

# “A Matter Requiring the Utmost Discretion”

A REPORT FROM THE ADVISORY TASK FORCE ON THE HISTORY OF  
JEWISH ADMISSIONS AND EXPERIENCE AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY

September, 2022

## **Task Force Members:**

Professor Ari Y Kelman (faculty), Chair  
Professor Anthony Antonio (faculty)  
Erika Bullock (graduate research assistant)  
Emily Greenwald (graduate student)  
Rabbi Laurie Hahn Tapper (staff)  
Jem Jebbia (graduate research assistant)  
Professor Emily Levine (faculty)  
Odelia Lorch (undergraduate student)  
Professor Kathryn Gin Lum (faculty)  
Professor Matthew Snipp (staff)  
Isaac Stein (alumnus)  
Professor Mitchell Stevens (faculty)  
Jeffrey Stone (trustee)



## Table of Contents

Charge from the President to the Advisory Task Force on the History of Jewish Admissions and Experience at Stanford University .....	4
Executive Summary .....	5
Introduction .....	7
What We Can Learn from Admissions .....	11
The Emergence of Selective Admissions at Stanford .....	13
Snyder’s Intention to Suppress the Number of Jewish Students at Stanford .....	17
Targeting High Schools.....	20
Who Else Knew About Snyder’s Intentions?.....	25
Admissions in Policy and Practice .....	26
Denial in Practice .....	31
Impressions of Quotas .....	39
Stanford’s Jewish Population .....	45
Conclusion.....	49
Recommendations .....	52
Appendix A: The Glover Memo.....	63
Appendix B: Methodology for Historical Research.....	64
Appendix C: Methodology for Quantitative Analysis .....	65
Appendix D: Enrollment Data from Selected Public High Schools as Presented in Registrar’s Reports 1952-1960.....	67
Appendix E: All Possible Combinations of Annual Enrollments at Stanford from Fairfax High School, 1950-1958 .....	68
Appendix F: All Possible Combinations of Annual Enrollments at Stanford from Beverly Hills High School, 1950-1958 .....	69
Appendix G: Jewish Population Data .....	74
Acknowledgements.....	75

## Charge from the President to the Advisory Task Force on the History of Jewish Admissions and Experience at Stanford University

**January, 2022**

The Advisory Task Force on the History of Jewish Admissions and Experience at Stanford University is charged with: (1) researching the history of admission policies and practices for Jewish students at Stanford in the 1950s, including the allegations in a recent blog posting “How I Discovered Stanford’s Jewish Quota” by Charles Petersen and (2) making recommendations about how to enhance Jewish life on campus, including how best to address any findings resulting from the research on admissions practices.

The task force will conduct this work under the sponsorship of the Office for Religious and Spiritual Life and the Vice Provost for Institutional Equity, Access and Community. The findings and recommendations of the task force will be presented to the President and Provost. The President and Provost may ask for additional information or that the task force conduct such other work as they deem appropriate.

All task force members will serve with an objective to represent the best interests of the entire university and need to be open to multiple perspectives. Task force members are not intended to represent any particular constituencies, but rather to consider issues impartially. It is possible that committee members have heard, or even participated in, discussions on the issues at hand. However, the role of the task force is to ascertain the relevant facts through the fact-finding process and consider applicable principles with an open mind. Advocacy groups and stakeholder perspectives may provide input on the issue through other methods, as determined by the chair of the task force.

## Executive Summary

In January 2022, an Advisory Task Force on the History of Jewish Admissions and Experience at Stanford University was established to fulfill two interlocking charges. The first was to examine Stanford's admissions policies and practices during the middle of the 20th century to address allegations about biases against Jewish students. The second was to make recommendations to the university about "how to enhance Jewish life on campus, including how best to address any findings resulting from the research on admissions practices."

### Charge #1

An extensive investigation uncovered two key findings. First, we discovered evidence of actions taken to suppress the number of Jewish students admitted to Stanford during the early 1950s. Second, we found that members of the Stanford administration regularly misled parents and friends of applicants, alumni, outside investigators, and trustees who raised concerns about those actions throughout the 1950s and 1960s.

Early in 1953, Stanford's Director of Admissions, Rixford Snyder, raised concerns about the number of Jewish students at Stanford to Frederic Glover, the assistant to Stanford President Wallace Sterling. Glover conveyed his account of the conversation and of Snyder's desire "to disregard our stated policy of paying no attention to the race or religion of applicants" in a memo to Sterling. Glover supported Snyder's intentions. In the memo, Glover specified that Snyder was concerned about two Southern California high schools that he knew to have significant numbers of Jewish students: Beverly Hills High School and Fairfax High School.

We do not know whether Snyder also took action against any other schools or students who identified themselves as Jewish on their applications, regardless of their high school. But we found a sharp drop in enrollments from these two schools in the class that started Stanford in the fall of 1953. No other schools experienced such a sharp reduction in students enrolling at Stanford at that time.

Snyder did not act alone. Although we do not know whether Sterling read the memo from Glover, at least three other people in the top levels of Stanford's leadership read it, including the Provost, Douglas Whitaker. If Sterling read the memo, which we cannot confirm, then he, too, may be implicated in knowing about Snyder's intentions and not acting to stop them.

We do not know how long Snyder acted against these two schools or if he acted against other schools or individual students. But the effect was felt particularly keenly among Jews in Southern California among whom developed a widespread understanding that Stanford had a "quota" on Jewish students. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, when alumni, the Anti-Defamation League, and at least one trustee raised concerns to Glover, Sterling, or Snyder, they were met with dismissals and denials. Glover's and Snyder's written responses took advantage of the literal definition of "quota" and the discretion built into Stanford's admissions policies to misrepresent what they knew to be otherwise true: that they collaborated to suppress the number of Jewish students enrolling at Stanford.

Although some of Stanford's peer institutions employed anti-Jewish prejudices in their approach to admissions, Stanford has always affirmatively prided itself on never having done

so. The historical research presented here calls that claim into question. While there may never have been a formal quota (and Stanford used that technical defense often), we have found clear evidence of anti-Jewish bias in admissions at the highest levels of the university in the early 1950s.

## Charge #2

The historical facts laid out in the fulfillment of the first charge to the task force serve as the foundation to the recommendations about how to enhance Jewish life on campus in the present and future. This task force evidences one example of how Stanford is beginning to face its past and build toward a more equitable, inclusive, and just future.

The challenges that Jewish students face in a world shaped by rising antisemitism and that they experience on campus rather than during the admissions process differ considerably from many of those identified in response to the first charge. In order to better frame the recommendations that follow, the task force organized two focus groups (one with undergraduates and one with graduate students) and 10 semi-structured interviews as part of a pilot project intended to better understand the experience of Jewish students at Stanford.

The insights shared by Jewish students generated two tiers of recommendations. The first tier responds to the discoveries of the task force regarding Stanford's history of efforts to suppress the number of Jewish students at Stanford and its record of denying and dismissing concerns about those efforts. The second tier draws on the pilot inquiry in order to direct resources that might enhance the experiences of Jewish students at Stanford in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We recommend that the university:

## Acknowledge and Apologize

- Stanford publicly acknowledge its historical participation in admissions practices designed to discriminate against Jewish students.
- Stanford publicly apologize for taking actions to suppress the number of Jewish students and for misleading those who raised concerns about those issues.

