Wright, who was retiring as Dean of Yale College. The independence of the Permanent Officers of Yale College gave substance to "a saying at Cambridge to the effect that the trustees ruled at Princeton, the president at Harvard, but at Yale it was the faculty."¹

Hadley's administration fostered, nevertheless, "the desire of Yale's lay graduates to have a larger voice in the clerically-dominated hierarchy." In keeping with this new spirit the Corporation of Yale University voted in 1906:

>'that the President be authorized to certify to the Trustees of the Carnegie Fund that no denominational test is imposed in the choice of trustees, officers, or teachers, or in the admission of students, nor are distinctly denominational tenets or doctrines taught to the students of Yale University.'

For two centuries, by a self-perpetuating authority to

¹ Pierson, Yale, I, pp. 123, [107], 147, 151-153, 130. In addition to choosing the Dean, the professors chose their colleagues, controlled their income from tuition and room rents, and allocated their expenses. See also Arthur T. Hadley to Professor F. S. Jones, March 27th, 1908, MSS Letters from Pres. Hadley, June 10, 1907 to April 30, 1908, Book No. 15, pp. 665-663. It was, wrote Hadley, "one of the traditions here that the professors should have an entirely free hand in electing their dean." He was pleased that Jones had been unanimously elected since "with our system of administration, it" was "absolutely necessary that the Dean should be, beyond all other men, the representative of a united sentiment on the part of the professors."
choose their successors, only ordained ministers had served as trustees of the Yale Corporation. By the 1920's, however, "six of the ten Successor Trustees were laymen."^5

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, the composition of the faculty and student body also diversified. Although the overwhelming majority of professors in the University were white Anglo-Saxon Protestant, a few Catholics and Jews began to appear on the faculty roster around 1900. They were usually connected with Sheffield Scientific School or with one of the professional schools. No professor of Jewish origin held a tenured College appointment until the 1940's; and less than a dozen taught for any length of time at Yale before 1930. Two were instructors of Russian, one for a few years (Meyer Wolodarsky, Ph.B. '94, 1899-1902), and the other Max Solomon Mandell, from 1907 to 1924. Another was a musician (Isidore Troostwoky, Instructor in Violin-Playing, 1894-1923, and Assistant Professor of Applied [later Practical] Music, 1901-1923); and four were professors of medicine or science. Dr. Max Mailhouse, Ph.B. 1876, was a Clinical Professor of Neurology, 1907-1920, and Dr. Milton Charles Winternitz, M.A., Yale '17 hon., Professor

---

of Pathology and Bacteriology, served as Dean of the School of Medicine, 1920-1935. Lafayette B. Mendel '91, Professor of Physiological Chemistry, 1903-1921, became department chairman in 1920 and was appointed to a Sterling professorship in 1921. And Frank Schlesinger, M.A. Yale '20 hon., was appointed Director of the Observatory in 1920 and Chairman of Department of Astronomy in 1921. During the 1930's and 1940's, several other Jews achieved prominence at Yale, as attested by the Sterling professorships they held, but the road was difficult and steep. 6

Even a Faculty appointment did not insure social acceptance. The elite social club for Yale men and Faculty in New Haven was the Graduates Club. Although it had been founded by Yale graduates, non-Yale men who were appointed to Faculty positions could also be proposed and accepted for membership, as was the case of Hadley's successor, University of Michigan-educated James R. Angell. Two classes of membership existed: resident and non-resident, the former was limited to 500-600, while the latter to 1200. The Committee on Admissions--eight members and the

6 Charles Reznikoff, "New Haven: The Jewish Community, A Portrait Sketch," Commentary, IV (November, 1947), 476-477. I. George Dobsevage, comp., "Jews of Prominence in the United States," The American Jewish Year Book 5683, XXIV (September 23, 1922, to September 10, 1923), 109-218. Professor Rollin G. Osterweiss, telephone conversation, New Haven, Connecticut, May 20, 1971. Although there were undoubtedly more instructors of Jewish origin than those listed above, the number of Jewish professors who received tenure before 1930 was well under a dozen. During the
Assistant Secretary of the Association--passed on recommendations for membership. Under their "secret and confidential" proceedings, "two negative ballots shall be sufficient to exclude; one negative ballot shall be sufficient to defer consideration of a candidate's name for one regular meeting, but such postponement shall occur but once." Furthermore, "no candidate shall be elected by less than four affirmative ballots."  

The decisions regarding the admission of two Jewish faculty members may provide the best illustration of the effect of the "Jewish question" upon the Yale community.

1930's, 1940's and early 1950's, six Jews held professorships at Yale: Leonard Bloomfield, Sterling Professor of Linguistics (1940-1949); Eugen Kahn, M.A. Yale '30 hon., Sterling Professor, 1930-1948, and Chairman of the Department of Psychiatry; Rollin G. Osterweis '30, Assistant and Associate Professor (1950-1968) and Professor of History and Oratory since 1968; Edward Sapir, M.A. Yale '31 hon., Sterling Professor of Anthropology and Linguistics, 1931-1939, and Chairman of the Department of Anthropology, 1937-1938; Harry Shulman, M.A. Yale '37 hon., Professor, 1937-1939, Sterling Professor of Law, 1940-1955, and Dean of the Law School, 1954-1955; and Paul Weiss, first Jew to be hired by Yale as a full professor, in Philosophy, 1946-1962, and Sterling Professor in 1962. There were Jewish coaches or instructors in those sports which were completely open to Jews: "Izzy"Winters in wrestling and "Mosey" King in boxing. Little information was available on the number of Catholic professors at Yale. As of 1930, Professor Albert G. Feuillerat of the French Department and Assistant Professor John E. McDonough in Political Economy were both known to be members of the Catholic Church (Elizabeth B. Sweeney, Secretary for Civic Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, to James R. Angell, May 16, 1930, and Secretary to the President in reply, May 21, 1930, Records of the President, JRA, Box Cas-Chem, folder Roman Catholic).

The Graduates Club, New Haven, Connecticut, 1919 (pamphlet on the rules of the Club and its membership
In 1920, President Hadley wrote a strong letter of endorsement on behalf of the candidacy of Dean Milton C. Winternitz. He argued against the exclusion of Winternitz on professional, racial, and social grounds. Of prime importance to the president was the fact that the Dean of the Medical School must have access to those places which served as a forum for Yale affairs. Hadley thus argued:

In his position as Dean, Winternitz will need to hold a number of conferences for which the Graduate Club is the natural place, partly because most of the men will be Graduate Club members, and partly because the Graduate Club is regarded by the public, and rightly so regarded, as the natural place for the discussion of Yale affairs by intelligent graduates. While our Club is not nominally connected with Yale more than with any other college, it is actually connected with it a great deal, and a belief that the Club allowed itself to ignore the interests of Yale in a serious matter would greatly imperil its prosperity.

As an 'Old Blue,' Hadley had a keen appreciation of the influence exercised by those in the inner group. The club proved itself to be a key decision-making institution on the campus no less than in the downtown business district or in suburbia. Hadley's arguments carried weight with the Club's Committee on Admissions: Dean Winternitz was elected a resident member in 1920.

lists), p. 11. See also the lists for 1921, 1925, 1930, and 1938.

8 Hadley to Luquiens, November 25, 1920. Hadley found Dean Winternitz to be a pleasant dinner guest. See also F. B. Luquiens to A. T. Hadley, November 30, 1920, Yale President Hadley Correspondence, Last Hadley Correspondence L-Ma, divider Lu.
But Hadley's powers of persuasion did not succeed in the case of another Jew, who was "a graduate of Yale, an active leader in educational and charitable work, and thoroughly likable man." "The commercial characteristics which are often so disagreeable," said Hadley, "have not been marked either in him or in his father," prominent New Haven businessmen. Although Hadley criticized exclusion on the basis of race, his attitude toward Jews was influenced by certain stereotypes: the unattractive, commercially aggressive Jew as opposed to the well-educated culturally assimilated Jewish community leader. Jews were racially different from Gentiles, he believed, but this difference should not be a barrier to their advancement and social acceptance. His professions of friendship for Jews were sincere, not patronizing.  

Hadley realized that some men on the Yale Faculty did not share his views, and that they disliked working with

9Arthur T. Hadley to Committee on Admissions, The Graduates Club, New Haven, March 5, 1918, MSS Letters from Pres. Hadley, November 12, 1917 to April 24, 1918 (inclusive), Book No. 32, p. 479. See also the letter which Hadley wrote to Dr. Guy M. Winslow, Lasell Seminary, February 20, 1920, on behalf of the Jewish alumnus' daughter (MSS Letters from Pres. Hadley, Sept. 1, 1919 to April 24, 1920 (incl.) Book No. 35, p. 525). Hadley did not protest against the existence of a published quota on Jewish students at Lasell: "If the one way in which Lasell can defend itself from too great an admixture of Hebrews is by the fixing of an absolute percentage, I should be the last to ask you to break your published word in the interests of an individual." But he asked that an exception be made in the case of the alumnus' daughter, because the family was "distinctly of the right sort."
a Jewish professor on a committee. Hence another professor would be a better choice for "a committee on Library site" than Professor Lafayette B. Mendel, because "while everybody likes him, the fact of his race has kept him in some measure apart from the life of the place." Although Mendel was a Yale man and belonged to the Graduates Club, he was still not accepted as a member of the inner group at Yale. During the 1920's, however, Mendel represented Sheffield Scientific School on the Board of Admissions. His representation on this important board might have been a matter of expediency. In comparison with other professors of Jewish origin, Mendel and Winternitz had achieved a comparatively elite position in the Yale community. But the fact that Hadley had to urge so strongly Winternitz's election to the Graduates Club proved that anti-Semitism, of that intangible, but deadly gentlemanly sort, was prevalent on the Old Campus. A frequently told, but never documented, story illustrated this unfortunate trend. A distinguished Yale professor of Jewish origin was denied membership in the Graduates Club during the 1930's. Apparently, there was no person of Arthur Twining Hadley's stature to persuade the Committee on Admission to reconsider its decision. 10

10 Arthur T. Hadley to Otto T. Bannard, April 19, 1918, p. 739; and Hadley to George Parmly Day, April 24, 1918, p. 748, Book No. 32. See also "Report of Robert N. Corwin, Chairman, Board of Admissions," Yale President's Report, 1923-24 - 1928-29. It is said in New Haven that the professor was Edward Sapir (1884-1939), who emigrated to the United States with his parents in 1899. He earned
Departmental hiring and tenure practices were not unaffected by ethnic considerations. The following correspondence over the question of appointing Mr. Max Mandell, Instructor in Russian, "to some more dignified position in the College Faculty," revealed strong faculty resistance to such a promotion. Although Mandell's appointment as an instructor had been urged by William Lyon Phelps of the Department of English, Dean Frederick S. Jones of the College Faculty was opposed to offering him a permanent position. The Dean learned from inquiry "that while Mr. Mandell has some knowledge of Russian literature he has an accent and idiom which is peculiar to the Russian Hebrew and this is immediately recognized by those familiar with the language." Even though Mandell had completed his doctoral requirements at Columbia, except for the publication of his dissertation, Jones felt it would be "unwise to nominate him for a position in the Faculty" for "many reasons." If Yale decided to "develop a department of Russian," it would "secure somebody who has a somewhat different background from that possessed by Mr. Mandell...." While Mandell might continue as an instructor under a limited contract, he should not be given an appointment "which might lead him to expect advancement and eventually a permanent

all his degrees at Columbia University and came to Yale in 1931 (supra, n. 6, p. 463).
position as a Professor of Russian." In regard to the latter appointment, Jones said: "I very much doubt the willingness of the Faculty to elect him." Whatever may have been President Angell's opinion in the case, he bowed to faculty prerogative: "As this is primarily a matter for the College Faculty, I regard my relation to the question as purely advisory." Ironically as millions in the Western World watched the Bolshevik experiment develop in Russia, the Yale Faculty voted to discontinue instruction in Russian at the end of the 1923-1924 academic year.  

11

Minorities at Yale

Before the early 1920's, there seems to have been relatively little faculty criticism or hostility toward Jewish students. One incident was reported in late 1915 of a professor's "discourteous treatment" of two Jewish students. The Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, Secretary of the University, learned of the situation from Rabbi Mann of New Haven, a Yale graduate student and a man for whom he had "much respect." According to the Rabbi, the professor in his Chaucer class

repeated three times the words in the Prioress' tale,
'accursed Jew, accursed Jew, accursed Jew,' each time with an accent indicating his own contempt for the race. Later he stated that he wished a composition written in English, not Yiddish. When two students, Messrs. Blumenthal and Cohen, protested to him, he said approximately the following: 'There are some members of the Faculty, and I am among that number, who believe the Jews ought not to be admitted to Yale.' He further asked the students if Jews were admitted to Princeton, again implying by his question and the tone of his voice that they should not be admitted here.

In addition to these slights, the professor also implied that he had given an academic warning to one of the students, because "it was not possible for him to treat Jews without prejudice." Although Secretary Stokes considered the man to be a good teacher, he clearly lacked restraint in his public utterances. The year before, the same professor's speech to an alumni dinner had been criticized for its vulgarity.12

According to a Jewish alumnus of the College Class of 1914, Yale was relatively open to Jews during these years. He counted 20 Jewish students in his class out of a total enrollment of 361. Moreover, he was one of six brothers who graduated from Yale: College classes of 1913, 1914, 1915, 1922, and twins in 1927. Significantly, all of them lived at home during their college course. Two of the brothers received virtually full tuition scholarships;

12Frederick S. Jones to Lawrence Mason, Dec. 6, 1915; Mason to Jones, Dec. 11 [1915], handwritten; and Anson Phelps Stokes to Jones, January 6, 1916, Records of the Dean, FSJ, folder Faculty.
three were elected to Phi Beta Kappa; and three subsequently attended the Yale Law School. "The above roster of admissions from one family," he continued, "would seem to indicate that up to that time at least there was no real imposition of a quota system." Yale

was a Protestant College which however would accept Jews, Catholics and others as members of its student body without particular relation to quotas which I believe were introduced some years later when the number of Jewish boys passing the entrance exams became 'too large' for the college authorities.

Yale also permitted the organization of Jewish groups. The Menorah Society, which had branched out from Harvard to other colleges, was allowed to have "a room in a University building for its monthly meetings and there was no problem connected with the use or obtaining such facilities and the Society as such was recognized as a University group."\(^{13}\)

Although Jewish students were generally tolerated, there was, nevertheless, occasional "evidence of some prejudicial conduct on the part of an official, but none on the part of a teaching professor or instructor," he recalled. When he entered Yale in the fall of 1910, students were allowed 8 cuts from classes during a semester. During that year the Jewish High Holidays came during the first two weeks of school. I did not attend classes and used up all 8 cuts during those first two weeks. I was fearful of my class standing and went to see the Dean of Yale College to explain my position. In answer

\(^{13}\)Mr. Louis Sachs, New Haven, Connecticut, to Marcia Synnott, October 6, 1971, and August 8 and September 7, 1972.
to my request for consideration he said to me, 'Young man this is neither a Jewish nor a Mohammedan institute. This is a Christian college and you will have to abide by its rules.' I was naturally terribly upset.

On his way out, the youth passed through the room of the Assistant Dean, "a Catholic who either at that time or later was married to a Jewish girl." Noticing the boy's "troubled look," the Assistant Dean inquired into the cause.

When I told him what had taken place he looked up at me sympathetically and said, 'Don't pay any attention to him, if you get into difficulty come in and see me and I will take care of you.' Fortunately, I staved healthy and never had to come in and see him though he remained a friend of mine for many years thereafter.

Although Dean Jones, who obviously had little liking or sympathy for Jewish students or faculty, took a hard line in regard to cut allowances for Jewish holidays, his Assistant was a man of broader sympathies.  

---

14 Ibid. Dean Jones also engaged in some campus humor at the expense of Jews and Jewish students, as the following exchange of verses indicated. During a visit to New Haven in the fall of 1923, President Lowell commented to Jones "that he was fast becoming ineligible for residence in Cambridge," and quoted a parody published in the Harvard Lampoon:

"'Here's to conservative Boston
The home of the bean and the cod,
Where the Lowells can't talk with the Cabots
Since the Cabots speak Yiddish, b'God!'

(In Boston, a man named Kabinsky or Kabotznick had had his name legally changed to Cabot.) Dean Jones later received the clipping from the Lampoon and an invitation to respond in kind. Thereupon Jones invited the Lowells to take up residence in New Haven:

"God has to speak Yiddish at Harvard,
Lest some of the Cabots may fail
To know what he means
But codfish and beans;
But the Angel(l)es speak English at Yale."

(Frederick S. Jones to William A. Taylor, April 11, 1924,
Relations between Catholics and Protestants at Yale seemed to have been harmonious. The degree to which Catholics had assimilated into the University as well as into American society was measured by the fact that they did not suffer from the restrictive policies aimed at immigrant groups, especially at the Jews. There was no evidence that Yale had any quota for Catholic students. Although undergraduate life was dominated by Protestants, especially Episcopalians, a number of Catholics were "Varsity men." Catholic students were elected to Yale fraternities in considerable numbers and even to the Senior Societies. Most of the Catholics in the fraternities were from well-to-do families and had been educated at preparatory schools. But occasionally a Catholic high school graduate who came to Yale on scholarship would be elected to a fraternity. The following table illustrates that Catholics were comparatively well represented in social clubs:

---

Records of the Dean, FSJ, Box 4, folder Harvard Verses; and Amory, The Proper Bostonians, p. 35).
TABLE 13
SOCIAL CLUB MEMBERSHIP OF CATHOLIC STUDENTS IN YALE COLLEGE, 1912, AND IN YALE COLLEGE AND SHEFFIELD SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL, 1927

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YALE COLLEGE</th>
<th>SHEFFIELD SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skull and Bones (1832)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll and Key (1842)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf's Head (1883)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elihu Club (1903)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from "Yale College 1912 Statistical Blanks," filled out by seniors for History of the Class of 1912, Yale College. Vol. I. YUA; and from Yale and Sheff Seniors listed as members of the "Catholic Club" in Yale Banner and Pot-Pourri, XIX, 1927 (New Haven, Connecticut), 202. See also "Foundation of Societies," YB and P-P, XXII, 1930, 171. Total number of Catholics in Yale College Class of 1912: 30, of whom 13 had neither Senior Society nor fraternity membership. Total number of Catholics in Yale College and Sheffield Scientific School Class of 1927 was not precisely known. Figures were based on the 61 Senior members of the Catholic Club in 1927, of whom 36 were in the College and 25 in Sheff. One non-member was included on the basis of additional information. A Varsity football player, Rupert Bloomfield McGunigle, 1927S, entered a Roman Catholic Monastic Order in 1930. Of these 62, 26 belonged to social clubs.

Prior to 1920, Sheffield offered a three year undergraduate course, which made comparisons between Sheff and Yale College classes difficult. Sheff students who entered in 1908 graduated in 1911, and those who graduated in 1912 entered in 1909.
TABLE 13--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YALE COLLEGE</th>
<th>SHEFFIELD SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior Fraternity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Societies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Delta Phi (1836)</td>
<td>Delta Psi (&quot;St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psi Upsilon (1838)</td>
<td>Anthony,&quot; 1869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Kappa Epsilon (1844)</td>
<td>Phi Gamma Delta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeta Psi (1888)</td>
<td>(1875) (&quot;Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Theta Pi (1906)</td>
<td>Hall,&quot; 1908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Sigma Phi (1924)</td>
<td>Chi Phi (&quot;York Hall,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Psi (1924)</td>
<td>1878)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Fraternities</strong></td>
<td>**Delta Phi (&quot;St. Elmo,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1888)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phi Sigma Kappa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Sachem Hall,&quot; 1893)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Delta Phi (1836)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psi Upsilon (1838)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Kappa Epsilon (1844)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeta Psi (1888)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Theta Pi (1906)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Sigma Phi (1924)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Psi (1924)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book and Bond (1899)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Chi Rho (1905)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia (1909)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c** Dates given indicated year in which each was recognized as a Junior Fraternity. At one time, ADP and BTP had been Academic Fraternities and ASP a Sophomore Society and then a University Fraternity.

**d** University Fraternities drew members from both the College and Sheff. Alpha Chi Rho, which began as a University Fraternity in 1905, became a College (1924) and then a Junior (1928) Fraternity.
The above tabulation was suggestive, although not conclusive. First, there was a considerable decline in Catholic membership in the Senior Societies from the Class of 1912 to the Class of 1927. Secondly, Psi Upsilon had no Catholic members in either year. And thirdly, in both years, one fraternity—DKE in 1912 and Alpha Sigma Phi in 1927—had a larger Catholic representation than any of the others. These observations may have some significance, but further information probably lies in the private fraternity records. Whatever the facts may be, it was true that Catholics enjoyed a far greater degree of social success at Yale than any other minority group. It was also true, of course, that Protestants enjoyed the greatest amount of social success.\textsuperscript{15}

Occasionally, incidents occurred which offended the sensibilities of some Catholics. For example, Terence L. Connolly, S. J., of Fordham University objected to the poem, entitled "Catholicism," by John A. Thomas, which appeared in the Yale Literary Magazine of April 1920:

She paused before God's thunder-silent throne,  
As shrewish echoes ploughed the sullen night;  
The frost-white altar gleamed with marble light—  
A pendent flame of crimson darkly shone.

One age-frail arm reached for the gilded toys  
That wheeling centuries called consecrate.  
While windowed saints writhed in a mocking hate  
And wasted limbs quaked at each fancied noise.

\textsuperscript{15} For an earlier discussion of Catholic and Jewish students at Yale, see supra, p. 50 and n. 42; pp. 45-48, 105-107.
But frantic, fragile hands worked swift, nor knew
of phantom priests, pacing in wrath beneath
the eddying shadows of the gloom-bound dome.

Trembling—and famine-grey her cheek—she drew
a tiny wafer from its hallowed home—
And then—then came the crunch of hungry teeth.

The poem was offensive to Catholics because it mocked the
ritual of the Mass and the traditions of the Church. Fordham's
college paper published an article "Attention Yale!", which
Father Connolly enclosed in his letter to President Hadley.
In reply, Hadley emphasized that the Literary Magazine was a
student publication over which the faculty exercised no form
of censorship. The author of the article in the Fordham
Monthly, he added, was "likely to do quite as much harm" by
his comments. Hadley defended "the tolerance of expression of
opinion" which went "much farther in Protestant colleges
than in Catholic ones" and the need for "truthfulness" as
well as "reverence." 16

to Arthur T. Hadley, undated, and May 31, '20, Yale President
Hadley Correspondence, Box 16 Col Apr. 1, 1917 to Daz May 31,
1904. Hadley to Rev. Terence L. Connolly, May 26, 1920,
p. 72, and June 1, 1920, p. 93; Hadley to James A. Flaherty,
Supreme Knight, Knights of Columbus, New Haven, June 18, 1920,
p. 137, MSS Letters from Pres. Hadley, Book No. 36. Father
Connolly, who had been educated for sixteen years in non-
Catholic schools, before entering upon twelve years of
Catholic training, found that "the judgments of Catholics
concerning religious questions relative to non-Catholics, have
generally been objectively less offensive than the judgments
of non-Catholics concerning Catholics,—though the non-Catholics in question, have often phrased their offensiveness more
politely."
At the same time, Hadley wrote J. W. Andrews, Chairman of the Board of Editors of the Literary Magazine. While the President was not trying to censor the magazine, he did feel that the poem should have had a different title. The contributors should realize, he said,

the extreme sensitiveness which affects our Catholic fellow citizens on many things which Protestants would take as a matter of course; and also the danger of splitting apart from each other by ill-considered words groups of people who will have to be working together on the side of law against anarchism, if the country is to pull through the present crisis in good shape.

Catholics were thus seen as necessary allies in the war between law and anarchism. As valuable allies of the Protestant majority, Catholics no longer shared the status of other minorities. Although Hadley and Father Connolly had different opinions in religious matters, these were not allowed to sour personal relations between Catholics and non-Catholics. The correspondence between the two men ended on a friendly note. 17

Although Hadley smoothed the matter over, Yale undergraduate literary efforts occasionally revealed a strong Protestant bias. An earlier example was a poem published in 1901 in the Yale Courant. "Wooster Square" briefly chronicled in verse the settlement of Southern Italian immigrants in what had once been a fashionable New Haven residential area.

The second stanza described:

The old white church in Wooster Square
Where godly people met and prayed—
Dear Souls! they worship Mary there,
Italian mother, man and maid
In gaudy Southern scarfs arrayed;
The horrid candles smoulder where
The godly people met and prayed.
Alas! the fall of Wooster Square!

By 1900, there were 7,780 Italians in New Haven, about one-third of whom were born in the United States. During the next thirty years, the number of Italians rose from 7.2 to over 25 per cent of the city's population. Since only a small percentage of their children graduated from high school, few attended college, and very few went to Yale. In the Yale College Class of 1927, for example, there were only four students of Italian descent, three of whose fathers had been born in Italy. There were eight Italo-Americans, however, in the Sheffield Class of 1927. And ten years later, Italian-born Paul Pasquariello graduated with the highest four-year average, a 98, attained in Yale College. According to Professor Angelo Lipari, only God "could know more Italian" than Pasquariello. 18

18 Sidney N. Deane '02, "Wooster Square," from the Yale Courant [ca. 1901] in A. G. Dana Collection, Vol. 6, p. 56, New Haven Colony Historical Society. See also Morty Miller, "New Haven: The Italian Community" (unpublished History 90 Essay, Yale University, 1969), pp. 25, 56, 58-65 (a xerox copy at New Haven Colony Historical Society). History of the Class of 1927 Yale College (New Haven, Conn.: Published under the Direction of the Class Secretaries Bureau, 1927) and History of the Class of Nineteen Hundred Twenty-Seven Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University
In regard to Negro students, Yale, like Harvard, was hospitable to the few who sought admission each year. There was no way of ascertaining how many applied, in excess of those admitted, but there seemed to have been no objection against admitting a handful. Socially their status was considerably lower than their white fellow students, largely because the status of blacks in the outside community was inferior. Until about 1923, Negro waiters served in the Commons and Negro hallmen cleaned rooms. Although they were then replaced by student waiters and white maids, Negroes still performed many of the menial jobs in the University.

For generations of Yale men,

Negro service was part of the tradition. Beds were made and rooms cleaned by the hallmen (janitors), of whom the great majority were colored. Negroes portered and swept, served at functions, drove, and barbered for Yale. They were, also, the picturesque hangers-on. Hannibal Silliman with his basket of homemade candy was an institution, and blind 'Candy Sam' only less well known. In the fraternities, Negro caretakers performed diverse duties, becoming the familiars of 'their boys.' Black men were sought out by returning alumni eager to recall old times and escapades....In the Negro community, Yale employment carried an aura of prestige.

Relations between blacks and whites were indeed cordial, and

even intimate. But the social barrier remained. 19

Yale encouraged truly exceptional blacks to attend by awarding them scholarships. Some were transfer students from such Southern Negro colleges as Talladega and Tuskegee, while a few came from New England private schools. Several were local youths, like Edward Alexander Bouchet, who in 1874 became the first Negro to graduate from Yale College. A member of Phi Beta Kappa, Bouchet earned a Ph.D. in Chemistry and Physics in 1876 and then became a teacher at the Institute for Colored Youth in Philadelphia. The career of Williams Pickens '04 was also of particular interest because of his cordial relationship with Dean Henry Parks Wright. Pickens, born in Anderson County, South Carolina, graduated from the College Department of Talladega College. He was recommended for admission to the Junior Class at Yale by the Reverend A. F. Beard, a Corresponding Secretary of the American Missionary Association of New York. Beard and Dr. Cooper, both Trustees of Talladega College, were impressed with Pickens's ability. According to Beard, he was "the most exceptional colored student in his ability and versatility that I have found in a long experience." And

"the promise of his future is the more hopeful as he is an earnest and consistent Christian." Any interest which Wright took in the young man would be "a good investment for his race." 20

In spite of the necessity of working his way through two years at Yale by washing pots and windows at the Y.M.C.A., Pickens was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and won the Ten Eyck Oratorical Contest prize. Dean Wright called him '"the best colored man we have ever had and worthy of all praise on account of what he has done.'" In the Senior Class Book of Yale College, 1904, Pickens wrote that "the pleasantest event...in his college course was his meeting with Dean Wright." He later wrote in a letter to the Dean that "the best opportunities of my life were in the two years I spent at Yale." After graduation, Pickens returned to Talladega as a teacher of Latin, German, English, and Esperanto. He then taught at Wiley University and later became Dean of Morgan College. In addition to teaching, he published several books, among them The New Negro (1916), a series of

essays, and *Bursting Bonds* (1923).  

Although Pickens had found his Yale years to be a great opportunity, most aspiring black students favored other Eastern, private colleges. In 1909, Alfred E. Stearns, principal of Phillips Andover Academy, asked Wright's successor, Dean Frederick S. Jones, whether a Negro student would be as welcome at Yale as at Dartmouth or Harvard. The only Negro student at Andover at that time, had been urged to seek a good education by a former Yale man, but he had come "to feel that he would have a better chance at Harvard." Stearns recommended him as

a good clean fellow, much better than the average 'darkey' and a boy who has in the main stood very well in his work here, indeed on several occasions he has been on our honor lists, although lately he had found the work harder, as almost all boys of his race do.

Except for a little help from some friends, the young man had to depend upon himself. Whatever Jones replied, the black student decided to enter the Class of 1914 at Harvard. There he won a major letter in track. And twenty-five years after graduation, he recalled that his "school days at

---

Phillips-Andover and college experiences at Harvard were the happiest years of my life." 22

Yale continued to admit a few Negroes most years, but in 1931 there was only one Negro in the three undergraduates schools. The general economic situation may have been largely responsible. In response to request by W. E. Burghart DuBois, editor of The Crisis, for a statement on "'The Negro and Yale University,'" President Angell suggested that he write directly to the one black undergraduate, Edward Morrow, 1931, of Huron, South Dakota. Before replying to DuBois, Angell had consulted with Robert N. Corwin, the Director of Admissions, who said that as far as he knew

there has never been any negro question here, nor has the necessity been felt for adopting a policy for determining our acceptance of negroes or our treatment of them. No discrimination has been shown in dealing with the colored race, either in this office or that of the three deans. I cannot, of course, speak from the Book in discussing the attitude of the undergraduate.

Corwin described Morrow as "quite an unusual boy in many respects." He had written a considerable part of the recently published Life of Paul Robeson and planned to become the concert artist's secretary after graduation. Angell, asserted too, that he did not know of any discrimination against Negroes at Yale, nor had he heard any complaints in

22 Alfred E. Stearns to Frederick S. Jones, September 30, 1909, Registrar, Correspondence, Historical Manuscripts, Box No. I, filed under S, YUA.
that regard. He thought that "colored boys, when they come here, are accepted on their merits and so dealt with just as are other students." Many years later this would be illustrated when Levi Alexander Jackson '50, was elected captain of the 1949 football team and tapped for Skull and Bones. Commenting on his selection, Jackson said: "If my name had been reversed, I never would have made it," but joined Berzelius instead to be with friends.  

Immigrants and Foreign Students

Not the least of President Hadley's contributions to Yale was his personal warmth in dealing with people. This fundamental humanity was rooted in a sense of justice toward others. Like President Eliot of Harvard, he understood the value of maintaining good relations with the various local ethnic and religious groups as well as encouraging a few bright foreign students to come to Yale. In contrast to Eliot, Hadley's views on the subject of immigration were

---

obscure. For example, he declined Edward Lauterbach's invitation to serve on a committee of the Liberal Immigration League on the grounds that he lacked the time.  

In 1915, however, Hadley wrote to Leon Sanders, President of the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society of America, that while he thought "highly" of the Society's work, he was not in complete agreement with it on the immigration issue. Hadley himself had come to believe that "we should soon have to come to some form of restriction, and that the only question before us was one of wise choice of means." He indicated some of the means he favored in a letter to Dr. Sidney L. Gulick of the League for Constructive Immigration Legislation. While the Federal Government should protect aliens and their property, it should so regulate immigration that only those who could be fully Americanized would be admitted. Hadley also felt that American living standards should be protected from both European and Oriental competition. On the basis of his work as Connecticut's Labor Commissioner, he had concluded that some peoples, such as the French Canadians, Italians, and Chinese, did not assimilate well or at all. Yet he realized the complexity of framing immigration regulation laws. "What is an 'Oriental'?", he asked. And "if a particular group of Orientals

will make good citizens and certain group of Occidentals will not make good citizens, why do we admit the one and exclude the other?" Moderation thus characterized Hadley's attitude toward the immigration question.25

During the Hadley years, Yale attracted a number of foreign students to its classrooms. Of these, Yale felt a special concern for the Chinese, dating from the days of Yung Wing, who graduated from the College in 1854. Yale's first Chinese graduate was largely responsible for encouraging the Imperial Government to send an educational mission of 120 students to the United States in the 1870's. But, following a change of policy in 1881, the Imperial Government recalled the students. Not until almost twenty-five years later, 1905-1911, did another sizable group of Chinese students seek entrance to American universities. This time foreign study was made possible by the United States Government's remission of the Boxer Indemnity, which the Imperial Government subsequently used to send students abroad. Like

Harvard, Columbia, and several other American colleges and universities, Yale felt it should do its part in educating the Chinese. 26

Because the Chinese did not usually fulfill Yale's entrance requirements, certain accommodations had to be made. Most of them had received some college training in China, often at a missionary-sponsored institution. In general, such training qualified them for admission to Sheffield or to the Graduate School, but not to Yale College which regularly required a knowledge of Greek and Latin. At the very least, the College Faculty expected Chinese candidates to be fluent in English, to have a good reading knowledge of French or German, and to understand elementary Latin. 27


27 Arthur T. Hadley to President F. L. Hawks Pott, St. John's College, Shanghai, China, October 13th, 1905, MSS Letters from Pres. Hadley, July 1, 1905 to December 31, 1905, Book No. 11, pp. 300-299. The following are all MSS Letters from Pres. Hadley, January 1st, 1906, to May 20th, 1906, Book No. 12: Arthur T. Hadley to Rev. Harlan P. Beach, February 27th, 1906, p. 355 in which he said that the Greek requirement would not be a barrier to Chinese students; Hadley to Professor A. W. Phillips, February 27, 1906, p. 355, in which he advised Phillips to ask "reasonable requirements" of the Chinese applicants, lest Yale attract the inferior Chinese by too easy standards; Hadley to His Excellency Tuan Fang, Washington, D. C., January 25th,
The Committee on Admission agreed in 1907 to admit Chinese graduates of the Western Department of the School of Arts and Sciences of St. John's College, Shanghai, to the Junior Class in Yale College on the basis of their B.A. degree, without examination, provided they studied history and languages. But F. L. Hawks Pott, President of St. John's, cogently argued that these requirements were too demanding in that the Chinese were obliged to study Caesar, Livy, Horace, and Tacitus. His students were already twenty-two years of age by the time they fulfilled the academic requirements at St. John's. To insist that they spend years learning Latin, Pott observed, failed to take into consideration quite enough the large amount of time a Chinese student spends on the acquisition of a knowledge of his own literature, and in forming a Chinese literary style. By means of this branch of study, his mind gets the same sort of training that our students get from the study of the Greek & Latin authors.

Because of the time Chinese students devoted to both Chinese and English, Pott wanted the Yale Faculty to reconsider the minimum Latin and French requirements needed for

1906, p. 152; Hadley to James B. Reynolds, February 7th, 1906, p. 247, in which he welcomed the visit of two Chinese commissioners, one of whom was Tuan Fang, to Yale; and Hadley to Kan-Ichi Asakawa, January 19th, 1906, p. 107, in which he offered Asakawa $1200 a year, beginning in 1907-1908, to teach the development of Japanese civilization and some modern Oriental history. Asakawa graduated from Dartmouth in 1899 and was elected to the Graduates Club in 1908.
those of St. John's graduates who transferred to Yale's Junior Class. Even Oxford, he pointed out, did not require either Latin or Greek of its Chinese students. "American colleges could be as liberal in their policy," especially Yale which was "deservedly...the most popular of American Universities with the Chinese students." 28

The Yale Faculty was cautious about changing admissions requirements and allowing substitutions for Greek and Latin. It feared that if it gave in too much to the Chinese, the door would be open to similar requests from the Japanese, and even from the Russians. The following memorandum, January, 1908, revealed a certain amount of Western, if not American, ethnocentrism:

The College professors have voted that duly certified knowledge of the Chinese classics may be accepted from Chinese students as a substitute for Greek. Beyond this the Committee have no authority to go in the direction of relaxing for Chinese applicants our usual requirements for admission. No substitute for the Latin required for admission is accepted from anyone.

While desiring "to aid China by assisting to train up Chinamen to serve their country well," they felt that

Yale College can do more for China, in the future as in the past, by giving her best to a few Chinamen of high character and ability, than by giving something less good to a larger number of inferior men,

28 Henry P. Wright to Rev. F. L. Hawks Pott, D.D., Jan. 21, 1907, copy, Henry P. Wright Papers, Historical Manuscripts, Box No. I; and Pott to Wright, Nov. 13, 1907, Henry P. Wright Papers, folder College Curriculum Scholastic Requirements.
unable to receive her best. It would be poor service to China to relax our standard.

In fact, the College Faculty believed that permission to substitute Chinese classics for Greek should only be a temporary exception. Since the Japanese received no special consideration, it would be difficult to justify a permanent exception for the Chinese. Harvard, in contrast to Yale, did not require Latin of Chinese students who had prepared in foreign schools. And some years before, Harvard had allowed Japanese students to substitute Chinese or Japanese classics for Greek. Yet, paradoxically, Yale continued to enjoy a high reputation in China in spite of its less flexible admission requirements.29

Several scholarships were established to help pay the expenses of Chinese students at Yale. The two Chinese Viceroyso, envoys to the United States, nominated candidates for two permanently endowed scholarships. Yale offered ten other $150 tuition scholarships from 1906 to 1910. These were to be filled upon the recommendations of the Chinese Legation in Washington, D.C., whose commissioner, Thomas D. Goodell to Henry P. Wright, Jan. 9, 1908, enclosing memorandum "From the Committee, T. D. Goodell"; B. S. Hurlbut, Dean of Harvard College, to Wright, January 13, 1908, Henry P. Wright Papers, folder College Curriculum Scholastic Requirements. See also C. P. Chang, Ann Arbor, Michigan, to "My dear Sir," Sept. 5, 1910, Frederick Jones, Registrar, Correspondence, Historical Manuscripts, Box No. I, filed under C.
Sir Chentung Liang Cheng was honored by Yale in 1906 with the Doctor of Laws degree.30

Although most of the Chinese students came to New Haven before the outbreak of World War I, a few matriculated in 1917 or later.31 When James R. Angell became President of Yale, he continued this policy of sympathetic interest in China and Chinese students. In fact, he wrote Admissions Director Robert N. Corwin that he was "distinctly interested in seeing the number of Chinese boys who come to us


31 Arthur T. Hadley to Professor Clive Day, October 10, 1917, pp. 640-639; and Hadley to T. T. Wong, October 13, 1917, p. 653, MSS Letters from Pres. Hadley, Book No. 31. Che-Chun Hsiang entered Yale College in the fall of 1917 as a Sophomore. Recommended by President Tsur of Tsing Hua College, Peking, Hsiang was under the guardianship of Mr. T. T. Wong, Superintendent of the Chinese Educational Mission, Washington, D.C. Hadley noted that "the whole matter" was "more thoroughly regular and official than has been the case with any Chinese students that have come here since the days of Yung Wing's mission in 1880; and any man coming with such credentials" was "worth looking after, for the sake of our relations to China no less than of the man himself."
somewhat increased and anything which can be reasonably done to spare Oriental sensibilities is, I think, in the line of good sense." His understanding of the Chinese was based upon the year and a half which he had spent in China as a youth, while accompanying his father on a trip around the world. Corwin in reply assured Angell that the Committee on Admissions had "usually 'taken a chance!'" with doubtful cases of Chinese applicants.\(^{32}\)

Yale men were sympathetically involved with the Chinese, in part, because their University had been "the first," according to the Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., '98, "to undertake through its graduates the creation of an educational mission in the Far East." Ya=li in China graduated its first class in 1912. Like Yale in New Haven, wrote F. Wells Williams '79, Assistant Professor of Modern Oriental History, the college in Changsha stood "for Christianity and an example of a Christian--but not sectarian--institution." And in 1911-1912, plans were being made to build both a new college campus and, nearby, a new Changsha Yale Hospital. Thus claimed Stokes, the foreign medical, educational, and missionary work of other American universities--Harvard, Princeton, and the Universities of

\(^{32}\)James R. Angell to R. N. Corwin, Feb. 10, 1922, and Corwin to Angell, February 13, 1922, Records of the President, JRA, Box 2 and folder Board of Admissions. Angell kept two diaries during his sojourn in China.
Michigan and Pennsylvania—had "been largely influenced by the Yale enterprise."^33

While Japan did not evoke sympathy, it did earn respect. President Hadley, for example, expressed a high regard for the Japanese, but acknowledged that he did not have "any real understanding of the inner life and soul of the people." For this reason and because he had never visited the country, he declined to write an article for a Japanese journal. It was more appropriate, he said, "to maintain an attitude of courteous observation and of friendly but respectful silence" toward Japan. But he did comment upon the anti-Japanese agitation in California. It was the result of a combination of economic, social, and commercial reasons in equal proportion. There is a social reaction against the formation of economic communities within our own borders on the part of a race that does not readily amalgamate with our own.

Although much of the hostility to the Japanese was localized on the Pacific Coast, he noted that there was a widespread feeling that the United States, and indeed any nation, could not sustain "within its borders any considerable organized elements which it does not assimilate."

---

This difficulty was further accentuated by the fact that "the ethics of the United States" were "predominantly commercial;" while "those of Japan" were "predominantly military." Consequently misunderstandings would be difficult to avoid. But he hoped "the spread of enlightenment" would enable both peoples to "appreciate" the good qualities of the other.34

To be sure, the University of Pennsylvania, and Columbia, Cornell, and Harvard Universities drew far more foreign students than Yale, Yet a small group of them did come to New Haven. More enrolled in the Yale Graduate and professional schools than in the College, because of the latter's rather rigid requirements. And because Yale's scholarship resources were limited, with none restricted to particular nationality groups, foreign students usually had to compete on the same basis for scholarship aid as Americans. As in the case of the Chinese, special funds sometimes were obtained for these students. The establishment of an Italian Fellowship Exchange was another example. The Italian Government offered five fellowships to American universities in Italy in exchange for five similar fellowships for Italian students in the United States. In order

34 Arthur T. Hadley to K. Minoura, Tokyo, July 16th, 1907, MSS Letters from Pres. Hadley, June 10, 1907, to April 30, 1908, Book No. 15, pp. 146-145; and Hadley to President Tasuku Harada, San Francisco, October 27, 1920, Book No. 36, p. 327.
to obtain one such fellowship Yale had to reciprocate. Fortunately, New Haven had a substantial Italian community, which agreed to raise the needed $1500. Most, if not all, of this sum was given by the movie house operator Sylvestre Z. Poli. The exchange of graduate students between Yale and an Italian university began in 1929-1930. Yale was pleased with the Italian students it subsequently received. Edgar S. Furniss, Dean of the Graduate School, said they were "consistently good" and "acted as a stimulus both to our students and to those of our faculty who came into contact with them."^35

The dislocation and economic hardship created by World War I in Europe caused an increase both in the number of foreign students seeking an American education and in the proportion of needy foreign students among them. As far as possible, Yale tried to provide modest scholarships or loans for some of them, but it could rarely comply with all requests for aid. Dr. Stephen C. Duggan of The Institute of International Education and S. P. Capen, Director of the American Council on Education asked on several occasions whether Yale could provide scholarships for

35 Albert Beecher Crawford to K. P. Damlamian, Secretary, Armenian Students' Association of America, February 2, 1922, folder Scholarships and Fellowships; and 1/11/30, Vote of thanks of the President and Fellows to Sylvestre Z. Poli, and Edgar S. Furniss to James R. Angell, May 20, 1931, folder Italian Fellowship Exchange, Records of the President, JRA.
students from such countries as Great Britain, France, Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Russia. In addition to appeals from organizations, Yale also received letters from students in Argentina, Lagos, and Nigeria.  

By providing some scholarship aid for a few foreign students, Yale enriched itself as it helped others. Because both Hadley and Angell believed that Yale should remain a first-rank university, they encouraged such cultural contacts. But in certain respects, Yale still bore the stamp of a provincial college during the 1920's and 1930's. Hardly had the spirit of cosmopolitanism been fostered than it was challenged by the entrenched forces of tribalism and provincialism.