## Explore, Educate, and Enforce

- Undertake a comprehensive study of contemporary Jewish life at Stanford.
- Develop and include modules addressing Jews and Jewish identity in appropriate educational trainings, seminars, and programs intended to make ours a more equitable, inclusive, and just community.
- The ASSU should enforce the Undergraduate Senate's "Resolution to Recognize Anti-Semitism in Our Community" (UGS-W2019-23).
- Schedule the opening of the school year so that it does not coincide with the Jewish High Holidays and specifically Yom Kippur and Rosh Hashana.
- Provide for student religious and cultural needs in housing and dining.
- Clarify the relationship between the university and Stanford Hillel.

## Introduction

“Rix is concerned that more than one quarter of the applications from men are from Jewish boys. Last year we had 150 Jewish applicants, of whom we accepted 50. This condition appears to apply one [sic] to men; there does not seem to be any increase in applications from Jewish girls. ... Rix ... says that the situation forces him to disregard our stated policy of paying no attention to the race or religion of applicants. I told him that I thought his current policy made sense, that it was a matter requiring the utmost discretion. ...”

- Fred Glover, February 4, 1953

“[I]t is inevitable that candidates of all faiths will be turned down. We are never accused of being anti-Catholic or anti-Methodist, but the charge does seem to arise sometimes, when a Jewish candidate is involved, that the University is anti-Jewish.”

- Fred Glover, December 28, 1954

This inquiry into the history of Stanford’s admissions policies takes shape during an historical moment in which institutions of all kinds are critically reexamining their own histories. A growing awareness of the severity of historical and systematic injustices have toppled monuments, reinvented museums, and led to movements to rename everything from public schools to city streets. As institutions committed to free inquiry and rigorous, fact-based investigation, universities bear a particularly heavy responsibility for leading the way in these efforts. Committees and commissions at Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Georgetown, and Johns Hopkins have advanced efforts to acknowledge the role these institutions and their leadership have played in the advancement of slavery, racism, eugenics, and other forces that exacerbated systematic inequalities between people.<sup>1</sup> Stanford has engaged in its own efforts of self-

---

<sup>1</sup> Anderson, Greta. 2020. “Campuses Reckon With Racist Past.” Inside Higher Ed. July 6, 2020. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/07/06/campuses-remove-monuments-and-building-names-legacies->

reflection, as well, which have resulted in the removal or alteration of names attached to campus features.<sup>2</sup> As part of this effort, Stanford has created new positions in the Provost's office "intended to lead equity and inclusion efforts at Stanford." It has also dedicated significant resources toward IDEAL, a multifaceted initiative to address questions of inequality and diversity in every area of the campus.<sup>3</sup> These efforts, both historical and programmatic, are among the many required to lay the groundwork for impactful and lasting change on our campuses and in our communities.

The immediate impetus for this investigation was the publication of an online newsletter by Dr. Charles Petersen entitled "How I Discovered Stanford's Jewish Quota."<sup>4</sup> The newsletter highlighted a memo (hereafter known as the Glover Memo) that Dr. Petersen discovered in the papers of Stanford President J. E. Wallace Sterling that shared concerns of the then-Director of Admissions, Rixford K. Snyder, about the possibility of a "high percentage" of

---

[racism](#); "Georgetown Reflects on Slavery, Memory, and Reconciliation." n.d. Georgetown University. Accessed April 7, 2022. <https://www.georgetown.edu/slavery/>; "Princeton Renames Wilson School and Residential College, Citing Former President's Racism." 2020. Princeton Alumni Weekly. June 27, 2020. <https://paw.princeton.edu/article/princeton-renames-wilson-school-and-residential-college-citing-former-presidents-racism>; Viglione, Giuliana, and Nidhi Subbaraman. 2020. "Universities Scrub Names of Racist Leaders — Students Say It's a First Step." *Nature* 584 (7821): 331–32. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-02393-3>; "Yale and Slavery Working Group." 2020. Office of the President. November 16, 2020.

<https://president.yale.edu/committees-programs/presidents-committees/yale-and-slavery-working-group>; "Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery." n.d. Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard University. Accessed May 3, 2022. <https://legacyofslavery.harvard.edu/homepage>.

<sup>2</sup> "Campus Names." n.d. Accessed April 7, 2022. <https://campusnames.stanford.edu/>; Stanford University. 2018. "Stanford Will Seek to Rename Serra Mall in Honor of Jane Stanford." Stanford News (blog). September 13, 2018. <https://news.stanford.edu/2018/09/13/naming-report/>; Stanford University. 2020. "Stanford Will Rename Campus Spaces Named for David Starr Jordan and Relocate Statue Depicting Louis Agassiz." Stanford News (blog). October 7, 2020. <https://news.stanford.edu/2020/10/07/jordan-agassiz/>.

<sup>3</sup> Beginning in 2018, IDEAL has introduced a dashboard for representing the composition of the Stanford community, new provostial fellows, new faculty hires, and "learning journeys," all of which are intended to support and encourage the creation of a campus that is a "respectful, fair and safe environment in which all members can thrive." See: <https://ideal.stanford.edu/>

<sup>4</sup> Petersen, Charles. 2021. "How I Discovered Stanford's Jewish Quota." Substack newsletter. Making History (blog). August 8, 2021. <https://charlespetersen.substack.com/p/stanfords-secret-jewish-quota>. The task force would like to thank Dr. Petersen for raising the issue that led to the work of the task force. We are also grateful for his generosity in sharing resources.

Jewish students enrolling at Stanford.<sup>5</sup> The memo, written by Sterling's assistant Fred Glover, reported that Snyder intended to limit the number of Jewish students, an idea that Glover believed "made sense." We do not know whether or not Sterling read the memo (a full transcription of the memo can be found in Appendix A).

The report that follows focuses on four concerns. First, it examines the memo within the context of Stanford's admissions policies and practices of the time and it identifies the mechanisms used to try and limit the number of Jewish students at Stanford. The second concern explores efforts that Snyder and Glover took to mislead independent investigators, alumni, and at least one trustee about their efforts. Third, it highlights the impact of Snyder's actions beyond the campus. Finally, it offers recommendations about how to improve the experience of Jewish students at Stanford.

This report, therefore, draws on the past to engage a present in which antisemitism is an increasingly pressing concern. Antisemitic events in the United States including the 2017 "Unite the Right" rally in Charlottesville, Virginia, the 2018 massacre of Jews at the Tree of Life synagogue, and the taking of hostages at a synagogue in Colleyville, Texas, in 2021 have shown this to be true. The Anti-Defamation League's 2021 Audit found antisemitic incidents in the United States to be at an all-time high.<sup>6</sup> While it is possible to disagree about what constitutes an antisemitic act, it is clear that American antisemitism remains a persistent, pernicious, and highly malleable feature of American politics and culture and that it has found expression

---

<sup>5</sup> Memo from Fred Glover to Wallace Sterling February 4, 1953. J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box 7, Folder 14). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.adl.org/audit2021w>

everywhere along the political spectrum from the far right to the far left.<sup>7</sup> Stanford is not insulated from these broader currents and members of the campus community feel the pressures and pains born of a context in which people feel increasingly emboldened to espouse antisemitic views and to act on them.<sup>8</sup>

In response to these conditions, an investigation into past practices seems both abstract and urgent. As some alumni interviewed for this project have asked, “Why investigate the distant past when the pressures of the present seem so urgent?” This is a fair question, and it is one that members of the task force have asked of ourselves. But as other such efforts at Stanford and elsewhere have taught, it is difficult to engage with the present until we reckon with the past. Reevaluating the past to reckon with and acknowledge it is a crucial step in making substantive, meaningful, and long-lasting change.