36 James R. Angell to Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, November 23, 1921; S. P. Capen to Angell, April 7, 1922; Angell to Capen, April 26, 1922; Minott A. Osborn to Duggan, July 11, 1922; Duggan to Angell, November 13, 1922; Duggan to Angell, June 30, 1924, copy, Records of the President, JRA, folder Scholarships for Foreign Students. Alexander Petrunkevitch to Angell, May 9, 1923; Albert Beecher Crawford to Winifred C. Putnam, National Information Bureau, Inc., December 12, 1923, copy; Crawford to Angell, December 28, 1923, Records of the President, JRA, folder Ru. Angell to Meises Gabay, May 13, 1930, and Gabay, an exchange student from the Argentine Republic, to Angell, May 15, 1930, handwritten; S. O. Odiliuji of Lagos to The President, Yale University, 2/9/33, handwritten; Davidson J. S. Amachree of Nigeria to The President of Yale University, 27th December 1933, handwritten; James J. King of Nigeria to "Sir," undated [ca. October 9, 1936], handwritten; two page statement drafted by the Phelps-Stokes Fund on "Information For Africans Planning To Study In The United States Of America," Records of the President, JRA, folder Foreign Students. See also Arthur T. Hadley to Dean W. L. Cross, January 22, 1920, p. 417; Hadley to Florence M. Snell, Oxford, England, February 10, 1920, p. 493; and Hadley to Hagop Bogigian, April 22, 1920, p. 736, MSS.
Letters from Pres. Hadley, September 1, 1919 to April 24, 1920 (incl.), Book No. 35.
CHAPTER IX

YALE: REACTION AND STABILIZATION

The Corporation's Committee on Educational Policy has asked me to report at an early date on the number and status of students of Jewish origin now in the Undergraduate Schools and to discuss with them the advisability or necessity of concerted measures for limiting the number of those of this race or religion to be admitted to college.

The restrictive measures enforced or to be enforced at other colleges which draw from the same sources as we make the serious consideration of this question imperative.

The opinion prevails that an undue proportion of Jewish students appears among the whole number of those whose conduct or scholarship necessitate disciplinary measures.

--Robert N. Corwin, Chairman of the Board of Admissions, to Frederick S. Jones, Dean of Yale College, May 3, 1922

Reacting to news carried by the academic grapevine as well as official announcements at other universities, especially from Harvard, Yale begun its own examination of Jewish students within the Undergraduate Schools. Any admissions decision which Harvard made was bound to affect Yale because the two universities drew upon a similar pool of applicants. Should other Eastern, privately endowed colleges impose a quota on Jewish students, Yale would have to follow suit for its own "self-protection." A subsequent

1Robert N. Corwin to Frederick S. Jones, May 3, 1922, Records of the Dean of the College, Frederick S. Jones (FSJ), Box 5, folder "Jews."
memorandum of May 12, 1922, pointed to "the fact" that Columbia had "reduced the number of its Jewish students by half," that Harvard was "taking measures leading to the same result, and that several other eastern colleges" were "limiting numbers partly with this same end in view...."

Consequently, it seemed "necessary that we should take some action if we are not to add to our present quota those who" were "refused admission to other universities" drawing "from the same sources"as Yale. In brief, Yale did not want to become a dumping ground for Jews excluded from other colleges. Secondly, Yale, if not necessarily its new president, James R. Angell, was having doubts about the overall quality of its Jewish students. To this point, Corwin asked Dean Jones several leading questions: Was it "desirable for reasons purely scholastic in the larger sense, to limit the number of Jewish students admitted to Yale?" Was "the present proportion of Jewish students...too great when the interests of the whole undergraduate body" were "taken into consideration?" And if these questions were answered affirmatively, as they were to be, "what measures" should be adopted to accomplish such a limitation?²

²Ibid., and "Memorandum on the Problems Arising From the Increase in the Enrollment of Students of Jewish Birth in the University," 5/12/22, Records of the President, James R. Angell (JRA), Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc.
President James Rowland Angell

On both the question of curtailing Jewish admissions and on the related one of limiting the size of the student body, President James R. Angell and his Faculty were not in complete agreement. But as an outsider to the Yale family, Angell could not count upon allies within the College Faculty. By custom, moreover, the Yale president was primus inter pares, "first among equals"; he could consult, but he presided neither at Faculty meetings nor directly initiated legislation. A letter written in 1924 from President-Emeritus Charles W. Eliot to Angell illustrated the relationship between president and faculty at Yale. The decisive Harvardian noted, more than three years after Angell's inauguration:

A rumor reached me lately that you had not yet taken your seat as Presiding Officer in each and every Yale Faculty, but were intending to do so shortly. When I became President of Harvard in May 1869, it had long been the custom for the President to preside in the College Faculty but in no other. As I look back on the work accomplished at Harvard between 1869 and 1909 I feel sure that much of it was due to the fact that I took the chair in all the Professional Faculties in the fall of 1869 and never missed a meeting, unless I was on some journey.

At Harvard the president very largely governed. At Yale, Professor George W. Pierson has written, Angell "was not even able to pick his own Dean." The Permanent Officers of Yale College wanted one of their own kind, a man who could "handle students, ... lead the faculty, and ... guard the interests of the College." After forty-four faculty members signed a petition in favor of the appointment of Clarence
Whittlesey Mendell '04, Angell reluctantly acquiesced. On this matter as on admissions decisions, the views of the "Old Blues" prevailed.3

Angell was, nonetheless, eminently qualified for the presidency of Yale. He had the scholarly attainments, administrative experience, and the appropriate background. While he did not have Yale connections, he was properly New England born. "On his father's side," wrote Professor Pierson, Angell "could trace back through eight generations of Scituate farmers and Providence settlers to the original founding of Rhode Island under Roger Williams." And "his mother's family had been Massachusetts and Mayflower people."

His father, James Burrill Angell, had taught at Brown University before moving on to the presidency of the University of Vermont. James Rowland Angell was born in Burlington, Vermont, in 1869, and two years later, his father began his thirty-eight year presidency of the University of Michigan. James Rowland Angell graduated from the Ann Arbor public schools and received his A.B. from the University of Michigan in 1890. In his graduate study in psychology, he worked under John Dewey at Michigan and William James at Harvard, earning two A.M. degrees. Then at the University of Halle,

he almost finished a German Ph.D. thesis on Immanuel Kant, but left to accept an instructorship at the University of Minnesota. From there he went to the University of Chicago where he held the following positions: professor of experimental psychology, Dean of the Faculties, and Acting President. After World War I, Angell served as president of the Carnegie Corporation. While serving in this office he received the call from Yale.\footnote{Pierson, \textit{Yale, II}, 16-19, and chap. 1 "Electing a New President," 3-15.}

According to Pierson, Angell soon won the support of both Yale students and alumni. But members of the faculty felt "neglected," and this slight added to their recent disappointments. Not only had they been "bypassed in the Reorganization" following World War I, but they also would have preferred as successor to President Arthur T. Hadley either his Secretary, the Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes '96 or Charles Seymour '08, Professor of History. By 1920, however, the Yale Corporation was dominated by businessmen and it, along with most of the alumni, was against reinstating an ordained minister in the president's office. To break a "deadlock" in the voting among Yale candidates, the Corporation solicited nominations from the outside. Angell was the best candidate, and after some dickering—the salary initially offered was modestly low—he was unanimously elected
President of Yale University.\textsuperscript{5}

But the Faculty had doubts, which were not resolved by their first impression of the President-elect. To be sure, he was eloquent, if not "a little wordy and long-winded." And continued Pierson, the Faculty felt Angell to be personally "ill at ease, cordial, a little jocose," while "some of them missed the breeding and cultivation so conspicuous in Hadley and which they had unconsciously associated with the office." For his part, Angell found the College "under the leadership of men whom he would not have chosen and about whose intellectual convictions he was extremely dubious."\textsuperscript{6}

As Angell announced in his inaugural address delivered at Commencement, June, 1921, he would work to enhance Yale's "'character as a national University." This could be accomplished in part by enrolling talented high school graduates and in part by strengthening the Graduate and professional schools. And finally he urged that the "content of liberal culture" be redefined and broadened. He spoke of the need for "change and adjustment," wrote Pierson, and did not say those words of praise for languages, literature, and "the classical or Christian heritage" which the College

\textsuperscript{5}Ibid., 25, 5-7, 10-11, 15.

\textsuperscript{6}Ibid., 25, 175.
Faculty wanted to hear.  

His emphasis on intellectual training seemed to encroach upon another part of a traditional Yale education, which many of the professors, having themselves been Yale undergraduates, considered essential: extracurricular and social activities. Angell had come to Yale after more than twenty years' association with the ethnically and socially more diversified and urban University of Chicago. In contrast, many of the Faculty wanted the College to preserve its basic homogeneity, by educating first and foremost white, middle-class, Anglo-Saxon Protestants. While the College educated boys from all parts of the country, some of whom came from humble backgrounds and poor schools, the Faculty had a strongly held stereotypical view of the ideal Yale undergraduate. 

---

7 Ibid., 26-29.

8 According to Floyd W. Reeves and John Dale Russell, The Alumni of the Colleges, University of Chicago Survey, VI (Chicago, 1933), "Table 6. Percentage Distribution of Graduates of Each Period According to Religious Preference," p. 15, Jews numbered 437 out of the total 3975 responding or 11 per cent for the period 1893 to 1930. From 1893 to 1900, Jews numbered only three per cent; 1901-1910, they rose to 5 per cent; during the next decade, they climbed to 8 per cent; and during the 1920's, they reached 15 per cent. The only larger denominations for the entire period were the Presbyterians at 17 per cent and the Methodists at 16 per cent. The Baptists, who had comprised 27 per cent of the graduates of 1893 to 1900, sharply declined in numbers thereafter. Although they numbered 11 per cent for the entire period, they constituted only 8 per cent of the graduates in the 1920's. The percentage of Catholics was much smaller at Chicago than at either Harvard or Yale. They rose from
President Angell certainly did not intend to make radical changes in Yale admissions policies, but he did want to broaden them. In contrast to President A. Lawrence Lowell, he never advocated adoption of a quota system at Yale, although apparently he acquiesced to such a policy when it was instituted. In an address entitled "The Public Schools and the Spirit of Tolerance," delivered at the annual meeting of Northeastern Ohio Teachers Association, October 26, 1928, Angell attacked prejudice and intolerance. The public schools had an important role in discouraging "local and provincial bias and prejudice" and in cultivating "an atmosphere of tolerance and fair play concerning controversial issues, whether in the field of politics, or religion, or in the larger world of ideas." They could accomplish this by proclaiming "on every proper occasion and by the consistent example of their leaders, the doctrine that religious faith is a personal matter which cannot be assailed without undermining that freedom of thought and conscience which is the most precious asset not only of our country but also of civilization itself." He then addressed

---

2 per cent of the 1893 to 1900 period to 7 per cent in the 1920's; their percentage for the entire period was a modest 6. In contrast to their large representation at the Big Three, Episcopalians totaled only 9 per cent of the graduates for the entire period. Other denominations constituted among the graduates, 1893-1930, the following percentages: Congregational 10; Lutheran, 5; and all other religions 11. Four per cent stated no religious preference. In addition, there were 560 graduates who did not provide information.
himself to another type of prejudice:

Perhaps the most socially and morally disintegrating of all the forms of bigotry, outside of religion, is that found in national and especially racial prejudice. The Jew against the Gentile, the white against the black, the Nordic against the yellow races -- the number of these instances is legion.

Agnell's publicized denunciation of religious and racial prejudice was unequivocal, and his sympathy for immigrant stocks who had often been "exploited industrially" and "despised socially" was explicit. 9

But there were those in the Corporation, on the faculty, and among the alumni who believed along with their Harvard and Princeton counterparts that the number of Jewish students at Yale should be limited. Angell unfortunately lacked both the presidential power and personal influence to block these advocates of restrictive admissions. Instead he

9President James R. Angell, "The Public Schools and the Spirit of Tolerance," Cleveland, [Ohio] October 26th, 1928, 20 pages, Records of the President, JRA, Folder 0, see pp. 2, 7-9. The original title of the address was "The Duty of the Schools to Break Through Local Provincial Prejudices and Purely National Prejudices." The Rabbi Stephen S. Wise was on the same program. Angell also said:

"I am not urging that the public school teacher in the grades, or even in the high schools, shall rush in and begin to preach to the children the gospel of the social, political and intellectual equality of the negro with the white, nor inveigh against the cruel injustice of the social discriminations of the gentile against the Jew, nor deprecate the mutual suspicion of the Protestant and the Catholic. What I do mean is that in every school, from the kindergarten to the university, there are abundant occasions when it becomes possible to point out and stress the difference between opinions based upon ignorant prejudice and hateful malice on the one hand, and on the other those flowing from honest effort to learn and weigh fairly with the least possible bias all the actual facts in a given case" (pp. 12-13).
tried to defuse the issue by urging a balanced and unemotional discussion of its ramifications. His sense of perspective and of humor were evident in the following exchange with Robert Nelson Corwin. The Chairman of the Board of Admissions informed him that 115 or about 13 per cent of the Class of 1927 were Jewish, half of these from New Haven and neighboring towns, by a count that was "approximately correct," although "not as accurate as that employed by Jephthah at the passages of the Jordan." The President wittily replied: "Perhaps what we really need is a rejuvenation of the house of the Philistines." 10

Yale's discussion of its Jewish question was sparked by similar discussions on other campuses. The increase of enrollment during the second decade of the century made it almost inevitable that colleges and universities would begin to ask themselves how large they intended to grow. Once some limitation on student body size was agreed upon, the next question concerned the criteria for admission. Subjective and social standards invariably intruded themselves in any discussion of admissions requirements during the 1920's. Yale was no exception to this pattern. An early, if not the first, sign of the policy that was to come was the vote by the Board of Admissions, on October 18, 1921, to

10 Robert N. Corwin to James R. Angell, February 29, 1924, and Angell to Corwin, March 8, 1924, Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc.
refer the question of a possible limitation of future Freshman classes to the University Council. This Council comprised the following: officers of the University—Provost, who served as chairman, Secretary of the University, Treasurer, Dean of Students, Librarian, and Chairman of the Board of Admissions; representatives of the schools—their respective Deans; and representatives of the Divisions—various professors. In November, the University Council voted that the chairman appoint a committee "to investigate the matter of limitation of numbers." President Angell was appointed chairman of the committee, which also included Deans Fred S. Jones, Roswell P. Angier, Wilbur L. Cross, and Director Russell H. Chittenden.11

11 Meeting of the Board of Admissions, October 18, 1921, Freshman Office Records, Box 1, 1920-1921/1921-1922, folder A 1. 10, Admissions Committee, Prof. Corwin Chairman. In "Memorandum of Matters to be brought before the University Council from the Chairman of the Board of Admissions," October 19, 1921, Corwin wrote:

"The request for the consideration of this question carries no implication of a sentiment in the Board of Admissions either for or against such limitation. At present, however, all candidates who qualify for admission to the Freshman class or to advanced standing are granted admission."

But some faculty felt that the Undergraduate Schools could not continue indefinitely to handle an increasing enrollment (See Freshman Office Records-Ex - 1926-1927 (3) Student Folders Van Camp-Budd, folder Admissions 1920-22 incl.). See also Minott A. Osborn, Secretary, to President James R. Angell, November 17, 1921 with copies for Deans Jones, Angier and Cross, and Director Chittenden, reporting the November 10th, 1921 minute and vote of the University Council (Freshman Office Records, Box 2, 1921-1922, folder A 3. 60).
While this subject was under investigation, the question of whether Jews in particular should be limited became the topic of some correspondence and several meetings. In January 1922, for example, about the same time that President Lowell was making his initial inquiries about the number of Jews at Harvard, President Angell began to ask his Deans and administrators for similar information. In response to questions raised during a conversation over dinner, Director Russell H. Chittenden sent Angell the following statistics:

TABLE 14

JEWISH STUDENTS IN THE SHEFFIELD SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL, CLASSES OF 1910-1924

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Total Men in Class</th>
<th>Number of Hebrews</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.T.C. PERIOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921/1922</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923 (fall 1920)</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923 (December 1921)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924 (December 1921)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Russell H. Chittenden to James R. Angell, January 26, 1922, Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc.

Jewish enrollment increased during the war years--Students' Army Training Corps--and, as of December 1921, promised to
maintain these gains during the coming decade. Furthermore "practically all members" of Sheff's Pre-Medical Course were "of Jewish or South European origin."¹²

Jewish Students at Yale

No immediate action was taken on these statistics, but during the next five months, especially in April and May, a great deal of data was collected on Jewish students at Yale, chiefly by Admissions Director Corwin and Dean Jones. Requested by the Corporation's Committee on Educational Policy to report on Jewish students at Yale, Corwin asked Dean Jones of the College, Roswell P. Angier of the Freshman Year, and A. K. Merritt, Registrar, for information and their views. Data supplied by Merritt, for example, showed that the tiny percentage of Jewish students in Yale College had more than tripled in twenty years. In 1901-1902, the number of Jewish students in the three upper classes was 18 or 2 per cent of the 878 total (whereas Congregationalists and Episcopalians were about 18 and 14 per cent, respectively, of the

¹²Russell H. Chittenden to James R. Angell, January 26, 1922, and Angell to Chittenden, January 26, 1922. See also a slip of paper to which had been attached the "Names of students in Pre-Medical Courses in the Sheffield Scientific School" (Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc.). Chittenden gave two figures for 1923, because this class "lost over a hundred men through withdrawal and dropping, in connection with the changes in courses, etc., but mainly because of the dropping of a group of Pre-Medical men who had violated the Honor System - all Hebrews...."
University's enrollment). By 1911-1912, Jewish students had increased to 40 out of 852, or to 4.7 per cent. Ten years later, the 78 Jewish students constituted 7.4 per cent of the 1042 total. 13

To some this was a disturbing realization. And the Dean of the Freshman Year confirmed these trends. In his letter of May 9, 1922, to Corwin, Dean Angier noted that the 96 Jews in the Freshman Year comprised 11 per cent of the Class of 1925. Academically, Jews did very well as a group, which would make it difficult to exclude them on the basis of present admissions tests. At midyear, they averaged 73.2, while the class average was 70. Jews constituted 15

13A. K. Merritt to Robert N. Corwin, April 11, 1922, copy, Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc. For religious affiliations of Yale College students from the 1870's to early 1900's, see Appendix D (1) "Church Members In Academic Classes 1873-1904" and Appendix D (2) "Religious Composition of Yale University, Jan. 1, 1901" (Two Centuries of Christian Activity at Yale, edited by James B. Reynolds, Samuel H. Fisher, Henry B. Wright, Committee of Publication (1901)). Statistics collected from the Senior Class (1873-1899) and from Freshman registration (1899-1904) on a total of 3628 students indicated the number of church members for each denomination: Congregational, 1205; Episcopal, 948; Presbyterian, 755; Baptist, 214; Methodist, 186; Roman Catholic, 130; Jewish, 44; Reformed, 35; Lutheran, 17; Disciples (Christian), 17; Unitarian, 12; and Scattering, 65.

As of Jan. 1, 1901, 59 per cent of all Yale University students were church members. In the College, the average was 63 per cent as compared to only 50 per cent in the Sheffield Scientific School. The following percentages indicated religious affiliation among 2527 students: Congregational, .18; Episcopal, .14; Presbyterian, .07; Methodist, Baptist, and Roman Catholic, each .04; Lutheran and Jewish, each .02; Disciples (Christian). 008; Reformed, .005; Friends, .003; Universalist and Unitarian, each .002; and scattered or absent, .02.
per cent of those earning a "honor stand," the grade of 80 or above, and only 4.8 per cent of those dropped for academic reasons. Moreover, in intelligence rating, the Jewish group averaged 61.3, the whole class only 50. But continued Angier, Jews numbered 7 out of the 19 Freshmen suspected of cheating during the past two years. He added, however, that the Student Discipline Committee found only five students guilty, one of whom was Jewish. Nevertheless, he expressed sympathy for a policy of restrictive admissions. "From the point of view of scholarship and intelligence" Jewish students were relatively better than the average of the class. On the whole, however, many of them are personally and socially unacceptable. They are very likely to be eager for all sorts of scholarship aid, even though in some cases they are not in dire need of it, and I feel that they are more or less in the nature of a foreign body in the class organism. They contribute very little to class life. So far as conduct is concerned, aside from the matter of the Honor System, they give very little trouble.

Yale was a besieged citadel which had to be protected from this "foreign body." He suggested four methods of selection: the requirement of passing knowledge of English A, a personal interview with the Chairman of the Board of Admissions for applicants within a fifty mile radius of New Haven, a more careful selection of those admitted "On Trial," and "extreme care in the award of scholarships."^{14}

---

^{14}[Roswell P. Angier] to R. N. Corwin, May 9, 1922, Freshman Office Records, 1920-1921/1921-1922, Box 1, folder A 1. 10 Admissions Committee Prof. Corwin Chairman. Angier
Around the same time, Dean Jones expressed his opinions on the impact of Jewish students upon Yale. Many of them were "fine students," but he thought "the general effect on the scholastic standing" was "bad":

Some men say that they are not disposed to compete with Jews for first honors; they do not care to be a minority in a group of men of higher scholarship record, most of whom are Jews. It is also cited that the recent vote that the "Y" is preferable to Phi Beta Kappa is indicative of a change of feeling which may be attributed in part to the feeling that the Jew is properly the 'greasy grind' and that other students may hesitate to join the group.

In other words, Jones blamed a declining interest in scholarship among Gentiles upon the academic success of Jews. His comments revealed exceptionally well the attitude of Gentile, largely white Anglo-Saxon Protestant, students toward Jews. An analogy could be drawn between the disdain they felt for intellectual achievement and for manual labor: both were performed by people of lower caste status. Consequently, it would be far more gentlemanly to shun honor grades and slide through college on the comfortable and mediocre "C." Moreover, if only a minimum amount of time was spent on studies, the gentleman would have much more time for the really important collegiate activities: managerships, editorships, and athletic competitions.  

was a Harvard graduate and president of the Harvard Club of New Haven.

15 Frederic S. Jones to R. N. Corwin, May 6, 1922, Records of the Dean, FSJ, Box 5, folder "Jews."
To stem what he felt was a swelling tide of Jewish students at Yale, Jones, like Angier, recommended that a prerequisite for admission be the passing of the English examination. He, too, felt that Jews should not be given many scholarships. In fact, they had been discriminated against in the award of scholarships for a dozen years:

Since I have been here in the office it has been our rule not to award the honorary scholarships in upper years to Jews. These scholarships in general are foundations established by people who did not have in mind the support of Jewish students but rather the idea of aiding deserving students of the Christian religion. Dean Wright agreed with me that we were fairly justified in awarding these scholarships to deserving boys other than Jews.

Undoubtedly Jones was correct in assuming that the donors of these scholarships intended to help students who were Christians, since, until the twentieth century, Jews never exceeded two per cent of the Yale student body. But his attitude was that of the nineteenth century and did not take sufficiently into account the changes in educational philosophy and student composition which had been developing at Yale since Hadley's administration. His prejudice toward Jews went beyond religious reasons. Yale had "a perfect right to allocate" its beneficiary aid as it saw "fit."

Several Connecticut scholarships awarded pretty largely on the recommendation of the principals of schools to these boys who are eligible and as a matter of fact quite a number of Jews secure them. I should be disposed to put a very definite limit, and a rather low one, on the amount of beneficiary aid that we grant to Jewish students, and I should not increase this as the proportion of Jews increased but would avoid offering financial inducements
to Jewish students to come here in accepted numbers. In other words, Jones would limit Jews to a low amount of scholarship aid and discourage those who had been accepted from attending. Moreover, the amount of aid available for Jews would remain static, irrespective of the number of Jewish students.16

Yet Dean Jones was a kindly man in other ways and to other students. For example, his treatment of two Roman Catholic students in the Class of 1912 exemplified the constructive role a dean could play. Jones believed in one boy's honesty when he denied the charge of trying to smuggle some books out of the Linonia Library. And he persuaded the other student to stay in college even though the father had asked him to come back and work in the family business. On second thought, the father agreed with the decision and thanked the Dean for the "fatherly interest" he had taken in his son. The Dean also made it possible for another student, the son of a German-born businessman, to finish his senior year. Since the young man had a car, good clothes, and membership in Beta Theta Pi fraternity, the Dean's tab ran into several hundred dollars above tuition and room rent. His generosity was repaid in appropriate fashion. In his will, the alumnus left "a substantial bequest to Yale University to

16 Ibid.
increase faculty salaries."

But Dean Jones had pronounced prejudices. His background suggested some explanations. Born in Missouri and prepared for Yale in Minnesota, Jones was the son of a physician, who had graduated from Princeton and Jefferson Medical College. At Yale, where he paid part of his expenses, he had been an excellent student and, like Corwin, a member of Psi Upsilon and Skull and Bones. After graduation in 1884 and two years of European study, he began a successful twenty-year career, first as professor of physics and electricity and then as Dean of the School of Engineering, at the University of Minnesota. This success was repeated at Yale, where he served as Dean of the College from 1909-1927. His religious and political affiliations were Episcopalian and Independent Republican. On the basis of this information, one might guess that Jones' prejudices derived from his upper middle class status and from his Southern birth. For he was clearly prejudiced against blacks as the following note, written to Professor Corwin during the height of the Jewish question at Yale, showed:

Yours rec'd. Too many Freshmen! How many Jews among them? and are there any Coons? Pennypacker is here & much disturbed over the Jew problem at Harvard. Don't let any colored transfers get rooms in College. I am having a big rest.

---

17"A human document. Dean Jones paid these bills & saved the receipts," folder RE Dean Jones Paying a Student's Bills, Dean's Office - General, Frederick S. Jones, Misc. Corres. & Student Material.
In addition to reflecting the attitudes of the writer, the note also indicated the grapevine which connected Harvard and Yale. Both Dean Jones and Henry Pennypacker, Chairman of the Harvard Board of Admission, were summering on Cape Cod, in or near Chatham.18

Yet the most interesting report on Jewish students at Yale was compiled by Dean Jones. Using the Senior Class Histories as well as his own recollections, he traced the careers of Jewish students from the Class of 1911 to that of 1925. One can picture the Dean, drawing charts with a pencil and ruler and filling in the information, while sitting in Connecticut Hall before his official table, a former piano which had done yeoman service for the glee club.

Jones and Corwin were Yale's equivalent to the Committee of Inquiry at Harvard. Perhaps Jones's memory may have been

18 For biographical sketch on Frederick S. Jones, see History of the Class of 1884, Yale College, Twenty-Five Year Record, pp. 213-215, see also Fred. S. J. to Bob [Corwin] Aug. 15/22, Freshman Office Records-Ex-1926-1927, Student Folders Van Camp--Budd, folder Admissions 1920-22 incl. Someone, probably Jones or Corwin, drew a pencil line from "them" in the second line to "rooms" in the fifth. This suggests that Jews also were not to get certain rooms. Corwin's August 11, 1922 letter to Dean Frederick S. Jones, with the list of admitted Freshmen, had asked: "Please remember me kindly to Mr. Pennypacker when you see him and express to him my hope that the Hebraic question is not interfering with his summer's rest." On Jones's powerful role as Dean of Yale College, see Pierson, Yale, I, chap. 9 "Tyrannosaurus Superbus," 155-163.
imperfect as he compiled lists of Jews for classes early in his deanship. A few students were classified as Jews who actually were Christians. In at least one instance, he may have followed the policy of "guilt by association": an Episcopalian had a Jewish roommate. But on the whole, his head count for each class showed the trend of Jewish enrollment at Yale. And his statistical tables, computed without the aid of statisticians from the Harvard Business School, reflected with reasonable accuracy the situation of Jewish students at Yale.\footnote{\textit{History of the Class of 1884, Yale College Twenty-Five Year Record}, pp. 213-215.}

Jones's tables showed the increase in Jewish enrollment over a fifteen year period, from the Class of 1911 to that of 1926. Until the 1920's that increase had been gradual (Table 15). Of particular interest was his tabulation of the nationality of the Jews. The Russian Jews were the largest nationality group. Since most of them were immigrants or sons of immigrants, he did not believe that they mixed as well into the student body (Table 16). Almost half the parents, 48 per cent, for whom information was known were born in Russia, while 29 per cent were born in the United States, 11 per cent in Germany, and 12 per cent in other European countries. And 39 of the 135 students of "Russian nationality" were also Russian-born. The sons of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>% Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on Table: "It will be observed that the Jewish element has nearly doubled in this period."

Source: [Frederick S. Jones] 11 page memorandum or report consisting of statistical tables and conclusions drawn therefrom [ca. September-October, 1922], Records of the Dean of the College, FSJ, Box 5, folder "Jews."
Table 16

"NATIONALITY OF JEWS IN YALE COLLEGE, CLASSES OF 1911-26, INC."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Austrian</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Hungarian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Roumanian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Nationality was determined by student responses in the Class Book, which was published Senior year.

Source: Records of the Dean, FSJ, Box 5, folder "Jews."
the newer, Eastern European immigrants were coming to Yale in small, but increasing numbers. 20

Understandably, a majority of Yale's Jewish students came from Connecticut. New York, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey sent the only other sizable numbers (Table 17).

TABLE 17

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH STUDENTS
IN YALE COLLEGE, CLASSES OF 1911-1926

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>% Jews enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Hartford</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; New Britain</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Bridgeport</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Other towns</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Conn.</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>% Jews enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Ohio</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Illinois</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; New Jersey</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Massachusetts</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; All other states</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of Jews from all sources 515.

Source: Records of the Dean, FSJ, Box 5, folder "Jews."

---

20 [Frederick S. Jones] 11 page memorandum or report consisting of statistical tables and conclusions drawn therefrom [ca. September-October, 1922], Records of the Dean, FSJ, Box 5, folder "Jews." Handwritten lists of Jews in Yale classes from 1911 through 1925, tabulated on the back of lists of "Recitation Rooms for Senior, Junior, and Sophomore Classes Yale College, September 23th, 1922."
The fact that three-fourths of the Jewish students came from either Connecticut—particularly New Haven, Hartford, and Bridgeport—or New York convinced some of the Yale Faculty that the so-called "Jewish problem" was really a local one. Although the Yale authorities were unhappy with the size of this local influx, Jones's other tables revealed that Jews were good students academically (Table 18).

** TABLE 18**

**SCHOLARSHIP RECORDS OF JEWISH STUDENTS IN YALE COLLEGE, CLASSES 1911-1925**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigma</th>
<th>P.B.K</th>
<th>Xi</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Records of the Dean, FSJ, Box 5, folder "Jews."

While 7.3 per cent of all students made "A" grades, only 4.8 per cent of the Jewish students attained this standing. On the other hand, only 20 per cent of the Jews made "D"
and "E" grades, while 30 per cent of all students did. A higher percentage of Jewish students earned "B" and "C" grades, respectively 29.6 and 45.6. The percentages for all students were 20.0 "B" grades and 42.6 "C" grades. But 45 or 16 per cent of the Jewish students achieved Phi Beta Kappa. Dean Jones observed, moreover, that "of 633 awards of Prizes and Premiums, the Jews took 68 or 10.7 per cent, a somewhat greater percentage than their share." 21

A high percentage of Jewish students was also found among those registering at the Bureau of Appointments and applying for scholarship aid and loans. The Dean was alarmed by the fact that in 1922 56 of 106 Jewish Freshmen had applied for financial assistance. In Yale College, 78 out of 105 Jewish students also applied for scholarships or loans. But only 24 Jewish Freshmen and 31 Jewish College students, about 40 per cent of the applicants in each case, received grants. In contrast, 72 and 75 per cent, respectively, of the other Freshman and College applicants were awarded scholarships. Including the Graduate and professional schools, Jewish students received 49 per cent of all scholarships for which they applied and were granted a total of 107 or 15 per cent of the 723 scholarships and loans given. The corresponding percentages for other students were 76 and 85 per cent. Although Dean Jones did not collect data

21 Ibid.
on the nationality of Jewish scholarship and loan applicants, most were probably from immigrant homes. Such students were considered not only culturally undesirable, but also economic liabilities.22

Between 1911 and 1922, however, about the same proportion of Jews, 77 per cent, graduated as non-Jews. Of the 64 Jewish non-graduates, 22 were dropped for unsatisfactory academic standing. Of these, ten were Russian-Jews. But of the 42 leaving with satisfactory academic records, only four were dismissed for disciplinary reasons. Six left to "go into business," four transferred to Sheff, and five went to other colleges. Of the 213 Jews listing their occupational choices in the Senior Class History, 41 per cent wanted to take up law, 20 per cent medicine, as opposed to 30 per cent who planned to enter business. For them, Yale was a stepping stone into the professions, which offered greater opportunities and also freedom from bureaucratic life. Moreover, the higher corporate echelons were usually closed to Jews, while open to native-born old stock Protestants, especially those who had been in a prestigious college fraternity or society.23

22Ibid.
23Ibid.
As far as participation in undergraduate life was concerned, Jewish students had a limited, but not completely negligible role. They were least represented in the snobbish social clubs. Only one was elected to a Senior Society—Elihu Club, the most recently established of the four. In twelve years, five were members of Junior fraternities: Beta Theta Pi, Delta Kappa Epsilon, Alpha Delta Phi, Alpha Sigma Phi, and Psi Upsilon. A far larger number were members of University fraternities (Jewish): Zeta Beta Tau, Sigma Alpha Mu, and Tau Epsilon Pi. Jews also belonged to the Menorah Society and, perhaps disproportionately, to the Society for the Study of Socialism.24

Jews were active in certain extra-curricular activities, especially in debating and the orchestra. Although few Jews "made the University teams," there were "many Jewish aspirants in football and basket-ball, fewer in swimming and base-ball." On the whole, the Dean concluded that "the Jew in Yale College is as active in extra-curriculum activities as he is encouraged to be." This conclusion was very similar to the one reached by the Committee of Inquiry at Harvard. At both colleges, Jews went out for extra-curricular activities and were successful in them as far as they were "encouraged" or allowed to be. On the basis of this evidence, the Jewish student could hardly have been the

24Ibid.
"alien" he was alleged to be.\textsuperscript{25}

Whatever may have been its original intent, Dean Jones's summary of the Jewish student's position at Yale was generally favorable, and he seemed to modify his assessment at an 1918 meeting of the Association of New England Deans, when he had said: "We have got to change our policies and get them into shape." Four years later, he decided that

The Jew, with ten and two-tenths per cent of the College enrollment, does not at present constitute an acute evil, but if the percentage increases during the next four College generations at the same rate as in the last four, it will become a serious problem.

To say that Jews were not "an acute evil" implied nonetheless that they were still something of an evil. Yet the Dean did praise them:

The best Jewish students have not the ability of the best students in College, but despite the handicaps of poverty and the necessity of working their way, the Jews make better average records than their Gentile fellows. They are ambitious and industrious and distinctly worth educating.

In short, despite certain drawbacks, Jones believed that it was worthwhile for Yale to educate Jewish students—at least a certain number of them. After studying the college careers of Jewish students, the Yale Dean concluded, as had his Harvard colleagues, that most Jews were educatable. Perhaps some of these deans and professors even admitted

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid.
privately to themselves that the hue and cry raised over the alien onslaught was not based on fact. 26

Limitation of Numbers

By the time the Corporation's Committee on Educational Policy met on May 12, 1922, Professor Corwin knew the sentiments of leading administrators and faculty. When the Director of Admissions presented his data, the following members of the Committee were present: President Angell, the Rev. William Adams Brown, Alfred L. Ripley, Fred T. Murphy, and Samuel H. Fisher. George G. Mason, Otto T. Bannard, and Thomas Wells Farnum were also invited. The notes of this meeting were cryptic, mentioning only a discussion of "the possible limitation in admission to the undergraduate department" and a subsequent vote:

That the Committee on Admissions be asked to advise if admission to the Freshman Class other than those established by scholastic examinations be desirable and if so what such limitation should be and what form they should take. 27

Two memoranda in the Angell Papers cast light upon this meeting. The situation at other colleges, especially at Columbia and Harvard, was one of the topics discussed.

26 Ibid., and see supra, pp. 168-170 and n. 50, p. 170.

27 Yale University, Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy, at Woodbridge Hall, May 12th, 1922, Reports of the Committee on Educational Policy to the Yale Corporation 1919-1929, p. 97 (Office of the Secretary, Yale University, Woodbridge Hall).
While Columbia College had reduced its Jewish students "from 40% to 20%," the matter came before the Harvard Faculty, Wednesday, May 9, for report and discussion - 514 Jews in undergraduate body - well over 20% and some increase in Freshman class - 60% of Jews in Honor List - 60% in discipline list. Proposed to reduce immediately and radically in spite of Judge ----

These comments on Columbia and Harvard were significant for several reasons. First, in spite of the fact that the May 12th Memorandum did not fully identify Judge Julian W. Mack, Harvard's first Jewish Overseer, there was no doubt that Yale was closely attuned to events at Harvard and decided to make further inquiries of its own. Publicly, Yale denied, of course, that it was even considering a quota policy; but privately, it was.28

Secondly, this Yale memorandum proved that discussion of a Jewish quota in one college had a snowballing effect: it drew more and more colleges into considering a similar policy. And thirdly, the statement that sixty percent of Harvard's Jewish students were on the discipline list, subsequently proven to be grossly exaggerated by the Committee of Inquiry's Report, gave support, nevertheless, to similar allegations with respect to Jews at other colleges. Finally, the colleges, by the very nature of the informal

28"Memorandum on the Problems Arising...Increase...Enrollment of Students of Jewish Birth...."5/12/22.
contacts between deans and professors of the prestigious Eastern colleges and universities even more than through their formalized meetings, were in a position to formulate what amounted to a concerted policy of restriction. In contrast, Jews had limited means to combat this insidious policy. They were unorganized, and sympathetic spokesmen like President Eliot, Jerome D. Greene, and Judge Mack were rare.

Whereas at Harvard President Lowell led the movement for restriction in the face of a wavering faculty, the evidence at Yale suggests the opposite:

The opinion is general in the Faculty that the proportion of those in the college whose racial elements are such as not to permit of assimilation has been exceeded and that the most noticeable representatives among those regarded as undesirable are the Jewish boys, especially those of local origin.

Accordingly, the overwhelming majority of the Yale Faculty was sympathetic toward some policy of limiting the number of incoming Freshmen. Such a limitation would make possible selection among the academically qualified applicants. Then tests, other than scholastic ones, could be imposed, which would have the effect of disqualifying sons of Jewish immigrants. These tests would be subjective, both in definition and application:

there are several characteristics other than scholarship essential to success in college, - manliness, uprightness, cleanliness, native refinement, etc. which are, it would appear, lacking in a large proportion of the representatives of this race whose parents have but recently immigrated from eastern and southern Europe.
What, for instance, was "manliness" and how was it measured? Were the young men who went out for football more manly than those whose hours were filled with study and outside work? "Native refinement" suggested a knowledge of etiquette, more useful at Emily Post's dinner table than in the library.29

Probably the faculty would have gone beyond the policy of limitation of numbers to some specific restrictions on the total of Jews admitted. At the very least, they would have favored, as Deans Jones and Angier did, a policy restricting the number of scholarships awarded to Jews to their percentage within the student body. Sons of immigrant Jews were competing too successfully for scholarships with the sons of middle class Americans:

There is, I believe, a feeling on the part of those who have studied the scholarship problem in college that that class which has felt the financial and social readjustment most is the solid middle class, composed in large part of people of education and refinement. The purchasing value of the salaries of this class has been so reduced as to, in many cases, place a college education out of their reach unless assistance is given, but the sons of such families are usually too self-respecting to ask such assistance.

Since a majority of both Yale faculty and students came from American middle class, such faculty sympathies were understandable. They considered sons of middle class Americans "more deserving of our aid than those of recent immigrants."

29 Memorandum on the Problems Arising...Increase...Enrollment of Students of Jewish Birth...."5/12/22.
and felt obligated to help them.  

But some alumni associations chose "the corner newsboy or the son of the janitor of their building or a boy similarly circumstanced in the evident belief that the boy who is in the most distressing financial circumstances must be the most needy intellectually." Many of those so chosen were Jewish. The extent to which Yale alumni wanted a Jewish quota is undeterminable, because discussion of the subject was closely guarded. But probably few would have objected to restriction based on "the general principle that the University must provide the greatest good for the largest number...." A quota of six per cent was suggested, which some considered generous, because it was twice the percentage

30 Ibid., and Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, n. 134, n. 135, n. 136, pp. 300-302. According to Professor Veysey: "Quantitative studies of professors' backgrounds in this period indicate that the largest number had businessmen for fathers, although ministers, farmers, and the other established professions were also well represented, in about that order." From his own study of "the biographies of 120 prominent professors and presidents, mainly at the leading institutions," Veysey could identify the occupations of 93 of their fathers: "merchant, banker, or manufacturer, 28; minister, missionary, or rabbi, 24; farmer, 19; college professor or president, 6; lawyer or judge, 3; doctor, 3; diplomat or statesman, 2; southern planter, 2; schoolteacher, 2; and artist, sea captain, lecturer, and manual laborer, 1 each." He was also able to determine the ethnic background of 111 of his sample, some of whom had "mixed parentages": "Old New England families, 76.5; Scotch-Irish, 7.5; Anglo-Saxon from the 'middle' states, 7; English (recent immigrants), 5; Anglo-Saxon from the southern states, 3; Scottish, 3; Jewish, 2.5; Scandinavian, 2; German, 1.5; Old Dutch in New York, 1; Dutch-Canadian, 1; Spanish, 1." In other words, American university professors and presidents were overwhelmingly WASP and middle-class.
of Jews in the national population. 31

But before any definite actions could be undertaken, further discussion and investigation were necessary. A second Memorandum in the Angell Papers raised a number of questions as to the intent of the Corporation. For example what percentage should the quota be: 6, 8, or 10 per cent? Who should discuss the matter, the three Undergraduate Faculties or the Board of Admissions? Did the Corporation prefer to announce the policy or did it prefer that the Board of Admissions "exercise such powers of restriction as expediency and experience shall dictate"? What means of restriction should Yale employ? Various methods were already in practice at other colleges.

(The means of restriction now in force: - Columbia - Psychological tests; Princeton - undergraduate sentiment; Harvard - New Plan examinations, refusal of transfers and registration data; Dartmouth and Williams - dormitories and general restriction of numbers. Pr. Schs.)

Within the decade, Yale would use most of these methods, but it relied chiefly on the following: limitation of the size of the Freshman Class, shutting the door to transfer students, a more searching application form, the psychological test, a personal interview with local candidates, the New

Plan examinations, and restriction of scholarship aid.\textsuperscript{32}

Following the May 12th meeting of the Corporation's Committee on Educational Policy, President Angell instructed Professor Corwin to obtain from the three Undergraduate Deans information on the number of Jews subject to disciplinary action. This data was subsequently sent by Corwin to Angell with a "Memorandum on Jewish Representation in Yale," in the event the President desired to present it to the Corporation's Prudential Committee. Although its Records did not indicate such a discussion, one may well have taken

\textsuperscript{32}"Memorandum on Jewish Problem," undated, but containing "the tentative proposals for restriction discussed with the Corporation's Committee on Educational Policy...." It was unsigned, but there were illegible letters at bottom of page which may be initials (Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, Folder Jewish Problem, etc.). Following a conversation with Angell, Albert Beecher Crawford, Director of the Bureau of Appointments, suggested on June 8, 1922, "the possibility of some territorial restriction on tuition scholarships." If they limited "the number of additional tuition scholarships which may be awarded to local applicants," this would, in effect, reduce the number of scholarships to Jews. Almost one-half of the Jewish students and over one-half of Jewish scholarship holders came from the New Haven area. To avoid criticism from the local press and authorities, he suggested the allotment of a certain number of scholarship awards to areas "outside of New Haven rather than of limiting negatively the number of such scholarships assigned to New Haven." He urged that scholarship money for tuition remis-
sions in Yale College be increased substantially above the $25,000 already appropriated by the Prudential Committee. He did "not see how the sum of something over $6,000 received by Jewish students in Yale College this year can be very greatly reduced since this sum includes prizes and prize scholarships as well as tuition remissions, loans, etc., and this class of students is certainly entitled to what it can fairly earn through scholastic excellence" (Records of the President, JRA, Folder on Scholarships and Fellowships).
place. The conclusions which Corwin presented in his Memorandum on May 26th were critical of Jewish students. While the three Undergraduate Deans reported that Jewish students conformed "in general to the routine regulations of college," most were commuters and therefore rarely involved in any campus disturbances or like breaches of discipline. All administrative officers, however, agree that students of this race are in most frequent conflict with the honor system where this obtains and that the ethical code of a large proportion of the individuals of this race differs from that of the average student especially in matters of student honor and financial honesty.