This notion is central to Judaism’s understanding of repentance or תשובה (teshuva). The term’s linguistic root is the same as the word “to return” or “to go back.” Etymologically, it implies a process of returning to the past in order to acknowledge it, apologize, and make amends. The evidence for what medieval philosopher Moses Maimonides calls “complete repentance” is that a person behaves differently in light of their acknowledgement of past

---

<sup>7</sup> Baddiel, David. 2021. *Jews Don’t Count*. TLS Books; Lipstadt, Deborah E. 2019. *Antisemitism: Here and Now*. New York: Schocken; Rosenberg, Yair. 2022. “Why So Many People Still Don’t Understand Anti-Semitism.” *The Atlantic*. January 19, 2022. <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2022/01/texas-synagogue-anti-semitism-conspiracy-theory/621286/>; Ward, Eric. 2017. “Skin in the Game.” *Political Research Associates*. Accessed April 7, 2022. <https://politicalresearch.org/2017/06/29/skin-in-the-game-how-antisemitism-animates-white-nationalism/>; Weiss, Bari. 2019. *How to Fight Anti-Semitism*. New York: Crown.

<sup>8</sup> Throughout this report, we will follow the convention of writing “antisemitism” rather than “anti-Semitism.” The rationale behind this spelling is best explicated by Deborah Lipstadt who has written: “In my own English-language usage I choose not to go with the hyphen because the word, both as its creator had intended and as it has been generally used for the past one hundred and fifty years, means, quite simply, the hatred of Jews. It does not mean hostility toward a nonexistent thing called ‘Semitism.’” Lipstadt, Deborah E. 2019. *Antisemitism: Here and Now*. New York: Schocken. 14.

deeds. It is in the spirit of תשובה that we offer this report to the university community, in the hope that this return to the past is the beginning of a turn toward a better, more respectful, and more equitable future for all of its members.

## What We Can Learn from Admissions

Admissions can be understood as a membrane between the university and the public.

Admissions policies and practices shape the character and culture of every university or college by selecting some people to join the institution while refusing others; these policies and practices construct a student body out of an assortment of applicants and build a university class by class.<sup>9</sup> Consequently, admissions offer a unique window into the composition of the campus community and the formation of its culture. The policies and practices that define admissions have profound and consequential effects far beyond the evaluation of any single student.

Admissions offices, however, do not operate alone and their decisions are not made in isolation. As an internal Stanford report from 1966 observed, “[A]dmissions policies and procedures do not stand in isolation from the rest of the University. Rather — for good and bad — they both influence and are influenced by the various characteristics of the Stanford

---

<sup>9</sup> Soares, Joseph A. 2007. *The Power of Privilege: Yale and America’s Elite Colleges*. Stanford: Stanford University Press; Steinberg, Jacques. 2002. *The Gatekeepers: Inside the Admissions Process of a Premier College*. 6/29/02 edition. Penguin Books; Stevens, Mitchell L. 2009. *Creating a Class: College Admissions and the Education of Elites*. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press.

curriculum, formal and informal.”<sup>10</sup> Archival documents indicate that during the middle decades of the 20th century, Stanford’s admissions decisions were managed by a small group of admissions officers in collaboration with others in the Offices of the President and Provost, development, alumni relations, faculty and staff, alumni “ambassadors,” and counselors and principals at hundreds of high schools across the United States.

This extended admissions apparatus illustrates the complexity of the process and the variety of factors accounted for within it. Early in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as qualified candidates began to outnumber available spots in incoming classes, elite American colleges and universities pivoted from “qualitative admissions,” which admitted all qualified applicants, toward an approach known as “selective admissions,” which chose among all qualified applicants.<sup>11</sup> This new approach birthed questions about how to justify the selection of one applicant over another or how to develop a policy that systematized acceptance decisions. As historians Jerome Karabel, Marsha Synnott, and Harold Wechsler have shown, selective admissions emerged at a moment in the history of American higher education when elite colleges and universities faced increased demand from qualified students who did not “fit” their image of either their desired students or their institutions.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Letter. Rixford K. Snyder to Thomas C. Dyer. January 23, 1967. Stanford University, President’s Office. Sterling-Pitzer Transition Papers (SC0217, Box 3, Folder 2). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>11</sup> In his oral history, Snyder recalled that he helped Stanford move from “qualitative admissions,” which admitted all qualified students, to “selective admissions,” which selects “among all those who do meet the established requirements. See Snyder, Rixford K. Oral History. Stanford Oral History Project Interviews (SC1017, <https://purl.stanford.edu/cf859pn5973>), pages 36-37. Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>12</sup> Karabel, Jerome. 2005. *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co; Synnott, Marcia Graham. 1979. *The Half-Opened Door: Discrimination and Admissions at Harvard, Yale and Princeton, 1900-1970*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press; Wechsler, Harold S. 1977. *The Qualified Student: A History of Selective College Admission in America*. New York: Wiley.

The innovation of selective admissions solved the problem of having too many qualified applicants by creating new, elaborate systems and metrics for evaluating them. This solution, however, introduced new challenges: How does a school create systems that can assess “well roundedness”? How does an application process provide indications of who will succeed and who will not? What other aspects of a campus culture does this particular school value and wish to account for in admissions? How does an admissions officer decide between two apparently equally qualified students? The result has been that college admissions processes, no matter how well-defined or well-explained, include plenty of room for discretion and judgment. Selective admissions, therefore, is highly dynamic and subject to erroneous judgments on the part of both institutions and applicants. “The decisions that determine the sorting among colleges are guided by a certain substratum of factual knowledge about higher education, supplemented by a vast, amorphous, and confused body of beliefs, rumors, folklore, and gossip. This situation is true both of students in choosing colleges and of colleges in choosing students.”<sup>13</sup>

### The Emergence of Selective Admissions at Stanford

Stanford’s approach to admissions has always afforded a great deal of discretion to those making admissions decisions. From the 1920s until 1947, admissions were handled by the Office of the Registrar in consultation with a faculty Committee on Admissions and Advanced

---

<sup>13</sup> Thresher, B. Alden. 1966. *College Admissions and the Public Interest*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board. 68.

Standing.<sup>14</sup> Applications were brief – barely two pages long – and recommendations were highly formalized.<sup>15</sup> Applications included typical questions about schooling and residence, alongside ratings of the applicant’s general health, eyesight, hearing, and whether they had “speech handicaps” or “physical handicaps.”<sup>16</sup> Applicants were asked to report their father’s occupation and their mother’s maiden name. It also included two questions about religion.

1. Of what church or religious society are you a member?
2. If not a member, church preference?

Applicants frequently left one or both of these answers blank. Others answered “Protestant” or “Latter-Day Saints” or the name of a specific parish or church. One applicant left the first question blank but indicated in the second that she was a member of Temple Shearith Israel in San Francisco. Another said simply “Judaism.” The religion questions remained on Stanford’s applications until 1950.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Fetter, Jean H. 1997. *Questions and Admissions: Reflections on 100,000 Admissions Decisions at Stanford*. Stanford University Press. 1-5. See also Mitchell, J. Pearce. 1958. *Stanford University 1916-1941*. Stanford, CA: The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. 48-52.

<sup>15</sup> Beginning in 1929, Stanford adopted a “personal rating blank” for recommenders to complete. This appears to have remained in use until the late 1940s when it was phased out in favor of a different approach to recommendations. For an example of the form, see Patterson, Ruth. 1931. “Evaluation of a Personal Rating Blank as Used at Stanford for Graduate Students.” Thesis (M.A.), Stanford, CA: Stanford University, School of Education, page 5.

<sup>16</sup> Stanford has retained files on every student who enrolled in the university. These files include grades, correspondence about financial aid and academic standing, and applications. All of the information about Stanford’s application forms during the period in question has been drawn from these microfilmed files. Stanford University Registrar’s Office, Records (SC1288, Series 9, Boxes 4-12).

<sup>17</sup> It is unclear what prompted the removal of the questions in 1950, but it was part of an overall revision of the application, likely initiated by Al Grommon, director of admissions 1948–1950. A brief story appeared in 1947 announcing that “Stanford University does not consider race or religion in determining a candidate’s eligibility for admission.” The article also noted that the religion questions would be deleted from new application forms. *The Stanford Daily*. July 28, 1947, 1. Around this same time, the ADL launched an effort to remove religion questions from college applications. It is unclear whether or not the ADL’s efforts influenced Stanford’s decision to change its applications. For a note about the University of Alabama changing its application questions, see *The ADL Bulletin*. 1952. “Bulletin Briefs,” January 1952. See also a note that Crack the Quota resulted in more than “700 colleges in 21 states” that had “had eliminated from their admission blanks those questions asking race, religion, mother’s birthplace, etc., which have no legitimate bearing on an applicant’s qualifications for getting into college, but are potentially harmful in the hands of a biased, or quota-minded, admissions officer.” *The ADL Bulletin*. 1956. “Bulletin Briefs,” January 1956.

Stanford Registrar J. Pearce Mitchell (who served 1925-1945) explained that once an application had been received, “The members of the Committee on Admissions and Advanced Standing then reviewed all the data and based their decisions on the total desirability of the applicant rather than on any one factor.”<sup>18</sup> The need to assess “total desirability” led to the codification of a ten-point scale that awarded “three [points] for the school record on a strictly mathematical scale; three [points] for the score on the aptitude test ... and four points for the Committee’s judgment regarding the student’s personal qualities, general promise, and so on. Two members of the Committee read and scored all the applications, and averaged the results.”<sup>19</sup> Although the process by which they decided to admit a given student or how they applied the ten-point scale is unknown, Mitchell believed that “the results were reasonably satisfactory.”<sup>20</sup>

The years immediately after World War II required a change in approach. Students returning from military service and others supported by the GI Bill resulted in an “unprecedented number of qualified applicants for admission [that] was too impressive to be ignored.”<sup>21</sup> Competition for spots had been “so keen” that the university was forced to “deny admission to hundreds of students with fine records who, in normal times, would have been accepted.”<sup>22</sup> In response, Stanford appointed Al Grommon, a professor of English, as its first

---

<sup>18</sup> Mitchell, J. Pearce. 1958. *Stanford University 1916-1941*. Stanford, CA: The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. 52. Also quoted in Fetter, 4-5.

<sup>19</sup> Mitchell, J. Pearce. 1958. *Stanford University 1916-1941*. Stanford, CA: The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. 52.

<sup>20</sup> Mitchell, J. Pearce. 1958. *Stanford University 1916-1941*. Stanford, CA: The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. 52

<sup>21</sup> President Donald Tresidder. Annual report of the president of Stanford University for the academic year ending 1946. 4. Stable url: [purl.stanford.edu/dz233yh9603](http://purl.stanford.edu/dz233yh9603)

<sup>22</sup> Annual report of the president of Stanford University for the academic year ending 1946. 5. Stable url: [purl.stanford.edu/dz233yh9603](http://purl.stanford.edu/dz233yh9603)

Director of Admissions in 1947. Grommon accomplished a great deal during his two years, despite working without his own budget or staff.<sup>23</sup>

In 1950, President J. E. Wallace Sterling replaced Grommon with a young professor of history and Stanford graduate, Rixford Snyder.<sup>24</sup> Snyder got the nod after serving on the Committee on Admissions and Advanced Standing, where he was the only member who regularly read application files.<sup>25</sup> As the Director of Admissions, Snyder understood that his role was to advance the mission of the university through the admissions process. He recalled that Sterling

gave me two guidelines for my work in admission — build up a student body that would be brighter than the then current faculty so he could attract outstanding professors from the East, and to remember that the students I admitted in the fifties would be supporting the university thirty years later — in short to consider both their qualifications and their potential loyalty to the university.<sup>26</sup>

Snyder understood that his job was to recruit students who would help ensure the future of the university, and he took the responsibility seriously. He did not offer a discrete vision for who these students ought to be, though he had a sense that they should not merely be “minds” or

---

<sup>23</sup> Letter and Report. August 7, 1950. Al Grommon to Dr. J. E. Wallace Sterling. Office of Undergraduate Admissions, Records (SC0407, Accession 1750, Box 1, Folder 7). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>24</sup> Stanford Daily. April 14, 1950. Snyder joined the faculty after serving in the Navy during World War II. Before his service in the Navy during World War II, Snyder taught in Stanford’s History Department as part of a team that taught the Western Civilization course, a three-course sequence required of all undergraduates. In that role, Snyder worked with Henry Madden, a lecturer who it has recently been discovered used his Stanford position and budget to espouse views that were sympathetic to Nazism. See “Preliminary Report of the Task Force to Review the Naming of the University Library.” April 18, 2022. Fresno, California: Fresno State University. <https://president.fresnostate.edu/taskforce-library/documents/HMMLibraryPreliminaryReport.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> Snyder, Rixford K. Oral History. Stanford Oral History Project Interviews (SC1017, <https://purl.stanford.edu/cf859pn5973>), 28. Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>26</sup> Snyder, Rixford K. “Memories of a Santa Clara valley boy who never left, 1908-1991” typescript, 1991. (SCM0237, Box 1), 86. Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

“grinds.”<sup>27</sup> Instead, he emphasized the significance of “motivation, attitudes, character, and future potential as citizens” in the creation of “strong alumni for the future.” Elsewhere, Snyder explained, “Because Stanford is a residence university, and because it is important that students fit into our community environment, the Committee bases as much as one-third of its estimate of a candidate on this factor.”<sup>28</sup>

Snyder served as the university’s Director of Admissions for 20 years that coincided with critical decades in Stanford’s growth and emergence as an elite institution.<sup>29</sup> The story of Stanford admissions during the 1950s and 1960s is one of creating a student body to match the university’s growing reputation and rising stature. Snyder was central to this effort.

## Snyder’s Intention to Suppress the Number of Jewish Students at Stanford

Snyder also played a central role in efforts to limit the number of Jewish students at Stanford. A 1953 memo written to President Sterling from his assistant, Fred Glover, explained that Snyder has expressed concerns over the number of Jewish applicants (see Appendix A for a

---

<sup>27</sup> Memo Rixford K. Snyder to Wallace Sterling. February 10, 1958. J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box A1, Folder 14). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. See also Press Release. October 10, 1963. Stanford University, News Service, Records circa 1891-2013 (SC 0122, Series 1, Box 186, Folder “Admissions: News releases 1960-1969”). The Press Release quotes Snyder saying, “They have an all-round scholastic quality which marks them as ‘bright without being grinds.’”

<sup>28</sup> Snyder, Rixford K. “Admissions Standards: Tough but Flexible.” *Stanford Review* (January 1958), 13-15. Stanford University News Service (SC0122, Box 3, Folder 1). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>29</sup> Rebecca Lowen’s history of Stanford during this period focuses almost exclusively on the efforts of the administration and faculty. Lowen, Rebecca S. 1997. *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford*. Berkeley: University of California Press. See also Gillmor, C. Stewart. 2004. *Fred Terman at Stanford: Building a Discipline, a University, and Silicon Valley*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

full transcription of the memo).<sup>30</sup> Calling the number of Jewish students a “problem,” Glover wrote: “Rix has been following a policy of picking the outstanding Jewish boys while endeavoring to keep a normal balance of Jewish men and women in the class.” He continued, “Rix feels that this problem is loaded with dynamite, and he wanted you [Sterling] to know about it, as he says that the situation forces him to disregard our stated policy of paying no attention to the race or religion of applicants.” Glover wrote that he approved of Snyder’s decision. “I told him that I thought his current policy made sense” and said that he promised to check with Sterling and let Snyder know if Sterling “had different views.”