Although few Jewish students participated in campus riots, many Jews, maintained Corwin and the Undergraduate Deans, did not uphold the honor system at Yale.33

This allegation must have been based in large part upon a single incident in Sheffield Scientific School. Chittenden said that the large number of Jews, subject to discipline in 1920-1921, were part of

one case of ten Hebrews, when nine were placed under official action for violation of the Honor System. These as you know were from the Sophomore Pre-Medical group, and it was distinctly understood that not all of these nine men violated directly the Honor System, but it was recognized that they were participants in that they refused to uphold the Honor System by giving such information as they must have had, so that all ten were disciplined, and eventually the majority dismissed.

33 Robert Nelson Corwin, "Memorandum on Jewish Representation in Yale," May 26, 1922; and Corwin to Deans Jones and Angier and to Director Chittenden, May 19, 1922, Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc.
TABLE 19
DISCIPLINARY CASES IN SHEFFIELD SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL, 1915-1922

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hebrews</th>
<th>Non-Hebrews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1915-16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-22 (May)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Russell H. Chittenden to Robert N. Corwin, May 23, 1922, Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc.

Of the ten non-Hebrews four were placed under official action for violation of the Honor System.

The problem in regard to the Honor System was complicated by the existence of group loyalties. As an insecure minority at Yale, nine of the ten Jews may have felt it would be far worse to turn against an erring brother than to maintain a silence which implicated themselves as well. Chittenden himself admitted that if this Pre-Medical group were eliminated, "we find men dismissed for violation of the Honor System amount to seven non-Hebrews for the last three college years, and two Hebrews."³⁴

---

³⁴Russell H. Chittenden to Robert N. Corwin, May 23, 1922, Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc. (see supra, pp. 509-510 and n. 12).
The facts, then, did not prove that a constantly higher proportion of Jews were subject to disciplinary action than non-Jewish students. Data provided on the Freshman Year showed that Jews numbered 5.4 per cent of those on cut probation, 10.2 per cent on mark probation, and 5.6 per cent on gymnasium probation. But Jews composed 11 per cent of the Freshman Year in 1921-1922. These figures suggested that the percentage of Jews subject to discipline was in proportion to their percentage within the student body. 35

The so-called facts, however, received a different interpretation. And Corwin again tentatively proposed the following measures: limitation in the size of the Freshman Class, restriction on the number of Jewish students proportionate to their number in the country, and limitation of scholarship aid to Jews. "Many feel," he wrote, "that

35J. R. Ellis, Memorandum for Dean Angier, May 25, 1922; and A. K. Merritt to R. N. Corwin, May 25, 1922, citing cases of dishonesty among Jews, four in the Class of 1920 and one in 1921: one "expelled for habitual dishonesty and cheating"; another "withdrew voluntarily," but was subsequently known as "a versatile criminal"; the third "expelled for stealing money from his classmates"; the fourth "withdrew under pressure being suspected of complicity in the activities of the third"; and the fifth, who left because of low stand, "was later expelled from a New York state hospital for falsifying the transcript of his record in Yale College." According to Merritt, there were 25 Jews in the Class of 1920 and 27 in the Class of 1921, which meant that 16 per cent of the Jews in the former were dishonest, but only 3.7 per cent of the latter. If the two classes were combined, the number was 5 out of 52 or about 9.61 per cent (Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc.).
the saturation point has already been passed" in terms of the number of Jews which the University could handle. Not only have Jews had a harmful effect on Yale, he alleged, but they also resisted the beneficial values of a Yale education. The real problem was:

here as at Harvard...the local Jew, who lives at home, knows nothing of dormitory associations, sees nothing of Chapel or Commons, and graduates into the world as naked of all the attributes of refinement and honor as when born into it. His wits have probably been sharpened but he has not gained wisdom, at least not the kind expected of college men.

The Jew was thus stereotyped as a cunning, crafty, and crude interloper.36

In spite of Corwin's strong and persistent endorsement of a Jewish quota, President Angell and the Yale Corporation did not act on these proposals. Angell's reply to President Henry A. Garfield, who had written him concerning the Jewish situation at Williams College, stated Yale's official position as of June 1922:

I judge that our Harvard friends have been passing through a rather unpleasant experience as a result of their discussion of methods of discouraging Hebrew patronage.

36 "Memorandum on Jewish Representation in Yale," May 26, 1922, and "Memorandum on the Problems Arising...increase...Enrollment of Students of Jewish Birth..."5/12/22, Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc. "Limitation of Numbers," one of two 2 page memoranda, Freshman Office Records, Com. on Limitation of Numbers 1922.
I am greatly interested in the suggestion made by Mr. Greenbaum and still more in the apparent effects of his proposal. Some of our people here have been getting a little nervous, but we have as yet taken no action of any kind.37

The Jewish question had appeared at Williams as early as 1910, with "demonstrations" by Gentile students against the increased number of Jews who had entered with the Class of 1914. These "demonstrations" were serious enough to receive comment from President Garfield in a morning Chapel exercise. Subsequently, one Mr. Greenbaum, an alumnus, offered to select only the "desirable" Jews from a list of those applying to Williams. Although Garfield felt that Williams should be responsible for its own admissions policy, he was interested in Greenbaum's suggestion. In effect, Greenbaum, himself, had divided Jews into two categories of desirability. The desirable class of Jews, implicitly the culturally assimilated German Jews—decided to assume responsibility for keeping out their undesirable co-religionists—immigrant Russian Jews. Garfield did not know whether Greenbaum actually took any action along these lines, but thereafter the number of Jewish applicants declined.38

37 James R. Angell to Henry A. Garfield, June 5, 1922, Records of the President, JRA, Box 94, Folder Jewish Problem, Etc.

38 James R. Angell to President Harry A. Garfield, June 5, 1922; and Garfield to Angell, June 1, 1922, enclosing copy of a May 31, 1922 letter from Garfield to Professor
President Angell's interest in Greenbaum's proposal suggested that he was looking for some way to handle the "Jewish problem" at Yale, while avoiding the publicized controversy which was then afflicting Harvard. Meanwhile he was kept informed about Harvard developments by Alfred L. Ripley, president of The Merchants National Bank of Boston and a member of the Yale Corporation. In the fall of 1922, Yale officials continued to discuss the problem of limiting numbers, while avoiding the unfavorable publicity reaped by Harvard. The Committee on Limitation of Numbers reported to the University Council that it had held two meetings and appointed two sub-committees and "'requested that publicity in connection with its deliberations be avoided for the present.'" Charles H. Warren, Dean of the Sheffield Scientific School, replaced Director Chittenden on this Committee, which had also been increased by the additions of Admissions Chairman Corwin and Minott A. Osborn, Secretary of the Alumni Advisory Board.39

William Ernest Hocking, Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc.

39Alfred L. Ripley to James R. Angell, June 3, 1922, Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc., and Minott A. Osborn, Acting Secretary of the University Council, to Robert N. Corwin, October 14, 1922, Freshman Office Records, Com. on Limitation of Numbers 1922.
To obtain information for the Committee on Limitation of Numbers, Corwin wrote letters to the following colleges, asking how they were limiting enrollment: Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Princeton, Vassar, and Williams. Although each of the colleges responded with general information it was difficult to get frank statements from the officials of other universities as to the means used in applying the requirements for admission with a view to limiting numbers, more especially the limitation as applied to those of the Hebrew race.

Unofficially, however, Yale learned of the measures taken at Columbia, Harvard, and Princeton specifically to reduce the number of Jewish students: psychological test, registration blank, and personal interview. Apparently, the issue was not as pressing at Brown, Dartmouth, Vassar, and Williams. A digest of this information was recorded in a memorandum, entitled "Limitation of Numbers." Because of the public controversy over Jewish restriction, Corwin advised that Yale would receive "better publicity if we should speak of selection and of the rigid enforcement of high standards rather than of the limitation of numbers."\(^4\)

Having collected information on the Jewish situation at Yale and at other colleges, Corwin prepared a second memorandum, also entitled "Limitation of Numbers," in which he urged that the Corporation "be asked to authorize the

\(^4\)"Limitation of Numbers," Com. on Limitation of Numbers 1922.
admission of approximately eight hundred Freshmen." According to the general criteria of admission, no candidate who presented satisfactory examinations and recommendations "would be excluded because of parentage." But all "doubtful candidates," who included

all those who have shown even slight deficiencies in any of the subjects of study should appear before the Board of Admissions and be admitted or excluded upon the basis of visible evidence of educability, it being understood that the Corporation and Faculty believe that the alien and unwashed element in college should be reduced rather than increased.

The "visible evidence of educability" was undoubtedly linked to the faces of freshly scrubbed, if adolescently pimply faced, "American" boys. Under the criteria thus proposed the Director of Admissions had wide discretionary powers of determining the "educability" of those with "slight deficiencies." 41

Finally, Corwin's arguments prevailed. After about fifteen months of intermittent discussion, of considerable letter writing, and of the compilation of numerous statistical tables, Yale made a significant policy change. On January 19, 1923, the University Council "voted to informally approve of the proposal to limit the numbers of the entering Freshman Class." The following month, President Angell brought the proposal before the Corporation for its

41 Ibid.
approval. And subsequently on Alumni Day, he announced the limitation of the size of the Freshman Class to 850. In supporting this measure, Angell pointed up its educational benefits—smaller classes and more effective instruction. Although the Committee on Admissions argued that limitation involved "no radical change either of principle or of procedure," there was conclusive evidence that one major reason for the policy was to limit the number of Jews by increasing the weight given to character tests. 42

Stabilization

The new emphasis did not immediately result in a reduction of the number of Jews admitted to Yale. For at least a year, admissions procedure remained more or less the same. For example, at the March 14, 1923 meeting of the Board of Admissions, it was voted not add "a new blank form," which the Principal or Headmaster would fill out "concerning the intelligence, persistence, reliability, emotional

42 Robert M. Hutchins, Secretary, to Robert N. Corwin, January 22, 1923; "Selection of Candidates for Admission to the Freshman Class under the Provision for the Limitation of Numbers," March 16, 1923; and "Admission to the Freshman Class," March 23, 1923, Com. on Limitation of Numbers 1922. See also Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy, January 12 and February 9, 1923. Report of the Committee on Educational Policy to the Yale Corporation, pp. 102, 105.
stability, cooperation, personal habits, and integrity of each applicant for admission." Forms already in use, it was believed, provided sufficient information. In addition, regulations in regard to transfer students, who supposedly were often Jewish were still comparatively lenient. The Board of Admissions did vote not to accept applications from transfers after August 1 of the year they hoped to enter. However, "the Chairman read the new transfer regulations now in force at Harvard and brought to the Board's attention Princeton's request that the College Entrance Examination Board make arrangements for giving intelligence tests."\(^\text{43}\)

Three reasons seemed to underlie Yale's caution in changing admission procedures. First, it wanted to see how successful the limitation of the size of the Freshman Class would be in excluding "undesirables." Second, it undoubtedly wanted time to weigh the probable effects of the changes adopted elsewhere, especially at Harvard, following publication of the "Report of the Committee on the Sifting of Candidates for Admission." And third, certain members of the Corporation, administration, and faculty may have been restraining or soothing the exaggerated fears of their fellows. Although President Angell's precise role in these

\(^{43}\)Minutes of a Meeting of the Board of Admissions, March 14, 1923, Freshman Office Records 1921-1922, 1922-23, Box 1, Folder A 1. 10, Admissions Committee.
deliberations does not appear in any of the available correspondence, he was unlikely to be influenced by distorted stereotypes or false alarms.

In dealing with the Jewish issue at Yale, President Angell avoided emotional and subjective judgments. He did not deny the existence of racial differences. Such a denial, he said, would be "purely sentimental." In a speech delivered in 1928, Angell maintained:

> We cannot be asked to stultify our intellectual integrity by pretending to be oblivious to the actual facts of racial and national peculiarities. A freedom from bigotry, which implied simply a wishy-washy disposition to appraise all groups and persons as of equal merit, would be a grotesque travesty....

Racial differences, however, should not become the subject of prejudice. Thus he continued:

> The real objection to bigotry is not that it involves a critical attitude toward any particular person, or institution, or belief, but that the opposition it reflects rests on sheer obstinate intolerance, ignorance, and at times even malice. The cure for such attitudes and dispositions is to be found in the habit of full and dispassionate examination and evaluation of whatever issue is under discussion.

Angell felt "the gravest anxiety," upon hearing "the views of many presumably intelligent people about certain of these more acutely controversial questions involving prejudice of race, nationality and religion." On the basis of this speech as well as observations made in several letters, it may be concluded that President Angell encouraged the "dispassionate examination and evaluation" of the Jewish
question among his colleagues at Yale. And to some extent, he succeeded.44

But, as noted, limitation of the size of Freshman Class failed to reduce the percentage of entering Jewish students, as Corwin reported to President Angell in February, 1924. Consequently, in June the Board of Admissions voted:

That admission by transfer will in general be refused to those from this general district (New Haven, Hartford, Bridgeport) who have attended schools which regularly prepare for the admission examinations.

Such a vote, of course, was intended to reduce the number of local Jewish transfer students. The following February, two other votes were passed which would also decrease the number of Jewish students. First, the Board voted in favor of "the preparation and setting of Intelligence Tests by the College Entrance Examination Board." Secondly, it voted:

That limitation of numbers shall not operate to exclude any son of a Yale graduate who has satisfied all the requirements for admission.

Alumni sons, overwhelmingly Protestant, were thus given priority in admission under the limitation of numbers. In addition to endorsing the use of CEEB Intelligence Tests, the Board later voted to require psychological tests of those September candidates who had not satisfied grade

requirements the previous June.  

President Angell was keenly interested in the effects of the new policy and procedures. In December, 1926, he expressed his concern to Corwin that Yale's "selective limitation of students" would tend to discourage applicants from high schools, especially those outside New England. He urged the Board of Admissions to give priority to studying "very carefully the whole problem in all its implications" and to

ascertain how, as compared with Dartmouth, for example, our present constituency stands in the matter of the representation of the different social, industrial and economic strata. I am also disposed to think that we must give more explicit consideration to geographical elements, if we do not wish to find ourselves shortly patronized solely, or almost solely, by the products of the private New England and central states preparatory schools. 

Clearly, Angell, himself a product of the public school system, did not want Yale to be patronized almost exclusively by the privately educated sons of the well-to-do. Such a development, he added, would be "little short of calamitous in terms of the ultimate welfare of the University."  

Meanwhile, Clarence Whittlesey Mendell, soon to be

---

45 Minutes of the Board of Admissions, June 10, 1924, February 16, 1925, and October 26, 1925, Freshman Office Records, folder on Admissions Committee.

46 James R. Angell to R. N. Corwin, December 2, 1926, Records of the President, JRA, Box 2 and folder Board of Admissions.
the new Dean of Yale college, reported to the President on what he had learned from visits to different colleges and universities. Mendell had undertaken a ten week trip to twenty universities, private schools and public schools in the South and West from late January to early April, 1926. Among the topics discussed with other educators were use of psychological tests, to which he found only a "lukewarm response." The best of the Western colleges, he thought, were Pomona, Stanford, and Washington, but entrance requirements at these institutions were not difficult. However, he felt "the most important thing to be learned at Stanford was the matter of limitation of numbers." Stanford used a ten point scale, which weighted school record and Thorndyke's psychological test at three each and judgment of the admissions committee at four.\footnote{Report of Dean Clarence W. Mendell, January-April, 1926, 59 pp., p. 34, Records of the President, JRA, file on Clarence W. Mendell.}

Even more interesting were the reports of Mendell's visit to Harvard and Dartmouth in late November or early December, 1926. He conferred with leading Harvard administrators and faculty about admissions policies, Harvard's tutorial system, and a proposed Harvard-Yale-Princeton academic competition. Relations were cordial between the two universities, judging from Mendell's reception by President Lowell; Henry Pennypacker, the Director of Admission; Clifford Moore, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and
Sciences; Chester N. Greenough, Dean of Harvard College; and Edward Allen Whitney, Dean of Freshmen. Cordiality bred a certain frankness in discussion, particularly about methods devised to reduce the percentage of Jewish students at Harvard from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. Very likely this decision by Harvard's Board of Admission led to similar resolutions in New Haven. The Harvard deans and President Lowell also tried to persuade Yale, through Mendell, to adopt its tutorial system, which Lowell considered "his real achievement during his administration." 48

Although Jews were not mentioned specifically in Mendell's report on Dartmouth, the latter's policy of selective admissions was obviously designed to bring a certain type of student to Hanover. "In general," wrote the Yale Dean,

the administration authorities claim that they believe certification to be better than exams and character a better criterion than intellect. Also that Dartmouth gets the very best. This is a good deal discounted by members of the faculty.... The testimony in general of the faculty men I talked with who are not Dartmouth men was that the scholarship standard is essentially low, that men come with so little conception of scholarship and so little foundation that they are at least a year behind the Harvard or Yale freshmen and also a poorer group intellectually. No one questions the fact that they are a fine group of attractive gentlemen and excellent sportsmen.

The "gentlemen-sportsmen" of Dartmouth were chosen "almost entirely without examination." Students standing in the

highest fourth of any one of over 1200 accredited schools could be admitted. Preference was given to alumni sons and "men from New Hampshire, from west of the Mississippi and south of Mason and Dixon Line." Candidates from these regions were rated by alumni groups on the basis of personality, rather than scholarship. And Mendell concluded that Dartmouth's so-called "'new curriculum'" was "really a terrific let down - never have I seen more of a case of the mountain and the mouse." On the whole, its provisions for course distribution, major and minor studies, and comprehensive examinations did not promise to raise substantially Dartmouth's intellectual level.49

Dean Mendell also learned much from his visits to other colleges during 1926. He was fully convinced that Yale not only should maintain, but more important raise its academic standards. He wanted to offer greater opportunities for scholarship aid to the academically better third of undergraduates. On the other hand, it was clear that most colleges practiced some form of selective admissions. Yale's task was to be selective, without lowering its standards.50

49[Clarence W. Mendell], report on "Dartmouth," stamped "Dec. 8 - 1926 Rec'd," ibid.

50Pierson, Yale, II, 193-206.
During the late 1920's, Yale's admission policies became increasingly selective. "Less desirable" Jews as well as academically weak alumni sons were denied admission. The Graduate School was affected as well as the Freshman Year, Yale College, and Sheffield Scientific School. Although in previous years the percentage had run "up to eight or nine per cent" in the Graduate School, Jewish enrollment was "down to nearly four per cent" in 1926-1927.51

Considerable alumni pressure was exerted on the Board of Admissions to admit alumni sons to the undergraduate schools. In September 1929, the following memorandum was sent to members of the Board of Admissions on "The Admission Requirements As Applied to the Sons of Yale Alumni." The problem of selecting a limited number of students from a large number of applicants had

become still further complicated by the insistence on the part of a considerable number of the Alumni that they have been promised preferential treatment for their sons,--a procedure which would run counter to the avowed aims and the printed announcements of the University.

The percentage of alumni sons admitted had indeed increased, but in 1927, some of those connected with the University's endowment campaign urged that "more specific assurances" be

51 W. L. Cross, Dean of the Graduate School, to Provost Henry Solon Graves, January 20, 1927, in Report of the Committee on Educational Policy to the Yale Corporation, pp. 170, f, g.
given the Alumni. Others "thought that announcements proposed looked or might look like a thinly disguised plan for the sale of indulgences." Nevertheless, a number of alumni believed that Yale had committed itself during the fund drive to provide for "Yale sons of good character and reasonably good record...regardless of the number of applicants and of the superiority of outside competitors." Any Yale affiliation and even friendship with those having such alumni connections was seen as according special status in the quest for admission. 52

Although the Board recognized "the pitfalls of a double or doubtful standard of admission," it felt committed by certain announcements made during the appeal for increased endowment...to a continuance for the time being of its present procedure in dealing with the credentials of the sons of graduates of Yale College and the Sheffield Scientific School, that is, to regard such applicants as having satisfied the scholastic requirements for admission upon their passing examinations in fifteen units with a mark of 60 or above by June of the year in which they proposed to enter.

In other words, alumni sons could gain admission to Yale on the minimum satisfactory academic credentials, whereas candidates with less desirable antecedents probably had to average ten points higher. 53

52 Memorandum for Members of the Board of Admissions, "The Admission Requirements As Applied To The Sons Of Yale Alumni," September 28, 1929, Freshman Office Records, folder Admissions Board.

53 Ibid., and Minutes of a Meeting of the Board of
Despite the advantages accorded to alumni sons, Jewish applicants continued to threaten the position of Yale's traditional clientele. In 1929, a Fellow of the Yale Corporation complained to Director Corwin regarding the number of Jewish names among incoming Freshmen from Connecticut. Corwin's reply revealed not only his own personal attitudes but also the status of Yale's admissions policy with respect to Jews. Referring to the list of Freshmen published in the newspaper, he said that it "reads like some of the 'begat' portions of the Old Testament and might easily be mistaken for a recent roll call at the Wailing Wall." The format of the article, however, gave an exaggerated impression of the number of Jews at Yale. "As a matter of fact," wrote Corwin

the Jewish representation in our Undergraduate Schools has not as yet run to embarrassing proportions, though I should not put on black if it were less. No accurate count has been made of the Jewish representation in the present Freshman Class, but it will not be far from ten per cent,—a little under, I think and hope.

He implied that the Board of Admissions was trying to keep Jewish enrollment at what it considered a tolerable level, about ten per cent. "This racial problem" Corwin added, was "never wholly absent from the minds of the Board of Admissions," for Yale would "become a different place when and if the proportion of Jews passes a certain as yet unknown

Admissions, October 22, 1929.
limit." Although Corwin and the Board of Admissions did not specify the exact point beyond which the number of Jewish students should not increase, they did not want Yale to suffer the "peaceful penetration" of New York City colleges. To avoid this fate, some limitation was obviously necessary.

It would be easily possible to limit the number or proportion of Jews admitted, if those associated with you in higher authority approve and will stand by whatever the immediate consequences.

In effect, Corwin maintained that effective limitation depended upon the Corporation's support. Being well aware of Harvard's difficulties, he wanted such a policy to be applied discreetly. Harvard had learned its lesson and was now "sawing wood and saying not a word." But those excluded by this "present silent process expect us to take up the slack which she is paying out." Some Jews, "the more intelligent and influential members of the race," said "they believe in a certain degree of limitation and prefer to have their boys enter a university which practices it." But "the fact that so great a proportion of our Jewish representatives are of local origin," affected the Corporation "rather intimately."

Some of our prominent local Jews hold key positions, politically and financially, and it is I suspect feared that questions of taxation and like matters might become troublesome if any possible excuse or occasion were given. If, however, the matter were handled without publicity and firmly, any agitation
would probably exhaust itself largely in threats and innuendoes. The matter is as delicate as it is important and touches many things over and above the requirements for admission. 54

Whether indeed the Corporation agreed to Corwin's proposal that a quota on Jewish students be formally adopted cannot be known for sure. But considerable evidence pointed to the existence of an informal quota, which in effect meant that the Board of Admissions was given considerable discretionary authority in selecting the number and type of Jews to be admitted. Consequently, the number and percentage of Jewish students could fluctuate from class to class. Formal quotas tended to be more rigid.

In contrast to Harvard, Yale did not ask for the applicant's race and religion on its admission form. Not until 1934 was there a major change in the questions asked with regard to parental background. Until then, Corwin had advised against "asking questions which might seem to indicate a sudden anti-Semitic attitude." The father's full name and birthplace and mother's maiden name, "together with the comments of principals and headmasters, rarely leave us in doubt as to the ethnological classification of the applicant." This information was sufficient: the percentage of Jews in

54 Robert N. Corwin to Francis Parsons, October 1, 1929, copy, Records of the President, JRA, Box 2 and folder Board of Admissions. Parsons, B.A. '93, LL.B. '97, and M.A. '25 hon., was a Fellow of the Yale Corporation, 1925-1937.
the Class of 1934 was only 8.2 per cent, down five per cent from the high of 13.3 per cent in the Class of 1927. Between 1926 and 1930, the number of Jewish students from Connecticut declined from fifty in the Class of 1930 to thirty-five in the Class of 1934.\(^5\)

The Depression did not change this policy. Not until 1932 did Yale feel the impact of declining applications. In May of that year, Corwin reported to the Board of Admissions that the number of applications was 1330, down 140 from the previous May. Nevertheless, Yale had no intention of easing restrictions on Jewish applicants. For example, the Dean of Sheffield Scientific School, Charles H. Warren, opposed increasing the number of transfer students, because for

the last two or three years at least the great majority of these applications have been from young gentlemen of Hebrew persuasion who are anxious to come here for the purpose of preparing for medical work. In my opinion there are very few of these who are really desirable students, and among those who appear to be fairly desirable, there are almost none who do not apply for substantial scholarship aid. Clearly, an increase in the number of Jewish transfer students would not help Yale financially.\(^6\)

\(^5\) Robert N. Corwin to James R. Angell, January 7, 1930, and statistics on "Distribution of Jews in Connecticut in the Classes of 1930-34," Records of the President, JRA, Box 2 and folder Board of Admissions.

\(^6\) C. H. Warren to James R. Angell, April 29, 1932, ibid.
After a difficult three-day session in July, the Board admitted to the Class of 1936, 959 applicants, including ten transferees and nine men dropped from the Class of 1935. The Corporation had voted to allow the admission of an additional 85 Freshmen beyond the limitation of 850. A larger number of Jewish applicants was also admitted. Corwin noted that "the racial quota among the provisionally accepted applicants" was "somewhat larger" than was "usual or desirable," but he trusted that it would "be reduced by the conditions imposed in the letters sent to those requesting aid." The lack of scholarship aid may have discouraged some Jewish applicants, but the percentage for the Class of 1936 was 3.4 per cent higher -- 11.6 per cent -- than that of the previous two classes. Of the 884 students who enrolled in the Class of 1936, 29.6 per cent had Yale fathers, a gain of almost 3 per cent over the previous class and almost 6 per cent over the Class of 1934.57 Alumni sons were becoming the backbone of Yale during times of financial adversity (Table 20).

57 Robert N. Corwin, memorandum "To Members of the Board of Admissions," May 20, 1932; Corwin to James R. Angell, July 26, 1932, see handwritten postscript; and Corwin to Angell, January 3, 1933, enclosing tables, dated October 19, 1932, on "Yale Fathers" and on "our Jewish population for the last ten years," ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Total Membership</th>
<th>No. of Students Whose Fathers are Yale Men</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>% of Freshmen Whose Fathers are Yale men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grads.</td>
<td>Non-Grads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>157*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>189**</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>213***</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>242**</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 4 Yale Fathers with 2 Sons each in Class - 8 counted in total
** 6 Yale Fathers with 2 Sons each in Class - 12 counted in total
*** 3 Yale Fathers with 2 Sons each in Class - 6 counted in total

Source: Robert N. Corwin, Chairman, Board of Admissions, to James R. Angell, January 3, 1933, enclosing table, dated October 19, 1932, on "Yale Fathers," Records of the President, JRA, Box 2 and folder Board of Admissions.
During these same years, Jewish enrollment fluctuated between 8.2 and 13.3 per cent. In response to Corwin's letter, enclosing statistics on Jewish enrollment from 1926 through 1936, President Angell commented ironically:

The oscillations from year to year are rather larger than I would have expected. In any case, the material is very informing and it seems quite clear that, if we could have an Armenian massacre confined to the New Haven district, with occasional incursions into Bridgeport and Hartford, we might protect our Nordic stock almost completely.

An "Armenian massacre" was not necessary, however. In 1934, another check was added to the admission form, by asking the applicant to include his mother's birthplace. Jewish enrollment would remain within certain bounds—averaging around 10 per cent for at least another decade—until World War II placed new demands on the "Old Campus."\

Whatever his personal views, President Angell seemingly acquiesced in this policy. Moreover, he expressed some concern about "a possible influx of undesirable racial groups" from urban areas. Consequently, when he suggested that Yale admit the "upper fifth" of secondary schools without examination, he recognized that it might be necessary to exclude

---

58 Corwin to Angell, January 3, 1933, enclosing tables; Angell to Corwin, January 6, 1933; and Alan Valentine to James R. Angell, January 9, 1934. Ibid. Valentine succeeded Corwin as Chairman of the Board of Admissions.
### TABLE 21
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF JEWISH STUDENTS IN YALE CLASSES, 1926-1936

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of</th>
<th>1926</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1928</th>
<th>1929</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1932</th>
<th>1933</th>
<th>1934</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1936</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Membership</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Jews in whole class</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. % of Jews in whole class</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. % of group 1 residing in Connecticut</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. % of Jews in group of Conn. residents</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robert N. Corwin, Chairman, Board Admissions, to James R. Angell, January 3, 1933, enclosing table, dated October 19, 1932, "showing our Jewish population for the last ten years," Records of the President, JRA, Box 2 and folder Board of Admissions.
schools in Eastern urban areas. This was to be Yale's answer to Harvard's "highest seventh" plan. Like Harvard, Yale wanted to attract boys from high schools and small private schools. But benefiting from Harvard's experience, Angell suggested that this privilege not be extended to high schools which produced a large proportion of "undesirable racial groups." \(^59\)

Angell was by no means unsympathetic to Jews. He denounced Hitler's attacks on Jews and the subservience of the German universities to the state. But he neither gained nor sought the publicity of Dr. James Bryant Conant of Harvard, who refused the offer of a $1,000 scholarship from Dr. Ernst F.S. Hanfstaengl, Harvard 1909. In his letter to Rabbi Edgar E. Siskin of Congregation Mishkan Israel of New Haven, Angell condemned Nazi practices and said he would

be glad to participate in any steps which might tend to check these abuses, but I am frank to say that I greatly fear the unfavorable effect of public demonstrations, especially in view of the fact that the German press is apparently at the moment completely muzzled and consequently no fair and impartial report of the American attitude can at present be expected.

Furthermore, he declined to speak at a mass meeting in New Haven's Shubert Theatre in protest against "the anti-Semitic excesses now being carried out in Germany." During

\(^{59}\) James R. Angell to Alan Valentine, March 9, 1934, ibid.
the early 1930's, Angell noted that Yale's "percentage of Jewish students has remained fairly constant" and that it has "not as yet felt any additional pressure as the result of anti-Semitic policies abroad." Yet in 1934, The Jewish Advocate published the following statement by President Angell:

'We have before our eyes the pitiful spectacle of the German University, a little while ago the justly venerated home of creative thought, with freedom of teaching, freedom of learning, and freedom of utterance as its inalienable rights. And behold it now, stripped of its glory! Most of its learned scholars scouraged into exile before the fury of the mob, its freedom in shackles, its teaching prostituted to the ends of political expediency.... And this pathetic disaster, be it recalled, is ostensibly justified by social and political exigency.'

Beyond a doubt, Angell believed that universities should be independent of such political considerations. In the fall of 1934, his speech to the Jewish Club of Yale University was well received. Irving Goleman, Director of the Club, thanked the President for his "fine analysis from the liberal point of view of one of the gravest problems facing the American University today...."

60 See supra, n. 63, 456, and The Jewish Advocate, October 5, 1934, p. 1. James R. Angell to Rabbi Edgar E. Siskin, March 25, 1933; Siskin to Angell, March twenty-fourth, 1933; Angell to Conrad Hoffmann, Jr., December 7, 1933; and Irving Goleman to Angell, November 21, 1934, handwritten, Records of the President, JRA, Box 84, folder Jewish Problem, Etc.
During Angell's administration, Yale had stabilized its Jewish population and accorded to Jewish applicants a certain percentage of the scholarship awards. Officially, the University also approved the existence of Jewish clubs and fraternities. In achieving this stabilization and quasi-acceptance, Yale avoided both the drastic quota imposed at Columbia and the heated controversy which afflicted Harvard. Although little public discussion of the issue took place in New Haven, there was virtually no doubt that this policy of leveling off the percentage of Jewish enrollment received tacit support from the great majority of undergraduates and alumni.

One of the better guides to undergraduate opinion was the Yale Daily News, which, on March 30, 1926, declared editorially that "Yale must institute an Ellis Island with immigration laws more prohibitive than those of the United States government." A Personnel Bureau should be established, it said, "to study the character, personality, promise and background of men who wish to enter the University." Unless this was done, the day would be "fast dawning," when potential captains of industry must absent themselves from the groves of academe and take up their unpurposeful studies elsewhere, while the intelligentsia of the approaching renaissance Americanize even such an isolated province as Yale in a merciless competition for seats in the University. If this era is admitted, Yale will no longer be a heterogeneous group of average citizens, but will be essentially a brain plant.
To keep the University open, "Yale would be justified even with her ideal of 'service to the nation' in sloughing off the unkempt at the same time she drops the unlettered." The previous day's editorial had approved of Harvard's new admissions policy which would consider character and personality in admitting Freshmen to a class limited to 1,000 students. Harvard also required applicants to submit personal photographs. The News urged that Yale "might go them one better and require applicants to submit photographs of their fathers also." These two editorials implicitly criticized the ambitious sons of immigrants--mostly Jewish--who gained admission to Yale on the basis of their scholastic abilities. Such an attitude undoubtedly struck responsive cords in the hearts of Yale fathers. Admission to the alma mater was simply a matter of perpetuating the family line.61

CHAPTER X

PRINCETON: COLLEGE VERSUS CLUBS

My relations with Princeton were not intimate during the first twenty years of my presidency of Harvard. In fact, I had many a difference at Teachers' Meetings with the representative of Princeton. Neither my religious views nor my projects in regard to the development of the college into a university met with much sympathy from the authorities at Princeton.... Woodrow Wilson's ideas about a college curriculum and a university programme differed in many respects from mine during his presidency of Princeton. He and I struck fire like flint and steel in many a Teacher's Meeting.

--Charles W. Eliot to President John Grier Hibben, August 26, 1924.

At Cambridge, on July 1, 1909, President Woodrow Wilson of Princeton University delivered an eloquent oration before Harvard University's chapter of Phi Beta Kappa. Into his address, "The Spirit of Learning," Wilson put "the whole of my academic creed." He extolled the intellectual values and mental discipline gained from a four-year, liberal, and "generalized" college education in which extracurricular activities were secondary. Although social development was important--"manliness, esprit de corps, a release of their social gifts, a training in give and take, a catholic taste in men, and the standards of true

---

1 Charles W. Eliot to John Grier Hibben, August 26, 1924, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 390: 1924, D-J.
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sportsmen"—students primarily needed intellectual illumination. College

should give them insight into the things of the mind and of the spirit, a sense of having lived and formed their friendships amidst the gardens of the mind where grows the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, a consciousness of having undergone the discipline, never to be shaken off, of those who seek wisdom in candor, with faithful labour and travail of spirit.

Since "the comradeships of undergraduates" would never by themselves "breed the spirit of learning," teachers should associate with students outside the classrooms. "We are not seeking to force a marriage between knowledge and pleasure," he concluded; "we are simply trying to throw them a great deal together in the confidence that they will fall in love with one another." As the very quintessence of his educational philosophy, the oration went beyond Wilson's current campaign to win over the Princeton alumni in his epic struggle with Dean Andrew Fleming West over the location of the Graduate School. He was addressing the entire American academic community.²

Much to Wilson's "great astonishment," his address was received with enthusiasm (Think of enthusiasm at Cambridge!) and I was made to feel that my audience

sympathized with the whole conception I sought to lay before them,—a conception which, if carried out at Harvard, would undo half the work Mr. Eliot has done. Mr. Eliot was in the audience, and showed very plainly that he was disturbed both by what I said and by the reception given it there where he had been king.

On the other hand, the new "king," A. Lawrence Lowell, who believed that students at Harvard College should develop "an intellectual and social cohesion," must have applauded enthusiastically. Although Lowell formulated most of his ideas on collegiate education independently of Wilson, he approved the recent educational reforms at Princeton. And after receiving a Harvard LL.D. degree at the 1907 Commencement, Wilson won more friends when he drew the following distinctions between Eliot's and his own philosophies:

I want to say frankly that Harvard seems to me to be doing what all America wants to do,—namely, she is saying to every one, Assess yourself; seek what you want; get what you please. And Princeton is doing for America what she should wish to do. She is seeking to combine men in a common discipline in which the chief term is tradition, in which the chief emphasis is law, in which the chief idea is submission to that discipline which has made men time out of mind, and made them companions in a common social endeavor.

While Eliot's Harvard championed the ideal of intellectual independence among its students, Wilson's Princeton would seek to create a community by a discipline which was as much social as intellectual. Wilson's Quadrangle Plan, which was to be defeated by the Princeton Trustees and influential alumni that autumn, was warmly supported by Charles Francis Adams, Treasurer of Harvard. "Your theory of "Quads' seems to me," Adams wrote:
more nearly to meet existing college requirements than anything else which has been advanced. . . . My own firm conviction is that Eliot, during his long career as President, so far as the college is concerned, has done much to demoralize our youth. At Harvard there is today, so far as I am competent to judge, -- and I have made pretty careful enquiry, -- no trace of either systematic mental discipline or intelligent intellectual training. It is all a go-as-you-please, on the basis of supposed natural aptitudes, and along the lines of least resistance.

In his Phi Beta Kappa Address at Columbia in 1906, Adams had spoken in a similar vein about the need to reform both the elective and collegiate social systems. Wilson then had a strong core of allies, united in defense of "liberal culture," even in enemy bastions. 3

In addition to this commitment to the traditional humanistic values of a liberal arts education, Woodrow Wilson brought another quality to his presidency of Princeton. He was an opportunist, in the sense that his conception of Princeton's educational role broadened as his audience and potential constituency expanded. Wilson was unlike his counterparts at Harvard and Yale, because he was not content to spend his life wrestling in the academic lion's den. As political possibilities opened up for him,

his speeches took on an increasingly democratic tone. Hence it is difficult to determine during the last two years of his presidency where Wilson the educator left off and where Wilson the nascent politician began. And in spite of the volumes written on the controversies over the Quad Plan and Graduate School, a few important questions remain unanswered. How "radical in character," as Wilson described his proposal, was his Quad Plan in comparison with the social systems existing at Harvard and Yale? What did Wilson mean by "democracy" when he first proposed the Quad Plan in December, 1906? To what extent did his conception of democracy broaden during the subsequent Graduate School controversy? Was this "democracy" an essentially elitist concept according to which only the clubable would be encouraged to attend Princeton? Or was this concept potentially dynamic, envisioning a deliberate fusion of diverse elements into a community bound together by certain intellectual and ethical values? Some answers to these questions can be found by examining Wilson's background, personality, and attitudes toward minority groups both within Princeton University and within the country as a whole.4

4"A Supplementary Report to the Board of Trustees of Princeton University" [c. Dec. 13, 1906], Trustees' Papers, Princeton University Archives (PUA); and "Memorandum Concerning Residential Quads," reprinted from the Princeton alumni Weekly (PAW), June 12, 1907, Woodrow Wilson Papers (hereafter abbreviated as WWP), PUA.
Southern Heritage and Presbyterian Faith

Wilson was hardly a "typical" Southerner, although his father, the Reverend Joseph Ruggles Wilson, had preached sermons in support of slavery and had served as a chaplain in the Confederate Army. Woodrow Wilson always loved the South for its traditionalism and defense of constitutional principles, but he argued that both slavery and secession were wrong. As a young man, he decided to go north to Princeton for his college education after a year at Davidson College in North Carolina. He broadened his social and intellectual contacts at Princeton, even though the College of New Jersey, as it was then called, was a sectional, rather than a national institution. Following graduation in 1879, he went to the University of Virginia for legal training and then after a year studying law at home in Wilmington, North Carolina, he began to practice in Atlanta, Georgia. But he soon came to dislike both the provincialness of Atlanta and the narrowness of the legal profession. He wrote an article, printed by the New York Evening Post, denouncing Georgia's system of convict labor. Who, on either ethical or economic grounds, he asked, could "defend a system which makes the punishment of criminals, that high prerogative of government, a source of private gain?"\(^5\)

---

After leaving the South—to undertake graduate work at Johns Hopkins (1883-1885) and then to teach at Bryn Mawr, Wesleyan, and Princeton—Wilson consciously tried to free himself from Southern provincialisms. For example, he worked on both his own and his wife's accents. Yet Ellen Axson Wilson, a native of Georgia, reassured her husband that he had not become really "'Northanized'" [sic]. He was not a 'Southerner' either in the old sense; you are an American citizen—of Southern birth. I do believe you love the South, darling,—that she hasn't a truer son, that you will be, and are, an infinitely better, more helpful son to her than any of those who cling so desperately to the past and the old prejudices. I believe you are her greatest son in this generation and also the one who will have greatest claim on her gratitude. But you are free from 'provincialisms' of any sort;—that expresses the whole state of the case. Oh, I am so glad you hav'n't any of those prejudices!

Because Wilson had largely freed himself from Southern prejudices and provincialisms, his wife believed, he could render greater service to the South. And during these same years, Wilson displayed a nationalist point of view in his historical writings. When Albert Bushnell Hart asked him to write the third volume for the Epochs of American History series—later published as Division and Reunion 1829-1889 (1893)—he thanked the Harvard professor for his

"confidence in my impartiality," Again Wilson stressed that he was not a "typical" Southerner:

Though born in the South and bred in its sympathies, I am not of Southern-born parents. My father was born in Ohio, my mother in England. Ever since I have had independent judgments of my own I have been a Federalist (!) It is this mixture of elements in me--full identification with the South, non-Southern blood, and Federalist principles--that makes me hope that a detachment of my affectionate, reminiscent sympathies from my historical judgments is not beyond hoping for.

He was thus an American nationlist with a deep attachment to the South. Once his political ambitions were aroused, however, he emphasized his Southern heritage, especially his Virginia birth. 6

During Wilson's presidency of Princeton, he urged that college be a meeting-ground for students from all sections of the country. During an address at the Peddie Institute in 1903 on "'The Meaning of a College Course'," Wilson said: "'If the eastern young man has regarded the prairies as a benighted part of the world and referred to them with scorn, it will do him good to go to college and meet a man from Kansas,'" who would change that opinion. The following year, in a lecture on Americanism, Wilson elaborated on

this theme:

'To rid our young men of provincialism, I would have every young man of the North educated in the South and every young man of the South educated in the North. I would have every young man of the West educated in the East, although that is manifestly impossible, and to carry out the matter to its conclusion, every young man of the East educated in the West.'

And in still another address the same year, Wilson praised the Middle States as "'the most typically American part of the United States,'" because they "'were mixed of all races and kinds from the first,'" unlike New England and the South. This "'American mixture'" had endowed the people of the Middle States with "'a greater elasticity of mental movement'" and "'more ability to see from more points of view, than any other region of the country.'" The development of a broad or "catholic" -the word he frequently used--outlook was extremely important to Wilson. He told the alumni of Western Pennsylvania that "'the college man must have a Catholic mind--not necessarily a Roman Catholic mind,'" by which he meant "'a man who is not afraid to take up new ideals and put them to use.'" A mixing of ideas and ideals, rather than "'the blending of races," was needed, he told the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. It was not necessary in a country like ours that you should blend in blood. The real blending in this country is an intellectual and a social blending. It is the process of living in each other's opinions that makes us all Americans. [Applause] It is n't that we intermarry. That is the more pleasing aspect of it. It is that very much more extended view of affairs which brings us into the presence of each other's opinions. And in proportion as the atmosphere of America is a
conducting medium, just in that proportion are races blended.

These addresses strongly suggested that Wilson favored not only geographical diversity, but also a certain amount of cosmopolitanism and ethnic representation at Princeton.\(^7\)

As a staunch but latitudinarian Presbyterian, Wilson advocated a considerable degree of religious toleration. As a clergyman's son, he naturally had had a very religious upbringing. On July 5, 1873, he and two other young men, "after a free conversation during which they severally exhibited evidences of a work of grace begun in their hearts--were unanimously admitted into the membership" of the First Presbyterian Church of Columbia, South Carolina. But the Wilsons were not religious fundamentalists. In fact, Woodrow Wilson's uncle, Dr. James Woodrow, was

removed from his chair at the Columbia Theological Seminary because he believed in and defended publicly the Darwinian theory of evolution. The leader of the opposition to Woodrow was Dr. J. B. Mack, who as a trustee of Davidson, said Wilson, had "tried, in the most offensive, ungentlemanly manner to silence father as unworthy of any voice in the management of the college because he had been untrue to it in taking me away and sending me to the hated North, where I could learn more." And Wilson thought there was something almost amusing in the request that uncle James should confess himself unchristian by resigning before any action has been taken by anybody but Dr. M! If Dr. M. would but wait and read uncle James's views when they appear, as they will, in print, he would find Dr. Woodrow quite as good a Christian as he—only more conversant with the indisputable facts of science.  

Fundamentalism also pervaded other sections of the country. After Wilson's unanimous election to the Chair of Jurisprudence and Political Economy at Princeton in 1890, President Francis Landey Patton informed him of "one or two criticisms" that he had heard regarding his "work on the State." Although Patton had not reported them to the

---

Board of Trustees as a whole, he felt he should bring them
to Wilson's attention:

in your discussion of the origin of the State you
minimise the supernatural, & make such unqualified
application of the doctrine of naturalistic evolution
& and the genesis of the State as to leave the reader
of your pages in a state of uncertainty as to your own
position & the place you give to Divine Providence.