Glover wrote the memo at precisely the moment when Snyder was starting to organize and systematize the admissions process. In the oral history he conducted with the Stanford Historical Society, Snyder recalled that “it wasn’t until really 1953 our admissions changed” to become more selective, and that 1952 was the first year when he had to “turn down qualified male applicants.” Calling the rise in applications a “problem” and a “major revolution in the Stanford application picture,” Snyder noted that between 1951 and 1958, applications from male candidates rose 151 percent and applications from female applications rose 101 percent.<sup>31</sup> Among other concerns, Snyder was trying to manage an admissions process that was changing rapidly in three ways. First, competition between male students had grown

---

<sup>30</sup> Memo from Fred Glover to Wallace Sterling February 4, 1953. J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box 7, Folder 14). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>31</sup> Snyder, Rixford K. “Admissions Standards: Tough but Flexible.” *Stanford Review* (January 1958), 13-15. Stanford University News Service (SC0122, Box 3, Folder 1). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. See also Report. Rixford K. Snyder “SUMMARY OF REPORT ON ADMISSIONS MADE ON JUNE 19, 1957 TO THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES BY RIXFORD K. SNYDER DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS.” J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box B1, Folder 1). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

increasingly competitive and Snyder needed to develop a rationale for determining which students to admit and which to reject.<sup>32</sup> Second, he and his two assistants were reading more and more applications each year and they were looking for a way to manage the process.

In the Glover Memo, Glover relayed that Snyder had identified “a number of high schools in Los Angeles — Beverly Hills and Fairfax are examples — whose studentbody [sic] runs from 95 to 98% Jewish. If we accept a few Jewish applicants from these schools, the following year we get a flood of Jewish applications.” Contemporary reports from the Registrar support Snyder’s hunch: Between 1949 and 1952, Fairfax sent 20 male students and Beverly Hills High School sent 67 – the fourth largest number among public high schools in California and the largest outside of the Bay Area.<sup>33</sup> During these years, however, Stanford rejected very few male applicants, so these numbers reflect a largely non-selective admissions process. Nevertheless, he expressed concern over the number of applicants from these two schools because of the “flood” created “if we accept a few Jewish applicants.”

Fairfax High School and Beverly Hills High School, while not the only schools to serve substantially Jewish neighborhoods, were exceptional in this regard, situated in two of the most densely Jewish neighborhoods in the Los Angeles area.<sup>34</sup> As one demographic study of Los Angeles Jews concluded, “We find that the densest areas of Jewish population are on the

---

<sup>32</sup> Owing to Jane Stanford’s quota on female students, competition among female applicants was much tougher than it was among male applicants. Even after the Trustees voted to lift the quota in 1933 to allow more female students and, in the process, to fend off economic pressures, a de facto quota remained in place as the university required female students to live on campus but did not expand housing for them. The quota on female students was only formally lifted in 1973.

<sup>33</sup> Registrar’s Report for 1952 (SC1760 box 3).

<sup>34</sup> Massarik, Fred. 1953. “A Report on the Jewish Population of Los Angeles.” Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles Jewish Community Council; Massarik, Fred. 1959. “A Report on the Jewish Population of Los Angeles.” Los Angeles, CA: Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles.

Westside, with the Wilshire-Fairfax and the Beverly Fairfax area being more than 60 percent Jewish. ... A surprisingly high proportion of Jewish population is found in the Beverly Hills area.”<sup>35</sup> These neighborhoods were so densely Jewish that it raised concerns for leaders in the Los Angeles Jewish community who noted that non-Jewish students were requesting transfers out of Fairfax High School, where they were uncomfortable in their minority status.<sup>36</sup> Snyder appears to have used the demographics of these two schools as a proxy for Jewish students.

## Targeting High Schools

Snyder needed a proxy because Stanford’s application forms did not ask about religion or ethnicity, although it retained questions about father’s occupation and mother’s maiden name, along with a requirement that applicants supply a photograph of themselves. On their own, however, these pieces of information would not have allowed Snyder and his office to identify Jewish applicants with certainty. This was even the case at Harvard, earlier in the century. When Harvard set about trying to limit the number of Jewish students in 1922, it convened a committee to develop a system for detecting Jewish applicants. An applicant labelled “J1” meant that “the evidence pointed conclusively to the fact that the student was

---

<sup>35</sup> Massarik, Fred. 1953. “A Report on the Jewish Population of Los Angeles.” Los Angeles, CA: Los Angeles Jewish Community Council. 13. For a note about Fairfax, see Moore, Deborah Dash. 1994. *To the Golden Cities: Pursuing the American Jewish Dream in Miami and L.A.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 86. See also Morris, Bonnie J. 1997. *The High School Scene in the Fifties: Voices from West L.A.* Westport, Conn: Bergin & Garvey; Vorspan, Max, and Lloyd P. Gartner. 1970. *History of the Jews of Los Angeles.* Regional History Series of the American Jewish History Center of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. San Marino, Calif: Huntington Library.

<sup>36</sup> “West Side Tensions,” n.d. (1955-1956). Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles, Community Relations Committee Collection IV, Box 9, Folder “CRC-1956, “Westside Tensions Committee.” Urban Archives Center, Oviatt Library, California State University, Northridge. See also Baumgarten, Max David. 2017. “Searching for a Stake: The Scope of Jewish Politics in Los Angeles from Watts to Rodney King, 1965-1992.” Ph.D., Los Angeles, CA: UCLA. <https://escholarship.org/content/qt8gk6m3ks/qt8gk6m3ks.pdf>. 45. With gratitude to Max D. Baumgarten for providing these valuable documents.

Jewish,” whereas one identified as “J3” “suggested the possibility that the student was Jewish.”<sup>37</sup> Snyder did not have the resources for such an elaborate undertaking.

Instead, Snyder followed a simpler and more discreet path laid out by his colleagues at Yale. Although Glover noted that “Harvard and Yale stick strictly to a quota system,” it was also not entirely accurate.<sup>38</sup> Before adding a question about religion to its applications in 1934, Yale reduced but did not eliminate Jewish enrollments from neighboring areas known to have sizeable Jewish populations: New Haven, Hartford, and Bridgeport, as well as public school students from New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia, the three cities with the largest American Jewish populations.<sup>39</sup> Of course, some non-Jewish students would have been caught up in this effort, but Yale’s admissions team chalked it up to the cost of a more discreet effort intended to “protect our Nordic stock,” according to Yale President James Rowland Angell.<sup>40</sup> Yale’s strategy worked to suppress the number of Jewish students on campus and to effectively hide its efforts from scrutiny.

Snyder appears to have followed this approach and its effect coincided with the expression of his intention. First, Snyder stopped including these two schools in his recruitment efforts.<sup>41</sup> Prior to 1953, itineraries of recruitment trips of Stanford’s admissions officers

---

<sup>37</sup> “Statistical Report of the Statisticians” quoted in Karabel. *The Chosen*. 96. See also Synnott. *The Half-Opened Door*, 94-95.

<sup>38</sup> The nature of Harvard’s and Yale’s efforts to suppress the number of Jewish students was also not common knowledge in 1953. Though Harvard’s activities in the 1920s were a matter of public record, Harvard seems to have evaded the suspicions of the Anti-Defamation League in the early 1950s. “Great institutions—Harvard, New York University, the University of Chicago, the University of Pennsylvania, to name a few—place no racial or religious barriers upon admission.” Forster, Arnold. 1950. *A Measure of Freedom*. New York, NY: Doubleday and Company. 116.

<sup>39</sup> Oren. *Joining the Club*. 53-55. See also Karabel. *The Chosen*, 117-119; Synnott. *The Half-Opened Door*, 152.

<sup>40</sup> Angell quoted in Karabel, 119.

<sup>41</sup> Itinerary. “Southern California Trip.” January 8-12, 1951. Cuthbertson (Kenneth M.) Papers 1941-1994 (SC0582, Box 98, file 9) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. This document mentions visits to both Beverly Hills High School and Fairfax High School. A collection of

included trips to Fairfax High School and Beverly Hills High School. After the Glover Memo, they disappear, though other Los Angeles high schools that catered to neighborhoods with large Jewish populations, like Hamilton High School, Hollywood and North Hollywood High Schools, continued to appear on recruitment schedules. Despite reporting that “the three Admissions Officers concentrated their efforts on the problems of recruitment of the Freshman Class,” Snyder omitted recruiting directly from two schools that previously had regularly sent significant numbers of students to Stanford.<sup>42</sup> Their records would easily have qualified them as “feeder schools,” in the parlance of the Admissions Office.

Second, Snyder appears to have taken other steps that had more direct and measurable effects, visible only in a close analysis of the annual reports of the Registrar’s Office. As mentioned earlier, between 1949 and 1952 Stanford enrolled 67 students from Beverly Hills High School and 20 students from Fairfax. From 1952 to 1955 Stanford enrolled 13 students from Beverly Hills High School and 1 from Fairfax.<sup>43</sup> The Registrar’s records do not indicate any other public schools that experienced such a sharp drop in student enrollments over that same six-year period or any other six-year period during the 1950s and 1960s.

---

itineraries and recruiting trip reports from 1954 and 1955 can be found in J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box 7, Folder 17) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. None of these mention Beverly Hills or Fairfax. School recruitment visits were also announced through the Stanford University News Service. For example, see Press Release, October 21, 1953. Stanford University, News Service, Records circa 1891-2013 (SC 0122, Series 1, Box 186, Folder “Admissions 1949-59: News Releases) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>42</sup> Report “Annual Report of the Director of Admissions for the Year 1953-1954.” Rixford K. Snyder. Annual Report of the President of Stanford University (SC 1103, Box 2, Folder “President's Report Administration 1953-54”) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>43</sup> The date range corresponds to calendar years, while the Registrar’s Office presented its data according to academic year, so what looks like four calendar years refers to three academic years: 1949-1950, 1950-1951, and 1952. This was the practice throughout the period in question.

Though the Registrar's Office reported enrollments annually, it presented data on high schools in three-year increments. As a result, each Registrar's Report does not reflect a single year's total but the sum of three years of admissions. The 67 students from Beverly Hills High School that had enrolled at Stanford (according to the Registrar's Report of 1952) accounted for the total number of students over three academic years: 1949-1950, 1950-1951, and 1951-1952. Similarly, when the Registrar reported in 1955 that Stanford enrolled only a single student from Fairfax, that, too, reflected the total number of students over three years: 1952-1953, 1953-1954, and 1954-1955. Given this approach to reporting, it is impossible to ascertain how many students from any given high school enrolled at Stanford in a particular academic year.

Additional analyses, however, confirmed both the pattern and the timing of the decline, suggesting a strong correlation between Snyder's intention, Glover's support of it, and the reduction in students from those two schools who enrolled at Stanford. Though it is impossible to determine with certainty how many graduates of any particular high school enrolled at Stanford in any given year, we were able to calculate all of the possible combinations of admission totals for each of these two high schools for the years in question (a more complete description of our methods can be found in Appendix C and the data tables for the two high schools are reproduced in Appendix E and Appendix F).

Our analysis revealed that between 16 and 29 graduates of Beverly Hills High School enrolled at Stanford in the fall of 1952. One year later, that number dropped to between 0 and 13, which remained the range of possible enrollments for the next three years. Practically the same story unfolds with respect to Fairfax High School. In 1951-1952, Fairfax sent either eight

or nine students to Stanford. The following year, Fairfax sent either a single student or no students. This pattern persisted for the next three years, with only one or zero Fairfax graduates enrolling in any given year.

We wish to offer three important caveats in the conclusions we can draw from the data. First, we have no way of knowing whether or not the students who applied to Stanford from these schools identified as Jews. We note, however, Snyder's understanding that these schools had significant Jewish populations, so we followed his inclination and focused our analysis on those schools. Second, there is no way of knowing precisely how many students from any single high school actually enrolled at Stanford during any given year. Third, these data are based only on the number of students who ultimately enrolled at Stanford. They do not reveal how many students applied, how many were accepted, and how many opted to attend elsewhere. The number of admits from a given school or the "yield" of those students (what was then referred to as the "drop off" rate) were not retained and are not available. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to conclude that the sharp drop in enrollments from these schools reflected a reduction in offers of admission. Furthermore, to have had two schools that regularly and reliably sent students to Stanford so suddenly reverse course and stop sending students on its own accord would likely have raised concerns in the Admissions and Registrar's offices. We found no evidence of such concerns.

It is worth noting in this regard that enrollments from other public schools that had significant Jewish student populations remained relatively stable. San Francisco's Lowell High School, which was known to attract significant numbers of San Francisco's Jewish teenagers, did experience a drop in the number of students it sent, but it was not nearly as sharp as Fairfax

and Beverly Hills High Schools. Hamilton High School, which served another Jewish neighborhood in Los Angeles, saw a slight increase in the number of students it sent to Stanford, and Hollywood and North Hollywood High Schools consistently sent a small number of students that was largely unchanged between 1952 and 1955. Beyond California, schools known to have large Jewish student populations, like New Trier High School (Winnetka, IL), Garfield High School (Seattle, WA), or Grant and Lincoln High Schools (Portland, OR), experienced no comparatively sharp decline in the students they sent to Stanford as a result of Snyder's intention to limit the number of Jewish students at Stanford (See Appendix D for enrollment data from selected public high schools).<sup>44</sup> These schools, however, did not have the density of Jewish students that the two Los Angeles area schools did.

It is unclear how long Snyder's efforts were in effect, but the repercussions were long lasting. Over the course of the 1950s and into the 1960s, Beverly Hills High School rebounded somewhat, possibly sending as many as 21 and as few as 8 students in 1958. But Fairfax never did. Our estimates suggest that it may have sent between 1 and 3 students each year through the end of the 1950s.<sup>45</sup>

## Who Else Knew About Snyder's Intentions?

Snyder's intentions with respect to Jewish applicants were not a secret among Stanford's leadership. Glover knew about them, thought that they "made sense," and

---

<sup>44</sup> Masotti, Louis H. 1967. *Education and Politics in Suburbia: The New Trier Experience*. Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University.

<sup>45</sup> Again, however, these numbers would not have remained consistent, and a rise one year would have to be followed by a reduction in following years, in order to match the three-year totals provided in the Registrar's Reports.

conveyed both his and Snyder's sentiments to President Sterling. As was common practice at that time, people in the administration indicated that they had read a particular document by checking off their initials on a list, usually typed or stamped directly on the document.