The Patton, an ordained minister, described in no uncertain
terms the attitude of Princeton's Trustees, who meant
to keep this College on the old ground of loyalty to
the Christian religion: that they expect the high
topics pertaining to your chair & that of the chairs
contiguous to that one you are chosen to fill to be
dealt with under theistic and Christian persuppositions:
& they would not regard with favour such a conception
of academic freedom or teaching as would leave in doubt
the very direct bearing of historical Christianity as
a revealed religion upon the problems of civilization.

Princeton clearly was still a sectarian college, even though
it would assume the title of "University" in 1896 when it
changed its name from the College of New Jersey. Professors
who did not observe a certain religious conformity had no
place at Princeton. When Wilson proposed two former stu-
dents from Johns Hopkins for a position in the Department
of History--first Frederick Jackson Turner and then Charles
H. Haskins, both professors at the University of Wisconsin--
Patton chose Haskins, because he "could not take the respon-
sibility of nominating Turner," who was a Unitarian. Wil-
son had written Turner, in November, 1896: "I think I can
say without qualification that no religious tests are
applied here." But the Rev. Dr. George Black Stewart '76,
a member of the Trustees's Curriculum Committee, based his objections to Turner, "upon the inexpediency of letting the orthodox Presbyterians who have given us money see us appoint a Unitarian." Haskins declined two offers from Princeton, and both he and Turner eventually went to Harvard. Only by a five-year contract and an additional $2500 a year were the Trustees able to persuade a disappointed Wilson to remain at Princeton.9

9Francis Landey Patton to Woodrow Wilson, Feb. 18 '90, and Patton to Cyrus Hall McCormick, April 4th 1898, Patton Letterpress Books, PUA. Frederick Jackson Turner to Woodrow Wilson, Nov. 8, 1896, pp. 42-45; Wilson to Turner, Nov. 15/96, pp. 50-53; Wilson to Ellen Axson Wilson, 29 January 1897, and n.1, pp. 123-124, 2 February, 1897, pp. 138-139, and 16 February, 1897, pp. 163-164; Wilson to Patton, 28 March '97, p. 196; Wilson to Charles Ewing Green, 28 March '97, p. 197; Patton to Wilson, March 29th 1897, pp. 199-200, Wilson to Turner, 31 March, 1897, pp. 201-202; and Turner to Wilson, 3 April 1897, p. 213, The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, ed. by Arthur S. Link et al., X: 1896-1898 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1971). For an interesting letter on Turner's view of Wilson, see Frederick J. Turner to Charles W. Eliot, April 5, 1924, handwritten, CWEP, 1909-1926, Box 391: 1924, P-Z. Turner said that he "first became intimate with him because I stopped taking notes at one of his lectures and began to laugh, at what the rest of the students were recording with solemnity--the delicacy of the irony had deceived them." Wilson, he continued, "was a most stimulating force in my graduate study--opening new vistas and arousing me by his appreciation of any new points of view which I happened to offer." Turner also was "glad" that he "voted for him." See Henry W. Bragdon, Woodrow Wilson: The Academic Years (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 226-227. When Dean Andrew F. West learned that Turner was a Unitarian, he was against even introducing him to the Princeton Faculty. See also George C. Osborn, Woodrow Wilson, The Early Years (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), pp. 277-280.
President of Princeton

When Wilson became the University's first lay president in 1902, he tried to liberate Princeton from its rather narrow sectarianism. He assumed the right to make Faculty appointments without consulting the Trustees's Curriculum Committee beforehand. According to the editors of The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, his "initiative in offering the chair to [Harry A.] Garfield represented a turning point in the history of Princeton University." Whereas Patton sought prior approval of the Curriculum Committee, even to the point of allowing it to choose from among several nominees for Faculty positions, Wilson offered Garfield the chair in Politics and then asked the Committee's approval. Of course, Wilson did seek the advice of department heads and Faculty when conducting his search for new men. He chose them, moreover, on the basis scholarship, not religious conformity. For example, in 1904, Wilson offered the professorship of Psychology to Frank Thilly, although he was not a church member. Thilly accepted and taught at Princeton for two years, 1904-1906. Wilson also appointed the first Roman Catholic to the Faculty, David Aloysius McCabe, Harvard '04, and Ph.D. Johns Hopkins, '09, became an instructor of Economics in 1909, an assistant professor in 1910, and professor in 1919. The next Catholic to join the Princeton Faculty was probably English-born Hugh Stott Taylor, appointed professor of Chemistry in 1922. Although
Horace Meyer Kallen, Harvard '03, served as an instructor of English, 1903-1905, not until the mid-1920's were the first Jews appointed to tenured positions at Princeton. In 1924 Herbert Sidney Langfeld was brought from Harvard to be professor of Psychology and Director of the Psychological Laboratory. (He listed himself as a Republican and Episcopalian in Who's Who.) And Russian-born Solomon Lefschetz, visiting professor from the University of Kansas in 1924-25, became associate professor of Mathematics at Princeton in 1925, and professor in 1928.10

10 Rev. David Ruddach Frazer, a member of the Trustees's Curriculum Committee, to Woodrow Wilson, 10/23/03, referring to the dissatisfaction of the Rev. Elijah R. Craven, the Chairman, over Wilson's offer to Garfield, and n. 2, Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XV, 26. For typed copies of letters from Woodrow Wilson: to Frank Thilly, see the Ray Stannard Baker Papers, Library of Congress (DLC), and for letters from Thilly to Wilson, see the Wilson Papers, DLC. Of particular interest is the letter which Wilson wrote Thilly on 1 February, 1904, in which he referred to a letter and conversation between John Grier Hibben and Thilly over "the church question." Evidently, both Wilson and Hibben assured Thilly that the fact of his not being a church member was not a bar to his becoming a professor of Psychology at Princeton. In his February 4th, 1904 letter to Wilson, Thilly explained why he had delayed answering him: "Finally the thought occurred to me that I may not have expressed myself fully on the church question and that my coming to Princeton might possibly prove an embarrassment to you. Your last letter removes all my doubts, and I am now ready to accept the position which you so generously offered to me." Thilly also thanked Wilson "for the frank and openhearted manner in which you have treated me in this whole matter."

Mr. M. Halsey Thomas, former Archivist at Princeton University, interview in the Firestone Library, Princeton University, April 15, 1971. Mr. Thomas is a source of valuable information and insights on Princeton history. According to the General Catalogue of Princeton
To Woodrow Wilson belonged the credit of bringing a more cosmopolitan Faculty to Princeton through his appointments of both professors and young preceptors. In a highly significant letter to Thomas Nelson Page, Wilson discussed the powers of Princeton's president. The institution's charter stated merely that the president had "immediate care of the education and government" of the students and was ex-officio Chairman of the Board of Trustees when the Governor of New Jersey was absent. Consequently, presidential powers largely derived from the experience of previous administrations during the past 150 years. Wilson thought "that the office may be regarded as normal here as anywhere, standing midway between the autocratic presidency and the presidency which is a mere chairmanship of the Faculty." As a member of both the Board of Trustees and the Faculty, the president had a dual voice:

We expect him in the Board to represent the real views of the Faculty upon strictly educational matters, and in the Faculty to represent and enforce the views of the Board with regard to the administrative management of the University. He is not, of course, bound to confine his recommendations in educational matters to those things which have been accepted by the Faculty; he may, of course, even antagonize their views there: but it is against the traditions of the place for him to do so, inasmuch as his function is conceived

University, 1746-1906 (Princeton, New Jersey: Published by the University, 1908), p. 53, I. Loewenthal, A.M., Teacher of German, 1852-1855, may have been the first Jewish instructor at Princeton.
to be one of leadership in which it is expected that he win the support of the Faculty for his measures before seeking the acquiescence of the Board.

He next discussed the extent of presidential power in the making of new appointments: he consulted, but was "not bound" by Faculty advice, nor did he expect rejection of his professorial nominations by the Board of Trustees. As defined by Wilson, under the "unwritten constitution" of Princeton, the president should play an affirmative and decisive role. And the University needed strong leadership after the do-nothing administration of the Rev. Francis L. Patton, who had finally been "persuaded" to resign by Trustees, supported by a number of the Faculty. When Wilson entered the office, he sought to achieve a balance between the powers of the Yale and Harvard presidents. While Arthur T. Hadley and James R. Angell of Yale were only the "first among equals," who deferred to their Faculties in making appointments and in determining educational policy, Charles W. Eliot and A. Lawrence Lowell were the strong men of Harvard during their respective administrations. Of course, continued success as a university president required a sound grasp of the principles of military strategy: he should know when to advance and when to retreat.11

11 Woodrow Wilson to Thomas Nelson Page, June 24, 1904, Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XV, 393-395.
Between 1902 and 1906, the situation at Princeton was propitious for rapid advance. And Wilson was aided by the election of sixteen new men to the Board of Trustees between 1896 and 1901, five of whom were the first Alumni Trustees. Of the sixteen, half were graduates of the 1870's, and most were businessmen and lawyers, who evaluated the purposes of a Princeton education in a rather different light than their predecessors, many of whom had been ministers. Among the influential Trustees were Moses Taylor Pyne '77 (1885-1921), Cyrus Hall McCormick '79 and A.M. '87 hon. (1839-1936), the Reverend Dr. Melanchton William Jacobus '77 (1890-1937), David Benton Jones '76, Alumni Trustee (1901-1908), and Grover Cleveland LL.D. '97 hon. (1901-1908).12

The Trustees and influential alumni responded well when Wilson asked for $12,502,832 to build up Princeton's physical plant and to hire additional professors as well as some fifty tutors. In his first report as president to the Board of Trustees, October 21, 1902, Wilson pointed out that Princeton had "not kept pace" with Harvard and Yale "in university development" and that while she had "lingered, other, newer, institutions, like Columbia, the Johns Hopkins,

and the University of Chicago" had "pressed in ahead of her." Either Princeton had to raise the money for salaries, library endowment, laboratories, a School of Science, a School of Jurisprudence, and a Graduate School, or she must "withdraw from the university competition" and make the best of what she had.  

13

In this same report, Wilson called for a thorough reform of the curriculum, which he subsequently outlined in his inaugural address of October 25, 1902: "Princeton for the Nation's Service." The University's purpose was to train "men of vision" and general knowledge through a humanistically-oriented curriculum: Greek, Latin, mathematics, English, history, philosophy, politics, economics, modern languages as well as such sciences as astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology, and physics. But the newer, half-developed sciences should be excluded. The acceptable subjects should then be arranged by the Faculty in such a way that the students would have to choose a balanced curriculum. The next step was the appointment of a Faculty Committee on the Course of Study. Under Wilson's chairmanship, it began to work in earnest in the autumn of 1903.  

14

---

13 Annual Report of the President of Princeton University, 21 October, 1902, 7 pp. (hereafter abbreviated as Princeton President's Report, date), PUA.

Its Report, presented to the Princeton Faculty on April 16, 1904 and adopted ten days later, constituted a major overhaul of the curriculum. It proposed unification of academic and scientific students in one undergraduate school, although the B.S. degree would continue to be offered to those students entering with Latin, but without Greek, and concentrating in mathematics or the sciences. Of greatest significance was the development of highly structured and prescribed curriculum at Princeton: Freshmen could take only required courses, while Sophomores were allowed some electives; Special Honors in any subject were open to Freshmen and Sophomores; Juniors and Seniors were required to concentrate in one subject or in certain related subjects, under new groupings in eleven fields within four divisions. After taking the Proseminary of his department of concentration, a Senior might achieve one of three grades of Final Special Honors. These reforms, together with the Preceptorial System—in September, 1905, small groups of students began to meet weekly with a tutor in each department, except in laboratory sciences—succeeded in elevating Princeton's academic standards. They offered, moreover, a constructive alternative to the free elective system. 15

Wilson was firmly convinced that undergraduates needed four years of collegiate education: "The freshmen is a boy; the sophomore is adolescent; the junior is staggering for his sea legs; the senior finds them." Consequently, undergraduates should be given "the full-body of fundamental studies," the sequence of which would be "determined even in the period of free election which comes with junior and senior year." In contrast, Charles W. Eliot felt that some undergraduates could finish the college course within three years and thereby enter graduate or professional training a year earlier. But many colleges were beginning to modify or balance their electives with required courses in the belief that the majority of undergraduates benefited from a more structured curriculum.16

W. McAlpin] to Woodrow Wilson, November 19, 1903, C. W. McAlpin Correspondence on "Woodrow Wilson," PUA. For the Preceptorial System, see Prof. Hiram Bingham, "The Princeton Preceptor," Boston Transcript, January 6, 1906; Andrew F. West, "The Tutorial System in College," reprinted from the Educational Review (December, 1906), pp. 500-514; and Nathaniel E. Griffin, "The Princeton Preceptorial System," reprinted from the Sewanee Review, XVIII (April, 1910), 169-176, WWP, folder Preceptorial System, PUA. Also see "The Committee of Fifty of Princeton University" with President Wilson's "Statement of the Tutorial System," WWP, folder Committee of Fifty, PUA. It raised the money to pay for the new educational measures, for example, the hiring of nearly fifty preceptors.

The Quadrangle Plan

Having successfully carried through his academic reforms, Wilson launched his attack on the undergraduate club system at the December 13, 1906 meeting of the Princeton Board of Trustees. For some years, he had been mulling over a solution to the undemocratic practices which had become entrenched in undergraduate social life. Although students were reading more books under the Preceptorial System, undergraduate life still revolved around the social clubs. "As the University has grown in numbers and in popularity," Wilson said, "elements have been introduced into its life which threaten a kind of disintegration, which would unquestionably mean, also, a deep demoralization." Freshmen and Sophomores took their cues from the more worldly Juniors and Seniors in order to "make" one of the Upperclass Clubs. The "sharp social competition ... upon which a majority of the men stake their happiness" had made "the spirit of the place less democratic than it used to be." Wilson remembered nostalgically his own undergraduate days of the late 1870's, before the rise of the club system. At that time, students chose their dining companions on the basis of individual compatibility, instead of preparatory school affiliation. But now students who failed to make a club seemed "more and more thrust out of the best and most enjoyable things which university life naturally offers—the best comradeships, the freest play of
personal influence, the best chance of such social consideration as ought always to be won by natural gifts and force of character." The remedy for these ills was "to oblige the undergraduates to live together, not in clubs but in colleges." Accordingly, he proposed that the University be divided into a number of colleges and that "we induce the stronger upperclass clubs themselves to become colleges under the guidance of the University." The clubs could retain their privilege of selecting new members if they agreed to build a dormitory adjoining their houses, permitted one or two unmarried Faculty members to reside therein, and accepted the guidance of these faculty residents in some of their daily affairs. The new colleges would be more than dormitories; they would be self-contained social units in which undergraduates would eat and live together under "a large measure of self-government." Through them, Wilson "would substitute the college for the club" and "provide a new comradeship for pupil and pupil." 17

At this time, Wilson seemed to be arguing for the Quad Plan as much on social as on academic grounds. In a very brief memorandum on the clubs, drawn up in February, 1906, he had questioned the future direction of the Upper-class Clubs. "More and more expense and only social aims

17 "A Supplementary Report to the Board of Trustees of Princeton University" [c. Dec. 13, 1906], Trustees' Papers, PUA.
or University aims, ?" he asked. Wilson saw a "danger" that Princeton would "develop socially as Harvard did and as Yale is tending to do." But most Princetonians believed that their clubs were "better" than those collegiate systems existing at other universities. In June, 1903, the Committee on Conference with Upper Class Clubs chaired by Moses Taylor Pyne reported that students were pledged at Columbia, Cornell, Pennsylvania, as well as many smaller colleges even before they entered. And at "Yale and Harvard."

there is a gradual weeding out by the passing upwards from one society to another, so that in Senior year very few out of a Class succeed in making a society. This is a great abuse at Yale where three Senior Societies—the Scull & Bones and Scroll & Key and Wolf's Head select fifteen each out of a Class of several hundred men, and the influence of these societies is so potent that it touches all college interests, sometime, it is said, even affecting the choice of members of the Faculty.

In contrast, Princeton Clubs were neither "secret societies" nor chapters of national fraternities. Rather they were eating clubs, and the fact that eleven were located on Prospect Street facilitated friendly social intercourse among them. The report recognized that those students who did not make one of the clubs posed a "serious question."

The only solution, therefore, was to increase the number of clubs. Tower was organized in 1903, and Charter and Quadrangle the previous year. Finally, the report noted, both Freshmen and Sophomores needed improved food and
After discussing Wilson's Supplementary Report of December 13, 1906, the Trustees resolved that the President appoint a committee of seven, of which he would be the chairman, to study his proposal and report on it in March. The other six members were M. Taylor Pyne, Melancthon W. Jacobus, Bayard Henry, David B. Jones, Cleveland H. Dodge, and Robert Garrett. During the intervening months, Wilson reconsidered the principles on which he should base his argument for residential quadrangles. As he wrote Cleveland Dodge in February, 1907:

It becomes clearer to me every day that I made the mistake, in reporting to the Board, of putting my own plans only on one and that not the most important ground of desirability to be considered. When the committee meets, I shall lay the matter before them in an entirely different light.

Wilson consequently shifted his argument from the issue of social democracy to the academic one. As long as the club system prevailed, most undergraduates would subordinate intellectual interests to social and extra curricular activities.

---


19 Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Trustees of Princeton University, December 13, 1906, Trustees' Papers, PUA. Woodrow Wilson to Cleveland Hoadley Dodge, February 20th, 1907 and n. 2, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII.
Not until the June 10 meeting of the Board of Trustees was Wilson's committee ready to present its "Report on the Social Co-ordination of the University." Wilson, who wrote the document, stressed the intellectual benefits which would accrue from a social reorganization of the College and spoke about the isolation of that one-third of each class who were not elected to one of the clubs. Attempts at reforming the system had proven unsatisfactory: the Inter-Club treaty, forbidding the recruitment of Sophomores before the spring term "bicker," had been broken and renewed on stricter terms several times. Sophomores, moreover, had established clubs to prepare their way into the Upperclass Clubs. Freshmen, too, formed clubs in their various dining halls for the purpose of obtaining admission into the Sophomore clubs. Consequently, "the social ambitions created by the existing system of club life" were "too strong for individual honour." But even a strict observance of the treaties would "not prevent the social divisions among the Freshmen and Sophomores which it is their main purpose to prevent." In addition to the evils of social segregation, the Upperclass Clubs had introduced a more luxurious style of living. The two oldest--Ivy (1879) and Cottage (1887)--had "houses of extraordinary elegance and luxury of appointment and five other clubs are maturing plans for replacing their present comfortable structures with buildings which will rival the others in
beauty, spaciousness, and comfort." If these tendencies continued unchecked, the University would become "only an artistic setting and background for life on Prospect Avenue." A residential quadrangle plan for all four classes was "the only adequate means" of effecting "an immediate reintegration of our academic life." 20

Obviously this report took a much tougher attitude toward the clubs than had the Supplementary Report of the previous December. At that time, Wilson had said that if the clubs accepted University guidance, the addition of a dormitory, and resident Faculty, they could continue to select their membership. But now he argued that "the elective principle," the heart of the club system, had to be abolished, in order to revitalize academic life. The impact "upon the upper-class clubs would be either their abolition or their absorption."

The withdrawal of the greater part of the Juniors and Seniors from the life of the proposed residential quads would of course be out of the question... But the history of the upper-class clubs has been most honorable and useful. They have served the University in a period of transition, when no plans were thought of for its coördination... Their abolition ought not to be thought of if their adaptation to the new order of things can be effected.

If the clubs cooperated with Wilson's proposal, they could become "smaller residential quads." If they did not, he

---

20 Woodrow Wilson, "Report on the Social Co-ordination of the University" [c. June 6, 1907], from the Trustees' Papers, reprinted from PAW, June 12, 1907, WWP, PUA.
strongly implied that they would be abolished.21

Wilson did not intend that the University take over club property as his "Memorandum Concerning Residential Quads" and correspondence revealed. For example, in a letter to William Beldon Reed, Jr., '96, Chairman of the Board of Governors of Elm Club, Wilson suggested that each club choose the majority of a small Board of self-perpetuating Trustees, who would manage club property. And he proposed that the University assume any mortgage interests. On the whole, he wanted to allow the clubs "a certain amount of individuality in the development of their property and in their relation to the quad system." But he insisted that undergraduates be forbidden to join social clubs of this nature once the quad system was established, although the existing clubs did have the right to transform themselves into graduate clubs. On the other hand, Wilson would not object to "purely social organizations," which might occasionally "spring up."22

After Wilson presented his "Report on the Social

21 "Report on the Social Co-ordination of the University" and "President Wilson's Address to the Board of Trustees," reprinted from PAW, June 12, 1907.

22 Woodrow Wilson to William B. Reed, August 31st, 1907, in reply to Reed's August 27, 1907 letter to Wilson, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII. "Memorandum Concerning Residential Quads," reprinted from PAW, June 12, 1907.
Co-ordination of the University," the Trustees adopted the Committee's recommendation that the President be authorized to develop his plan. Wilson interpreted the Trustees' resolutions of June 10, 1907, as a firm acceptance of the principles behind residential quadrangles. Such was not to prove to be the case, after alumni groups and the Princeton Alumni Weekly began to marshal opposing arguments. But during the first few weeks after the publication of the "Report," Wilson's address to the Trustees, and the memorandum to the clubs, alumni response was generally favorable. And five Trustees, in particular, strongly supported Wilson: Clevland H. Dodge, '79, Melancthon W. Jacobus, David B. Jones, Cyrus H. McCormick, and George B. Stewart. For example, Jones hoped that Princeton would be "redeemed" and that in the process, "one secondary result of importance will be the putting an end to the adoration of the athlete as the supreme emotion of the undergraduate world." Wilson, himself, was pleased by the written and verbal support he was "receiving from influential people of many kinds." While attending Harvard's Commencement, Wilson heard reassuring words: "The men up there bade us God-speed with the greatest earnestness, confessing that they had not had the courage to tackle the problem, and saying, of course if you do it, we shall have to do it." Yet he was aware that "a storm" was brewing among some Princeton
alumni.\(^{23}\)

Wilson was convinced, nonetheless, that his Quad Plan should be effected without delay, because the club situation was more pervasive and harmful than he had previously thought. Moreover he asked Cleveland Dodge for a letter of introduction to Mrs. Russell Sage. While believing "in evolutionary processes," Wilson fully appreciated that "money will lubricate the evolution as nothing else will." In early July, Wilson went on vacation in the Adirondacks, confident that he could win the battle for the Quad Plan, just as earlier he had won support for the new curriculum and the Preceptorial System. "The fight is on," he wrote, "and I regard it, not as a fight for the development, but as a fight for the restoration of Princeton." His "heart" was "in it more than it has been in anything else, because it is a scheme of salvation." If victory meant "salvation," how could he fail?\(^{24}\)

\(^{23}\)Minutes of the Board of Trustees of Princeton University, June 10, 1907, Trustees' Papers, PUA. Cyrus H. McCormick to Woodrow Wilson, June 10, 1907; David B. Jones to Woodrow Wilson, June 12, 1907, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII, Woodrow Wilson to the Rev. Dr. Melancthon W. Jacobus, June 27th, 1907, WWP, PUA, folder Curriculum Committee of the Board. Jacobus and Stewart were ministers, while the other three Trustees were businessmen: Dodge (vice president of Phelps Dodge Corporation); Jones (lawyer and successful Chicago businessman, director of New Jersey Zinc Company); McCormick (president of International Harvest Company). Dr. Stewart later became one of Wilson's opponents.

\(^{24}\)Woodrow Wilson to Cleveland H. Dodge, July 1st
Minorities at Princeton

The success or failure of the Quad Plan would determine, in large measure, whether students from minority backgrounds would be welcomed or rejected at Princeton. Although Wilson hardly foresaw the ultimate consequence of the Quad Plan's defeat, because he viewed it primarily as a personal frustration, it indeed signaled the triumph of caste over cosmopolitanism and the "clubable" over the non-"clubable."

During the summer of 1907, Wilson began to define in greater detail the kinds of social contacts he hoped the quadrangles would foster. To H. Howard Armstrong '05, who asked about the probable effects of mixing classes and whether more financially poor students could attend Princeton under the Quad Plan, Wilson replied that "a certain amount of discretion must be used in the allotment of the men to the several quads, and it would be perfectly possible to see that no quad gained the reputation of being socially uncongenial." Although he did not specify the extent to which men of similar backgrounds and interests would find themselves residing in the same quad, Wilson clearly intended his plan to broaden undergraduate social contacts.

and July 3rd, 1907 (WC, NjP), and Wilson to Melancthon W. Jacobus, July 1st, 1907 (RSB Coll., DLC), to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII.
First, all members of the four undergraduate classes would be assigned to a quad; there would be no segregation of Freshmen in separate halls as later developed at Harvard. Wilson also said that poor men could attend Princeton under the new arrangement more easily and with greater advantage than formerly, partly because there will be more ways in which in connection with the administration of the University they can in part pay for their board, and because the men who are under the present arrangement excluded from the clubs because they cannot afford to enter them will have the full advantages of university life and associations.

Thus Wilson believed that economic and social circumstances should not bar a man from coming to Princeton nor exclude him on arrival from the full benefit of intellectual contacts and other university associations.  

In an address on "The Young People and the Church," in October, 1904, Wilson had spoken sympathetically of boys from the slums. He had even "sometimes thought that if we could get a whole college of youngsters who had spent their boyhood in the slums, where they had to have wits in order to live, we would make extraordinary progress in scholarship." In contrast, sons of the wealthy had often "escaped" these essential "lessons." Although praising direct experience with life, Wilson firmly believed Princeton should educate its students in isolation from the larger world.

---

25Woodrow Wilson to H. Hovard Armstrong, September 3rd, 1907 (WC, NJP) and Armstrong to Wilson, Aug. 29th, 1907 (WP, DLC), to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII.
Because Columbia and other urban universities lacked "the community atmosphere," he told an audience at the Brooklyn Institute, in December, 1902, they failed to fulfill "the highest and best definition of the American university." Students absorbed by city life after the end of classes were "simply going to a day school." They never felt "the real effects of a university," which were "wrought between the hours of 6 P.M. and 9 A.M." In order to cultivate the "association between mind and mind," it was "absolutely necessary that the American university should be a compact and homogeneous community." Moreover, Wilson asserted: "The individualistic spirit is not American." Universities were "democratic" in that "the only lines of demarcation among the students" were "intellectual, athletic, or social" attainments. Universities, he said at Swarthmore College, in December, 1905, were for "a small minority," but there was "nothing restrictive, nothing exclusive" in this number, because it was "self-chosen":

The vitality of democracy lies in this one thing[.] that every individual is free to choose for himself any career or achievement that he cares to aspire to, unlimited by class, by social condition, by social prejudice, but free to rise to anything that is not above his strength....So that the minority that frequents the halls of the university is a self-chosen minority, chosen by reason of ambition, theoretically at any rate.

Of course, Wilson pointed out that parents often chose a university education for their children, giving truth to the "proverb": "'You can lead an ass to knowledge, but you
cannot make him think."  

Wilson's address at Swarthmore expressed the American middle class ethic that ambition and hard work were rewarded. Yet he surely was aware that only an extremely small percentage of American families could afford four years of a liberal arts education at Princeton. As he wrote H. Howard Armstrong, the Quad Plan hopefully would make it easier for poor youths to study at Princeton. In regard to students from different economic classes, Wilson then was "democratic." But did this attitude also apply in matters of "social prejudice"? By reputation Princeton discouraged the attendance of minority groups. In an article on "Princeton University," published in The Independent of March 4, 1909, Edwin E. Slosson wrote:

The aim of Princeton is homogeneity. Harvard's ideal is diversity. The Harvard students are gathered from all over the world, admitted under all sorts of conditions and given the most diversified training.... But Princeton practically offers one particular kind of college training to one rather limited social class of the United States.

Princeton's admission requirements, tuition and other costs, restricted number of electives, lack of professional training, and indeed its "traditions and atmosphere, shut out or

fail to attract the vast majority of potential students."

Alone among the fourteen universities Slosson visited, Princeton made no provision for the education of women. In regard to blacks, the author found

Negroes also are shut out by reason of their race, another injustice in which Princeton is unique among the universities. Nothing is said about this in the catalogue, but...if a negro, presuming upon this omission, should present himself for entrance he would be so strongly advised to go elsewhere that he would go.

While some Oriental students were admitted, they were not particularly welcomed. Princeton had "no share in the international movement which" was "sweeping over the country." Harvard, Yale and Cornell each had at least 25 Chinese students; Princeton had just one. Although Princetonians supported missionary work by their graduates in China, they did "not like to have them[Chinese] around."

In contrast to the Columbia's 23 Japanese students, Princeton had only one, a graduate student. A similar situation existed in regard to the number of South American students at Cornell and Pennsylvania on the one hand, and Princeton on the other.  

According to Slosson, "anti-Semitic feeling" was "more dominant at Princeton than at any of the other" thirteen universities. "The Christian tradition of Princeton, the exclusiveness of the upper-class clubs and the prejudices of the students" discouraged Jews, although there were eleven Jewish Freshmen. Typically it was said that "'if the Jews once got in,' ..., 'they would ruin Princeton as they have Columbia and Pennsylvania.'" In spite of such examples of prejudice at Princeton, Slosson pointed out some of the advantages of a homogeneous student body, among them: Princeton's honor system during examinations, in contrast to Harvard's reliance on vigilant proctors.\(^\text{28}\)

Although available evidence on Wilson's attitude toward minority groups is slight, it strongly suggests that he was more liberal than many Princetonians. To be sure, he was prejudiced against blacks, but hardly more so than a Yankee like A. Lawrence Lowell. Like Lowell, Wilson welcomes the presence of Irish boys on campus. And both probably regretted the existence of anti-Semitism on their respective campuses. Finally, in keeping with his sense of America's obligation to China, Wilson would have liked to increase the number of Chinese students at Princeton.

\(^\text{28}\)Slosson, Great American Universities, pp. 105-106.
The fight over the Quad Plan and the Graduate School controversy may well have deepened Wilson's concept of social democracy, but they did not change his firm belief that Princeton's tradition of discouraging black applicants should be continued. In September, 1904, he noted that,

while there is nothing in the law of the University to prevent a negro's entering, the whole temper and tradition of the place are such that no negro has ever applied for admission, and it seems extremely unlikely that the question will ever assume a practical form.

Five years later, Wilson drafted an outline answer to "a poor Southern colored man from South Carolina," who had said that he could make his way if permitted to come:

Regret to say that it is altogether inadvisable for a colored man to enter Princeton. Appreciate his desire to do so, but strongly recommend his securing education in a southern institute perhaps completing it with a course at the Princeton Theol. Sem., which is under entirely separate control from the Univ.

In the University's official reply to G. McArthur Sullivan, Secretary Charles W. McAlpin advised him to apply either to a Southern school or to such Northern colleges as Harvard, Dartmouth, or Brown. 29

Princeton had not always been so uncordial, if not downright hostile, to black applicants. Although Arthur

29Woodrow Wilson to John Rogers Williams, 2 September 1904, C. W. McAlpin Correspondence, Woodrow Wilson, 1901-1911, PUA. G. McArthur Sullivan to Woodrow Wilson, Nov. 20, 1909, and the Secretary's reply of December 6, 1909, Subject File on Students--Nationalities, Negro, PUA. See Also Negroes at Princeton, PUA. Woodrow Wilson, a draft of
Jewell Wilson, one of four black students entering Princeton in 1945, was the first black to receive an undergraduate degree—significantly a wartime A.B., June, 1947—John Chavis, a black Presbyterian minister and an educator from North Carolina had entered the College in 1792. Since Chavis did not complete the work for a degree, he was listed as a non-graduate of the College. In 1774, free blacks Bristol Yamma and John Quamine were sent by the Missionary Society of Newport, Rhode Island, to study privately under President John Witherspoon, in preparation for missionary work in Africa. And since the nineteenth century, black students at Princeton Theological Seminary had attended graduate courses at the College and then at the University. In fact, white students who protested the enrollment of a black Seminary student in President James McCosh's Psychology course in 1876 were themselves given the option of withdrawing. The first blacks to receive graduate degrees from Princeton were the Reverends Irwin William Langston Houndtreet, A.M. '95, and George Shippen Stark, A.M. '06.  

Princeton's racial bar against blacks was never applied to American Indians, but only ten have been identified as either graduates or non-graduates. Although the College of New Jersey as not founded to further the education of Indians as was Dartmouth, Indian boys had studied at President Witherspoon's Nassau Grammar School during the late eighteenth century. Among them were Delaware Indians, George Morgan White Eyes, Thomas and John Killbuck. The government had agreed to pay for their education, during discussions following the conclusion of a treaty between the Continental Congress and several Delaware chieftains in 1779. For their part, the Delawares agreed to give some of their territory to the government should it win independence from Great Britain. Of the three, only George White Eyes (non-graduate, 1789) attended the College; he was the third Indian to do so, the first having been a son of King of the Delawares, Peter Tatami, ca. 1753. But the government apparently was not concerned with White Eyes's well-being: "'I am not of as much Consequence as a Dog,'" he bitterly wrote to President George Washington. More than fifty years later, Princeton graduated its first Indian students: John McDonald Ross, A.B., 1841; William Potter Ross, A.B., 1842, and A.M., 1891, Chief of the Cherokee Nation; and Robert Daniel Ross, A.B., 1843, A.M., 1846, and M.D. (University of Pennsylvania) 1847. But perhaps the best known Indian graduate of recent times was
Joseph Paul Baldeagle, A.B. '23. A South Dakota-born Sioux—one of his ancestors was Chief No-Flesh, who had defeated General George Custer—Baldeagle had previously been educated on scholarships at Carlisle Indian School, Mt. Hermon School and Mercersburg Academy. Also a scholarship student at Princeton, he had played as a substitute on the football team. For thirty-five years after graduation, he had taught English at Bordentown, New Jersey, High School. Upon retirement, Baldeagle returned to Princeton to work at the Information Desk in Firestone Library. He also ran unsuccessfully as a Democratic candidate for Princeton borough council. Princeton's religious heritage—missionary work by its graduates among the "heathen"—may have explained its begrudging receptivity to Indian students while it totally excluded black applicants.  

31 See Subject File Students--Nationalities, American Indians, PUA: Varnum Lansing Collins, "Indian Wards at Princeton," The Princeton University Bulletin, XIII (May, 1902), 101-106; V. L. Collins to Julius D. Dreher, October 17, 1932; Secretary to Mr. [Alexander] Leitch, Acting Secretary, to Nelson A. Swartz, April 10, 1935; Phyllis E. Rapp, Office of the Secretary, to Miss Helen M. Wright, March 3, 1947; "An Indian at Princeton," PAW, Oct. 8, 1937; a list of "American Indian Students At Princeton," compiled by F. J. Dallett, Oct. 1970; and copies of extracts from Records of the Presbyterian Church (1751-1752, 1755-1758), from Records of The Church of Scotland (1752, 1754-1756), and from Minutes of the Society in Scotland for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, relating to the College of New Jersey (1748-1750, 1753-1754). See also in same Subject File, "Four Indian Boys Preparing For Princeton," The Princeton Press, September 18, 1915, p. 1. Rodman Wanamaker, a longtime friend of the American Indian, was supporting four Indian youths on Wanamaker Scholarships at
Princeton's official policy of discouraging black applicants to the College pre-dated Wilson's administration and continued thirty-five years beyond it. Wilson referred to Princeton's strong ante-bellum Southern connection and its continuing attraction for students from that region as the main reason for advising blacks to apply elsewhere. But Princeton's student body was predominantly Middle Atlantic in origin during his presidency. In 1909, for example, Slosson had written that sixty-six per cent of Princeton's students came from New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. And according to Table I on "Geographical Distribution By Residence of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton Undergraduates" (pp. 161-164), Yale outdrew Princeton in the South in 1915-1916, although Princeton was to make substantial gains during the 1920's. Yet in deference to a rather small constituency and a ghostly memory--in 1848, a majority of its students had come from Dixie--Princeton maintained its

Mericersburg Academy: members of the Choctaw, Pima, Snoqualmie, and Shawnee tribes. After Princeton, they were to return to and work with their respective tribes. For information on Joseph Paul Baldeagle, see The Nassau Herald, Class of 1923 (the Senior Class album), p. 23; "Parties Reveal Slates," Princeton Packet, Mar. 7, 1963, Subject File American Indians. And from The Daily Princetonian: "Retired Colonel, Indian Run Information Desk," Feb. 10, 1961, p. 5; "Democrats Choose Baldeagle, Strayer to Enter Council Race," Mar. 8, 1963; and "Baldeagle Discusses '2 Lives,'" Nov. 20, 1963. Baldeagle joined the Democratic Party because "'their principles pay particular attention to the rights of minority groups.'" He felt that the Indians have "'very little opportunity to improve under present conditions.'"
"Southern" prejudices.  

Writing on "Negroes in College" in 1926, W. E. Burghardt Du Bois found that most Northern universities did not exclude blacks, but that their "attitude" varied "from tolerance to active hostility." Princeton, while it shuffles and refuses to make a clear statement, has never admitted a Negro to its college department although it has had Negroes in the theological school. Yale has never encouraged their attendance. Harvard used to encourage them until their number began to grow. Vassar has graduated but one Negro student and did not know it at the time. Bryn Mawr

32 Slosson, Great American Universities," p. 105. For other letters about and from blacks and from Princeton officials, particularly the Secretaries of the University (Charles W. McAlpin, 1901-1917; Varnum Lansing Collins, 1917-1920 (acting); 1920-1936), see Subject File on Students--Nationalities. Negro, PUA; Eugene R. Hayne, attorney at law, to Secretary, July 26th, 1912; President B. F. Allen, Lincoln Institute, Jefferson City, Missouri, to Secretary, Sept. 9, 1912; Assistant to the Secretary to Allen, September 18, 1912; Charles H. Jones, Registrar, to Professor E. G. Conklin, December 3 and 7th December, 1914; A. Barrow Dillon, Government Inspector of Schools, British Honduras, to President of Princeton University [Nov. 1915]; Secretary to A. Barrow Dillon, November 10, 1915; and S. V. Desai, Columbia University, to The Secretary, Sept. 11, 1923, and Secretary to S. V. Desai, September 21, 1923. Desai hoped that statements in the Indian Monthly--which were "trying to show what it thinks the hypocrisy of democracy in this country"--among them that Princeton did not admit blacks, were untrue. Secretary Collins replied that Princeton had no official rule barring blacks, but that he advised them to apply elsewhere, because Princeton was "so strongly impregnated with Southern blood" that they would be unhappy there. See also Winthrop M. Daniels, to Charles W. McAlpin, Aug. 7, 1912, WWP, folder on Graduate College, PUA, probably in reference to Eugene R. Hayne's letter of July 26th, 1912. T. A. Spraggins, a black lawyer who shared an office with Hayne, had been appointed a delegate to Denver by Wilson during his governorship. Ledlie I. Laughlin '12, "Admission Without Examination," PAW, December 4, 1936, Subject Folder Administration, Entrance Requirements, PUA.
and Barnard have tried desperately to exclude them. Radcliffe, Wellesley, and Smith have treated them with tolerance and even cordiality. Many small institutions or institutions with one or two Negro students have been gracious and kindly toward them, particularly in the Middle West.

Recent enrollment pressures on the colleges as well as an increasing number of black applicants had strengthened "the tendency toward hostility" and the efforts "to segregate and insult them in various ways." In conclusion, Du Bois asked: Were Negroes to be educated as "independent, self-directing, modern men" or "as a subordinate caste?" The answers of most privately endowed Eastern colleges and universities were not encouraging. And Princeton's response was among the most negative, because it denied virtually any responsibility for the education of blacks.33

Not only did Princeton exclude blacks, but its students resented playing against them in inter-collegiate athletic competition. One Harvard alumnus fondly recounted

33 W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, "Negroes in College," The Nation, CXXII (March 3, 1926), 229-230. Du Bois was apparently unaware of John Chavis's enrollment as an undergraduate at the College of New Jersey. He was also unclear about the relationship between Princeton University and Princeton Theological Seminary. Paul Robeson would not have been admitted to Princeton during this period, even though his father was a pastor in a local church. Instead, after winning a competitive state scholarship, Robeson became the third black student to enter Rutgers. He played Varsity football and was selected as an All-American player in 1917 and 1918. Robeson won three other varsity letters and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa his junior year (Richard Bardolph, The Negro Vanguard (New York: Vintage, 1972), pp. 216-217, 270).
the following incident as an example of "the fundamentally democratic life at Harvard, where the only aristocracy of any real consequence was an intellectual one." He had been told that once when Harvard was playing football at Princeton—I suppose it was back in the nineties—there was one colored player on the Harvard squad. The two teams were to eat together during Harvard's stay at Princeton; when however the Princeton team saw the Harvard team enter the dining room with the colored member included, they (the Princeton team) arose and left in a body, the Harvard team dining without their hosts.

But after the controversy developed over Harvard's exclusion of blacks from the Freshman Halls, the alumnus wrote President Lowell that he had "spoiled a perfectly good story" about Harvard democracy. Nevertheless, blacks played on Harvard teams fifty years before they were even admitted as undergraduates to Princeton.34

While Princetonian democracy did include the poor boy who received scholarship aid and worked his way through college, it deplored those who engaged in menial labor. One of Wilson's prejudices was that white students should not wait on table. Although "such services," he observed, were "often rendered by the men in the New England colleges," it was "entirely different where menial service of that kind" was "ordinarily rendered by negroes." A student

waiter inevitably would lose "self-respect and social standing." Wilson felt compelled to deny a story that he had ever been obliged to engage in "menial work." In fact, his father had supported him fully until he began law practice.35

Woodrow Wilson, like most white Americans of his generation, was a racist. Yet in spite of a certain condescension toward blacks and a fondness for "darkey stories"—used to leaven his speeches at alumni dinners and even at formal academic occasions—Wilson occasionally expressed some concern for the situation of Negroes in America. According to his notes for an address for the Hampton Institute, delivered at the Academy of Music in Philadelphia, he recognized that Negroes faced, "because of economic changes and other races,--a more complicated problem in adjustment." They had been "thrown out of adjustment" by Reconstruction, "a colossal example of mal-adjustment." Education was the "means" of social and economic adjustment. People "of wealth and influence," moreover, had the obligation to provide "private aid." Continuing this theme in an address to the Men's Association of the Witherspoon Street Presbyterian Church in Princeton, Wilson declared that "the so-called

'negro problem'" was "not of color but capacity; not a racial, but an economic problem." It was, he said, "the negro's problem rather than the negro problem." He admitted that he had "never been able" to arrive at "a satisfactory conclusion" in regard to the Negro's future. But he felt that "men resident among the Southern negroes" were the only ones who could "really answer this question with any degree of confidence."36

Wilson recognized the right of blacks to have a voice in their own government, although throughout his educational and political careers he listened far more attentively to the voices of white Southerners who usually believed to the contrary. In a lecture on the "Problems of City Government," delivered at Baltimore in 1896, Wilson had argued that the city was not an economic corporation, but "'a humane economic society.'" Princeton, a borough which had no mayor, illustrated:

'the control of public improvements in accordance with the desire of the poorer classes. Streets in the poorer districts of the town were improved first. Now

36 Woodrow Wilson, For Hampton Institute, Notes for an Address, 26 Feb'y, 1909; A News Report of an Address in Princeton at the Witherspoon Street Presbyterian Church, Princeton Press, April 3, 1909, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XIX. Woodrow Wilson to Louis Edelman, September 20th, 1909, WC, NJP. As a Southerner, Wilson often described humorous incidents involving Negroes, while imitating their dialect. Probably he was unconscious that he was making fun of black people. See his address at Harvard University in June, 1907, which was printed in the Harvard Graduates' Magazine, XVI (Sept. 1907), 85-87.
this is not what a body of wealthy property-owners would arrange to do. Yet—unpalatable as the truth may be—the management of affairs by these poorer classes—mostly Irish and negroes—has resulted in a better condition of things than if it had been left to the educated classes.

Public health had been endangered by unsanitary streets with poor drainage, which were largely in the poorer districts. Not only did this speech anticipate some of Wilson's later progressivism, but it also indicated that he was not isolated in an ivory tower at Princeton.37

Except for his attitude toward blacks, Wilson had few, if any, racial prejudices. Wilson's greatest prejudices were always directed against those men who opposed his views, as both his educational and political careers amply demonstrated. If a man was loyal to him, his ethnic origin mattered little. In an amusing after-dinner speech to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Wilson revealed an important side to his character. "I have never objected to the race, to the blood of other men," he said; "I have objected to their opinions." On this particular occasion, he must have told the following story about the Irish with an unfeigned pleasure. He prefaced it by saying that he has "had misgivings about the Irish race of late." A few years

ago, on March 17th, some of the Princeton Seniors, not wanting to study, had organized a St. Patrick's Day parade as an alternative endeavor. When the Juniors responded by organizing an Orangeman's parade, "there was a preconcerted and most interesting meeting between the processions." As a consequence of a newspaper report of the incident, Wilson received a fierce letter from an Irish gentleman saying that it was outrageous that a great university should permit the Irish race thus to be insulted. I replied to him that there was only one cause of misgiving in my mind from his letter, and that was the fear that the Irish were losing their sense of humor. [laughter] I did not suppose that any Irish fellow-countryman of mine could so mistake the spirit of college students.

So spoke Wilson, the Scotch-Irish American. The good humor of his audience was proof that anti-Irish prejudice had in many ways "long since passed away." 38

---

38 "Speech of Woodrow Wilson," Printed in The 125th Anniversary Dinner of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in the City of New York, Held at Delmonico's March 17, 1909. (n.p., n.d.) pp. 28-29, 27-33, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XIX. In three letters to the Editor of the N.C. Presbyterian, Jan. 25, Feb. 15, and March 22, 1882, Wilson, signing himself "Anti-Sham," took issue with editorial statements in regard to the installation of the Catholic bishop of North Carolina and with an advertisement of the "Young Catholic Friends' Society," in the Wilmington Morning Star. Papers of Woodrow Wilson, II, 97-103, 113-117. These three "Anti-Sham" letters seem to have been Wilson's only strong attack on Catholicism. Although he denounced the Church hierarchy, because it adhered to the "Syllabus of Errors" of 1864, there was no evidence that he ever disliked Catholics because of their religion. He criticized the establishment of parochial schools and thought it beneficial for Catholics to attend public schools and such private institutions as Princeton.
In fact, Catholic students were beginning to attend elite privately endowed colleges around the turn of the century. A few members of the Catholic hierarchy, including Bishop McFaul of Trenton, were not altogether pleased with this trend. In 1909, Wilson noted that Bishop McFaul's assault upon the Eastern Universities did appear very much at length in the papers in this part of the country, and I think, from some things that I have heard said, that nobody is more chagrined about it than the Roman Catholics. Such violence, of course, answers and refutes itself. I was called up yesterday over the telephone by Father Leahy, the priest of the Princeton church, who expressed his great chagrin and indignation, and I am sure that, if he dared, he would speak out very vigorously in contradiction of his superior. The real gravamen of Bishop McFaul's charge is that Roman Catholics are beginning to send their sons to Princeton and Harvard and Yale.

Bishop McFaul obviously did not speak for the Roman Catholic Church as a whole. He had, moreover, a reputation "of extreme violence" and was "in the habit of insulting even his own people." 39

Despite the fact that Princeton required compulsory chapel for more than fifty years after Harvard had dropped it, the enrollment of Catholic students grew slowly, but steadily, from the early 1900's onward. By the mid-1920's, Catholics constituted about 7 per cent of the entering Freshman Class (Table 22). Both Samuel Ross Winans and

39 Woodrow Wilson to Lawrence C. Woods, June 23, 1909, WC, NjP.
his successor as Dean of the Faculty, Henry Burchard Pine, took special note of the number of entering Catholic students in their reports to the Board of Trustees' Committee on Morals and Discipline. In 1902, Dean Winsan pointed out that 10 of the 14 Roman Catholic students were enrolled in the Scientific Department. This concentration might possibly be explained by the fact that a year's less preparation was required for entrance into the Scientific program. And whereas the ratio of communicants among Academic students was 2 to 1, non-communicants were somewhat more numerous among the Scientific students. Of the seventeen Catholics who signed the Matriculation Book in October, 1902, only six declared themselves to be communicants. 40

Among Catholic students attending Princeton during these years were the sons of James Smith, Jr., a former grocery clerk who rose to be United States Senator from New Jersey (1893-1899). Smith admired Wilson, until the latter, as governor, undercut him by joining the state's progressives. The future Secretary of Defense, James Vincent Forrestal, a contractor's son, joined Princeton's Class of 1915 as a sophomore, having transferred from

40 Princeton University, Report Of The Dean Of The Faculty To The Committee On Morals And Discipline Of The Board of Trustees, October 21, 1902 and October 21, 1903, Minutes Of The Trustees. X (June 1901-Jan. 1908), 235, 237-235, 363; and College of New Jersey, Matriculation Book, II (1893-1903), PUA.
### TABLE 22
CATHOLIC STUDENTS MATRICULATING AT PRINCETON, 1877-1902

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Specials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>2c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>7d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>16 (14)e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a* Compiled from: College of New Jersey, President's Entrance Book, I (1871-1893), and Matriculation Book, II (1893-1903); Reports Of The Dean Of The Faculty To The Committee On Morals And Discipline Of The Board of Trustees, Minutes of The Trustees, IX (Dec. 1898-Mar. 1901) and X (June 1901-Jan. 1908); Princeton President's Reports, 1908-1923; The Nassau Herald, Class of Nineteen Hundred and Twenty-Three (Princeton University Press, 1923); and Radcliffe Heermance, Office of the Supervisor [in 1925, Dean] of Freshmen, "Preliminary Analysis of Freshman Class," in September, 1921-1929, Trustees' Papers, PUA.

*b* No student indicated Catholic religious affiliation, 1871-1876, 1878, 1882-1883, 1885-1886, and 1895.

*c* In 1880, one of the Freshmen transferred to the School of Science.

*d* Of the 7 Freshmen matriculating in 1900, 1 entered in May and 6 in September.

*e* In 1902, Dean S. R. Winans listed 14 Catholics in his report to the Trustees' Committee on Morals and Discipline; but 17 Catholics enrolled in the Matriculation Book in 1902, 16 as Freshmen and 1 as a Junior. Three registered later than the others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Catholic Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>21 (and 1 Qualifying Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>29 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualifying Students were provisional students who did not have sufficient academic credits to be enrolled in one of the three upper classes. The statistics on religious affiliation in the Princeton President's Reports included qualifying Freshmen with regular Freshmen.

Figures for 1919 were based upon biographical sketches in The Nassau Herald, Class of Nineteen Hundred and Twenty-Three, the Senior Class Album. Most likely, a number of Catholic students, along with non-Catholic students, had left Princeton since matriculating for academic, personal, or other reasons.

Princeton President's Report, December 31, 1923, gave a higher number of Catholic students than the "Preliminary Analysis" of September.
Dartmouth. While at Princeton, he was chairman both of the Daily Princetonian and the Nassau Herald Committee, and a member of the Senior Council, the Class Day Committee, and the University Cottage Club. Forrestal's religious affiliation obviously was no bar to his social success at Princeton. Nor did it hinder the efforts of Frances Scott Key Fitzgerald to become a "Big Man" on campus, although he lacked the self-assurance of an Adlai E. Stevenson, '22, a wealthy, old stock Protestant (Stevenson listed himself as a Unitarian and a Democrat in the Nassau Herald). Fitzgerald "unable to determine to which class he himself belonged," tried almost too hard to succeed. But he did win considerable recognition: the libretto he wrote freshman year for the Triangle Club was produced the following semester. He also became an editor of the Tiger and Nassau Literary Magazine. And having turned down invitations to Cannon, Quadrangle, and Cap and Gown, he joined Cottage Club. The next step would have been the presidency of Triangle and election to the Senior Council. But Fitzgerald's cavalier indifference, if not studied neglect, of academic work resulted in an unsatisfactory scholastic record. In December, 1915, during his junior year, he left Princeton, because he was no longer eligible to compete for further extra-curricular honors, because he was ill with malaria, and because he might as well leave before he was flunked
In addition to the aforementioned Catholics who became famous in later life were dozens who pursued successful careers both at Princeton and in the business world after graduation. In the undergraduate world of Princeton, success was measured principally by athletic accomplishment (This avenue was closed to Fitzgerald, who at five feet, seven inches and 138 pounds, was too light for football). In practically every class during this period, there were at least one or two Catholic boys, if not more, who became proud wearers of the "P." Such an athletic honor carried with it, unless one were Jewish, an invitation to one of the Upper Class eating clubs. Many Catholic athletes received bids from Tiger Inn, which prided itself on the athletic prowess of its members. For example, E. J. Hart, '12, winner of the "P" for football and track, and C. G. Reilly, '12, Manager of the Baseball Team, were both members of Tiger Inn. And Henry A. Callahan, '21, born in Lawrence, Massachusetts and prepared at the Phillips Exeter Academy, was definitely a "Big Man" at Princeton: captain of the football

---

team; Triangle Club; Chorus; Varsity Club; president of the Right Wing Club; Senior Council; Class Day Committee; Undergraduate Athletic Committee; Undergraduate Schools Committee; and president of Tiger Inn his senior Year.  

To be sure, students of Presbyterian affiliation were still in the majority, although their numbers had declined from two-thirds to about half, between 1890 and 1900. By 1909, Presbyterians composed only 38 per cent of the Freshman Class, while the number of Episcopalians had rapidly increased from less than half as many as the Presbyterians to 30 per cent of the total during the same two decades. Episcopalians numbered well over 200 (from 195 to 252) students in classes of 605 to 633 Freshmen matriculating between 1922 and 1929. In the same classes, Presbyterians mustered 178 to 209 members, trailed by Methodists and Congregationalists, who averaged around 25 to 35 adherents. Baptists numbered between one and two dozen followers, while such other denominations as Christian Scientists, Dutch Reformed, Lutherans, and Unitarians ranged from half a dozen to under twenty members. And those stating no religious preference fluctuated between as few as 5 and 30-odd. But the numerical dominance of the Episcopalians was firmly established by the early 1920's. According to historian Henry W. Bragdon, this shift in religious affiliations at Princeton began with the arrival of wealthy New York  

businessmen or lawyers, who built imposing mansions within a mile or two of the campus. Undergraduate rewards seemed naturally, but not exclusively, to go to these young scions of the WASP upper class.  

Wilson did not believe that a Princeton education was the exclusive preserve of these wealthy young men. He came increasingly to feel that for their own benefit they should mingle with students of different socio-economic, even ethnic backgrounds. Not only did he welcome Catholic students, but he probably received, with some degree of hospitality, a few representatives of the recent, Eastern European immigrants. Since Wilson made no explicit comments about such immigrants as students during his years at Princeton, his attitude toward them must be derived from both earlier and later statements. On the one hand, as Bragdon pointed out, "Wilson expressed fear of the recent hordes of immigrants" in Volume V of his *History of the American People*: "'multitudes of men of the lowest class from the south of Italy, and men of the meaner sort out of Hungary and Poland, men out of the ranks where there was neither skill nor energy nor any initiative of given intelligence.'" They brought "'social chaos.'" But on the other hand, in 1905 he also

---

43Reports Of The Dean Of The Faculty To The Trustees' Committee On Morals And Discipline, 1900-1908; Princeton President's Reports, 1908-1923; Radcliffe Heermance, Office of the Supervisor [in 1925, Dean] of Freshmen, "Preliminary Analysis of Freshman Class" in September, 1921-1929, Trustees' Papers, PUA; and Bragdon, Woodrow Wilson, pp. 272-274 and n. 9.
said, at the opening of the Institute of Musical Art in New York, that "composite America" was "being merged together":

It is not from my blood--the Scotch-Irish--that American music is now springing. That blood is good to fight with but not to play the violin with. It is not from her own blood that America is getting her musicians, but from the German blood, from the Scandinavian blood, from the Polish blood, from the Hungarian blood. From those nationalities which are being combined in this country, she is now separately getting her musical inspirations, and when these are once merged into the single impulse, then there will be American musicians and American music.

Thus Wilson acknowledged the positive cultural contributions which Hungarians and Poles among others could and did make to the United States. What had frightened him about the masses of immigrants pouring into Eastern urban centers was probably the thought that they might not be assimilated. 44

But unlike Lawrence Lowell and the Immigration Restriction League, Wilson did not urge a quota. On the contrary, like his opponent in educational matters--Charles W. Eliot--Wilson was also a member of the National Liberal Immigration League. His role in this organization may have just been a perfunctory one, however, since, unlike Eliot, he apparently wrote no letters on its behalf. To counteract

the unfavorable impression of such earlier statements as those in the *History of the American People*, Wilson's letter to an Italian-American was circulated by the Democratic National Committee. "'America has always been proud to open her gates to everyone who loved liberty and sought opportunity,'" Wilson wrote, "'and she will never seek another course under the guidance of the Democratic Party.'" Undoubtedly political considerations played a substantial role here as they would in his later Presidential vetoes of two literacy bills, 1915 and 1917, and his pocket veto of the Emergency Quota Act of 1921. Against these actions favorable to immigrants must be placed his less admirable attack on hypenates during the 1916 campaign and his use of the Alien Enemies and Sedition Acts during the war. On balance, however, Wilson's attitude toward immigrants was decidedly more positive than hostile. While Wilson emphasized "America's cosmopolitan nationality," according to historian John Higham, he attacked immigrants when they failed to understand the "mission" of the United States.\(^4\)

To be sure, Wilson did not intend to transform Princeton into an academic Ellis Island. Of all the groups associated with the new immigration, only one—the Jews—was

large enough at Princeton to be even counted. It was brought to his attention on at least two occasions that Jewish students were usually treated as social outcasts. In September, 1904, Jacob Ridgway Wright, a Princeton classmate, wrote Wilson about John Coons of Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, who was entering that fall as a freshman. The boy's father was "a leading member of Luzerne County Bar," a man of "sterling character and strong professional qualities," and Wright's "warmest, closest friend." In addition, Joseph Coons had served on the Executive Committee of B'nai B'rith for the past ten years and had been one of those who petitioned the Tsar of Russia, through President Theodore Roosevelt, in regard to the Kisheneff massacre. 46

The boy, according to Wright, was "very like his father in temperament and mentality." Not only was he intelligent, but he also loved music and might go out for one of the college musical groups. Wright then asked Wilson "to see to it" that the boy was "not 'held up' or discriminated against" because of his ethnic and religious background:

If he should merit a place, and chance favors his winning on his merits, I do not want him to be 'thrown over' in this or any other direction because of his religious belief. Both you and I know that it is the fashion to look at the Jew unsympathetically, simply because he is a Jew. But I cannot be wrong in my belief that you would not allow this boy, or any other

46 Jacob Ridgway Wright '79 to Woodrow Wilson, September 16, 1904, WP, DLC.
boy, in fact, to be discriminated against because of his race, color, belief or otherwise.... I want him to have a fair and even chance with the other fellows, and I know you will keep your eye on him and see that he is protected without permitting him to know it.

Since Wilson's reply is missing, one can only guess that he kept a fatherly eye on John Coons. Undoubtedly, the two met, because Wright had given Coons a note of introduction to Wilson. Although Coons did not make any of the eating clubs, he was a member of Triangle Club and got the chance to play his violin. In the *Nassau Herald* of 1908, Coons listed history as his favorite study and his political preference as Democratic. After graduating from Princeton with high honors, he studied at Harvard Law School but did not finish because of ill health. Subsequently, he did practice law.\footnote{Wright to Wilson, September 16, 1904. For John Coons's career, see the various albums of the Class of 1908, for example, the *Nassau Herald*, and 5th and 50th records of the class.}

Wilson seemed to have a more favorable attitude toward Jews than most academicians of this period. On one occasion, he did make a recorded statement disparaging a particular Jew. During his second year at the University of Virginia Law School, Wilson reacted negatively toward the winner of an oratorical contest in Washington. In appearance, wrote Wilson, "'he suggested to me a greasy, Junkshop Jew who had been partially washed and renovated and oiled that he might appear to his overwhelming disadvantage among decent people.'" His clothing—"the
### TABLE 23

JEWS STUDENTS MATRICULATING AT PRINCETON, 1876-1902

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Specials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>3 + (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**a** Compiled from: College of New Jersey, President's Entrance-Book, I (1871-1893), and Matriculation Book, II (1893-1903); Reports Of The Dean Of The Faculty To The Committee On Morals And Discipline Of The Board Of Trustees; Minutes Of The Trustees, IX (Dec. 1893-Mar. 1901), and X (June 1901-Jan. 1903); Princeton President's Reports, 1909-1923; The Nassau Herald, Class of Nineteen Hundred and Twenty-Three (Princeton University Press, 1923); and Radcliffe Heermance, Office of the Supervisor [in 1925, Dean] of Freshmen, "Preliminary Analysis of Freshman Class," in September, 1921-1929, Trustees' Papers, PUA.

**b** No student indicated Jewish religious affiliation, 1871-1875, 1878-1882, 1885-1888, 1890, 1892, and 1895.

**c** Between December, 1901, and March, 1902, three Jewish students enrolled; two others, who professed no affiliation, may also been Jewish.
## TABLE 22--Continued

### JEWISH STUDENTS MATRICULATING AT PRINCETON

1903-1925

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Jewish Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>13 (and 1 Qualifying Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>12 (and 1 Qualifying Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>16 (and 1 who stated No Affiliation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>21 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In 1903 and 1904, the number of entering Jewish students was too small to be mentioned specifically. Undoubtedly, one or, possibly, two did matriculate, but were lumped with the remainder of the class (after counting the 40 per cent Presbyterians, 25 per cent Episcopalians, 30 Methodists, 13 Congregationalists, 12 Catholics, and 11 Baptists) as scattered among a dozen denominations.*

*Qualifying Students were provisional students who did not have sufficient academic credits to be enrolled in one of the three upper classes. The statistics on religious affiliation in the Princeton President's Reports included qualifying Freshmen with the regular Freshmen.*

*Figures for 1919 were based upon biographical sketches in The Nassau Herald, Class of Nineteen Hundred and Twenty-Three, the Senior Class Album. Most likely, a number of Jewish students, along with Gentile students, had left Princeton since matriculating for academic, personal, or other reasons.*

*Princeton President's Report, December 31, 1923, gave a higher number of Jewish Students than the "Preliminary Analysis" of September.*
extravagantly long coat and the tilt of his hat'"—gave him "'the stamp of vulgarity.'" Such a statement hardly represented Wilson's attitude toward most Jews, as his later political career demonstrated. For example, as Governor of New Jersey, Wilson nominated Samuel Kalisch, his political leader in Newark, as associate justice of the State Supreme Court. Kalisch thus became the first Jew to serve on this New Jersey court. Five years later, Wilson appointed the first Jew to the United States Supreme Court, Louis D. Brandeis. 48

Wilson spoke eloquently on "The Rights of the Jews" in an address at Carnegie Hall, on December 6, 1911. Russia had not fulfilled the terms of an 80-year old treaty with the United States under which citizens of both nations were to be free to travel in each other's territory on legitimate business. The United States Government had merely protested against the violation of the rights of "our Jewish fellow-citizens" during the past forty years. But it had erred, said Wilson, in speaking "for special interests or from some special point of view and not for the American people."

While Americans wanted to be Russia's "friend," "principles" were at stake. The benefits of trade with Russia were not worth the "price," if the rights of some Americans were denied. Wilson then praised in glowing terms the contributions of Jews to American life:

Here is a great body of our Jewish fellow-citizens, from whom have sprung men of genius in every walk of our varied life, men who have become part of the very stuff of America, who have conceived its ideals with singular clearness and led its enterprise with spirit and sagacity. They are playing a particularly conspicuous part in building up the very prosperity of which our Government has so great a stake in its dealings with the Russian Government with regard to the rights of men. They are not Jews in America; they are American citizens....They have suddenly become representatives of us all. By our action for them shall be tested our sincerity, our genuineness, the reality of principle among us.

The fact that Wilson was making a political speech in a city heavily populated by Jews should not render his statements any less sincere. He went far beyond merely polite criticism of the Russian Government, when he said: "We are not here to express our sympathy with our Jewish fellow-citizens, but to make evident our sense of identity with them." All Americans were bound together in this matter as fellow-citizens and as people "who love justice and do right." Unless Russia changed its policy, the United States should "break off the intercourse between our people and our merchants," or at the very least negotiate another treaty on different terms.  

---

49 Woodrow Wilson, "The Rights of the Jews," Address
Wilson's concern for the rights of Jewish citizens may have been affected by his fight for the Quad Plan at Princeton. Under the existing club system, Jewish students and all others not offered membership were effectively denied equal access to that community life which was part of a Princeton education. In other words, there were two classes of students at Princeton—the clubable and the unclubbed—although they had presumably been admitted on a basis of relative equality. Wilson's Quad Plan sought to create an intellectual and social community within which students could win recognition according to true merit rather than through artificially imposed social distinctions.

Non-club men were understandably favorable to Wilson's plan. One of the first alumni to praise the proposed "radical changes," was Leon Michael Levy, who had been a member of the Class of 1905 for two years, first as a freshman and then as a special student. Although achieving some distinction by winning Whig Hall's Sophomore Essay Contest in 1903, he left Princeton the same year and enrolled at the University of Pennsylvania. After receiving a LL.B. in 1906, he began to practice law in Scranton, Pennsylvania. Levy blamed the "abominable system of club life" for the "social humiliation" and "class prejudice" he suffered at Carnegie Hall, New York, December 6, 1911 (From "The Congressional Record," 62D Congress, 2D Session, XLVIII, Appendix, 497-498), The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson, College and State, Educational, Literary and Political Papers (1875-1913), Authorized Edition, ed. by Ray Stannard Baker and William E. Dodd, II (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1925) 318-322.
Princeton because he was Jewish. "Without any undue egotism," Levy described himself as "not of the worst type." He found, however, only "the essence and acme of snobbishness": "the democracy of Princeton! Faugh!" First, he "was hazed a deal, but took it good-naturedly," without initially thinking that it was partly motivated by "racial contempt." Then at the end of freshman year, he felt himself to be "an Ishmaelite and outcast" when he was not taken into one of the sophomore "hat lines." Although he did not wear the "yellow cap, the badge of disgrace," worn by his ancestors in Europe, "the absence of a cap or insignia of any sort branded" him "as an outsider." "The great majority" of undergraduates were "snobbish, addleheaded young cads, with ambitions centred on upper-class clubs, and their idol not a Calf of Gold, but a calf of sinew with an arm to match."

As a consequence, his only friends were two other Jewish students and two Gentiles, one of whom was "an eccentric literary genius," the other the College's "finest debater."\(^{50}\)

Of course, Jewish students were not the only ones excluded from the eating clubs. At least one-third of each class was in a similar position. Like Levy, Harold Zeiss '07, a Unitarian and a Mugwump, described the clubs as "the acme of snobbishness." The selection process really began during the Freshman year when "positions in the social life

\(^{50}\) Leon M. Levy, "Sometime of the Class of 1905," to Woodrow Wilson, ca. June 25, 1907, handwritten, WP, DLC. See
of the college" were "prematurely fixed, regardless of ability." If a student "'queers' himself by some little thing Freshman year," Zeiss wrote Wilson, he was "likely to be 'down' for the rest of his college course." There was, moreover, "a tendency to cater to riches and social position in the selection of men for Freshmen clubs." While conceding that some members benefited from the experience of managing club affairs, Zeiss argued that the overall effect was "demoralizing." The survivors of the selection process found club life expensive and too much a competitor with their studies. But for non-members, the situation was worse: "These men lose many pleasant opportunities, they are often miserable, and cannot become whole hearted Princeton men."\footnote{Harold Zeiss to Woodrow Wilson, June 27, 1907, \textit{ibid.} See \textit{Nassau Herald, Class of 1907}.}

Another non-club member, a graduate of the Class of 1894, not only expressed approval of the Quad Plan, but also suggested several ways for putting it into operation. Louis I. Reichner, a Presbyterian and a Republican, proposed, first that Princeton buy all the club houses at cost and then rent certain ones, in rotation, to the upper class clubs.
Secondly, the University should prohibit the wearing of distinctive hatbands, neckties, and other insignia by both undergraduates and graduates. Thirdly, Freshman and Sophomore Commons should be established in which every member of these two classes must eat. And finally, all Freshman and Sophomore social clubs should be abolished. Inter-class contests, Reichner suggested, should be encouraged to promote class spirit. 52

Critics of the club system usually pointed to two of its major defects: its dominance over the lives of its members and potential members and the isolation imposed upon non-members. Wilson explicitly described this situation in an address to the Princeton Club of Chicago, in March, 1908. It was "not merely a social question," said Wilson, it was

a question whether you are going to get digestible food or not, a question whether you are going to get comradeship, a question of the organization, decency, and pleasure of your whole life as an undergraduate. It is not merely a question of social ambition. There is no other way [to] live at Princeton so desirable as can be found by getting into a club.

Neither Princeton's "beautiful campus and buildings, the spirit, the traditions, the romance," which had attracted Levy, nor its outstanding Faculty were enough to compensate for the social isolation imposed upon non-club members. It

52 L. Irving Reichner to Woodrow Wilson, July 17th, 1907, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII; Reichner was then an attorney in Philadelphia. See also the Nassau Herald, Class of 1894.
was not simply a matter of club membership—Levy, for instance, has been happy at the University of Pennsylvania Law School even though he had not belonged to a fraternity, because he had been "treated...like a man and brother." Opportunities prevailed at other universities, lacking at Princeton, for a non-fraternity man to make friends and participate in various extra-curricular activities. Moreover, Princeton was geographically isolated from the larger life of urban centers; hence students excluded from the clubs could find little solace in the borough itself. Jewish students, in particular, could not count upon a nearby supportive religious and cultural community. 53

Oriental students faced a similar social situation at Princeton, but a small number did attend. Although Edwin E. Slosson had written that Princeton did not "share in the international movement" of the day, three Japanese had enrolled there as early as 1871. Two of them had presented themselves with a letter of introduction to the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions and had been escorted to Princeton by the Board's Treasurer. President McCosh invited them to be his guests, called a Faculty meeting to consider their case, and appointed a committee to guide them. These Japanese and another who came later were enrolled as special

Sophomores—students "not pursuing the full course."
The first Japanese to graduate from Princeton was Hikoichi Orita, A.B. '76 and A.M. '79. When Orita enrolled as a Freshman in 1872, the following comment was entered beside his name in the President's Entrance-Book: "A Japanese not of any Christian denomination." During his years in college, he converted to Christianity and joined the Presbyterian Church. He was also a member of Whig Hall, one of the two debating and oratory societies, and was a Commencement orator. After graduation he returned to Japan and began a long career in the Department of Education. He became Director of Daisan Koto Gakko (Third Imperial College), was appointed a life member of the House of Peers by the Emperor, and was awarded the Third Degree of the Decoration of Honor. Orita thus became one of Princeton's distinguished alumni.54

One Japanese graduate, Motakichi Takahashi, A.M. '06, wrote Wilson that he was "very much thankful for

54 Walter Mead Rankin, M.S. '84, professor of Biology, gave to Princeton the "brief account of the arrival of the first Japanese students in Princeton," written by his father, who was then Treasurer of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, Subject File Students—Nationalities, Japanese. For material on Hikoichi Orita, see his Alumni Biographical File, PUA. The Rev. Dr. Corwin of Millstone, New Jersey, privately prepared Orita for Princeton. After serving as a judge at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia, Orita presented Japan's exhibit—a natural history collection—to Princeton. Also see his obituary notice in PAW, May 19, 1920. President's Entrance-Book, I (1871-1893), PUA.
Princeton, who educated and upheld me." But he was keenly aware of the discrepancy between his "most pleasant life in Princeton" and "the friendship of this country," on the one hand, and the segregation of Oriental students in San Francisco, on the other. While Wilson recognized the merits of hardworking Orientals in the United States, he acquiesced to, or criticized only mildly restrictive legislation of this kind.55

Nevertheless, Wilson felt that the United States had both an educational and political mission regarding Orientals. Impatient with "the anti-imperialist weepings and wailings that came out of Boston," Wilson saw the Philippines as a "new frontier." Although refusing to lend his name to the movement for Philippine independence, he authorized a favorable reply to the United States Philippine Commission: "I see no possible objection to the admission of such Filipinos as may be sent us, and of course we should be willing to make the same concessions in the matter of tuition to them as to others in need of

55Moto Takahashi to Woodrow Wilson, Jan. 10th, 1907, Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVI, 557-559. Takahashi hoped that Wilson would visit Japan and said he was going to send him a "Satsuma Vase," Bragdon, Wilson, p. 249: "Although granting the west coast Chinese the virtues of skill, intelligence, industry, and thrift, he excused the Caucasian laborers who demanded the exclusion of these 'Orientals, who, with their yellow skin and strange, debasing, habits of life seemed to them hardly fellow men at all, but evil spirits rather.'" (See History of the American People, V).
assistance.” Only a few Filipinos ever came to Princeton.  

Wilson’s sense of duty toward Orientals was most clearly expressed in regard to the Chinese. In 1909, for example, he accepted an invitation to become one of the twelve lay members—President Arthur T. Hadley of Yale was another—of the Committee of Christian Education in China. Representing Protestant foreign missions, the Committee was observing with great interest “the extraordinary intellectual movement” then occurring in China. In January of the same year, Wilson initially expressed great eagerness to get “the ear of the Chinese Legation in Washington” and to place Princeton “upon some preferred list” for Chinese students coming to the United States. “Of course,” wrote Wilson  

the only thing Princeton will get out of this business is a grip upon the minds of men who may be influential in guiding the future of the Chinese empire. I do not feel that our facilities for giving them what they want are as great as the facilities of some other universities, but I do feel that it is clearly our duty to  

56 Woodrow Wilson, “Our Elastic Constitution,” report of an address in Montclair, New Jersey, Philadelphia Press, Jan. 28, 1904, pp. 142-143; and Woodrow Wilson to Edward Warren Ordway, Secretary of the New York Anti-Imperialist League, 20 Feb[r]uary, 1904, p. 175, Papers of Woodrow Wilson XV. See also Woodrow Wilson, “Democracy and Efficiency,” [ca. Oct. 1, 1900], published in Atlantic Monthly, LXXXVII (March, 1901), 289-299. Wilson said that self-government should be extended to the Philippines and Porto Rico as soon as they were prepared for it by a “moral” government (Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XII, 18-20). Woodrow Wilson to Charles W. McAlpin, Secretary, 27 May, 1903, C. W. McAlpin Correspondence, Woodrow Wilson, 1901-1911, PUA.
take advantage of such an opportunity for influence. However, upon further reflection and after several conferences with Lucius H. Miller, assistant professor of Biblical Instruction, and with others, Wilson had decided by March that Chinese students would be better served at other universities. First of all, Princeton could not provide the training in engineering and the professions which most of them sought. The University's program was less varied and flexible than those offered elsewhere. Thirdly, Wilson believed his "fear" to be "well grounded,"

that our present social organization at Princeton would be sure to result in making any Chinese students who might come here feel like outsiders, not received into the real life of the University but set apart for some reason of race or caste which would render them most uncomfortable. There is no door that I can see by which they could really enter our university life at all, and to have them come and form a group apart would certainly be most undesirable.

In other words, the existing club system would exclude, rather than assimilate Chinese students who entered the College. Perhaps this reason was the most important one in explaining why Wilson "very reluctantly" concluded that there was "nothing" that Princeton could "wisely do to press our claims for recognition in the distribution of the numerous Chinese students who" would "be brought to this country in the expenditure of the indemnity money by the Chinese government."\(^57\)

\(^{57}\)Arthur J. Brown to Woodrow Wilson, March 17, 1909 and W. Henry Grant to Woodrow Wilson, Dec. 2, 1909 to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XIX. The Committee
Although Wilson dropped the idea of bringing Chinese students to the College, he pursued it in regard to the Graduate School. He sent to Andrew Fleming West, Dean of the Graduate School, the Third Catalogue of the Pei Yang University of Tiensin, China, and a letter from Charles D. Tenney, Chinese Secretary of the American Legation in Pekin. West thought that Pei Yang graduates "might be admitted to our Graduate School" but wrote Harvard and Yale to learn "under what conditions they admit these Chinese students." He noted that the Chinese studied either the sciences, especially the applied, or political subjects in American universities. 58

Over the years, a number of Chinese students came to Princeton, mainly to the Graduate School. In April, 1928, for example, the Princeton Alumni Weekly listed five Graduate School Chinese alumni who "have given a good account of themselves in their native land." And in October, 1948, Frederick Liu, secretary of Princeton's Chinese Club, claimed that "Old Nassau" was "responsible for a

---

planned to meet during the Seventeenth Conference of Foreign Mission Boards of the United States and Canada in New York, January, 1910. Woodrow Wilson to Professor Lucius H. Miller, January 15th, 1909 and Wilson to Andrew C. Imbrie, March 26th, 1909, WWP, miscellany, PUA.

58 Andrew F. West to Woodrow Wilson, July 12, 1909, WWP, Graduate School, Committee of the Board, PUA.
lion's share of the leaders in Nationalist China today," although his Club was the smallest of those in leading American colleges. Among prominent Princeton-educated Chinese were K. C. Wu, mayor of Shanghai; P. T. Chen, financier; K. L. Lo, Chinese ambassador to India; and James Yen, educator. Most of them either entered government service or became university professors of science, in particular, of physics. 59

The Graduate School, rather than the College, attracted the majority of Princeton's foreign students. 60 One of the main deterrents to foreign students in the College, with the exception of the easily assimilated British and Canadians, was the club system. Wilson came to believe that the nature of the College, the kinds of men it trained for leadership, and Princeton's mission, in the larger sense, were at stake in his fight for the Quad Plan. Ultimately, it was a struggle to determine which would prevail: the college ideal or the club system.


60 Homer Edmiston to Woodrow Wilson, April 16 and August 3, 1907, WWP, Curriculum Committee of the Board, about a proposed exchange of students between Princeton and Italian universities, which did not materialize; and see also Subject File Students--Nationalities (Undergraduate and Graduate), PUA.
CHAPTER XI

THE TRIUMPH OF THE CLUBS

I hope the Alumni will tip us off to any Hebrew candidates. As a matter of fact, however, our strongest barrier is our club system. If the graduate members of the clubs will ram the idea home on the undergraduate bicker committees and make the admission of a Hebrew to a club the rarest sort of a thing, I do not think the Hebrew question will become serious.

--Varnum Lansing Collins, Secretary of Princeton University and member of the Committee on Admission, to Henry M. Canby, November 23, 1922.

By the 1920's, the clubs not only completely dominated undergraduate life at Princeton, but even became unofficial arbiters as to who should be admitted. Any Jewish or other applicants considered not "clubable" who defied the unwritten policy of the clubs by obtaining admission to Princeton could look forward to four years of social isolation. Neither intellectual achievement nor even athletic prowess would open the door to the clubs if a man was labeled an outsider. Woodrow Wilson had fought hard against the clubs because he rightly saw them as competitors with the

\[1\] Varnum Lansing Collins '92 to Henry M. Canby B.S. '95, Endowment Fund Chairman for Delaware, November 23, 1922, Papers of H. Alexander Smith (hereafter abbreviated HASP), 1920-1927, Box 37, Folder Executive Secretary Trips - to Alumni Meetings ex Number of Students Receiving Financial Aid for the Year 1922-1923, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library (hereafter abbreviated RB&SCPUL). Collins also served as Clerk of the Faculty.
college. There should be "no elective membership" in a true college community, wrote Wilson, because

Admission to the University must mean full membership in its community, as truly as admission to citizenship means full membership of the political community,—more truly, indeed, for the University must be, no mere formal political organism, but a social unit and community in the fullest meaning of those words.

The only inequalities, he said, should be "the natural inequalities of age and experience." Free of artificial barriers, such a community would be democratic because, by Wilson's definition, "democracy" was "made up of unchosen experiences." But Wilson's defeat over the Quad Plan meant the defeat of a broader concept of democracy at Princeton until the late 1950's. Not until the last decade or so have the Upper Class clubs diminished in importance in the eyes of Princeton undergraduates. As long as the clubs embodied their ultimate ambition, Princeton would, by its very nature, discourage, if not exclude students of diverse ethnic backgrounds.²

Defeat of the Quad Plan

Like a stone cast into a pond, the Quad Plan was creating ever widening circles during the summer of 1907. After the June meeting of the Board of Trustees, Wilson had

assumed that the principle of his plan had already been accepted. But he had consulted neither the Faculty as a group nor the alumni as a body. A number of both began to express dissatisfaction, first, in personal letters to Wilson, then in the pages of the Princeton Alumni Weekly. Prominent among Wilson's Faculty opponents were Henry van Dyke, an ordained Presbyterian minister and professor of English; Graduate Dean Andrew F. West; and John Grier Hibben, professor of Logic and Wilson's intimate friend. At the very least, all three wanted the Faculty to have an opportunity to discuss the merits of the proposal.3

In contrast to the critical comments of these men, George McLean Harper, then Holmes Professor of Belles Lettres and Language and Literature, strongly endorsed his President's plan, which he called "eminently conservative and considerate of existing prejudices...." He himself had hoped that someday Princeton would be organized into "a group of subordinate colleges," but found others "were singularly slow in grasping the idea." When he remembered, as an undergraduate in the early 1880's,

the absorbing & unnatural fascination the Clubs have exerted in the case of several students with

3Henry van Dyke to Woodrow Wilson, July 5th, 1907; Wilson to van Dyke, July 8th, 1907; Andrew F. West to Woodrow Wilson, July 10, 1907; Wilson to West, 11 July '07; John Grier Hibben to Woodrow Wilson, July 8, 1907; and Wilson to Hibben, 10 July '07, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII. Henry van Dyke, "The 'Residential Quad' Idea at Princeton," July 10th, 1907, PAW, VIII (September 25, 1907), 4-7.
whom I was intimate, the morbid jealousy, the perverted sense of loyalty & honor, the sensitiveness to criticism, I am less amazed at the attitude of the young alumni, but am all the more convinced that your proposal should be carried out at any cost.

Such a residential plan would enable a small college like Princeton to achieve internal unity. Harper realized the difficulties involved in Wilson's undertaking "to educate 7000 alumni, on the subject of education itself." If he succeeded, he would "have done something for higher education in America of even greater importance than introducing the preceptorial system, and of more good consequence to Princeton than even the new course of study." The Faculty had thus divided itself into two camps. Among other Wilson supporters, led by Dean Henry B. Fine, were Professors Stockton Axson, Winthrop M. Daniels, Edward Elliott, Harry A. Garfield, Alexander T. Ormand, and W. U. Vreeland. 4

Alumni, especially the clubmen, quickly made their opposition heard. They felt a strong proprietary interest in their clubs. Although some clubs owned their houses debt-free, others were heavily mortgaged. These debts with their interest fees were being paid off largely by graduate dues, with some contribution from initiation fees. Without graduate financial support, many of the houses would be

closed. Tiger Inn was one of the first clubs to register its protest. While Franklin Murphy, Jr. '95, president of the club's Board of Governors, acknowledged that the clubs exercised too great an influence on undergraduate life, he pointed out that the loyalty of many Princetonians was sparked by the attachments they felt toward their clubs.

The very strength of this sentiment underscored Wilson's point: There was brotherhood within each club, but not necessarily between clubs and not at all between club members and the "non-clubbed." In his reply to Murphy, Wilson stressed the changes which had occurred in club life and suggested that the alumni were not fully aware of "the radical things" which were occurring. The clubs no longer fostered "class spirit"; instead they promoted "clique feeling." 5

Other alumni argued against the Quad Plan on the quite explicit grounds that Princeton should cater to the sons of well-to-do and cultured families. Henry Fairfield Osborn '77, a former Princeton Faculty member and then head of the Biology Department at Columbia, felt that on the basis of their fathers' record the scions of the privileged would

5 Franklin Murphy, Jr. vice president of the Murphy Varnish Company of Newark (his father had been Governor of New Jersey) to Woodrow Wilson, June 7th and June 18, 1907; and Wilson to Murphy, June 20th, 1907 to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII.
have greater success in life than "the sons of obscure men." To ameliorate Princeton's social situation, Osborn, a noted racist, suggested greater Faculty participation in the clubs, sophomore membership in certain Upper Class Clubs, and the establishment of "a general university club," along the lines of New York's Century Club, which would be open to men of "character, attainments or social charm," in short, the cultured. Wilson, of course, deplored his suggestions, especially "the argument for making Princeton a rich man's college." 6

Recent graduates, no less than the older alumni, defended the existing club system as an integral part of their continuing relations with Princeton. A graduate of the Class of 1907, Arthur H. Osborn wrote:

Under the present conditions he returns to Princeton for a few days visit, and, if he be a member of a club, he makes his headquarters at his club-house where he may eat and sleep, and meet men he knows, and in short make it a medium whereby he may once more enter into, one might almost say, the undergraduate life. It strikes me as being an ideal system for this reason if no other. It is a sort of second home to him.

The club-house, far more than the library, chapel, laboratories, or even Nassau Hall, was the focus of his enduring affections. The graduate would be annoyed, if not outraged, upon returning to find his club abolished and

---

6 Henry Fairfield Osborn to Woodrow Wilson, September 17th, 1907; and Wilson to Melancthon W. Jacobus, September 20th, 1907, in which he enclosed a copy of Osborn's letter, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII.
men living in the house that his energy, time, and money have helped to create. Men living there, concerning whose right to do he has no opportunity to say yes or no, while he, to whom, in part at least the house is due, must seek quarters elsewhere wherever he can find room and seek his meals at some town restaurant.

The unfortunate graduate, Arthur H. Osborn predicted dolefully, would be turned out of his own home in order to accommodate a stranger. Such a policy amounted to the confiscation of private property and was clearly "contrary to the Constitution of our Country."7

Even graduates of the days before the ascendency of the clubs argued for their continuation. Adrian Joline, 1870, denounced the Quad Plan because of its "revolutionary" nature; it would lead to "the destruction of Princeton." And Joline well perceived the double-edged nature of Wilson's argument: it was "to appeal to opponents of the Clubs because the Quads" were "to supplant the Clubs, and to a Club man because it" was "the best thing for the University." Joline did not accept either argument. Not only had the clubs served Princeton well for thirty years, he said, but their abolition would simply lead to the development of secret social organizations.8

7 Arthur H. Osborn to Woodrow Wilson, July 9, 1907, with a handwritten memorandum, "A Plan in Respect to the Club Situation in Princeton To-day," 8 pp., ibid.

8 Adrian H. Joline to the Editor of PAW, VIII (October 9, 1907), 36-38.
Although after a initially hesitant or unfavorable reaction, a number of clubmen gradually came to approve of Wilson's plan, a majority of the alumni, especially those in major Eastern cities, opposed it. Trustee Andrew C. Imbrie reported that most Princetonians in New York were at least "disposed to consider the question with an open mind." But according to Trustee Henry B. Thompson of Wilmington, Delaware: "Here among the graduates and in Philadelphia it has no friends." He had "yet to hear from a man who endorses it." Two weeks later, he wrote fellow Trustee, Moses Taylor Pyne: "Wilson's eloquence has over-persuaded us." The same situation prevailed in Philadelphia, wrote Trustee Bayard Henry. Alumni clubs appointed committees to confer with President Wilson and the Trustees's Committee. Moreover, a number of Trustees felt that "the plan was not adopted but the idea merely was approved, provided it met with the approval of all concerned." In June, twenty-four out of the twenty-five Trustees present had voted in favor of Wilson's proposal. Less than eight weeks later, some were backing away and qualifying their commitment. 9

9See Linsly R. Williams to Woodrow Wilson, June 27, 1907, for a clubman's approval of Wilson's plan; and the following for the Trustees's comments on alumni sentiment: Andrew C. Imbrie to Woodrow Wilson, July 25/07 [published, along with Wilson's reply in PAW, VIII (September 25, 1907), 7-9]; Henry B. Thompson to Harold Griffith Murray, 7th Mo., 16th, 1907, and Thompson to Moses Taylor Pyne, 7th Mo., 30th, 1907 [Thompson Letterpress Books, NJP]; and Bayard Henry to Woodrow Wilson, July 29, 1907, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII. Baker, Wilson, Princeton, II, 228, 232-233.
Bayard Henry was a case in point. Although he had been one of the committee of seven which theoretically, at least, issued the "Report on the Social Co-ordination of the University," he raised several major objections to Wilson's plan about a month later. Building dormitories, dining halls and kitchens would cost "at least $2,000,000." Students from different classes would not agree to eat together. The method of distributing students into the different quadrangles posed difficulties. If intellect or financial means were made the basis of selection, students would become even more segregated than at present. And finally students would object to uniform room and board rates. As Henry saw it:

Wilson's idea of uniformity as to food is socialistic and not natural, and if students are to have the same food at so much a week there is no reason why they should not wear the same clothes or a uniform, which would be all right in a military or naval school, but hardly satisfactory in a college or university.