According to this convention, we can conclude that the Glover Memo was read by Sterling's two secretaries, Marguerite Cole and Lillian Caroline Owen, and by the Provost, Douglas Merritt Whitaker. Sterling did not indicate that he read the memo, as no check mark appears by his name. As a result, we cannot definitively conclude that Sterling read the Glover Memo.

The tone and content of the memo, however, indicated that Glover intended it for Sterling. Glover concluded the memo by stating his intention to "relay these highlights of our conversation to you [Sterling] and let Rix know if you had different views." He used a familiar salutation ("Dear Wally"), adding that this "was a matter requiring the utmost discretion."

## Admissions in Policy and Practice

Identifying others who knew about the Glover Memo contributes a crucial piece of this larger story, as it illustrates that Snyder acted within the broad mandate of his office and with the tacit permission of others in the administration. Stanford assigned its Director of Admissions "the final responsibility for the admission or rejection of all candidates."<sup>46</sup> Though Snyder consulted with the Faculty Committee on Admissions, he regularly complained that they

---

<sup>46</sup> Report. Rixford K. Snyder. November 21, 1958. "Annual Report of the Office of Admissions to the President for the Academic Year 1957-1958." J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box 7, Folder 18) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

were not fulfilling their duties.<sup>47</sup> The result was an admissions policy that assigned a great deal of discretion to the Director of Admissions.<sup>48</sup>

Snyder had inherited the ten-point system with its allotment of four points to “personal qualities” from Grommon and the Registrar’s office.<sup>49</sup> He also inherited a policy that made explicit his latitude and authority over admissions decisions. A 1945 outline of the responsibilities of the Admissions Committee assigned it the authority for “adjusting entrance credentials,” as well as the power to “exercise such discretion as shall subserve the equities in particular cases without imperiling the general regulation.”<sup>50</sup> In other words, they were given the power to both set the rules and make exceptions to them.

Snyder relished this policy and Sterling backed Snyder’s efforts to defend the discretion afforded the Admissions Office throughout his presidency. In 1957, when Stanford published its first self-study in a volume called *The Undergraduate in the University*, the faculty committee behind the study criticized the ten-point scale. Specifically, the faculty committee expressed

---

<sup>47</sup> In one report, Snyder wrote with exasperation, “Again this year, the members of the Faculty Committee on Admissions failed to read any folders, despite repeated requests to do it.” J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box 7, Folder 18) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>48</sup> In 1959, The Committee on Admissions passed a motion affirming their faith in the Director of Admissions. “We express our confidence in the Director of Admissions and support him in his use of judgment within the present limits of his authority.” Excerpts from Minutes of Committee on Admissions. December 22, 1959. J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box A1, Folder 14) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>49</sup> Beginning in 1929, Stanford adopted a “personal rating blank” for recommenders to complete. This appears to have remained in use until the late 1940s when it was phased out in favor of a different approach to recommendations. For an example of the form, see Patterson, Ruth. 1931. “Evaluation of a Personal Rating Blank as Used at Stanford for Graduate Students.” Thesis (M.A.), Stanford, CA: Stanford University, School of Education, page 5. It also asked recommenders to evaluate the student’s “manner and affect,” leadership, initiative (“does he need constant prodding?”), ability to control emotions, and sense of purpose. It also asks if students have “superior physique, athletic ability, normal health and strength, frequent sickness, some physical disability.”

<sup>50</sup> “By-Laws of the Academic Council.” June 15, 1945. Richard Lyman, President of Stanford University (SC0215, Series 1, Box 2, Folder: “Enrollment Data: Stanford”). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

concerns about the four points allotted to a “personal rating,” which they felt to be “avowedly subjective: determination of qualification is based upon the joint estimate of high school counselors and admissions staff members of the student’s character, personality, motivation, ability to survive at Stanford, anticipated contribution to the University community, and special talents and abilities.”<sup>51</sup> The faculty committee sought a more formal approach, grounded in an assessment of applicant qualities that they hoped would predict the likelihood of a student’s “survival” at Stanford.

Snyder was furious about the report, which he felt did not appreciate the demands of his office. He stressed that without his “freedom of judgment” Stanford would lose top candidates from “prestige private schools.” He fiercely defended the admission of athletes, the allotment of legacy admissions, and his power to admit students who were wealthy and connected, despite his belief that the faculty “Admissions Committee would reject them.” Objecting to the imposition of such a system for making admissions decisions, Snyder cracked, “It is not ‘family-like’ to base all decisions affecting the family according to a formula.” He saved his choicest criticism for the faculty, whom he deemed “irresponsible.” “They are exercising authority without assuming the responsibility for their actions,” he continued. “They will then leave the admissions staff with the responsibility of handling the consequences of their actions and of explaining them to those affected by them, but with no authority to

---

<sup>51</sup> Hoopes, Robert, and Hubert Marshall. 1957. *The Undergraduate in the University: A Report to the Faculty by the Executive Committee of the Stanford Study of Undergraduate Education, 1954-56*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University. 18.

operate under principles and policies which we sincerely believe to be correct and best for Stanford.”<sup>52</sup>

Sterling supported Snyder in his effort to retain the freedom of his office and avoid what Sterling thought to be the excessive meddling of the faculty. In a response to Snyder’s memo, Sterling affirmed both his commitment to the policy and to Snyder’s desire to operate without excessive faculty oversight. “The policy as stated is clear and agreeable, and I ask that you utilize it in the administration of admissions to Stanford University. It is my further understanding that the matter of consulting with the Subcommittee on Undergraduate Admissions ... is *at your discretion*.”<sup>53</sup>

Thus empowered, Snyder continued to resist efforts by the faculty to direct the work of his office until he resigned as Dean of Admissions in 1969. When Stanford completed its second campus self-study, which took the form of a ten-volume report known as the “Study of Education at Stanford” (SES), the faculty again found fault in the ten-point scale and flexibility it afforded.<sup>54</sup> “The scheme would be more nearly described by a division which gave 4 points to the prediction of academic achievement and 6 points to the personal ratings.”<sup>55</sup> The

---

<sup>52</sup> Memo. Rixford K. Snyder to Wallace Sterling. February 10, 1958. J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box A1, Folder 14). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>53</sup> Memo. Wallace Sterling to Rixford K. Snyder. February 17, 1958. J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box A1, Folder 14). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. Emphasis added. See also Memo. J. E. Wallace Sterling to Rixford K. Snyder. January 28, 1960. J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box 7, Folder 18) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>54</sup> Stanford University, ed. 1969. *The Study of Education at Stanford: Report to the University*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

<sup>55</sup> “Report to the Humanities and Sciences Faculty,” 1967(?), Office of Undergraduate Admissions, records, 1962-2020 (SC1750, Folder 7). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

committee made a number of recommendations to improve the process and, importantly, to undertake more systematic efforts to recruit minority candidates.<sup>56</sup>

As he had a decade earlier, Snyder defended his office, complaining that SES unfairly characterized his work and the policies that guided it. After a long list of questions and concerns, Snyder concluded, “What disturbs me most, however, is the unfairness with which the reports present the current admission procedures and ignore reality in their proposals.”<sup>57</sup> However, he did not just intend to defend the reputation of his office but its role in shaping the university. He closed his correspondence on the matter by stating his “sincere conviction that the University’s best interests are jeopardized by the ... major recommendations.”<sup>58</sup>

Toward the end of his tenure, in response to the changing tides of the campus and the country, Snyder supported the university’s efforts to recruit more broadly and specifically to recruit students from minoritized groups. But he also advocated for expanding religious and geographic diversity, noting that “religious and geographical diversity are synonymous here since the Jewish and Catholic population are concentrated in the Northeast.”<sup>59</sup> His conflation

---

<sup>56</sup> Stanford University, ed. 1969. *The Study of Education at Stanford: Report to the University*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University. 69. In part, the recommendation reads, “We make no recommendation on the number or proportion of minority-group student Stanford should admit. There are too few now, and we can hardly foresee a time when there will be too many.”