In effect, Henry was saying that college should not alter the socio-economic distinctions which students brought with them from their home environments. Food, clothing, and club affiliations were marks of status. "In a University," he maintained, "as well as elsewhere in America, men like to be on their own level, or else to be in a position where they can better themselves. They will not be put on a level with those below them." If Princeton tried to go against natural preferences and impose uniformity, the young men
would choose another college. 10

Undergraduates largely echoed the opinions expressed by the conservative, pro-club alumni. While an editorial in the Daily Princetonian appreciated the "great benefits" to "be derived from a closer affiliation of the educational and social sides of Princeton life," it doubted whether these benefits would thoroughly justify a change so radical that Princeton as it is to-day would cease to exist and another, a strange and unknown Princeton rise in its place. It is true that present social conditions are a little uneasy but with the wholesome sentiment gathering strength as we believe it is to-day, these conditions should eventually acquire a stability which is typical of the Yale system. Then, to follow another line of thought is not this affiliation between the two sides of undergraduate life being unconsciously accomplished by a slow system of evolution?

Since the social system could take of itself, by the slow process of evolution, the editorial recommended that Princeton devote itself to "perfecting and broadening the preceptorial system" instead of trying to institute "radical" changes. And it argued that the Quad Plan would undermine the Princeton spirit by dividing the campus. "Class distinctions exist to-day," it said, "and experience has long ago taught us the worth of a democracy reconciled with that

---

10 Bayard Henry to Henry Burling Thompson. July 13, 1907, enclosed with letter from Henry to Woodrow Wilson, July 29, 1907; and Woodrow Wilson to Andrew C. Imbrie, July 29th, 1907, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII.
wholesome aristocracy based on class seniority." Such distinctions were necessary to the creation of class spirit. In conclusion, the editorial asked that President Wilson personally explain his plan to the undergraduates.  

As the opposition mounted through the summer and early fall, Wilson began to consider the possibility of resigning his office should the Quad Plan be defeated. According to Stockton Axson, the President's brother-in-law, he had "never seen Wilson more stiffly bent and insistent on a project." And Henry B. Thompson found him "nervous and excitable," but "well under restraint in discussion." This strain increased as Wilson realized that several of the Trustees, one of whom was Thompson, interpreted the June vote differently than he did. Some of the Trustees, moreover, were becoming concerned that a fight over the Quad Plan would seriously impair alumni fund raising, thus jeopardizing the Preceptorial system, which depended on annual contributions.

Although Wilson expressed interest to David B. Jones "in the alternative plans" which were being advanced, he was  

---

11 "The 'Quad System,'" editorial, Daily Princetonian, October 2, 1907.

12 W. M. Daniels to John Grier Hibben, Aug. 19, 1907 [W. Farrand Coll., NjP]; Henry B. Thompson to Cleveland H. Dodge, 9th Mo., 10th, 1907 [Thompson Letterpress Books, NjP]; Harold G. Murray, Secretary of the Committee of Fifty, to Andrew C. Imbrie [A. C. Imbrie Coll., NjP], to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII.
against any social organizations based upon "student election." They would "result in dividing the University into two classes, those who were distinctly clubable and those who were not." Such a division "would certainly put the best students of the University at a marked and most undeserved social disadvantage." Statistics compiled by Wilson's secretary, Gilbert F. Close, showed that in the past four years only 9.3 per cent of club men had achieved honors (a stand in either the first or second group) while 41.7 per cent of the non-clubmen had been honor men. Another way to express these "very striking figures" was to point out that during those four years there have been 1516 clubmen, and 140 of these have been honor men. Of that 140 twenty-one have been first group men and 119 second group men. During those same four years there have been 621 non-clubmen, and of these forty-five have stood in the first group and 215 in the second.

Club membership was unquestionably a deterrent to scholastic achievement. Consequently, Wilson believed that the principle he and Jones had agreed on in June was "absolutely impeachable, namely that our object is entirely educational and that the social organization sought shall be intended only to serve that end." 13

The club problem, as David B. Jones emphasized, really centered on the four oldest clubs: Ivy, Tiger Inn, Cottage, and Cap and Gown. These fostered the spirit of social competition and set the tone for undergraduate life.

13 Woodrow Wilson to David B. Jones, September 26th, 1907, WWP, PUA.
In contrast, the more recent smaller clubs were "the external manifestation of successive disappointments in failure to make the older and larger clubs." And the way they felt about the older clubs was similar to the feelings of non-club men toward the club system.\textsuperscript{14}

Jones and Dr. Melancthon Jacobus were Wilson's most uncompromising supporters. For example, Jacobus urged that the Board of Trustees adopt the resolution:

That the Quadrangle Plan presented to the Board in the report of the Committee last June embodied the principle that the existence of the University is dependent upon a guaranteed equality of intellectual and social opportunities to its students and an elimination of any system of special privileges as fatal to its life.

Jacobus, in other words, favored "guaranteed equality" of social as well as intellectual opportunities, a very progressive position for the times. Other Trustees, like Cleveland H. Dodge, urged that the plan be modified in an evolutionary direction. Still others, like Henry B. Thompson and M. Taylor Pyne, wanted Wilson to withdraw the Quad Plan altogether. Their point of view would prevail at the fall meeting of the Board of Trustees on October 17, 1907.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{14} David B. Jones to Woodrow Wilson, September 28th, 1907, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII.

\textsuperscript{15} M. W. Jacobus to Woodrow Wilson, 14 Oct. 1907; Cleveland H. Dodge to Wilson, Sept. 28th, 1907; and Henry B. Thompson to Cleveland H. Dodge, 10th Mo., 15th, 1907 [Thompson Letterpress Books, NJP], ibid.
The struggle over the Quad Plan began in earnest at the special faculty meeting of September 26th. Professor Daniels presented a resolution that the Faculty agree to the proposal which the Trustees had passed on in June and that a committee of seven Faculty members be appointed to work with President Wilson, Dean Fine, and the Trustees's committee. But Dr. van Dyke moved that a joint Trustees and Faculty committee be appointed to act with the President in investigating the existing social evils, in consultation with alumni and student representatives. Much to Wilson's dismay, Professor Hibben seconded this motion. At another meeting on September 30, van Dyke's motion was defeated by a vote of 80 to 23. Wilson carried 31 out of 53 of the "'old faculty'" as well as a majority of the young Preceptors.  

During the next meeting on October 7, Wilson made "one of the remarkable addresses of his life." He argued that the Quad Plan was "a necessary sequel to the preceptorial plan," not "a remedy for evils." He did not talk about the "abuses" of the clubs so much as the logic of their development. In effect, the clubs put the Faculty, "honormen," underclasses, and even the University itself outside of undergraduate life. The Quad Plan would reunite them in a new body, which would "be susceptible of being dominated by educational influences." No vote was passed

at this time; further action was left up to the Trustees. 17

But at their October 17 meeting, the Board of Trustees, fully realizing the danger of antagonizing the alumni in a year of financial panic, reversed their decision of the previous June. All except one Trustee voted in favor of the three resolutions proposed by Moses Taylor Pyne: that the Board reconsider their earlier decision; that since the Board no longer thought it "wise to adopt the recommendation" of the report of Wilson's Committee, "the President be requested to withdraw the plan...."; and finally, that "the Committee be discharged." Then the Board threw a sop to Wilson's ego by saying that they understood the depth of his beliefs and that he could still try to persuade them and the alumni of the merits of his plan. In point of fact, most of the Trustees, with the exception of devoted followers like David B. Jones and Dr. Jacobus, wanted Wilson to remain silent on the subject of the Quad Plan. 18

Wilson's defeat—his first major defeat—profoundly influenced both his personal life and educational philosophy.

17 Ibid., and Woodrow Wilson, Notes for an Address to the Princeton University Faculty, Oct. 7, 1907, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII.

18 Minutes of the Board of Trustees of Princeton University, October 17, 1907, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII; and Baker, Wilson, Princeton, II, 260-262.
Biographers and historians agree that Wilson emerged a changed man from this bitter experience. He became aloof, somewhat cold. Believing that Hibben had, in some sense, betrayed him, Wilson shied away from close personal friendships of this sort. And blaming his defeat on the men of wealth, he began to speak for an educational democracy based on scholarship in opposition to education for the specially privileged. Consequently, the issues involved in the Quad Plan continued to live during the remainder of his presidency. Initially, Wilson had argued for his plan on social or democratic grounds, but then he had emphasized its academic benefits in an attempt to counter the protests of the clubmen. After failing in this endeavor and then encountering opposition from similar quarters during the ensuing Graduate School controversy, Wilson returned to the theme of social democracy. As he saw broader horizons opening up to him in politics and as he sensed the growing sentiment for reform in the country, he sounded this theme even more vigorously.19

The Fight for Social Democracy

Although Wilson decided not to press the Quad issue for awhile after his defeat by the Trustees, he believed that "we shall really not be free to do what we deem best at

Princeton until we are relieved from the dictation of the men who subscribe to the Committee of Fifty Fund and who can withhold our living from us if we displease them." One of these men was M. Taylor Pyne, who threatened to stop his generous financial support to Princeton unless Wilson dropped the Quad Plan. Wilson's dissatisfaction with the power exercised by these wealthy benefactors and clubmen was reinforced by the support of David B. Jones and Dr. Jacobus. Feeling that further agitation of the Quad issue among the Faculty and Trustees would be fruitless for the time being, Wilson decided to carry his message to various alumni groups. 20

His first important address in this vein was in March, 1908, to the Princeton Club of Chicago. The purpose of a university, Wilson began, was to teach men to think, and in the United States, "democratic thinking" was "absolutely necessary." The latter was broad and without the limitations of class or professional interests; it offered a free and open field for everyone. Under this principle, the best man would win the race of life. "Democratic thinking" meant

not stopping to ask a man's origin, not stopping to ask a man's influence, but regarding a man, every man, as

---

20 Woodrow Wilson to Melancthon W. Jacobus, November 6th, 1907; David B. Jones to Woodrow Wilson, November 12th, 1907; Woodrow Wilson, Notes for Remarks to the Board of Trustees of Princeton University, 9 January, 1908, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XVII. Baker, Wilson, Princeton, II, 264-266.
different from his fellows only in capacity, only in trustworthiness, only in character....Whenever you have shut classes up tight, nations have begun to rot, because the individual worth has been checked and individual opportunities denied.

Because extracurricular activities occupied approximately two-thirds of undergraduate time, Wilson continued, Princeton did not foster such thinking. Although the character of clubs was "clean and legitimate and excellent," their tendency was "to standardize" students. Of course, Harvard and Yale faced a similar problem, but Princeton could "lead the way" to reform albeit through "a certain period of excitement and trouble." 21

On April 8, however, Wilson received another setback, when the committee of three Trustees, which had met a committee of alumni to discuss the social system, reported favorably on the side of the clubs. The trouble was not in the clubs themselves, but only in the process of getting selected. With the support of the Senior Council several reforms were passed to remedy these defects and to make the continuation of the Upper Class Clubs tolerable: abolition of freshman and sophomore clubs; establishment of compulsory commons for these two classes; creation of a commons for the "unclubbed" upperclassmen; and an end to the Inter-Club Treaty. These reforms were to have little effect in reducing

the undergraduate's excessive concentration on extracurricular activities.22

Wilson spent the summer alone in Britain where he visited for a time Andrew Carnegie and assembled guests at his Scottish castle. He returned to Princeton reinvigorated for the next round. Through intermediaries, Wilson tried to interest the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching in providing the money—he estimated about $3,500,000—for the quadrangles, but Carnegie himself was against it. The fact that Wilson could find no wealthy backer for his cherished plan, which he believed would be the "consummation" of his administration, influenced his decision to consider seriously his political opportunities.23

Meanwhile, Wilson went to Chicago to address the Princeton Club on "Abraham Lincoln: A Man of the People." He lost no time in connecting Lincoln with the modern American university. The intellectual task of a university, said Wilson, was to produce "'a generalized American,'" like Lincoln. Yet in the process, it should make students

22Bragdon, Wilson, p. 332. In October, 1908, the Board of Trustees resolved that the Upperclass Clubs should appoint a graduate committee to act for all clubs in communicating with the administration, Faculty, and Trustees (Woodrow Wilson to Franklin Murphy, Jr., January 26th, 1909, WWP, PUA).

23Woodrow Wilson to Frank A. Vanderlip, February 1st and 5, 1909; Henry S. Pritchett to Woodrow Wilson, Feby. 18, and May 5 and 11, 1909; and C. H. Dodge to Woodrow Wilson, March 16th, 1909, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XIX. Bragdon, Wilson, pp. 334.
"as much unlike their fathers as possible." The latter were specialists. Lincoln, Wilson's ideal American, was a completely different type of man from the clubmen who paid Princeton's bills:

This man had no caution. He was absolutely direct and fearless. You will say that he had very little worldly goods to lose. He did not allow himself to be encumbered by riches, therefore he could say what he pleased. You know that men who are encumbered by riches are apt to be more silent than others. They have given hostages to fortune, and for them it is very necessary to maintain the status quo.

Princeton itself was and would remain a hostage to fortune and a defender of the status quo, Wilson implied, unless it found the money to establish the quads, which in time would produce more men like Lincoln.\(^2\)

In an address a few days later to the Presbyterian Union of Baltimore, Wilson again praised Lincoln as "a generalized American," but implied that he would not have belonged at Princeton as it was then academically and socially structured. Instead of catering primarily to the privileged, universities should, like the Church in the Middle Ages, "afford open, unclogged channels for the rising of the obscure powers of a nation into observation and supremacy." And just as a tree died when the sap could no longer rise, so also would those "pretending to be cultivated" when they "cut their tap roots." Such people, Wilson predicted, would

---

one day be dominated by "some man born of some despised portion of the race," just as Lincoln had "dominated all the cultivated men of his time." By arguing that the university itself should provide open channels, he was implicitly denying the contention of certain clubmen that Princeton was virtually their property. He was also attacking the views of alumni like Henry Fairfield Osborn, who doubted that "the sons of obscure men" would contribute as much to America as the sons of the well-to-do and cultured. The theme—of keeping the channels open from the bottom to the top of society—would gain increasing usage as Wilson moved toward the governorship of New Jersey and then toward the New Freedom.25

Because "democracy" was one of the great issues of the Progressive period, Wilson's comments on Princeton inevitably had broader implications. An address in Philadelphia showed this linkage in its title: "University's Part in Political Life." Generalized university training, he said, prepared men for responsible behavior in public life. Instead of defending the status quo, the broadly trained graduate would support necessary reforms in society. Indeed,


25 An Address to the Presbyterian Union of Baltimore [Feb. 19, 1909], to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XIX.
Wilson believed so intensely that his educational and social ideals would prepare the best citizens and leaders that he began to see his presidency as "a sort of minor statesmanship." It was another version, though one substantially transformed, of his "Princeton for the Nation's Service."

On July 1, 1909, Wilson carried his message of "The Spirit of Learning" to Harvard. Although his reputation among academic circles was at its zenith, the problems of his own university bore heavily upon him. The Board of Trustees had agreed in April, 1908, that the new Graduate College be built on the grounds of Prospect, the presidential home located in the center of the campus. A year later it gave a large measure of control over the Graduate School to a Faculty committee friendly to Wilson. But in May, 1909, William Cooper Proctor, a friend of Dean Andrew F. West, offered Princeton $500,000 to build a Graduate College, if this sum could be matched by other gifts. And Proctor was opposed to the Prospect location. He and West preferred a site removed from the campus, either at Merwick or on the golf links. "It was evident by the summer of 1909," Arthur

---

26 Woodrow Wilson, A News Report of an Address in Philadelphia to the University Extension Society, Philadelphia Public Ledger, March 13, 1909; An Address at the Inauguration of Henry Harbaugh Apple as President of Franklin and Marshall College, Jan. 7, 1910, to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XIX.
S. Link has written, "that another first-class controversy was in the making, and the lines of battle were beginning to be tightly drawn at Princeton."27

During this summer, Wilson sketched out or began to write several articles and addresses. "What is a College For?", published in Scribner's Magazine in November, pointedly discussed the impact of wealth and the sons of rich businessmen on the higher learning. A college, he wrote, was "for the training of the men who are to rise above the ranks." But under the current social system, "the born leaders and managers and originators" were "drafted off to 'run the college,'" creating a situation in which "the side shows" were "so numerous, so diverting,...that they have swallowed up the circus, and those who perform in the main tent must often whistle for their audiences, discouraged and humiliated." These "side shows" had to "be subordinated" to the real purpose of a college: the "intellectual discipline and moral enlightenment" of students.28

Not until early 1910 would Wilson's past resentments over the Quad Plan's defeat and present frustrations over


28Baker, Wilson, Princeton, II, pp. 304-305; Woodrow Wilson, "What is a College For?" Scribner's Magazine, XLVI (November, 1909), 570-577; and Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson, College and State, ed. by Baker and Dodd, II, 160-177, especially 164-166, 174-175, 177.
the location of the Graduate College fuse, according to Professor Link, into "a great crusade for social democracy."

On October 21, 1909, for example, the Board of Trustees accepted Proctor's conditions and agreed to the golf links location, provided they could legally use the Swann bequest (for building on campus Thompson College, a graduate student residence) at the same site. The situation was further complicated by the fact that Wilson had not yet made it clear to the Trustees, let alone to the alumni, why he wanted the Graduate College to be located in the middle of the campus. He was talking in terms of geography rather than in terms of the nature of the Graduate College and its relationship to the rest of the University. Also at stake was whether Dean West, supported by Pyne and other Trustees, or Wilson would control it. Wilson felt that the Trustees had "'taken the guidance of the University'" away from him by accepting Proctor's gift. He threatened to resign unless the offer was declined, because he could not work with Dean West. By this means, he hoped to win a majority of the Trustees to his side by the January 13, 1910 meeting.29

At this meeting, Pyne produced a letter from Proctor agreeing to Wilson's suggestion that there be two graduate colleges, one to be built on campus with the Swann bequest and the other on the golf links with Proctor's gift. The

president was so taken by surprise that he made several contradictory statements. First, he undermined his own position by stating that if the Graduate College were "based on proper ideals," the Faculty could "make it a success anywhere in Mercer County." Moving on to attack West's conception of the Graduate College, Wilson denied that he had ever seen Dean West's Proposed Graduate College of Princeton University (1903) for which he had written a complimentary preface. And then Wilson came out flatly against the proposal for two Graduate Colleges. The upshot of this meeting, wrote Link, was that Pyne "lost all faith in Wilson's integrity and ability to govern the University." He was determined to drive him out of office. 30

The Wilson faction thought they had won the fight when Proctor decided to withdraw his offer on February 6, and four days later, the Board of Trustees accepted the pro-Wilson report of a special committee of five Trustees appointed in January to negotiate with Proctor. At the Board's April meeting, Wilson, in fact, felt he was in a strong enough position to effect West's removal as Dean of the Graduate School. That the president was acting vindictively distressed his supporters among the Trustees. But Wilson was gaining a great deal of experience in political infighting

Wilson's friends outside the University were not altogether clear about the issues. In February, 1910, A. Lawrence Lowell wrote him that he was "very sorry to see that you have been having some trouble about the Graduate College, and have lost a gift therefor." While he could not fully understand the issue, he had "a blind confidence" that Wilson was right. Later Lowell himself took heed of Wilson's experience when launching the House Plan at Harvard.  

Increasingly Wilson began to see in the Graduate School controversy the issue of social democracy. On January 31, 1910, Herbert B. Brougham, Yale '02, had written him that he, as an editorial writer of the New York Times, would be glad to help Wilson in his "efforts to organize the college life at Princeton in a different spirit and for a different purpose than the spirit and purpose fostered there by tradition...." Brougham had recently discussed "the situation at Princeton" with Albert S. Cook, professor of English, and other Yale Faculty members. He believed that the ultimate settlement of the Princeton controversy would "affect profoundly for good or ill the life of American

31 Link, Road to White House, pp. 72-73.

colleges." Wilson accepted Brougham's offer of help, especially in light of the hostile articles in the New York Herald, which interpreted the Graduate School conflict as a continuation of the quadrangle plan issue.\textsuperscript{33}

In replying to Brougham, Wilson denied any "attempt to revive the question of the re-organization of the social life of the undergraduates at this time." He said that the attempt of certain alumni to present that as "the real issue" was "very disingenuous." On the other hand, he acknowledged "a real truth underlying these representations." In Wilson's mind the two controversies shared a similar principle. If Princeton accepted Proctor's offer of $500,000 for the Graduate College with both explicit and implicit conditions attached, it would have meant extending to the graduate life of the University "the same artificial and unsound social standards that already dominate the life of the undergraduates." Really "serious graduate students," he argued, would have gone elsewhere, making "the realization of sober ideals of sound scholarship more difficult than ever." Wilson opposed "the physical isolation" of the Graduate College from the rest of campus, because it "would contribute to the spirit of social exclusiveness which we particularly desire

it should not have." His own ideals of the University were "those of genuine democracy and serious scholarship" which went together. Any academic organization, he continued, which catered to social exclusiveness constituted "the worst possible soil for serious intellectual endeavor." Although Wilson hoped that Proctor did not intend to further social exclusiveness and that his gift could be used "in the interests of simple living and high thinking," he believed the issue was "now joined between a college life into which all the bad elements of social ambition and unrest intrude themselves, and a life ordered upon a simpler plan under the domination of real university influences and upon a basis of genuine democracy." Wilson asserted that "a most formidable working majority" was behind him and enclosed a copy of a paper to be presented to the Board of Trustees, which was to be kept "confidential."

On February 3, 1910, an editorial on "Princeton" appeared in the New York Times. Using the arguments supplied by Wilson, Brougham attacked "special privilege" at Princeton and in "all other endowed universities." He asked whether they were going to train "men intellectually well

---

34. Wilson to Brougham, February 1st, 1910. George McLean Harper, who saw the situation as "a duel between the President and Professor West," believed that if given the opportunity, the Faculty "would decide in favor of President Wilson by a vote of four to one." He felt there was only one true answer to the question: "Which can Princeton least afford to lose, Professor West & $500,000, or Woodrow Wilson & our honorable rank among American universities?" (George
rounded, of wide sympathies and unfettered judgment," or dilettante clubmen. As might be expected, the editorial aroused both defenses of the Graduate College and counter charges. Wilson's allegations to the contrary, there was no proof that Dean West and his supporters intended to turn the Graduate College into a select club. Fortunately for Wilson, his substantial contribution to Brougham's editorial was unknown, because its revelation would have caused "a fatal explosion in the Board of Trustees." Wilson, himself, realized the need for a more temperate statement. In another letter to Brougham, he played down the issue of social democracy and even acknowledged the "'democratic professions'" of West and his supporters. 35

A further example of Wilson's willingness to pull in the reigns was his decision not to publish his most advanced statement on social democracy. Shortly after the February 10th victory of his faction in the Board of Trustees, he sailed for Bermuda for a vacation. While there he began to work on another article for Scribner's, entitled "The Country and the College." If Wilson really meant what he wrote, his concept of the purpose of a college was genuinely


progressive. Rather than educating the same kind of students as in the past and imbuing them with the ideals of their parents, a college should educate for the future. "Its function" was "not to please the passing generation, but to recruit and invigorate the next." Since the world was continually changing, "every generation" presented "a fresh face in the class-room." The educator's "plans must be as consciously provident of the future, as those of the statesman himself." Turning to the theme of "democracy", Wilson continued:

There is a happy coincidence between the spirit of learning and the true spirit of American life. They are both essentially democratic. Learning knows no differences of social caste or privilege. The mind is a radical democrat. Genius comes into what family it pleases, and laughs at the orders of society, takes delight in humble origins, and yet will appear in palaces if it please. It cannot be wooed by good form or bought at any price....It recognizes no privilege or preference not bestowed by nature herself....A college that would be truly American, therefore, will embody the true spirit of learning.

In giving uncompromising recognition to "the radical democracy of the mind and of truth itself," a college would "rank its men according to their native kinds, not their social accomplishments, and bestow its favours upon immaterial achievement." Wilson's ideals were obviously leagues removed from those of many Princetonians, and, for that matter, from the alumni of many privately endowed colleges. But in the end he did not publish the article, apparently for two reasons. First, he thought he might be attacked for trying to resuscitate the quadrangle plan. And second,
believing that he had won the fight over the Graduate School, he had nothing to gain from further agitation. 36

But Wilson's enemies—Pyne and his supporters—had by no means surrendered. Pyne was busily recruiting support for the election of Adrian H. Joline, who opposed Wilson's policies, as an Alumni Trustee. Wilson therefore determined to carry his message again to the alumni. Though he seemed to conciliate the alumni in Baltimore, Brooklyn, Jersey City, and St. Louis, he received a cold, if not hostile reception on April 7 from the New York alumni. And at the meeting of the Board of Trustees, a week later, Pyne was strong enough to prevent Wilson from taking the Graduate College issue to the Faculty for a vote. Stung by this defeat, Wilson spoke intemperately two days later to the Pittsburgh alumni. Because colleges, he declared, did not produce men "serviceable to the country as a whole"—indeed, Lincoln would not "have been as serviceable to the people of this country had he been a college man"—he had dedicated himself "to a democratic regeneration." American colleges had to become "saturated in the same sympathies as the common people," because the nation would "tolerate nothing that savours of exclusiveness." Dean West's conception of an exclusive and secluded Graduate College was wrong.

36Woodrow Wilson, "The Country and the College" (pp. 2-4), to be published in Papers of Woodrow Wilson, XX; see n. 2.
"Will America tolerate the seclusion of graduate students?", Wilson asked and then answered in the negative. But probably he had not fully considered the consequences of his assertions. Professor Link, for instance, has doubted that Wilson "was really prepared to undertake the moral and spiritual regeneration of American democracy." On the other hand, with the possibilities of a political career developing into realities, it was "not unlikely that Wilson found himself being forced to take a radical position, not only in the Princeton controversy, but also on certain political issues, despite the fact that he had never believed in radical solutions." 37

The "Pittsburgh Speech" aroused comment not only from Princeton alumni, but also from a number of newspaper editors. Since most of the response was critical, Wilson retreated to a moderate position the following month in an address to the alumni of Chicago. Meanwhile, Pyne and others on the Board of Trustees worked to settle the differences between the two factions by compromise: a renewed Proctor offer and the Swann bequest to be used for building.

37 Woodrow Wilson, "Address to Pittsburg Alumni," Delivered at Pittsburgh Banquet, April 16. 1910 (From Pittsburgh Dispatch, April 17, 1910), Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson, College and State, ed. by Baker and Dodd, II, 202-203; Link, Road to White House, pp. 85, 78-84; and Bragdon, Wilson, pp. 375-378. See Baker, Wilson, Princeton, II, 342, for Professor Albert Bushnell Hart's reaction to Wilson's "Pittsburgh Speech." Hart believed Wilson was "'fighting the cause of scholarship and education'" and saw "'at Harvard the same kind of forces'" which Wilson discussed.
on the golf links site; administration of the Graduate School by a Faculty committee; and West to yield his deanship and become resident head of the Graduate College. But neither Wilson nor West was willing to accept what seemed to each a surrender to the other. In May, 1910, fate intervened with the death of Isaac C. Wyman, 1848, who left his estate to build a Graduate College for Princeton. Dean West, who had been named one of the estate's two trustees, had won. Realizing that he could not fight an estimated several million dollars—ironically the Wyman bequest was worth, as Henry W. Bragdon has pointed out, only about $660,000 to Princeton—Wilson yielded in a generous spirit. West and Pyne, however, were less than charitable in accepting the proffered olive branch. Moreover, on June 9, the Board of Trustees accepted Proctor's reoffered gift. Wilson's lone triumph was the defeat of Pyne's candidate for Alumni Trustee, Adrian H. Joline. Although Wilson might have stayed on as president, he did not have to evaluate his longterm prospects at Princeton: In the summer of 1910 he agreed to run as the Democratic candidate for Governor of New Jersey.38

During the first half of his administration, Wilson accomplished several constructive educational reforms at Princeton. But by 1910, he had deeply divided the University

by the battles over the Quad Plan and over the control and location of the Graduate College. Historians, notably Arthur S. Link and Henry W. Bragdon, have drawn significant parallels between these years as college president and his later years as President of the United States. Early years of great achievement were followed in both cases by an almost self-inflicted defeat. In large measure, Wilson's personality, perhaps already affected by a brief bout with that cerebral arterial sclerosis which later paralyzed him, was to blame. As Charles W. Eliot, Wilson's educational opponent but political supporter (A. Lawrence Lowell also voted for this Democratic presidential candidate in 1912), wrote in 1924: "Woodrow Wilson, like most reformers and pioneering folk, had a fierce and unlovely side."

Wilson and Lowell

Had Wilson succeeded at Princeton, the University would have taken a different path than it did. In his most progressive statements, he had said that Princeton should be

a place where there was "no caste or privilege...but where America herself is reproduced in small." Of course, this was not meant literally because he himself agreed to the exclusion of black students from the College. On the other hand, he undoubtedly believed that Princeton should be accessible to all white students. Although well aware of Princeton's Presbyterian heritage, he hardly mentioned it in his addresses. Speaking in 1909 to the Philadelphian Society, a campus religious organization, Wilson had said that as long as the undergraduate social system standardized students, Princeton was "neither university nor Christian." His references to Princeton as a Christian university were relatively few; about all he wanted it to be a university.

It is intriguing to consider how Wilson might have reacted, had he been president of a university as ethnically diverse as Harvard. For surely in 1910 Harvard was far closer to being America "reproduced in small" than Princeton would be until the 1960's. To be sure, Wilson and Lowell agreed that colleges should foster "social co-ordination" or cohesion, and that they needed a certain amount of homogeneity. And both believed that collegiate democracy

---

could be achieved through some form of compulsory residence, be it Harvard's Freshman Halls or Wilson's quadrangles. Finally, both were critical of the impact of wealth upon their respective universities. While Wilson regretted the dependency of Princeton upon the subscribers to the Committee of Fifty Fund and attacked the club system, Lowell broke up the preparatory school cliques through the Freshman Halls and then destroyed Harvard's "Gold Coast" by the House Plan.

But in three important respects, Wilson differed from Lowell. First, Wilson evaluated students according to their individual attainments, whereas Lowell considered them as members of a group, stamped as in the case of Jewish students with a particular group identity. And the Princetonian also contended that membership in a college community, just as citizenship in the United States, carried with it the rights of equal treatment and full participation. In contrast, Lowell seemed to believe that some students were more equal than others. A quota, for example, denied Jews equal treatment and so singled them out that full participation in the college community was often impossible. Of course, both Wilson and Lowell considered blacks to be second-class citizens and continued the policies of previous administrations in regard to the admission of black students.

Secondly, Wilson did not favor quotas— they were socially exclusive— any more than he did tariffs— they created special privileges. In 1921, he vetoed an act
establishing an immigration quota. Thirdly, he believed that the mind, which he called "a radical democrat," was the ultimate object of a college education. Although Lowell's defense of academic freedom during World War I should not be forgotten, Wilson became the democratic idealist, whose interest in a political career led him to assume both radical and popular positions. Circumstantial evidence thus suggests that Wilson would not have proposed a quota on Jewish students had he been in A. Lawrence Lowell's position in 1922-1923.

Princeton During the 1920's

Wilson's successor at Princeton, John Grier Hibben, was a different kind of man. Chosen in January, 1912, after several inconclusive meetings, Hibben was regarded as the candidate of the anti-Wilson Trustees. Subsequently, two pro-Wilson Trustees resigned from the Board, and Wilson declined to attend his former friend's inauguration. At the latter event only one speaker, President Lowell of Harvard, mentioned Wilson's administration by praising the Preceptorial System. According to Henry W. Bragdon, "the official policy of silence continued for a generation." Others with longtime Princeton affiliation say that the two factions remained bitter and socially divided for decades. In such an atmosphere, it was unlikely that anyone would discuss publicly either the Quad Plan or Wilson's ideals of social
democracy. 

Yet both Bragdon and Ray Stannard Baker complimented Hibben's work of conciliation among the Faculty. Hibben was, wrote Baker.

the type of man, the conciliator, the just and self-effacing administrator, who was needed to hold the institution steady until it could fully assimilate the new ideas. He has been a devoted promoter of certain of the great essentials of Wilson's programme and has made two of Wilson's strong supporters, Eisenhart, dean of the faculty, and Gauss, dean of the college.

Dean Pine, a Wilson stalwart, later commented that Hibben had been a "singularly happy choice." At the very beginning, he had pleased the Faculty by giving to it the power of appointing committees. Not only did Hibben win over Wilson's supporters, but said Bragdon, he also helped bring the latter's reforms to "full fruition." The Preceptorial System was improved by having full professors teach in it.

In 1925, independent study for juniors and seniors replaced one course under the "four-course plan," which also required comprehensive examinations in the student's major field.

The Graduate College, cause of so much controversy, was built on the golf links, about one mile from the center of campus; it was ceremoniously opened in October, 1913. Although a statue of Andrew F. West sits in brooding judgment in its courtyard, the Dean lost his bid to make the School largely self-governing within the University. The bylaws written in

41Bragdon, Wilson, pp. 405-406.
1913 placed the Graduate School administratively under the president and under the Trustees's and Faculty committees. The problem of the Upper Class clubs, however, continued to plague succeeding administrations. In 1917, for example, President Hibben attacked "the flagrant abuses of the club system in terms almost as scathing as any that Wilson ever applied." Seven years later, he appointed a committee to investigate the club system. According to its report, which appeared in the Princeton Alumni Weekly of May 21, 1924, undergraduates generally considered the system of electing club members to be "intolerable." The Senior Class president, athletic team captains and managers, The Princetonians's chairman as well as club presidents petitioned Hibben to end the procedure of club elections, known as "bicker week." And the petition continued:

Our life here should and must be one complete whole, incapable of segregation into separate compartments. At the present time it is evident that the social life suffers by separation from the intellectual life, and clearly the intellectual life suffers from a lack of spontaneous and whole-hearted recognition of its worth in our clubs....

The present exaggerated emphasis upon false values and standards and the consequent divorce of our social

---

42 Baker, Wilson, Princeton, II, 356. Luther Pfahler Eisenhart, professor of Mathematics, was Dean of the Faculty, 1925-1933. Christian Frederick Gauss, professor of Modern Languages, was Dean of the College, 1925-1945. Dr. Luther P. Eisenhart, "The First Year of the New Plan of Upperclass Study," PAW, XXIV (June 13, 1924), 794-795. Bragdon, Wilson, pp. 406-408.
from our academic life threatens, as we have already pointed out, our whole purpose and direction as an educational institution.

Here was an echo of Woodrow Wilson. But no effective reform resulted, because neither the administration, the students nor the alumni were really committed to finding alternatives until the late 1950's. In 1955, President Harold W. Dodds and the Trustees agreed to build a house for the non-clubmen. In addition to providing meals and other services at reasonable cost, Wilcox Hall had its own library. Approximately 600 upperclassmen now reside in adjacent dormitories. This "quadrangle" is managed by an undergraduate organization, appropriately named the Woodrow Wilson Society. Of course, Wilson had felt that a quadrangle for the unclubbed alone did not solve the evils of the club system. In 1967, a Faculty subcommittee proposed that residential "quadrangles" or "colleges" be established to unify undergraduate intellectual and social life. But Princeton has not as yet followed Harvard and Yale in developing either a House Plan or residential colleges.43

During Hibben's administration, 1912-1932, the clubs dominated undergraduate life and even influenced admission

policy by rigidly excluding Jews as V. L. Collines had urged in 1922. Since this did not sufficiently deter Jewish applicants, a quota was introduced, probably in 1924. Although not necessarily the instigator of this Jewish quota, Hibben seemed to participate willingly enough in its application. While lunching with the Hibbens "sometime between 1930 and 1932," Robert M. Hutchins, then president of the University of Chicago, inquired about the enrollment of both black and Jewish students at Princeton. Hibben said that there were no black students, because "'they just don't seem to want to come.'" But he declared that about two hundred Jewish students were enrolled. When Hutchins, obviously doubting the accuracy of this figure, asked about the number of Jewish students the previous year, Hibben replied:

'About two hundred.' I asked how many there were the year before that. He said, 'About two hundred.' I said that was very odd and asked how it happened. He said he didn't know; it just happened. Mrs. Hibben was outraged and said, 'Jack Hibben, I don't see how you can sit there and lie to this young man. You know very well that you and Dean Eisenhart get together every year and fix the quota.'

Although Hutchins did not comment upon either Hibben's gross exaggeration of the number of Jewish students at Princeton or upon Mrs. Hibben's assertion that there was a Jewish quota, his report of the discussion is substantial evidence that Princeton did indeed limit drastically the number of Jews admitted.  

\[44\]

\[44\] Robert M. Hutchins to Steven Buenning, December 17, 1970, quoted in Steven L. Buenning, "John Grier Hibben: A
Very little additional evidence exists, however, because Hibben justified Ray Stannard Baker's description of himself as a "self-effacing administrator" by destroying most of his presidential papers. A story is told in Princeton that toward the end of his presidency, he and Mrs. Hibben spent a number of evenings burning these papers. Fortunately, Hibben, having found the administrative duties of his office too demanding, appointed Howard Alexander Smith '01, Executive Secretary of the University in the autumn of 1920. Because of alumni dissatisfaction, Smith had devoted two months in the spring of 1919 to consultations with the Princeton administration, including Hibben, the Faculty, and the Trustees. He concluded that an uninspired administration had led to alumni apathy. Hibben responded by appointing Smith chairman of a committee which would examine over the next year the organization and functioning of the University.  

First of all, Smith believed that Princeton should have a more effective endowment campaign, one which would

---

Biographical Study (1919-1932)" (unpublished senior thesis in history, Princeton University, 1971), pp. 60-61. Permission to quote from this letter was granted to Marcia G. Synnott by Robert M. Hutchins, April 12, 1971.

de-emphasize the influence of a small number of large donors. Rather he would solicit the rank-and-file of the alumni. To this end, Smith brought about the unification of all alumni groups in a new National Association of Princeton Alumni. And in June, 1920, his committee reported that the University needed to modernize its administrative organization and fiscal system. One of the proposed changes concerned the creation of the office of Executive Secretary. In his first three years in this position, Smith was able to guide through and effect several of his recommendations.

During six of his seven years as Executive Secretary, Smith was highly successful in his numerous duties. Not only did he assist Hibben, but he also served as an ex officio member of every Trustees' committee and attended Faculty meetings. He belonged to the Budget Committee, the Interclub Committee, and to various special committees. And he played an instrumental role with Dean Luther P. Eisenhart in developing curricular changes, especially the "four-course plan." Smith might have become President Hibben's successor had he not become involved in the controversy over the influence of the evangelical Buchman movement on the activities of the Philadelphian Society.

\[^{46}^\text{Ibid.}\]

\[^{47}^\text{Ibid. pp. 19-20.}\]
While President Hibben and most Princetonians were either indifferent or hostile to the Reverend Frank M. D. Buchman and his followers, Smith felt that Buchmanism had been misunderstood and that the abuses stemming from its insistence upon public confession of sin exaggerated unfairly. Believing that Princeton should encourage and teach Christianity, Smith was unhappy about the degree of religious indifference among undergraduates. Due to student and administration opposition, most of the leadership of the Philadelphian Society resigned in February, 1920—Ray Foote Purdy, General Secretary, five Associate Secretaries, and more than half of the Undergraduate Cabinet. Several months later Smith resigned his office as Executive Secretary. That October, he underwent a conversion experience, following conversations with Buchman and his fellow workers in England. Although Smith was appointed to a lecturership on international relations at Princeton a year later, he felt so unwelcome that he resigned in 1930. He did not find a new calling for some years until he entered New Jersey politics. 48

Special Committee on Limitation of Enrollment, 1921-1922

One of the special committees on which H. Alexander Smith served during his years as Executive Secretary was

48 Ibid., pp. 20-28 (see supra, pp. 77-79, n. 23).
asked to report on the desirability of limiting Princeton's undergraduate enrollment and to propose a new admission procedure. Although discussions and actions at other campuses—notably Columbia, Dartmouth, and Stanford—had sparked Princeton's own concerns, Woodrow Wilson had privately anticipated that Princeton might have to limit its enrollment someday. Undoubtedly many Princetonians shared his views.

"it of course," he wrote in December, 1904, gave us a little concern to see the University growing into so numerous a community and it is agreed by some of us that it might be wise before very long to limit the number to be admitted to (say) 2000 undergraduates, in order that we might provide in the best possible way for them and at the same time guard against impairing the homogeneity of the place and preserve for it the democratic character which has always been its chief charm.

At that time, however, Princeton was still a homogeneous, and therefore by Wilson's definition, a democratic community. Although he never entirely relinquished this nostalgic vision of Princeton as he knew it during the 1870's, his concept of democracy changed radically between 1904 and 1910. But when his successors came to consider the limitation of numbers, they were more interested in fostering homogeneity than democracy.

Like most American colleges, Princeton's enrollment had increased since 1900, although with some fluctuations. Exclusive of graduate students, there were 1161 undergraduates in 1900-1901; 1303, in 1910-1911; 1711, in 1919-1920;

---

\[49\] Woodrow Wilson to Zephaniah Charles Folt, December 6, 1904, WC, NJP.
1814, in 1920-1921; and 2227, in 1929-1930. But as of December, 1920, Princeton could accommodate only between 1275 and 1350 students in its present dormitories and another 400 when the new dormitories were built. Its dining halls could feed about 1200 students. For reasons of space rather than race, Princeton decided to limit its enrollment, although the latter subject was discussed in order to prevent a future "problem." Following a year’s consideration, the Board of Trustees voted that "the number of undergraduates that can be adequately accommodated and properly taught is approximately 2000." Because more careful selection among candidates would be necessary, President Hibben had appointed at a University Faculty meeting on January 17, 1921, a "Special Committee to consider and report a method to be pursued in limitation of the number of undergraduates." The Committee was under the chairmanship of Howard McClenahan, Dean of the College (1912-1925) and its other members included Varnum Lansing Collins, Secretary of the University; Professor Christian F. Gauss; Fred LeRoy Hutson, Registrar; and H. Alexander Smith. 50

---

50 Catalogues of Princeton University, 1900-01, 1910-11; 1919-20; 1920-21; and 1922-23 (published by the University, Princeton, New Jersey). George C. Wintringer, Controller, memorandum to H. Alexander Smith, December 6th, 1920; and V. Lansing Collins, Office of the Clerk of the Faculty to H. Alexander Smith, January 12, 1921, HAMP, 1920-27, Box 38, folder Limitation of Students, Com. 1921-22, Minutes of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees, January 12, 1922, Minutes of the Trustees of Princeton University, 27 (Oct.-June 1921-22), 6-8, PUA. H. Alexander Smith, "The Limitation of Enrollment at Princeton," The Princeton
The Committee inquired into and then considered the methods employed in other colleges, for example, Dartmouth's "Selective Process For Admission," and also the Rhodes's Scholarship Requirements of "Character," "Scholarship," "Athletics," and "Leadership." Smith was eager to consider any plan that embodied methods of selection "outside of the orthodox examination," such as psychological testing, personal interview, alumni preference, geographical distribution, school activities, and "character." Among some Faculty and Trustees there was considerable interest in experimenting with the psychological tests used by the Army during World War I before making them a part of the admission process. Both Howard C. Warren '89, professor of psychology, and Dr. Carl C. Brigham '12, believed it would be valuable to correlate the results of these tests with course grades in subsequent years. And former Wilson supporter, Dr. M. W. Jacobus, chairman of the Trustees's Committee on Curriculum, wrote Smith that

We will have to come to some principle of selective enrolment if we limit our numbers; we will doubtless go through some experimenting before we settle down as to the principle of selection; while this experimenting is going on, we might be trying out the psychological process within our own classes and so be in better condition to decide as to the value in connection with entrance requirements....If Princeton goes at this quietly and thoroughly, she may work out something of real value to education.

Pictorial, X (March 30, 1922), 268-269.
Of course, the term "mental" or "psychological" test was applied during the 1920's to several different kinds of examinations: the Army Alpha Test; the Scholastic Aptitude Test of the College Entrance Examination Board—verbal section (1926) and mathematical section (1930); and various "predictive" tests used to place freshmen in appropriate course levels as well estimating their college achievement.

In June, 1922, the Princeton Board of Trustees authorized the giving of psychological tests to all students who entered that autumn.51

Princeton required SATs as of 1926 and also developed an index (based on psychological test score, College Board and school averages, and age) to predict a student's probable academic success in College. Each student's

51 "Dartmouth College The Selective Process For Admission, 1921-1922," a small brochure; H. Alexander Smith to Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, Stanford University, January 28th, 1921; Wilbur to Smith, February 9, 1921, enclosing memorandum of "Proposed Revision of Entrance Requirements recommended by the Committee on Admission and Advanced Standing," dated January 20th, 1921; M. W. Jacobus to H. Alexander Smith, January 22, 1921; Howard C. Warren to Smith, January 26, 1921; Smith to Dr. M. W. Jacobus, February 3rd, 1921; to H. C. Warren, February 3rd 1921; to Dean Howard McClenahan, February 4th, 1921; and to Edward A. Woods, February 5th, 1921; and Woods to Smith, February 7, 1921; HASP, 1920-1927, Box 38, folder Limitation of Students Com. 1921-22. On October 3, 1921, the Faculty voted in favor of Dean McClenahan's motion to authorize President Hibben "to appoint a committee to study the results of psychological tests and the feasibility of instituting such tests in the University" (Princeton University, Meeting of the Faculty, October 3, 1921, Minutes of Faculty (24 September 1914 to 8 April 1929), p. 315 (PUA); and Meeting of the Board of Trustees, October 26, 1922, Minutes of the Trustees, XXI (Oct.-June 1922-23)).
index was then converted into a number from 1.00 to 7.00, corresponding to an academic group on Princeton's making scale, in order to predict mathematically the academic or "bogie" group which he should attain. Those whose achievement fell below their "bogie" could be identified earlier and hopefully saved from academic mediocrity, if not from failure.\textsuperscript{52}

By early March, the Special Committee on Limitation of Enrollment had drafted a report, and Dean McClenahan obtained Faculty approval for its printing and distribution to members of that body. But this report was to undergo two revisions because of Faculty and Trustee opposition. The first and second versions, presented to the University Faculty on March 14 and March 21, 1921, recommended adoption of very specific admission qualifications. After proposing that the number of future Freshmen not exceed 600, the Committee outlined the admission procedure: every applicant was to "submit evidence of good character," in the form of a letter of recommendation from his principal, president, dean, and later a member of the Committee on Admissions, thought that "the greatest usefulness of psychological tests" would be "in the guidance of men in college—guidance in their choice of electives, in the academic load they can carry, in the amount of time they can afford to devote to outside activities," in short, in their whole college career (Brigham, "Psychological Tests at Princeton," \textit{PAW}, XXIV (November 28, 1923), 185-187).

\textsuperscript{52}Princeton President's Report, for Year ending July 31, 1925, pp. 43-46. Carl C. Brigham, professor of Psychology and later a member of the Committee on Admissions, thought that "the greatest usefulness of psychological tests" would be "in the guidance of men in college—guidance in their choice of electives, in the academic load they can carry, in the amount of time they can afford to devote to outside activities," in short, in their whole college career (Brigham, "Psychological Tests at Princeton," \textit{PAW}, XXIV (November 28, 1923), 185-187).
or private tutor, and supplementary letters, preferably from Princeton alumni. Every applicant, except transfers, also had to pass the entrance examinations. 

Applicants would then be divided into four categories. The first three would be "assured" admission: those passing "all examinations with an average of at least 80 per cent"; sons of alumni and University officers passing the examinations; and qualified applicants nominated for scholarships. But applicants who were neither high scholarship men nor with Princeton connections, had to submit another form answered by the school principal showing: "Mental Qualifications"; "Manhood Qualifications"--"sense of honor, fearlessness"; "Leadership Qualifications," demonstrated by "personality, popularity and place held among applicant's fellows"; "Physical Qualifications," demonstrated by athletic achievements, including "records established; feats performed; ideas on sportsmanship." Then there were "Other Qualifications," such as artistic, literary, and musical talents, as "executive" ability in extra-curricular activities, as "Home environment and companions," and as

53 Princeton University, Meetings of the Faculty, March 7 and March 14, Special Meeting, 1921, Minutes of Faculty (24 September 1914 to 8 April 1929), 293. "Report of the Special Committee on Limitation of Enrollment, Presented to the University Faculty, Monday, March 14, 1921" (See also Subject File Admission, Box I, PUA, for a copy of the report; and for various drafts of report, see HASP, 1920-1927, Box 38, folder Limitation of Students Com. 1921-22).
"Religious belief and attitude toward religious activities."
The Committee on Admissions would subdivide these applicants even further. Alumni Association districts would each be given "a quota of vacancies," with "special consideration" accorded to New Jersey applicants, at least until the June entrance examinations. The Committee on Admissions would also exercise its discretion by giving "preference" to four other groups: applicants with "satisfactory" records, "in spite of less favorable opportunity for preparation"—a small sop to high school boys; those prepared in Greek for the A.B. degree and Latin for the B.S.; "applicants who, in the opinion of the Committee, are particularly qualified for admission"; and those who applied early. In order to carry out this rather complicated selective process, the Special Committee recommended that a new Committee on Admissions—three Faculty, one Trustee, and the Registrar—be appointed by President Hibben to replace the existing Entrance Committee, which was a Faculty standing committee.54

Two proposed basic changes in admissions procedure aroused Faculty opposition. By one, the Faculty would no longer be the almost exclusive arbiter as to who would be admitted; in time special personnel, either non-teaching or only part-time Faculty, would assume virtually the entire work of admissions. Naturally, the Princeton Faculty viewed

54 "Report of the Special Committee on Limitation of Enrollment," March 14, 1921.
a Committee appointed by the President in place of one of its standing committees as a challenge to its authority. In the other change, the Special Committee recommended adoption of a large number of new admission "qualifications." Only one relatively small group of students—those averaging 80 per cent or higher on entrance examinations—would be admitted on the basis of academic achievement alone. And those nominated for scholarships would also have to show some academic ability. But a majority of a class conceivably could be admitted on the basis of either Princeton connections or certain manly qualities attributed by Anglo-Saxons to those of the same stock. As many of the Faculty pointed out, such qualities had very little to do with the real purposes of a University: the education and enlightenment of the mind.55

The Faculty did not support Dean McClenahan's motion that the report be adopted. Professor George McLean Harper, former Wilson loyalist, moved instead that the part of the report dealing with "qualifications" be stricken, undoubtedly because of its subjective, non-academic emphasis. Then Gordon H. Gerould, professor of English and a former Wilson Preceptor moved that the Committee re-frame the statement on "qualifications." It was adopted. Approving another of Gerould's motions, the Faculty also sent back "for restatement" the paragraph reserving "a limited number of vacancies."

55 Ibid.
for those whom the Committee on Admission considered "particularly qualified." Finally, Faculty sentiment was clearly expressed by its affirmative vote on the motion of William Starr Myers, professor of Political Science and another of Wilson's Preceptors: "that it be the sense of the Faculty that primary consideration be placed upon scholarship and that other considerations be regarded as secondary." 56

A week later, on March 21, the Special Committee presented an Amended Report, which placed greater emphasis on entrance examination grades. For example, the category of "high stand applicants" was broadened to include those averaging "at least 75 per cent" on the examinations. And in selecting those for "General Admission" as opposed to "Assured Admission," examination results would first be considered. But "all applicants" had to submit blanks, now only signed by principal, president, or dean, with data on their various qualifications. These were listed briefly in the report, with the more explicit "race and nationality" substituted for "religious belief." As for those who were to be admitted upon the discretionary authority of the Committee on Admissions, they were now described as "exceptional applicants who,...,should be admitted even if they have not fully satisfied the regular entrance requirements." Although there was still some dissatisfaction about detailed

56 Special Faculty Meeting, March 14, 1921, p. 293.
statements on qualifications, the Faculty was primarily concerned about the proposed method of appointing the Committee on Admissions as well as its composition. Consequently, on March 21, the Faculty voted in favor of Dean Fine's motion "that the proposed Committee on Admissions be a Committee of the Faculty to include the Registrar and to be appointed in the usual way." 

Having received two setbacks, the Special Committee decided to spend the summer and autumn reconsidering its basic objectives. H. Alexander Smith consulted extensively with Walter E. Hope '01, a New York lawyer, who had been elected an Alumni Trustee in 1919. Undoubtedly, Hope, expressed the views of the vast majority of Princeton alumni in commenting on another draft of the report, which Smith sent him in July. He did "not agree that anyone should be admitted solely on the basis of his passing mark on examinations, irrespective of other qualifications." While "examinations should be of primary importance," Hope felt that Princeton should educate "men of broader qualifications," not just students who scored high marks. He also

---

57 Princeton University, Meeting of the Faculty, March 21, 1921, Minutes of Faculty, p. 295, and "Amended Report of the Special Committee on Limitation of Enrollment, Presented to the University Faculty, Monday, March 21, 1921" (For another copy of this report, see Subject File, folder Enrollment, PUA, and for various drafts of report, see HASP, 1920-1297, Box 38, folder Limitation of Students Com. 1921-22).
advised Smith that certain statements should not be published, but left rather "in the nature of informal regulations for the guidance of the Committee on Admissions." The provision referring to alumni sons, for example, "might not make a favorable impression on outsiders," and alumni could be adequately informed through their weekly magazine. And "requirements" in regard to "'race and nationality', if published, might stir something up, whereas the blanks, when obtained," would "speak for themselves." In a final word of advice, Hope suggested that the report state a few general principles, leaving enough "elasticity" for the Committee on Admissions to exercise its own judgment in working out the details. This view ultimately prevailed.\(^58\)

Smith sent Hope's letter to "Irish" McClenahan, with the observation that the Trustees would "all see the importance of some evidence besides the mere passing of examinations" and would "also favor a large discretion in the Committee." Since this could lead to a possible confrontation between Faculty and Trustees, Smith sought to develop an acceptable "practical diplomatic formula," which would "prevent the outbreak of any hostilities."\(^59\)

\(^{58}\) Walter E. Hope to H. Alexander Smith, July 5th, 1921, HASP, 1920-1927, Box 38, folder Limitation of Students Com. 1921-22. Aware of developments at Harvard and Yale, Hope had sent Smith information on their new admission requirements (See Hope to Smith, Feb. 28th and Smith to Hope, March 1st, 1921, folder Limitation of Students).

\(^{59}\) H. Alexander Smith to Dean McClenahan, July 17/21,
In October, Smith pursued this matter in letters and memoranda to "Wilkie" Collins and to Dean McClenahan. First, the Special Committee should meet to revise the last draft of the report which it had prepared the previous spring, because without "certain fundamental changes in the whole idea," it would be unacceptable to the Trustees. Moreover, Smith was "perfectly certain that the extreme view of the Faculty would be turned down by the Trustees without much comment," and "also reasonably certain that an Admissions Committee appointed solely by the Faculty would not be acceptable to the Trustees." On the other hand, Professor Gauss thought "there might be a row if we tried to put across the program for the appointment of the committee by the President," without first preparing "a foundation for this procedure." Gauss then proposed that Dr. Jacobus be asked to arrange a meeting of the Trustees's Curriculum Committee with a Faculty Conference Committee to discuss "the whole program." And as for the report, Gauss agreed with the others that it "should emphasize a committee with broad powers."  

60 Memorandum for Mr. Collins from H. Alexander Smith, October 19th, 1921; Smith to Secretary V. L. Collins, October 25th, 1921; Memorandum for Dean McClanahan from H. Alexander Smith, October 19th, 1921; and Smith to Dean H. McClanahan, October 31st, 1921, HASP, 1920-1927, Box 38, folder Limitation of Students Com. 1921-22. See also Dean of the College, Old Files, Box II, folder H. Alexander Smith.
Smith worked hard to develop a consensus among the five members of the Special Committee. On November 29, 1921, for example, he wrote Walter E. Hope that he was "endeavoring to get the other members of the Dean's Committee to agree to the principle of a short report, emphasizing a broad authority in the committee, which" would "be held responsible to Trustees and Faculty." The chairman of the Committee on Admissions should be a presidential appointee, because he would represent the Faculty, Trustees, and Alumni. Moreover, he should be a full-time administrative officer. The Special Committee thus aimed to "present a unanimous front to both Faculty and Trustees," before meeting with the Curriculum Committee. And apparently the Conference Committee meeting called by Dr. Jacobus was able to resolve differences between Faculty and Trustees.61

As a result, the University Faculty adopted the "Report of the Special Committee on Limitation of Undergraduate Enrolment" at a special meeting on January 9, 1922.

61 H. Alexander Smith to Walter E. Hope, November 29th, 1921; Smith to McClenahan, October 31st, 1921; Smith to Dr. M. W. Jacobus, October 31, 1921 and Nov. 8, 1921; Jacobus to Smith, October 31, 1921; Memorandum for Dean McClenahan from H. Alexander Smith, Nov. 23, 1921, HASP, 1920-1927, Box 38, folder Limitation of Students Com. 1921-22. On November 4, the alumni were given an opportunity to express their feelings on limitation of undergraduate enrollment at an open meeting of the Graduate Council. Apparently, no great alumni opposition to the proposed limitation developed, probably because sufficient reassurances were given (See Notice from V. Lansing Collins, Secretary, October 21, 1921. Limitation of Students Com.).
Three days later, the Board of Trustees adopted this report, resolved that undergraduate enrollment be limited to 2000, and empowered the President to appoint a Director of Admissions whose Committee would report every year to the Trustees's Curriculum Committee. In its final form, the report confined itself to setting forth only "a general plan for the administration of admission." The director of Admissions would "devote his entire time to the administration of undergraduate admission to the University," and would be an ex-officio Faculty member. The Faculty would appoint four of its members to serve on the Committee on Admissions, which would be given virtually a free hand for two years to admit applicants under the existing entrance requirements, subject to an annual report to the Faculty. The report did state that "in determining admission to the University the primary considerations shall be scholarship and character." But instead of the extensive qualifications proposed in its first report, the Special Committee listed just two requirements: taking the College Board Entrance Examinations and submitting "certificates of good character and statements of school and personal record." And only two categories of applicants—qualified scholarship candidates and those with records showing "unusual promise, seriousness of purpose, or achievement under difficulty"—were given explicit preference. From the point of view of avoiding unfavorable reactions, this report was indeed wiser than the previous
Judging from editorials in the *Daily Princetonian*, undergraduates generally approved of the Trustees' resolution to limit enrollment. On January 26, 1922, the editorial argued that admission based on "the high standards of scholarship, character, and ability" would not be undemocratic. The next day's editorial warmly approved the decision to entrust the Committee on Admissions and its Director with implementation of the new policy. The most satisfactory principle of limitation, the editorial argued, was "a broad one," which would consider such vital factors as character, personality, physical ability, public spirit, and all that goes to make up leadership of the highest type. It is our ambition for Princeton that it shall develop, not mere scholars, but leaders—men sound of body, mind, and spirit: men who have demonstrated their capacity for leadership through an active interest in the affairs of college.

Selection based solely on academic standing, however, would be "unfair," because it benefited those educated at the better preparatory school or those products of cram courses.

---

62 Princeton University, Special Meeting of the Faculty, January 9, 1922, Minutes of Faculty, p. 319; and Meeting of the Board of Trustees, January 12, 1922, Minutes of the Trustees, XX (Oct.-June 1921-22), 6-8 (For another copy of the "Report of the Special Committee on Limitation of Undergraduate Enrolment," see Subject File Admission, Box I, PUA. The "Report of the Dean of the Graduate School to the Trustees' Committee on the Graduate School, June 16, 1922" (Meeting of the Board of Trustees, June 19-20, 1922, Minutes of the Trustees, XX) included a "Report on Limiting Graduate Enrolment." The Graduate School could provide instruction for 200 students, but rooms for only 150. Therefore, as of 1922-23, it decided to limit full-time graduate students to 200, not including "incidental" graduate students from Princeton Theological Seminary.
Then the Princetonian proposed again a plan it had suggested the previous May for "a double system of examinations." In addition to the regular entrance examinations, there should be established "a system of examination by boards of alumni in various alumni centers, under the direction of a responsible Faculty committee on admission." From this would come two groups of applicants. One would consist of those achieving above 80 to 85 on the entrance examinations, while the other, the larger of the two, would be composed of alumni and faculty sons who scored between the 80-85 range and the passing grade. Those in the first group would be admitted on the basis of their examination grade, "providing, of course, they were of good moral character, and were not in any way obviously undesirable." Those in the second group, however, would subsequently be examined by local alumni boards "as to personality, leadership, public spirit, and similar personal qualities." Moreover, these applicants would be asked to submit to the alumni boards a personality evaluation by their headmaster and teachers. The alumni boards would also look into the applicant's athletic and extracurricular school activities and hold a personal interview. Such alumni activity would be an extension of the already existing regional alumni boards, which annually appointed the Regional Scholars. The alumni, of course, made only recommendations; the Director of Admissions would make the final selections. 63

63 Editorials, "Why More Than Two Thousand?", "How
The Princetonian's advocacy of preferential treatment for alumni sons was not without its critics. A person signing himself, T. McCamant 1922, asked whether the campus newspaper felt that "sons of Princeton men are ipso facto men of superior merit?" Such an "air of conscious superiority" was "revolting." The young man, who was not an alumni son, asked if this were not "a sop to the alumni," whose continued financial generosity to the University might well be dependent upon the admission of their sons. The Princetonian, in reply, accused the letter writer of being "unsympathetic" and of placing "an entirely false interpretation upon the motives" underlying the proposal. Alumni sons who pass entrance examinations deserved preference because

An university lives by the support of its alumni body. This support is not financial as much as it is moral. The finest Princeton spirit will animate those whose families have been identified with Princeton for generations: who are linked to their Alma Mater by bonds of tradition and memory. The landmarks of the campus acquire a certain sanctity when they are associated with fond family memories.

For the typical alumnus, his Princeton years were among the happiest of his life. His undergraduate activities and financial donations since graduation contributed to the University's reputation and vigor. It was not "the son of a Princeton man who has a claim on Princeton, it is his

Although the weight of undergraduate opinion at Princeton, as at the other Eastern colleges, was in favor of some form of selective admissions, the subject was debated for some time, formally as well as informally. In March, 1924, the topic of the Triangular Debate among Princeton, Harvard, and Yale was, "'Resolved, That Limitation of enrollment in American colleges and universities by means other than raising the competitive scholastic standards for entrance is justifiable.'" Princeton's negative team lost to Yale at Princeton, but its affirmative team defeated Harvard at Cambridge. Princeton won by arguing that "scholastic limitation alone discriminates against the West and South, and against those unable to afford expensive secondary school training." They also maintained that "a limitation which retained men with personality, leadership, character, and intellect" was "the only fair basis." In contrast, Harvard argued against the resolution on two grounds: first, that character means the application, industry, and effort which manifest themselves in high scholastic attainments. The second point urged the stressing of high scholastic attainment as the only effective reaction to the present over-emphasis laid upon extra-curriculum activities.

The debates were not decided, however, on the merits of each team's argument. Under the new rules of debate the delivery and speaking of each member was weighted more heavily—three-fourths, "while the way in which the teams cooperated in building up substantial brief's scored but one-fourth." Since all three teams lost to their visitors, the year's Triangular Debate ended in a three-way tie.65

"Selective Admission"

In October, 1922, President Hibben appointed Professor Radcliffe Heermance, Director of Admissions and Four Faculty Members to serve on the Committee: Professor Varnum Lansing Collins, Secretary of the University (a former Wilson Preceptor in Modern Languages); Fred LeRoy Hutson, Registrar (a former Wilson Preceptor in Classics); Professor Luther P. Eisenhart (a former Wilson Preceptor in Mathematics); and Professor Charles W. Kennedy (appointed an instructor of English by Wilson). Although Princeton followed Harvard and Yale in appointing a full-time Director of Admissions, it avoided virtually all discussion of thorny admissions questions among Faculty and alumni by granting so much discretionary authority to the new Committee. And it predated Harvard and Yale in limiting its total undergraduate enrollment and the size of the Freshman Class. A

65 Ibid., February 4, 1922, p. 3; March 22, 1924, p. 1; and March 24, 1924, pp. 1, 5.
limitation of numbers, of course, was the essential first step in developing Princeton's "Selective Admission." Unfortunately, some members of the Committee on Admissions, including its Director, were hardly impartial in selecting applicants. In this regard they probably were reflecting the sentiments of the vast majority of Princeton alumni as well as many in the Hibben administration. 66

Princeton's methods of exclusion were well known at other colleges. Yale's Admissions Director, Robert N. Corwin, observed:

The restriction at Princeton is enforced in two ways, or by two agencies,—first and perhaps chiefly, by undergraduate sentiment, which refuses social honors to Jews, and secondly, by a rigid selection based upon a personal inspection of all doubtful candidates. This fall more than two hundred and fifty such candidates appeared in person before the Committee on Admission. The Chairman of this Committee concedes that personal impression gained in this personal interview is frequently the deciding factor.

The first line of defense against any ethnic invasion of Princeton were the Upper Class Clubs, whose policy of social segregation was counted on to discourage Jewish applicants. The second line—used against those bold enough to apply was the "Selective Admission," aided and abetted by vigilant alumni. The possibility of "unchosen experiences" was thus reduced to a minimum. 67

66 Trustees' Meeting, October 26, 1922.

67 "Limitation of Numbers," Freshman Office Records, Com. on Limitation of Numbers 1922, YUA.
During the first year of its operation, 1922-1923, the Committee on Admissions developed its basic procedures, which would last virtually unchanged until 1932, when economic conditions compelled Princeton to admit 85 per cent of the applicants. Although Director Heermance conferred extensively with admissions officers elsewhere during the summer and autumn of 1922—paying particular attention to methods employed at Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, and Yale—he "found that none of the systems thus outlined would fit the Princeton situation." Hence the Committee had to start "de novo," Heermance wrote President Lowell, in December, 1923, "to consider the problem in its relation to Princeton." Heermance had been asked by President Hibben to write Lowell, who was undoubtedly interested—in view of developments at Harvard—to learn about methods used elsewhere to select students for a limited enrollment. First of all, Heermance told Lowell, upon recommendation of the Committee, the Princeton Faculty voted that freshmen be admitted only on the basis of examinations and not by transfer. In other words, this "back-door method of admission" was closed. Probably most of those seeking admission by transfer, he observed, came from the poorer high schools. At any rate, of the 728 transfers applying for admission to Princeton in September, 1923, 601 were discouraged by the stated requirements from pursuing the matter further; of the 127 re-applying, only 39 were accepted. Those who sought to transfer to one of
the upperclasses had to show progressively a higher academic standing. Secondly, three blank forms were developed to aid in the selection of a class of about 600 from the 1200 applicants. Those who filled out an application card were mailed two blanks in January. On Form I, the "Applicant's Information Blank," the candidate supplied vital statistics and three references. Data on the candidate's scholastic and extra-curricular work was supplied by Form II, "Principal's Report on Applicant Blank." Upon receipt of Form I, the Committee on Admissions sent Form III, "Report on Applicant" to the three persons who were to write recommendations. The Committee found that the forms, especially the first two, provided a better overall view of candidates than the army rating system. 68

68Princeton University, Minutes of the Meetings of the Committee on Admission, Meetings of January 15th and 22nd, 1923 (Office of the Committee on Admission). Radcliffe Heermance invited Professor Adam Le Roy Jones, Director of Admission at Columbia University and former Princeton Preceptor in Philosophy, "to discuss problems arising out of the system of limitation of numbers." Jones visited Princeton on January 22, 1923, and "explained the regulations governing admission" to Columbia. Both Jones and Princeton's Committee were in favor of urging the CEEB "to conduct psychological examinations" in June, 1923. Jones said that he would try to get support from Dartmouth, the University of Pennsylvania, and MIT. Radcliffe Heermance to A. Lawrence Lowell, 12th December, 1923, enclosing a six-page statement on "Limitation of Enrolment by the Selective Method (An Informal Statement of the procedure used by the Committee on Admission during the year 1923)," ALLP, 1922-1925, #76 Admission, Committee on, September 1922-December 1923. See also Heermance's address, "The Operation of the Plan of Selective Admission," at the Atlanta Meeting of the National Alumni Association, PAW, XXIV (April 9, 1924), 549-551. See also Princeton President's Report for the Year ending December 31, 1923, pp. 16-22.
Thirdly, on the basis of data transcribed from these three forms to a card for each individual, all applicants were sorted into four classes, even before the results of the College Board examinations were known. Classes 1 and 2 were rated, respectively, "very desirable" and "desirable." Since Class 3 was considered "doubtful," the final examination grades would be emphasized. Although applicants in Class 3 still had some chance of gaining admission, those in Class 4 had none. Because the latter were judged "undesirable from the point of view of character," they would "be excluded no matter what the results of the entrance examinations might be." A student with an "undesirable" character could include a convicted felon, a boy expelled from prep school, or, given the attitude of some of the Committee on Admissions, a Jew. Class 4 could simply be used as a large wastebasket. 69

In the fourth stage of the procedure, those with "desirable" characters were subdivided into five new categories, following the June examinations. Applicants who achieved "a weighted average of 70% or above (distinguished scholarship)" in all examinations were considered Class A and assured admission. A weighted average was obtained for Old Plan Examinations by multiplying the applicant's grade

69Heermance to Lowell, 12th December 1923, and "Operation of the Plan of Selective Admission," PAW (April 9, 1924), 550.
on each of them by the units per subject, and then by divid-
ing the total by 15, the units required for admission. A
weighted average for a New Plan candidate was obtained by
multiplying his grade on each of the four examinations by
the units per subject and then by dividing this number by
the total units of the four subjects. Class B applicants—
weighted average of 60 to 69 per cent on all examinations—
would also be admitted unconditionally. These first two
categories were determined on a clear-cut basis. Class C
showed, however, some interesting reasoning. Princeton
would accept men in this class without conditions—who aver-
aged least 70 per cent on the June examinations, even though
they had failed one subject (50 per cent) or two subjects
(55 per cent)—on the grounds that they demonstrated suffi-
cient ability in some subjects and could do freshman work.
Classes A, B, and C thus provided 400 acceptable candidates.
The 800 remaining of the original 1200 applicants were
placed in Class D, because of their failures on the June ex-
aminations. The 200 most promising among them were put on
a preferred list, which meant that they would be admitted
if they did satisfactory work on the September examinations.
Of these 200, 158 gained admission at that time. The remain-
der of the Freshman Class was made up of other Class D's
and 9 men in Class E. The latter were "exceptional cases"
and were "admitted on trial" in the fall. Some of these
men had served in World War I and were much older than their
classmates. Although they would never gain admission in terms of credit units because of poor preparation, the Committee felt they had the motivation to benefit from a Princeton education. Results of the psychological test, taken by all entering freshmen, were used especially in the evaluation of "doubtful cases." Only 26 freshmen received conditions, 9 of whom were in Class E. In contrast, five candidates with the required fifteen credit units on the September examinations were denied admission "because of unsatisfactory character records." 70

Of the 629 members of the Class of 1927, 473 or about 75 per cent attended private schools, mostly in New England and the Middle Atlantic States. Interestingly enough, the proportion of private school students would be even higher for the Depression Classes of 1932-1939, when it ranged between 82 and 86 per cent. Or to put it another way, only 800 students out of 5000 were prepared in public high schools during the same period. To be sure, some Princetonians were concerned that so small a number of public school boys, especially from the Midwest and West, came to the University. For example, Walter E. Hope wrote H. Alexander Smith in February, 1922, that Princeton's admission

terms were "practically a bar to students in many Western High Schools." Then referring to developments at Harvard and Yale, Hope suggested that Princeton "might arrange to offer an alternative to students who had ranked in the higher half or third of their classes at school." In other words, he was proposing some form of admission without examination.  

At the December 13, 1923 meeting of the Committee on Admissions, Director Heermance spoke about Harvard and Yale's more flexible standards in terms of admission examinations and language requirements. They made

distinct concessions toward the high school boy. Yale required only a comprehensive examination in English, and three examinations in senior subjects, in one year subjects, and certified by his school as a new plan candidate. Harvard has gone over to the certification of 1/7 of the class. We have given some thought to the fact that we are getting a very few boys directly from high school.

71Radcliffe Heermance, Office of the Supervisor of Freshmen, "Preliminary Analysis of Freshman Class," September, 1923. Trustees's Papers, PUA. Carl C. Brigham, Secretary, Committee on Admissions, report, "The Quality of the Classes Admitted to Princeton in the Years 1928 to 1935," President's Office, Correspondence of Harold Willis Dodds 1935-1936, folder Admissions--Statistics on, PUA. Walter E. Hope to H. Alexander Smith, February 1, 1922, HASP, 1920-1927, Box 38, folder Limitation of Students Com. 1921-22. In a handwritten letter to Fred LeRoy Hutson, Aug. 17-21 (Dean of the College, Old Files, Box II, folder H. Alexander Smith), Smith expressed his interest in getting high school boys from the West, especially from Denver (he had spent a number of years in Colorado recovering from tuberculosis and practicing law). And in a letter to Fred J. Elliott of Phoenix, September 17, 1927, (HASP, 1920-1927, Box 36, folder Admissions, Director of, Sp. Cases), Smith wrote, in connection with an applicant rejected because of too many failures: "We need the western boys and they need us; and you know how enthusiastic I am about having the western spirit in a conservative eastern institution like this."
By "taking in more and more boys who have had the advantage of an additional year in some preparatory school," there was "danger that Princeton shall become a prep school university rather than a national one." Although Heermance suggested some "combination of both the Harvard and Yale plans," the "crux of the whole matter" was Princeton's course of study which required among other subjects, four years of Latin and three of modern language for the A.B. degree. Harvard required only two years of modern languages. On the other hand, Princeton had no intention of following Harvard and Yale blindly, before giving careful consideration to all facets of the problem. 72

Throughout the 1920's and 1930's, Princeton continued to draw a small percentage of high school students, most of whom came from the East, chiefly from New Jersey and New York, and the rest largely from Ohio, Illinois, and Missouri. In 1936, however, Princeton made a greater effort, under President Dodds, to attract high school boys. Although Princeton's students came from 46 states, more than 60 percent of its present undergraduates resided within 125 miles

72 Princeton University, Minutes of the Meetings of the Committee on Admission, Meeting of December 13th, 1923, Dean Eisenhart referred to the December 9, 1923, article in the New York Times reporting on Corliss Lamont's "Who Runs Harvard and Why," which had been published in the Harvard Advocate. (See supra, p. 102 and n. 43 p. 103). The preparatory school graduates dominated extra-curricular activities, while the high school graduates concentrated on scholarship and debating. At Princeton also, high school graduates were active in Clio and Whig, the debating societies.
of the University. Since 1900, Princeton had lost representation in both the West and the South. At the same time, the number of students from small towns and rural areas was declining in favor of boys from cities, towns, and suburbia. A new policy was needed, explained Ledlie I. Laughlin '12, assistant to Director Heermance, in the Princeton Alumni Weekly. "In an effort to obtain a more truly national representation in the student body," he wrote, and to widen the field from which Princeton selects its candidates for admission, the University has recently decided to admit without examination men of exceptional achievement and promise from certain schools in the West and South, and possibly from certain rural high schools in the East. This is Princeton's official acknowledgment that in those regions there are schools which do not specifically prepare for College Board Examinations, yet have high standards and give the basic training on which a successful Princeton undergraduate career may be laid.

In effect, Princeton adopted "the Harvard idea" thirteen years later.73

Director Heermance had written the Committee on Admission at Harvard in March, 1936, to inquire about the operation of its "highest seventh" plan. In reply, Harvard Admissions made a veiled reference to its "problem" with Jewish applicants:

The plan is open to boys from public high schools in small or large centers in the southern states and states

---

73 Ledlie I. Laughlin '12, "Admission Without Examination," Princeton Alumni Weekly, December 4, 1936, Subject Folder Administration, Entrance Requirements, FUA.
west of the Mississippi as well as to boys from rural communities in any part of the country (except New Jersey, Long Island, and eastern New York!)...if we seem to be getting a preponderance of an undesirable type from any particular locality, we cut out the whole locality. There are times, consequently, when we are not very popular in certain quarters, and there is much wailing and gnashing of teeth, but we stand to our guns.

Princeton was also advised that most students applying under the "highest seventh" plan would seek scholarship aid. In 1935, 174 out of 199 so admitted to Harvard applied for aid; 48 received it. But Harvard was pleased with this experiment, because those admitted under it had done "consistently better work" than the others entering under Plan A or Plan B.74

In September 1937, 29 of the 37 applicants granted "Admission Without Examination" entered the Freshman Class at Princeton. All ranked at least in the top seventh of their high school class. By residence, 9 came from Illinois, 5 from California, and one or two each from Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Oregon, and Washington. Only three came from the South, one each from Alabama, Florida, and Kentucky. Within a decade or so, this experiment began to bear fruit. In 1946, of 606 entering freshmen, 169 or "about 30%" had graduated from high schools.

74 Anne MacDonald, Assistant to the Chairman, Richard M. Gummere, The Committee on Admission, Harvard College, to Radcliffe Heermance, March 7, 1936, President's Office, Correspondence of Harold Willis Dodds, 1935-1936, folder Admissions—Statistics on, PUA (see supra, pp. 452-453 and n. 58).
And the Pacific Coast was represented by 24 students. But at the same time the number of alumni sons—in 1946, Princeton accepted 82 per cent of their applications—had increased. The Class of 1950 had 160 alumni sons, 26 per cent of the total, while the Class of 1931, with the same enrollment, had had only 90 alumni sons, or 16-1/2 per cent of the total. The proportion of alumni sons had risen 10 per cent.

Another constant in undergraduate composition was the presence of a large number of sons of businessmen. Thus in addition to Princeton's own selective process, the pool from which it drew most of its applicants was already selected in terms of educational background and economic status. For example, 248 of the fathers of the Class of 1927 were themselves college men; 70 had attended Princeton, and 55 had graduated. Ten of the eleven occupations represented by 20 or more fathers were concentrated in either business or the more lucrative professions: Business (70); Lawyer (63); Executive (59); None (56); Manufacturer (54); Physician (33); Merchant (31); Real Estate (28); Banker (27);

75"Heermance Reports 29 Freshmen Entered Under New Program," Princetonian, November 6, 1937; "29 Freshmen Admitted Without Examination," November 12, 1937, and "Admission," December 4, 1936, PAW, Subject Folder Admin. Offices, Admissions, PUA. Dean Radcliffe Heermance, "Admission to Princeton (being a Digest of Remarks Delivered by Dean Radcliffe Heermance at the Seventh Annual Dinner in honor of The Class Agents of The Princeton University Fund) at The Princeton Inn, October 4, 1946," Subject Folder Administration, Entrance Requirements, PUA."
and Broker (22). Twenty fathers were Ministers. At the
other end of the scale, the following occupations had token representation: Clerk (3); Farmer (5); Florist (1); Foreman (1); Grocer (3); Laborer (1); Letter Carrier (1); Machinist (1); Milliner (1); Miner (1); and Tanner (1).
Sons of these men rarely could attend a university like Princeton without scholarship aid. Although the families of some boys lived in Princeton or neighboring towns, the University had no commuter population comparable to that at Harvard or Yale, not to mention Columbia and the University of Pennsylvania. In short, Princeton was a residential college for the sons of men who could afford to pay around $1,000 per annum. In 1920-1921, the Catalogue estimated the basic cost of tuition, fees, board, and room from a minimum of at least $700 to slightly under $1,000. But there would be other expenses such as books, clothing, and for the select, the cost of joining a club.\footnote{76}

Given all these circumstances, students of poor, immigrant backgrounds were rare at Princeton. In the class of 1927, for example, there were between 29 and 33 Catholics, all of whom were of native-born Irish stock, except for one,

an American-born Italian for Philadelphia. There was also one American-born Greek from Philadelphia, who belonged to the Greek Orthodox Church. All of the Jewish students, numbering between 21 and 23, were born in the United States. Then there were four American-born students whose ancestry was at least in part, respectively, Austrian, German, Mexican, and Scandinavian. Finally, 8 students were born abroad: one German born in London; one Dutchman born in The Hague; one German-Briton born in Glasgow; one Englishman; a son of a Dutch-Reformed missionary born in Tokyo; one Irish-born Presbyterian; one Russian; and one Japanese. Although some of these men made a club, only the Catholics were members in large numbers: 21 out of the 27 for whom data was known, belonged to one of fourteen clubs. In contrast only one Jewish student was a member, in Court club. 77

In spite of the favorable showing of Catholics in the clubs, it is quite possible that the Committee on Admissions counted the number of Catholic applicants. Although the number of Catholics increased during the 1920's, especially beginning with the Class of 1924—the same year that the number of Jewish students declined sharply—it grew slowly for the next six or seven years. Interestingly enough, the combined totals of Catholics and Jews fluctuated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Total Catholics and Jews</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927a</td>
<td>29 (33)</td>
<td>21 (23)</td>
<td>50 (56)</td>
<td>629 (636)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Princeton President's Report, December, 1923, gave higher numbers of Catholic and Jewish students than did the "Preliminary Analysis" of September.

Source: Statistics on the Classes 1925-1933 from Princeton University, "Preliminary Analysis of Freshman Class," in September, 1921-1929, Trustees's Papers, PUA. Statistics on the Classes 1934-1940 from The Freshman Herald (Published by Student Employment Section, Department of Personnel, 1930-1933; Published by Bureau of Appointments and Student Employment 1934-1936). These two sources did not always give the same number of Catholics and Jews for the same years.
around 10 per cent from the Class of 1925 until the Class of 1936. Of course, Princeton admitted several times as many Catholics as Jews. Although V. L. Collins had written in 1922 that "no specific action" had "been taken to date regarding the Hebrew question," he had also said: "The number of Hebrews (confessed) in the Freshman Class" was "between 4 and 5 percent which" was "about the national quota." The Committee on Admission probably considered even this percentage too large. For example, of the 27 Jewish applicants—"probable Hebrew 28"—the number noted at the June 11, 1924, meeting, only 13 enrolled that September in the Class of 1928. The profile of the Class of 1935 showed that 106 sons of Princeton men, 28 Jews, and 77 Catholics had completed applications as of May 21, 1931. Among the 625 students enrolling in September were 89 alumni sons, 60 Catholics, and 5 Jews. The number of Jewish Freshmen was the lowest since 1917. And interestingly enough, in 1931, Princeton admitted 79 per cent of all applicants. Four years later, 12 Jews matriculated out of the 58 completing applications. But 69 per cent of the applicants were admitted to the Class of 1939.78

---

78 Collins to Canby, November 23, 1922. Princeton University, Minutes of the Meetings of the Committee on Admission, Meetings of June 11th, 1924, May 21st, 1931, and June 14th, 1935. Carl C. Brigham, "The Quality of the Classes Admitted to Princeton in the Years 1928 to 1935." George E. Tomberlin, Jr, "Trends in Princeton Admissions" (unpublished senior thesis in sociology, Princeton University, 1971), pp. 130-135. Only in a few places in the Minutes of the Meetings of the Committee on Admission were the exact number of Catholic or Jewish applicants given.
On several occasions Director Heermance expressed a certain dislike or distrust of Jewish students. He was reluctant to accept, if not opposed, to the adoption of the "highest seventh" plan at Princeton, because he feared it would bring in more Jews, especially those who would apply for financial aid. He also questioned the loyalty of all Jews, because some of them were brought before the Discipline Committee. Given this evidence of prejudice, the following incident summed up the situation of the Jewish applicant at Princeton during the 1920's and 1930's. In the summer of 1927, H. Alexander Smith was asked by a Gentile Princeton classmate to intercede with the Committee on Admissions on behalf of a friend who was Jewish. Smith had frequently been prevailed upon to put in a good word for sons of friends of the men of the Class of 1901. In regard to Jewish students, he showed no evidence of anti-Semitism. Indeed, in 1922, he had inquired into a complaint of discrimination against Jews among one or more boarding house keepers in the town. He then reported to Trustee Henry B. Thompson that while some individuals might refuse lodgings to Jews, he doubted that there was "any organized campaign against them." At any rate, Smith did write Director Heermance in regard to the case of the Jewish applicant, no doubt suggesting his own sense of obligation to a classmate. In late August, 1927, Heermance replied briefly: "Your little friend ________ has been admitted." Several weeks
later, Smith received a letter of thanks from his classmate: "You have made the seemingly impossible actually possible and I feel quite sure that the boy will be a credit to the Institution." He was. Not only did he make the Honor Roll, but he also won numerals on the Freshman Basketball Team and then played on the Varsity Basketball Squad his senior year.  

---

[Princeton University, Minutes of the Meetings of the Committee on Admission, Meetings of June 14th, 1935 and January 25th, 1938. Tomberlin, "Trends in Princeton Admissions," pp. 133-134. H. Alexander Smith to Henry B. Thompson, November 28th and December 8th, 1922, HASP, 1920-1927, Box 38, folder Undergraduate Life Com. 1922-27. Radcliffe Heermance to H. Alexander Smith, 29 August 1927; Smith to A. G. Bartholomew '01, Buffalo, Sept. 8, 1927; and Bartolomew to Smith, Sept. 16, 1927, HASP, 1920-1927, Box 36, folder Admissions, Director of, Sp. Cases. See letter from [Gordon Cowans Sikes, Assistant to the Secretary,] to Miss Ruth Rosenberger, Secretary, The American Hebrew, December 9, 1931, Subject File Students--Nationalities, Jewish, PUA, for a list of ten "outstanding" Jewish undergraduates. The first, who achieved Phi Beta Kappa and Highest Honors in history, won prizes and delivered the Latin Salutatory Oration at the 1931 Commencement. The second earned Phi Beta Kappa and Highest Honors and won prizes. The third and fourth were also Phi Beta Kappa and earned High Honors and Honors, respectively. Two attained the First Honor Group, and another the First General Group. The eighth was Goal Guard of the Varsity Hockey Team; the ninth was Captain of the Varsity Basketball Team; and the tenth was Associate Editor of Bric-à-Brac.]
CONCLUSION

A NEW ELITE

The new upper class that is forming is one of socially valuable talent and learning, not unlike Thomas Jefferson's concept of a 'natural aristocracy of talents and virtues.' It is assuming much of the power but not necessarily the great wealth--and certainly not the leisure--of the old upper class. The colleges with upper-class affiliations, with their spectacular increase in the amounts of scholarship aid and levels of academic standards, are helping to produce this new aristocracy of the able. They are compounding it of the best of the older upper class and the most talented of the lower and middle classes.

--Gene R. Hawes, "The Colleges Of America's Upper Class." 1

Since World War II the number of men from upper class or Social Register families--predominantly Anglo-Saxon Protestant--had declined at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. Accompanying this change was a considerable increase in the number of men from Catholic and Jewish middle- and lower-middle class families. In large measure, the elite colleges themselves effected this shift in student composition by requiring higher academic standards for admission and graduation as well as substantially expanding scholarship aid programs. By the early 1960's, most students at the Big Three ranked in the highest 5 to 10 per cent in

intellectual ability of all American college students. Prior to the 1940's, "manly character" and alumni connections could go a long way in securing admission for candidates whose academic ambitions soared no higher than the "gentleman's C." The age of tremendous business and industrial expansion, from the Civil War through the 1920's, wrote Gene Hawes, fostered the development of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, in particular, as "the colleges of the national upper class then in formation." Scions of established wealth, joined increasingly by sons of the new rich "enjoyed campus days marked by big-time football, rowing regattas, fraternities and clubs, riots, and good parties." Congenial associations were strengthened after graduation by membership in graduate clubs. This "drift of the upper class from the old regional colleges" to the Big Three "continued through the 1920s and 1930s, reaching its peak perhaps just before World War II."2

Although sizeable numbers of studious and/or athletically talented sons of the middle and lower classes also attended these institutions, too large a proportion of sons of Jewish, Irish, and Italian immigrants could annoy, if not threaten, the upper class. Indeed "young socialites" might leave the Big Three, as they had already left Columbia, to seek "their education among more agreeable companions at colleges that were less ready to admit talented youngsters

2 Ibid., pp. 62-70.
without consideration of their background." When Columbia tried to reverse these trends by adopting a Jewish quota of 18 to 20 per cent, the Big Three soon decided that they too had a "Jewish problem." With considerable resistance at Harvard, less at Yale, and virtually none at Princeton, all three began to limit Jewish students by various and not particularly subtle means ranging from photographs attached to admission forms, specific questions regarding the applicant's race and religion, personal interviews, and restriction of scholarship aid. Beginning in the mid-1920's, Harvard reduced its Jewish students from about 25 to 27 per cent to about 15 to 18 per cent. During this same period, Yale aimed at stabilizing its proportion of Jewish students at around 10 to 12 per cent. Princeton halved its number of successful Jewish candidates in order to admit no more, and usually less, than the percentage of the Jews in the national population, about 3 per cent. Restrictive admissions had the vocal support of certain prominent alumni as well as tacit approval of many other Americans.\(^3\)

But World War II released forces which ultimately undermined quota systems. Veterans as well as secondary school seniors flooded admission offices with applications.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 70. Carey McWilliams, A Mask for Privilege: Anti-Semitism in America (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1943), p. 136. Also see previous chapters of my dissertation.
When forced to choose between "the extremely gifted son of a mechanic in Missouri with his G.I. Bill benefits" and "the gentlemanly 'C' student from a prominent family and a noted prep school," said Hawes, "intellect won, though not easily or decisively," at the elite colleges. Unquestionably the Big Three would have compromised their academic reputations had they continued to prefer intellectually weaker or less motivated students over the talented newcomers. As a consequence, many a Social Register son has had to enter less prestigious private colleges and state universities. In 1963, Hawes concluded that "whereas nearly two-thirds of all upper-class sons attended three particular colleges during the first half of this century, less than one-half do so at present." Those attending the Big Three could still maintain their social relationships through clubs, fraternities and societies, although these began to lose much of their influence and luster during the turbulent 1960's.  

In accepting their obligations to educate a new elite, the Big Three—beginning with Harvard and then Yale in the 1950's and Princeton in the 1960's—have increasingly based admission upon academic criteria and adopted a policy of recruiting talented high school students outside the East

---

as well as members of minority groups. Like other colleges and universities, they undoubtedly were prompted in part by changing attitudes within the United States, signified by four important reports on discrimination in higher education. These were published, from December, 1947 to July, 1949, by the President's Commission on Higher Education, New York State Commission on the Need for a State University, Connecticut State Inter-Racial Commission, and the American Council on Education. It had become increasingly clear that the United States could not tolerate discrimination at home while playing the leader of democracy and the "free world" abroad. Under the combined pressures of state laws and new practices by certain leading institutions, most Northern colleges and universities dropped questions as to nationality, race, and religion from application blanks. In 1950, for example, Princeton omitted the question on religious preference from its application form.  

Harvard

During his twenty year tenure as President of Harvard University, James Byrant Conant's educational views broadened significantly. As of 1933, the year of his election, Conant believed an "ideal university" to be "the best of the German universities," known by its eminent scholars. The concept of a "university as an institution" with "special obligations to the community, the state or the nation was still almost completely absent from" his mind. Initially, Conant "had no plan for reforming the college or the university," unlike his predecessors, Charles W. Eliot and A. Lawrence Lowell. In regard to admission policies, he continued the direction taken during Lowell's administration. The "'upper-seventh plan'" was applied to benefit young men from small cities and towns, while "all-important limitations excluded would-be candidates who went to school in New York and Boston and nearby communities." Obviously, many of the high school applicants from Eastern urban centers were of immigrant, and more specifically Jewish, background; they would be required to pass regular examinations before being admitted.  


Conant succeeded in establishing in 1934, however, a number of National Scholarships for promising young men. Such a scholarship would pay "'nearly all of the student's essential college and living expenses'" through Harvard College and graduate school as long as he achieved an honor stand. The amount awarded depended upon financial need, determined by "'the sliding scale'' principle. Originally these scholarships aimed at attracting freshmen from the Midwest in order to broaden Harvard's national representation. To facilitate the selection of scholarship candidates, Harvard cooperated with Yale and Princeton in holding on the same day "special" examination in both the Scholastic Aptitude and Achievement Tests. Initially indifferent to the SATs during the late 1920's, Harvard began to rely on them in part, after having learned of their results at Princeton and Yale. Moreover under the existing "upper-seventh plan," the Harvard scholarship committee could select young men who had failed to take all of the regular entrance examinations. As a result, many "national scholars" came "from the smaller communities for which the upper-seventh plan was devised," thereby bringing to the College a more geographically representative group of secondary school graduates, "irrespective of the financial status of their parents."  

Whereas the National Scholarships had aimed at eliminating financial and geographical obstacles to a Harvard education, World War II and the postwar years initiated a minor social and educational revolution at the University. While preserving the major educational reforms of the Lowell years--course distribution and concentration, tutorial system, and general examination--the Conant administration eventually adopted a proposal made in 1939 by a committee of the Harvard Student Council that general education courses in humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences be required of all students. In 1943, a twelve-member committee was established under the chairmanship of Dean Paul H. Buck to consider and report on "The Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society." This committee was not merely concerned with educational reform at Harvard, but rather with "the whole matter of the general education of the 'great majority of each generation--not the comparatively small minority who attend our four-year colleges.'" Conant, himself, argued that "'the primary concern of American education today'" was

'not the development of the appreciation of the "good life" in young gentlemen born to the purple. It is the infusion of the liberal and humane tradition into our entire educational system. Our purpose is to cultivate in the largest possible number of our future citizens an appreciation of both the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are Americans and are free.'

The Buck committee's report, which appeared in 1945, developed, said Conant, "'a cogent, integrated, and balanced
conception of education at secondary and college levels in this country." And in October, 1945, the Faculty adopted the committee's recommendations in regard to Harvard. Following five years of experimentation, the Class of 1955 was required to pass during its freshman and sophomore years three General Education courses, one each in the Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences, as well as freshman English, called General Education A. To secure adequate distribution, additional courses were required outside a student's department of concentration. According to the Harvard Alumni Bulletin, this reform completed "'the cycle begun with President Eliot's revolutionary free elective system.'"\(^8\)

Not only did Harvard emphasize an education for the modern world, but it also began to instruct new kinds of students. Conant, who taught Natural Science 4 for three years, found "the mature student body which filled our colleges in 1946 and 1947...a delight to all who were then teaching undergraduates." Radcliffe women also entered Harvard classrooms for the first time as a result of a Faculty vote in March, 1943. Although Conant opposed coeducation early in his administration, he acquiesced in the new agreement between the Harvard Corporation and the Trustees

of Radcliffe College. Not until the mid-1960's would Princeton and Yale admit women undergraduates, although the latter had opened its Ph.D. program to qualified women as early as 1892. Some old grads of the Big Three undoubtedly believed that once women were let into the sacred precincts, the University might as well admit any qualified man, regardless of nationality, race, or religion. By the 1960's, for example, about thirty per cent of Harvard undergraduates were Jewish, and the University began seriously to recruit black students. And by the 1970's, four of Harvard's deans were Jewish, of whom one, an assistant dean, was a woman, while another assistant dean was black.9

Yale

World War II affected Yale's admission policies as it had those of so many other private colleges and universities. Although Yale continued to discriminate in admissions, it was forced at least once to reject in principle such a policy. In the spring of 1941, the Yale School of Nursing declined to accept a Negro applicant because of "an unwritten policy." According to Dean Effie J. Taylor,

"it would be exceedingly difficult for us to arrange for the experience of a negro student here or to make for her a happy and satisfactory adjustment." The National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses asked the Reverend Anson Phelps Stokes, former Secretary of Yale University, then president of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, for his assistance. Thereupon Stokes wrote President Charles Seymour that he believed "a New England university with Yale's tradition cannot afford to decline a competent colored student who wishes professional training exclusively because of her race." He pointed out that blacks had been accepted at most "of our representative Eastern institutions, except Princeton." One of his daughter's classmates at Bryn Mawr was "a very nice colored girl," and the reverend remembered "an excellent colored man, Dr. Boyer," in his own Yale class. And, of course, there had been "nearly always some colored divinity students at Yale." Stokes also emphasized that Negroes resented "the failure to capitalize the word 'Negro,'" and that Dean Taylor had omitted the capital "N" two out of three times in her letter. Finally, he considered the issue particularly important at a time "when we are opposing Nazi ideas of race." He questioned whether the Dean and Faculty of the School of Nursing had anticipated "all of the possible implications of their attitude." 

10Effie J. Taylor, Dean, Yale University School of Nursing, copy of a letter, to Mrs. Mabel K. Staupers, R.N.,
In reply, Seymour reassured Stokes of his "detestation of distinction based upon race or color" and his "strength of sympathy" with those "who have taken such interest in the education of the Negro." He said he was reviewing the case with both Dean Taylor and the hospital, but pointed out that "special difficulties arise because of the clinical service in the hospital" over which Yale had no control. Such "difficulties" involving "contacts with patients in the hospital and in the general life of the School," he noted, had forced a black student who had been admitted in the past "to resign." There was also some doubt as to "the physical fitness" of the recently rejected black applicant. But insisted Seymour: "There can be no question of discrimination on the part of the University." The previous year a Negro had won "one of the most distinguished" Divinity School prizes, while this year "one of the outstanding" Freshman scholars was a black student.\footnote{Charles Seymour to Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, May 8, 1941, Records of the President, CS, folder Negro.}

Apparently, the Yale School of Nursing reversed its
previous decision and decided to evaluate the young black woman's application on its own merits. But in the intervening five weeks, she was accepted elsewhere. Had Yale originally considered her application, it could have rejected her without controversy because she was overweight. In the future, however, applications would be received and considered by the School of Nursing on the basis of the student's qualifications. Yale was not unique in its reluctance to accept black applicants. Harvard had also met opposition in providing clinical training for black medical students.¹²

But history did not wait for universities to find convenient excuses; World War II fostered significant changes in the social and ethnic composition of their student bodies. The Selective Service Act increased markedly the number of college students prepared in public high schools, because they graduated at a younger age—around seventeen—than private school students. Graduating after his eighteenth birthday, the average Exeter senior, for example, was subject to the draft. Whereas in July, 1942, only 28.4 per cent of Yale Freshman entered from public schools, a year later the percentage was 43.6. As of

¹²Ruth Logan Roberts to Dr. Anson Phelps Stokes, July 2, 1941, and Stokes, a copy of a letter, to Mrs. Roberts, July 9, 1941, Records of the President, CS, folder Negro.
July, 1944, the percentage had climbed to 47.6 and, high school graduates numbered 53.6 per cent in the March, 1945, group. While the public school graduates may have been less well prepared than those from private schools, they were usually intellectually able and well-motivated. This increase in the percentage of high school students was encouraged by the Yale Alumni Board, whose Committee on Enrollment and Scholarships interviewed many prospective candidates. During these same years, the percentage of alumni sons decreased from "a high" of 31.4 per cent in the Class of 1943 to 25.8 per cent in the July, 1946, Class. Such a shift in the composition of the Freshman Class brought problems. According to Edward Simpson Noyes, Chairman of the Board of Admissions:

Selective Service has increased the problem of Jewish applications for Yale, as for many other colleges. For any or all of a number of reasons, Jewish boys apparently finish secondary school at an earlier age than Gentiles. It may be that they mature earlier; it may be that they permit themselves - or are permitted - fewer distractions; it may be that they are pushed as fast as possible by their families. In any event, the proportion of Jewish applicants among those candidates who might be expected to matriculate has increased far beyond the proportion of Jewish applicants to the whole group of applicants. Moreover, even in the 'young' group, the matriculants, the Jewish boys are younger.

While Jewish students constituted less than 10 per cent of the class entering in July, 1943, they rose to 23 per cent by Sophomore year as a large number of their older Gentile classmates joined the service. For the first time in almost twenty years, Yale's stabilization policy was threatened.
"Realization of this situation," wrote Noyes, "has made it necessary for the Board of Admissions to adopt standards of selection from this group more severe than in the past, in order to prevent it from reaching an undue proportion in the residential colleges." He did not specify what these "standards" were, but they were undoubtedly of a non-scholastic nature.\(^{13}\)

These measures had some effect, because the following year, October, 1945, Noyes reported:

The proportion of Jews in the total number of candidates has increased very little, if at all, but the proportion of Jews among the candidates who are both scholastically qualified for admission and young enough to matriculate has somewhat increased and remains too large for comfort. The situation seems to be common to most of the universities and colleges in the Northeast, and to be spreading West and South to a degree unknown a few years ago.

Throughout the country, the sons and grandsons of immigrant Jews were seeking admission to colleges. Ultimately, they could not be denied unless colleges de-emphasized academic standards to the point where they could no longer be called colleges. Even Yale had to accept a larger proportion of intellectual students unless it wished to become a comfortable four-year sojourn for the non-intellectual. But

\(^{13}\)Edward S. Noyes, "Report of the Board of Admissions to the President and Fellows of Yale University," in Reports To The President By The Deans And Directors Of The Several Schools And Departments For The Academic Year, 1943-1944 and 1944-1945, YUA.
"Bulldog" values died hard. For example, the results of a conference between the Yale Football Committee and the Board of Admissions, in December, 1948, suggested continuation of a long-established policy of preferential admissions to outstanding athletes. "Assurance" would be given

(a) that we will welcome the applications of superior athletes who are at the same time superior persons;
(b) that the efforts of graduates to interest such boys in Yale, and to inform us of the qualifications of these boys, will be viewed as factors of assistance and not as undesirable intrusion into University affairs; and
(c) that we are prepared to take more gambling chances on the admission of athletes of superior personality, whose scholastic record offers likelihood that they can meet college standards but without distinction.

In other words, an excellent athlete with a "superior personality," but with a "mediocre" academic record, provided, Yale believed, "about as reliable an index of leadership potentiality as can be found." In addition to alumni information, the application blank continued to serve as a means of selection. Although the question on religious affiliation was deleted as a result of discussions by the Board of Admissions in 1948-1949, the blank still asked for the applicant's photograph as well as mother's maiden name and birthplace. 14

---

14 Noyes, "Report of the Board of Admissions to the President...," Reports To The President..., 1944-1945. Charles Seymour to Professor Edward S. Noyes, December 20, 1948; "Revisions Of Application Blank" and "Application for Admission to the Freshman Class to enter in...."; Edward S. Noyes to President Charles Seymour, November 2, 1948; Board of Admissions, November 10, 1948, "Possible changes in application blank, marked "Exhibit A," together with six additional pages--"1949 Announcement for Applicants
In spite of the depression and World War II, undergraduate priorities and values had not changed significantly since the 1920's. William Clyde DeVane, a soft-spoken Southerner and Dean of Yale College, was critical of the Yale system. He had graduated from the College in 1920, when activities were undoubtedly more important to undergraduates than study. It was perhaps for this reason that DeVane wanted to involve Yale's more talented, non-intellectual students in scholarship. In his report for 1947-1948, the Dean, who often spiced his official reports with poetic verse, quoted:

'I knew a man who used to say
Not once, but twenty times a day,
That in the struggle and the strife -
His very phrase - of human life,
The thing of ultimate effect
Was character, not intellect.
He therefore was at constant pains
To atrophy his puny brains,
And registered success in this
Beyond the dreams of avarice.'

The brains of the typical Yale undergraduate sometimes atrophied during his arduous pursuit of athletic, managerial, and social honors. Yale provided an excellent education for "the man of action," DeVane noted, but "for the man of

for Admission to the Freshman Class," "Admission to Yale," and "Suggested Statement Regarding The Choice Of College Rule," marked, respectively, Exhibits B, C, and D, and revised "Application for Admission," Records of the President, Charles Seymour, Box 2 Board of Admissions, folder Minutes, YUA.
intellectual achievement I am afraid that we are surpassed by Harvard, Columbia, and Chicago, in that order." This was a "a painful admission." It might be too drastic to try to "'change''' the ways of Yale, but he would like to "modify" them. He suggested that the Board of Admissions and the Scholarship Committee scrutinize with greater care "the intellectual and imaginative qualifications of candidates" and award scholarships on the basis of "real intellectual promise." In Freshman and Sophomore years, "the incompetent students must be weeded out, and their places taken by intelligent transfer students." The Dean was well aware that "the rewards which American society offers to brains are meagre" and that "men of stupidity and grossness" had greater opportunity for pecuniary reward. Yale was thus "a perfect reflection of the country: the honors which the undergraduates bestow - and those are the ones which the undergraduates value - all seem to go to the athletes and the managers of affairs." Fortunately, this value system, DeVane continued, was not true of the graduate and professional schools, which "have put some premium upon good college records, and so far have not asked for physical prowess, or too much for that indefinable thing called personality."15

15 William C. DeVane, "Report of the Dean of Yale College to the President...," Reports To The President..., 1947-1948, YUA.
Given the greater emphasis on scholarship in the graduate and professional schools, it was not surprising that the barriers against Jewish students were first lowered there. In his report for 1948-1949, Dean Edgar S. Furniss, commented on "the predicament in which the Graduate School" would find itself if laws forbidding social or religious discrimination in the selection of students should be enacted. The plain fact is that no such discrimination is practiced by the School; we do not even inquire into the racial or religious status of applicants for admission. It is also true, however, that our policy of restricted enrollment combined with the spread-out procedure of admission may result in the rejection of applicants with superior scholastic record. In other words, it would be impossible for the School, if challenged on this score, to prove that the students admitted in any given year were in all cases better qualified that those who were rejected. And we have learned from experience that some disappointed applicants with good scholastic records will certainly accuse the School of religious or racial discrimination.16

Although no "official" statistics existed on the racial background and religious affiliations of graduate students, those compiled by the University chaplain at least indicated the trend in enrollment. Apparently, students were asked at registration to complete, on a voluntary basis, forms designating religious preference or affiliation.

16 Edgar S. Furniss, "Report of the Dean of the Graduate School to the President....," Reports To The President..., 1948-1949, YUA.
According to Table 25, on the twelve largest denominations, Jews became the most numerous religious group in the Graduate Schools—429 or just over 17 per cent—in 1950-1951.17

To be sure, the total number of Protestants, all denominations lumped together—including Episcopalians, Fundamentalists, and Unitarians—still exceeded the combined totals of Catholic and Jewish students in both the College and the Graduate Schools. Episcopalians, as in the 1920's, were the most numerous Protestant denomination, more than twice as large as the Congregationalists, who had founded Yale. While Jewish students numbered 740 or just over 9 per cent of the enrollment in 1947-1948, they rose to 1002 or between 14 and 15 per cent of the enrollment in 1951-1952. They also displaced the Catholics as the largest non-Protestant group at Yale. In 1953-1954, Catholic and Jewish students together constituted over 28 per cent of the student body. And probably there were a number of students of Jewish and even of Catholic background among the 503 students claiming no religious affiliation.

Jewish students seemingly were overcoming the quota barrier of the 1920's and 1930's. But the data of the 1950's did not provide sufficient information to decide whether or

17In 1926-1927, there were only 29 Jewish students in the Graduate School or just somewhat over 4 per cent of the enrollment of 671 (W. L. Cross to Henry Solon Graves, January 20, 1927, Report of the Committee on Educational Policy (supra, p. 550 and n. 51).
TABLE 25

MAJOR RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES OF YALE UNDERGRADUATES AND GRADUATE STUDENTS, 1947-1954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Undergraduate Schools</td>
<td>Graduate Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Scientist</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples of Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdenominational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aThe statistics from the Chaplain's Office did not indicate what "Christian" meant, whether it was a general term or the designation used by the Disciples of Christ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Preference</th>
<th>1947 - 1948</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Undergraduate and Graduate Schools</th>
<th>1948 - 1949</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Undergraduate and Graduate Schools Total</th>
<th>1949 - 1950</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Undergraduate and Graduate Schools Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Schools Total</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Schools Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-denominational Protestant</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation (Protestant)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of above Religious Preferences</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>4321</td>
<td>7645</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>3820</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>7217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students Reporting a Religious Preference</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>4417</td>
<td>7910</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>3937</td>
<td>2484</td>
<td>7529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Most of the 27 Freshmen, Class of 1951, listing themselves as "Protestant" were undoubtedly included elsewhere in the column on Undergraduate preferences for 1947-1948.

c Religious groups with smaller representation at Yale were not included in the Table: such Protestant denominations as Mormons, Quakers, and Evangelical and Reformed sects; the Greek and Russian Orthodox Churches; other religions (Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam), and Atheism and Agnosticism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Upper-classmen</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Scientist</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples of Christ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian or Christian Church</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdenominational Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-denominational Protestant</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation (Protestant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of above Religious Preferences</td>
<td>4205</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>6529</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>2921</td>
<td>2467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students Reporting</td>
<td>4322</td>
<td>2474</td>
<td>6796</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>2991</td>
<td>2633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Upperclassmen</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopalian</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Scientist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples of Christ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian or Christian Church</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdenominational Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-denominational Protestant</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation (Protestant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of above Religious</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>3010</td>
<td>2641</td>
<td>6644</td>
<td>3933</td>
<td>3141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students Report-</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>3103</td>
<td>2797</td>
<td>6915</td>
<td>4030</td>
<td>3293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based upon "Religious Statistics" or "Religious Affiliations" compiled by the Chaplain's Office. Sidney Lovett, Church of Christ in Yale University, "Report as Chaplain of Yale University to the President and Fellows of Yale University," in Reports To The President By The Deans And Directors Of The Several Schools And Departments For the Academic Year, 1947-1948 - 1953-1954, YUA.
not a quota, albeit more generous than previously, was still being imposed on Jewish applicants. Yale continued to be dominated, as in the past, by Protestants. Although some Catholics made the fraternities, Jews were almost entirely excluded. Specifically Catholic or Jewish organizations, like the St. Thomas More Club or Hillel Foundation, had, according to William F. Buckley, Jr., no "social prestige of any sort," in contrast to Dwight Hall, the Protestant campus organization. 18

Jews, moreover, continued to experience conflicts with the larger University community. In 1953-1954, Chaplain Sidney Lovett reported that

Jewish students, because of their non-Christian religious and cultural heritage, find themselves, at times, in a somewhat isolated position, not because of the content and character of the University curriculum, but in a purely temporal conflict between a religious calendar year, ancient in its origin and with venerable prescriptions as to its High Holy Days, and the Gregorian measurement of days and years common to Western custom and usage, and naturally the basis of the University's timetable of operations.

Such "conflicts" over the calendar, Lovett added, were "undoubtedly exacerbated by the fact that the Jew is very apt to construe a purely temporal conflict as evidence of racial discrimination, to which, alas, he and his forebears have been and still are subjected by the Gentile majority."

Although the difference over the calendar was in no way deliberate, the Chaplain recognized the existence of continuing social discrimination against Jews. Thus he looked for ways to minimize conflicts between Jews and Gentiles on campus.

Here in the University much has been done, and is being accomplished, to allay this ugly fact and to reduce its dimensions. It seems to the Chaplain that it would be wise for the University officials who establish its annual schedule to consult with the Jewish rabbi, so that the Christian and Jewish calendar may be mutually adjusted so as to reduce if not to avoid altogether a situation where the undoubted rights of the University are in conflict with the religious sensibilities of one of its minority groups.

Lovett's attitude was far different from that held by President Lowell and others of similar persuasion during the 1920's and 1930's. Not only did it recognize that minorities had rights, but also that they had "sensibilities." As the Yale population had diversified, the University itself had to make certain compromises with its new clientele. A university, by virtue of its definition, was a community of scholars. The test for membership was academic achievement, not personality, social acceptability, or ethnic homogeneity. Jewish students had proven beyond all question that they added to the academic strength of Yale.19

19 Sidney Lovett, Church of Christ in Yale University, "Report as Chaplain of Yale University to the President....," Reports To The President...., 1953-1954, YUA.
Although Princeton remained "very low on the applicants' list of the Bronx High School of Science," it was not able to postpone for long the changes brought about by World War II and the G.I. Bill. Democracy had come to the campus. To be sure, some alumni shuddered at the thought of Negroes attending Princeton. But by 1940, other alumni, among them Norman Thomas and George McLean Harper, criticized their University for excluding blacks. Writing in the Alumni Weekly, Thomas accused Princeton of maintaining "a racial intolerance almost worthy of Hitler, and wholly alien to any ideal of a university or even a college in a democracy." And he continued, "if generation after generation of Princetonians is to support a custom which would make Princeton hell for the best qualified Negro, let us speak more respectfully of Hitler's barbarous pseudo science of race." Pressure for change intensified after the United States entered World War II. In September and October, 1942, the Princetonian published three editorials on "White Supremacy At Princeton." The first, "A Thousand Million Colored Allies" showed that discriminatory attitudes hurt American leadership during "a global war for democratic principles." In the second, "A Time to Decide," Princeton was urged to make its professions of democracy real by "revising its admissions policy so that qualified men may be admitted to the University regardless of the
accident of race or color." The next night, October 1, the chairman of the *Princetonian*, Francis L. Broderick '43, supported by co-chairman, C. Powell Whitehead, Jr. '43, participated in a forum held by the American Whig-Cliosophic Society: "'Should Negroes Be Admitted to Princeton?'" The President of the Princeton Senate, Lemuel C. Hutchins '43, and another classmate argued in the negative holding that the Negro student would be shut out of extracurricular activities, "and thus denied 50 per cent of the education he had been promised." Although no formal vote was taken, several members in the audience, among them the President of the Senior Class, John W. Douglas '43, favored admission of black students.

Following the forum, the *Princetonian* published the third of its series of editorials, entitled "We Make Answer." It strongly countered the arguments against the admission of blacks. Such a lengthy discussion and debate naturally elicited letters, both pro and con, from undergraduates and alumni. One argued that Princeton could admit whom it pleased since it was "a private institution, built and endowed with private capital, and not subject to control by any government." The writer, a Southerner, advanced

---

20 Clipping from PUA Subject File Students-Nationalities, Jewish: William A. McWhirter '63, "On The Campus," "At The Kosher Table," PAW, March 8, 1963. Clippings in PUA Subject File Students--Nationalities, Negro from PAW: Norman Thomas, March 29, 1940, and George McLean Harper, April 12, 1940, in Letters to the Editor, on "Negroes."
the interesting corollary that just as students had the right to choose their social companions, "we don't think we should deny ourselves the right also to choose our classmates." On the other hand, the Princetonian received support from The Harvard Liberal Union and from Princeton Local 552 of the American Federation of Teachers. And a local-born Negro, then Student Chairman of Group Prejudice Commission, National Assembly of Student Christian Movement, added his voice for the admission of qualified black applicants. According to a survey undertaken by the Nassau Sovereign, however, 62.4 per cent of the undergraduates polled (62.9 per cent of those from the North and 60 per cent of those from the South) were against the admission of Negroes to Princeton. Of the group favoring their admission, 92 per cent, more Northerners than Southerners, urged that Princeton "act now," rather than wait until the war ended. But 36.4 per cent of them would impose such "limitations" as banning black students from Prospect Street, "Dormitory segregation, much higher standards than for white people, and definite quotas." Again a higher percentage of

Northerners than Southerners, favored some limitations.21

The United States Navy partially settled the issue in 1945 by sending four blacks to Princeton under the V-12 program. Arthur Jewell Wilson, Jr., basketball team captain in 1945-46, became the first black to earn a Princeton A.B., wartime degree, in June, 1947. After the war ended, however, few blacks applied—only two for the fall of 1947. One of them enrolled as an undergraduate; another black was registered in the Graduate School. Two years later, four blacks enrolled, three as Freshmen and one as a Sophomore transfer; a fifth black student attended the Graduate School. Although the Princeton Liberal Union actively encouraged blacks to apply, less than a dozen matriculated between 1950 and 1961. Five black Freshmen enrolled the following year. Not until 1963, would Princeton adopted a policy of actively recruiting black students.22


22 In 1963, only five blacks enrolled, but eleven had been admitted of the twenty who had applied. Thereafter, the number of blacks applying to the Freshman Class rose significantly: 72 in 1964, 140 in 1968, and 325 and 620 (including women) in 1969 and 1970. For the same years, 19,
Recruitment would not be easy, because the pool of qualified Negro applicants was small and Princeton's reputation was a handicap in competition with Harvard, Brown, Dartmouth, and even with Yale. As many as one-fourth of those blacks matriculating at Princeton departed within the year. Some failed academically, but others probably left because they felt isolated in an alien environment.

The position of blacks began to improve with the appointment in 1964 of Carl A. Fields, Princeton's first black administrator, as Assistant Director of the Bureau of Student Aid. According to Dr. Fields, a black student at Princeton (and this was undoubtedly true at other universities as well) had one of three choices: "Forget that he was a Negro; ..." "Be quietly but militantly Negro...." "Keep to himself." He helped blacks "to deal with the anonymity or invisibility" which they felt in a college where most students were white, and strengthened their relationship to

the larger Negro community through the Family Sponsor program. 23

Whereas Princeton admitted, then recruited Negroes for sociological reasons—to develop a more diversified student body and to educate its share of black leaders—it was forced to relax and then remove its quota on Jewish students by the sheer volume of applicants in the postwar era. Nonetheless Princeton did not significantly broaden its admission policy until the late 1950's and early 1960's. In 1947, for example, 209 alumni sons were admitted or "75% of those sons who completed application, whereas only 750, or 30% of the total 2,500 applicants who completed application were admitted." In 1958, about 70 per cent of alumni son applicants were accepted for the Class of 1962, as against only 35 per cent of those without Princeton connections. An alumni son was not required "to compete against non-Princeton sons," but was admitted if his "character record" was "satisfactory" and if the committee could answer just one major question in the affirmative: "Can he be expected to graduate?" But whereas many of these "sons" were academically weak, other applicants were top-rate students. In the Freshman Class admitted in 1957, "50% of the bottom quarter, academically speaking, was made up of

Princeton sons," while five of nine failing at midyear were in the same category. To preserve its traditions and placate its graduates, the University wanted to maintain a certain percentage—around twenty—of alumni sons in each class. In 1964, the latter composed 19 per cent of the Freshman Class compared to 18 per cent in the mid-1930's. While Princeton realized that it could afford to accept only the academically better "sons," 59 per cent of those who applied were admitted in 1964 as opposed to the 24 per cent "overall admission rate." Since the "average test scores" for the current "applicant group" were "higher than the average scores for any class enrolled prior to 1958," alumni sons could expect "preference in admission in comparison with other candidates who have roughly equal qualifications," but could not "be accepted ahead of applicants who are clearly better qualified." According to one estimate, Princeton began to accept only about 50 per cent of alumni son applicants, while Harvard and Yale were then admitting respectively, 45 and 40 per cent.24

The "typical" Princeton student of the early 1960's was still an athlete and leader of his classmates. In addition to the 107 valedictorians among the 767 members of the

---

24 "Review of Princeton's Current Admission Policy," The Graduate Council of Princeton University, May 7, 1948, p. 4, Subject File Admin. offices, Admissions. "Answers to your questions about the Admission of Princeton Sons," The Alumni Council of Princeton University, June 1, 1958, Subject File, Admission, Box 1. E. Alden Dunham '53,
Class of 1961, there were 130 class or student body presidents, 93 school editors, "200 football players, 124 track men and 129 basketball players." When President Robert F. Goheen was asked in 1967 to describe the "'kind of boy'" he wanted to see at Princeton, he replied:

'We don't want any single "kind" here. There is no stereotyped Princeton boy. Oh, they've got to have a few things in common: a fairly high level of intelligence in order to stand the gaff; not to be too bothered by competition—or rather to be able to compete even though bothered; a good measure of curiosity and personal integrity—whether they're football players or classicists. But within these limits great variety is possible—and we want it.'

Princeton should have "'potential leaders in all walks of life.'" And while its undergraduates had later become prominent in business and industry, the professions, and government, Princeton had not "'produced a single Noble Laureate.'"25


25"Answers to your questions about the Admission of Princeton Sons," 1958. President Goheen quoted in William McCleery, "The Admission Process at Hard-to-Get into Colleges," University: A Princeton Quarterly, Summer, 1970, p. 26; see also pp. 23-30. Dunham, "A Look At Princeton Admissions." To its long-held preferences for alumni sons (and daughters since 1969), and athletes, Princeton established a "'target number'" for three other "categories": engineers; "blacks and other racial minorities," such as Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and American Indians; and "disadvantaged white students." Princeton has broadened considerably both its geographical and public high school representation. Whereas more than two-thirds of Princeton students came from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut from 1927 to 1937, only 45 per cent of the Class of 1968 came from New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. The percentage of high school graduates in the Freshman
Jewish enrollment grew slowly at Princeton, even though in March, 1948, Dean Radcliffe Heermance, Director of Admissions, had "categorically denied a charge," cited in Carey McWilliams's A Mask for Privilege that "'Princeton maintains a tight Jewish quota of less than 4 per cent of its enrollment.'" Table 26 casts doubt, however, upon Heermance's insistent denial: "'We've never had a quota system, we don't have a quota system, we never will have a quota system.'" More Jews began to enroll in the 1940's; and

**TABLE 26**

**JEWISH FRESHMEN AT PRINCETON, BY YEAR OF ENTRANCE, 1930-1949**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


by 1963, there were "nearly 400 Jewish students—a commonly
accepted figure—on the campus," or about one hundred per
class. In spite of this increase in Jewish enrollment,
Princeton, if no longer considered overtly anti-Semitic,
was still held in suspicion by some Jewish students.26

26 "Dean Heermance Denies Claim That Quota System Used
Here," Princetonian, March 24, 1948; "Getting Into Prince-
ton," Nassau Sovereign, April, 1949, Subject File Admin.
offices, Admissions, PUA. McWhirter, "At The Kosher Table."

Because a university's once-deserved reputation
may persist years after the institution has begun to change,
Arthur B. Cooper '74 formally complained in 1972 and 1973 to
B'nai Brith, the New Jersey Division of Civil Rights, the
United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
and to the University Council Judicial Committee about "the
massive, institutional Jew-hatred which infests" Princeton.
As proof of these allegations, Cooper cited various state-
ments, both heretofore published and unpublished, in his
articles on "Jew-baiting: The Princeton Pastime" in the
Princetonian, September 19, and 20, 1972. The next day,
Neil L. Rudenstine, Dean of the College, denied the exis-
tence of any "'restrictive Jewish quota!" and asserted that
"Mr. Cooper has neither now nor previously produced evidence
to substantiate his charge." Not only had "the university
welcomed a full exploration of the charges" the previous
spring, but both the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith
and the New Jersey Division of Civil Rights have found no
evidence of a quota (Arthur Cooper to Marcia Synnott,
June 1 and July 5, 1972, and the following articles from
the Princetonian: Arthur B. Cooper '74, "'J'accuse...,'"
February 8, 1973, pp. 4-5; Laird Hart, "Cooper files anti-
Semitism charges against Princeton trustees, officials,"
February 7, 1973, p. 1; Cooper, "Jew-baiting: The Prince-
ton pastime," September 19 and 20, 1972, p. 2; Neil L.
Rudenstine, To the Chairman, September 21, 1972, p. 2; and
David Zielenziger, "First Hebrew classes begin," Septem-
ber 20, 1972, p. 6).

According to Rabbi Norbert Samuelson, Director of
Princeton Hillel Foundation, their records, covering only
the previous six years, showed
"minimal change in the number of Jewish undergraduate
students admitted each year to Princeton until the
admission of girls began. With the addition of girls
the total number of new Jewish undergraduates increased,
but the number of new male Jewish undergraduates
Although "the first 100 per cent Bicker" took place in 1941, and elections in subsequent years were usually un-eventful, "the infamous Bicker of '58" gained national notice. About half of the "23 'men in trouble'—those without bids" were Jews. But the Interclub Committee would not "insure bids for those sophomores" because Prospect Club "had become non-selective," thus opening up the possibility all of them could receive "the universal 'bid' from that club." After they declined membership in Prospect Club, President Goheen argued that they could still join the small remained relatively constant. Furthermore the percentage of Jewish students at Princeton was significantly below the percentage in attendance at comparable universities such as Harvard and Yale."

Current religious preference cards indicated that in 1972 new Jewish undergraduates increased "more than 50 per cent . . . with a significant growth in the number of new Jewish male undergraduates." The Rabbi concluded, nevertheless, that more Jewish students would be attending Princeton, if admission were "based totally on academic qualifications than on a system that considers additional factors." And Rabbi Israel S. Dresner, National Vice President of the American Jewish Congress, requested that Princeton drop from its application blanks the question on national origin of parents, which had been added two years earlier to recruit minority students with low scores on the verbal part of the Scholastic Aptitude Test. In the future, the Princeton Admission Office would ask "whether English is the primary language spoken at home" (Rabbi Norbert Samuelson, "Rabbi responds," To the Chairman, Princetonian, September 25, 1972, p. 3; and David Zielenziger, "Admissions ends origin query at Jewish Congress' request, Princetonian, November 28, 1972, p. 1).
"non-selective" Wilson Lodge, which had been founded in 1955. Nevertheless, during Open House night some club members apparently said to Jewish sophomores: "'We'd love to have you but our quota is filled.'" While the Interclub Committee did "'not approve of religious and racial discrimination,'" it had "'no power to control the Bicker policy of individual clubs.'" William D'O. Lippincott '41, Dean of Students, had to calm the situation down after some students picketed Nassau Hall and B'nai Brith began an inquiry. Although "'the actual extent of religious discrimination was not determined,'" the Bicker system "'never fully recovered from its scars of 1958.'" 27

Lack of money and opposition to Bicker, combined with the development of social alternatives during the 1960's, caused ten of the seventeen "selective" clubs to close their doors. Of the five oldest, Ivy, Cottage, Cap and Gown, and Tiger remained healthy and "selective." But Colonial went "'non-selective'" in 1969-1970. When a non-selective club could no longer keep going, it might, like Cannon, turn the ownership over to Princeton. Whatever their future, an era had ended for the Princeton clubs, once bastions of social exclusiveness and a symbol of what some had formerly considered "'the pleasantest country club

Since 1950, when the question was dropped from the application blank, Princeton had not, apparently kept an official, annual record of student religious preference. The cards which students filled out at registration indicated religious preference of only those interested in being contacted by campus and local religious groups. According to this incomplete evidence, Roman Catholic students had "almost doubled" in number during the past fifteen years, while Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Methodists had each "declined by approximately 50 per cent." Interestingly enough, while more Roman Catholic and Jewish students stated a religious preference, "an increasing percentage of the entering classes do not indicate any religious preference" at all.29

The most complete, recent study of the backgrounds of Princeton Freshmen was done in the autumn of 1970 as part of a national survey by the American Council on

28 Ibid. Susan Stupin, "Non-selective clubs show varied support," Princetonian, October 4, 1972, pp. 1, 7. Fitzgerald, This Side of Paradise, p. 36.

29 Excerpts from a letter from Vice-President for Public Affairs William H. Weathersby to James W. Carter, Chief of the Bureau of Affirmative Action, Division on Civil Rights, Newark, New Jersey, [April 25, 1972,] published as "University reply to Cooper's charges," Princetonian, September 25, 1972, p. 3.
Education on 180,684 freshmen matriculating at 33 private and 241 public colleges and universities. According to "A Survey of Princeton Freshmen," the University still attracted students from wealthy families—19.6 per cent of the men and women came from families earning $40,000 or more a year—and it remained, of course, predominantly a white institution. But the days of black exclusion had passed. Of the almost 13 per cent who were non-white, 9.1 per cent were black; in addition, .2 per cent were American Indian, 2.4 Oriental, and 1.2 "Other." 30

According to the following table on religious preference, 28 per cent of the students expressed no preference when entering Princeton, whereas only 7.9 per cent of their mothers had acknowledged none. Less than 10 per cent were Presbyterians at a college originally established for this denomination. Episcopalians had declined from being the largest denomination of the 1920's through 1940's—a third or more of the students—to 10 per cent. In contrast, Roman Catholics had become the leaders with 18 per cent, followed by Jews at 13.5 per cent.

30 "A Survey of Princeton Freshmen," PAW, February 23, 1971, pp. 6-9, and Diana Savit "Bring back the old Princeton? Survey finds 1971 frosh liberal, wealthy," Princetonian, March 1, 1971. By 1970, Princeton's recruitment policy was reaching toward its "target number" of about 10 per cent blacks per freshman class, which would be proportionate to the percentage of blacks in the total national population.
### TABLE 27

RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES OF PRINCETON FRESHMEN, 1970, AND THEIR COMPARISON WITH MATERNAL PREFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Preference</th>
<th>Student Percentages</th>
<th>Total Student Percentages</th>
<th>Total Maternal Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Orthodox</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latter Day Saints</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaker</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Protestant</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religions</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Religious Preferences of fathers were either not asked for by the American Council on Education survey or not included in the results.

To be sure, discriminatory policies still existed at the Big Three, even if they were in favor of newer groups at the expense of both alumni sons and some of the academically well-qualified applicants. Although alumni have expressed dissatisfaction with these changes, probably most have accepted them with as good grace as could be expected. Beyond a doubt, a new generation of college students was in the making. Commenting on the undergraduate of the 1960's and 1970's, William C. DeVane of Yale, described him as "a much more serious person than his predecessor of forty years ago." Now he must compete for entrance to college and continuation in it with students of a type that forty years ago would not have thought a college experience available to them. One of the effects of the G.I. Bill was to show young people that college was possible for anyone with the requisite ability, and the strong trend towards the democratization of the colleges has now reached the point where many states, and soon perhaps the federal government, will regard free higher education as the right of every young person, and consequently think it the duty of government to provide it.

As a consequence of World War II and its aftermath, "students of every race and color, and of every social and economic class, swarm over the campus." While today's undergraduate was "less well-dressed than the collegiate dandy of the twenties and often" did "not know how to behave on social occasions," he was no longer "so deeply absorbed by the side shows of college life" and rushed "less eagerly into athletics, fraternities, and the multitudinous activities of the collegiate tradition." Such a student, DeVane predicted,
would "do well in the world, though he may be somewhat insensitive and at times ruthless in attaining his ends." 

SOURCES CONSULTED

Unpublished manuscripts provided most of the essential information for this dissertation, with the exception of published collections of Woodrow Wilson's papers, notably, The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, edited by Arthur S. Link et al. Hence the list of secondary sources is very selective. No attempt has been made to include a comprehensive bibliography of works relating to higher education in late nineteenth and early twentieth century America. As others have already noted, Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University A History (New York: Vintage Book, 1962), has largely fulfilled this need with a twenty-page bibliography. Discussion of the various manuscript sources cited should prove of greater value to the reader.

Essential starting points for any investigation of archival material at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton are the published Annual Reports of the President, which also include reports by or on the various departments or schools within the respective universities. Alumni publications were useful forums for both the administration and the graduates: Harvard Alumni Bulletin, Harvard Graduates' Magazine, Yale Alumni Weekly, and Princeton Alumni Weekly. College newspapers--Harvard Crimson, Yale Daily News, and the Daily Princetonian revealed undergraduate opinion and reaction to
current issues. Senior Class Albums and Histories were the best sources of biographical information on undergraduates and alumni during this period. In addition, each Archives has one or more useful collections of newspaper clippings and scrapbooks. Harvard has three on controversies involving Jewish and Negro students and at least one on athletics:
"Clippings on the Race Question, 1922"; "Comment Upon the Race Question, 1923"; "Negro Question Clippings (P. D. Davis) 1941"; and "Clippings, Comment Upon Pres. Lowell's Report, 1922." For Yale Old And New, see the 73 scrapbooks compiled by Arnold Guyot Dana. Finally, Princeton has a large assortment of boxes and files on subjects relating to admissions, to students of different nationalities or ethnic backgrounds, and to undergraduate life. Diligent collectors have saved this researcher much valuable time.

A. MANUSCRIPT AND ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Harvard has both the most extensive and rewarding of all the archival collections examined. For the most part, access to them is restricted, and dependent upon prior permission, which is sometimes difficult to obtain, especially in the case of the Abbott Lawrence Lowell Papers. In applying for the latter, I had to select from their index a certain number of folders, sight unseen, and hope that they contained the information which I was seeking. The Secretary of the Corporation granted me permission to examine 95 out of my 100 requested folders, but not the five from the
chronological section, 1930 to 1933, on the grounds that my dissertation emphasized the period 1900 to 1930. But given the controversial nature of much of the material in the Lowell Papers, some restrictions were inevitable. Both Harvard officials and the University Archives have given considerable time and effort to meeting my requests, for which I am most grateful.

The Lowell Papers contain extensive correspondence on and copious statistics relating to the controversies of 1922-1923. Other perspectives and corroboration are provided by the following: Charles W. Eliot Papers, Jerome D. Greene Papers, correspondence of Deans C.N. Greenough of the College and L.B.R. Briggs of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and by the Minutes of the Meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The last years of Eliot’s Second Chronological Correspondence File, 1909-1926, and the Jerome D. Greene Papers reveal the sharp differences of opinion which existed between them and the Lowell faction at Harvard.

The Records of President James R. Angell and of College Dean Frederick S. Jones document Yale's reaction to the discussions about admissions and the policy changes which took place elsewhere. In addition, the Freshman Office Records contain two important memoranda, the correspondence between Admissions Director Robert N. Corwin and other deans and officials, and Minutes of Meetings of the
Committee on Admissions. Official Yale records, deposited in Manuscripts and Archives, are generally open to examination, except those which are twenty or less years old. The Archives staff was most helpful in suggesting and locating boxes and files in the voluminous Angell and Hadley correspondence.

Princeton's archival offerings are much smaller than the holdings at either Harvard or Yale. Most valuable sources are the Minutes of the Meetings of the Faculty and of the Board of Trustees, together with reports from College, Faculty, and Freshmen Deans. A box of Woodrow Wilson Papers contains correspondence and documents relating to his presidency of Princeton. The Old Files of the College Dean and correspondence from both the President's Office and Secretary's Office include several documents and letters of interest. The best single source, or rather mine, of information on Wilson's presidency is, of course, The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, edited by Arthur S. Link et al., seven volumes (XIV through XX) of which are devoted to the years 1902-1910. By contrast, the papers of John Grier Hibben are negligible, because he and his wife destroyed most of them. Lack of information on Hibben's administration during the teens and twenties is partially compensated for by the detailed President's Reports and by the Papers of H. Alexander Smith, Executive Secretary of the University, 1920-1927, which are located in the Department of Rare Books.
and Special Collections. Finally, the Meetings of the Committee on Admission, although the Minutes of some meetings seem to be missing, provide both revealing comments and statistics. Prior permission is required to examine the Minutes of the Committee on Admission, the Faculty and Trustees' Minutes after 1914, and the Papers of H. Alexander Smith. Princeton Officials and Library staff members have both cooperate with and assisted my research.
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