<sup>57</sup> Memo. Rixford K. Snyder to Herbert Packer, Chairman, Steering Committee, Study of Education at Stanford. September 16, 1968. Stanford University, President’s Office, Sterling-Pitzer Transitional Records 1946-1970 (SC0217, Box 3, Folder 2). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>58</sup> Report. “Annual Report of the Office of Admissions to the President for the Academic Year 1957-1958. Rixford K. Snyder to Provost Fred Terman. November 21, 1958. Annual Report of the President of Stanford University (SC 1103, Box 5, Folder “Administration 1957-58”) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. See also: Memo. Rixford K. Snyder to Herbert Packer, Chairman, Steering Committee, Study of Education at Stanford. August 29, 1968. Stanford University, President’s Office, Sterling-Pitzer Transitional Records 1946-1970 (SC0217, Box 3, Folder 2). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>59</sup> Memo. Rixford K. Snyder to Richard Lyman, Vice President and Provost. March 17, 1967. Lyman (Richard W.), President of Stanford University, Papers 1965-1981 (SC0215, Series 1, Box 1, Folder “Student-Faculty Sub-

of religion and demography, though framed within an effort to ensure a diverse student body, inadvertently echoed his less generous response from the early 1950s. At the beginning of his term in the Admissions Office, Snyder used demography to stanch the enrollment of Jewish students; at the end, he employed demography as a recruitment tool. In both cases, however, demography served as a proxy for identifying Jewish students.

## Denial in Practice

Snyder acted with the tacit support of some in the president's inner circle and within an Admissions Office that was empowered by a policy that afforded him a great deal of discretion. This combination of factors created a situation in Stanford admissions wherein Snyder could reduce or restrict the number of Jewish students at Stanford by targeting specific high schools known to have significant populations of Jewish students and still claim that the university did not impose a quota on Jewish students.

University leadership took advantage of this technicality to dismiss claims that they unfairly restricted admissions of Jewish students. In public statements and private correspondence, Glover and Snyder each took advantage of the technical distinction between Stanford's formal policy and the literal definition of the term "quota" to reject and discredit concerns about Jewish applicants and students. Sterling took a similar approach, though we cannot determine whether or not he was acting with knowledge of Snyder's efforts. When alumni, parents, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL), and some trustees of the

---

Committee on Admissions 1967). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

university inquired about Stanford's orientation toward admitting Jewish students, Glover, Snyder, and Sterling rebuffed their concerns, sometimes taking umbrage that such a claim would even be levied against the institution.

The first such letter we found was written in December 1954, 18 months and two admissions cycles after the Glover Memo. An alumnus then serving as a judge in the Pacific Northwest wrote a letter to a member of the Law School faculty sharing that he had heard word "for more than a year" of Stanford's quota on Jewish students. At first, he said, he dismissed the concerns because they came from parents whose children were not accepted to Stanford and because he knows "how unreliable such statements can be." But, he observed, they persisted. "Within the past week," the author wrote, "two people, neither of whom is acquainted with the other," mentioned the limitation on Jewish students. "They also insisted that the statistics of the entering classes clearly show a sharp drop in the percentage of Jewish students who are admitted." He concluded, "If these rumors are false, and I am in a position to help stop them, I certainly will. However if they are true, I want to know about it."<sup>60</sup> The letter was forwarded to Fred Glover.

Glover's reply was dismissive, describing the ten-point scale in order to explain that "each applicant to Stanford is considered individually on the same three factors," before addressing the charges directly. "We are never accused of being anti-Catholic or anti-Methodist but the charge does seem to arise sometimes, when a Jewish candidate is involved, that the University is anti-Jewish." He went on to explain that the university's admissions

---

<sup>60</sup> Letter. Gus Solomon to James Brenner, Stanford Law School. December 6, 1954. Lyman (Richard W.), President of Stanford University, Papers 1965-1981 (SC0215, Box 10, Folder "Discrimination: Religious (Incl. Jewish)") Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

procedures do not ask about religion, race, or “social background,” so “if anyone has statistics on the proportion of Jewish students entering Stanford, the figures are not Stanford’s.” He added, “If we had such information, we could defend ourselves better against charges of discrimination, but if we maintained it, we would be open to charges that we kept the data to establish quotas.” He closed the letter by extending his sympathies and offering a note of cooperation and goodwill. “It disturbs us deeply to have such rumors circulating as you have heard, and I hope that the above information will answer the questions which have been raised in your own mind.”<sup>61</sup>

In his reply, Glover also noted that this was not the first time Stanford was accused of employing an “anti-Jewish” policy. He revealed that Stanford had recently been the subject of an investigation by the ADL that focused on its use of quotas, but that “the University was cleared of any anti-Jewish discrimination.” Glover tried to further minimize the judge’s concerns by stating that “the source of these rumors is very likely the same as” those which led to the first investigation, suggesting that they were hearing different accounts of the same incident and that they not be taken too seriously. In dismissing the judge’s concerns, Glover did not mention what he knew to be true: that the Admissions Office engaged in practices, congruent with policy, that were intended to suppress the number of Jewish students at Stanford.

Other letters arrived and earned responses from Glover, Sterling, and Snyder, all of whom offered the same dismissive treatment. In a 1955 letter to a parent inquiring about the

---

<sup>61</sup> Letter. Fred Glover to Gus Solomon. December 28, 1954. Lyman (Richard W.), President of Stanford University, Papers 1965-1981 (SC0215, Box 10, Folder “Discrimination: Religious (Incl. Jewish)”) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

situation, Sterling commented on the “ugly suspicion,” writing “among those rejected are some Jewish students well as Catholics, Methodists and adherents of other religions.”<sup>62</sup> He continued to emphasize the university’s treatment of each applicant as an individual, but also noted that this was not “the first time that a Jewish father or mother has written to us in a similar vein.”

Six years later, he responded to a handwritten letter from an alumna who recounted being at a dinner party and hearing from several people that they “knew” that Stanford limited the number of Catholic and Jewish students. She posed the question to President Sterling directly, “Is there now or has there ever been in the past a quota on the number of Jewish or Catholic students Stanford will accept?”<sup>63</sup> Sterling sharply denied the accusation, writing “Stanford has no quotas of any kind, racial, religious or geographic. It follows, therefore, that there are no quotas for Catholics or Jews. Statements or rumors to the contrary are wholly false.” He continued, though, noting that he has known about concerns about Stanford’s treatment of Jewish applicants:

It is interesting and significant to note that Stanford is not accused of being anti-Methodist or anti-Presbyterian; nor do I recall that Stanford has been accused of being anti-Catholic; when an anti-faith charge is made, it is usually that Stanford is anti-Jewish. This is simply not so. Why people choose to believe rumor or fragmentary truth rather than fact, I do not know.<sup>64</sup>

Written over the span of a few years, both Sterling’s and Glover’s letters employ a spurious comparison between antisemitism and “anti-Methodism” and indicate the administration’s

---

<sup>62</sup> Letter. Wallace Sterling to Jacob Chaitkin. May 31, 1955. Lyman (Richard W.), President of Stanford University, Papers 1965-1981 (SC0215, Box 10, Folder “Discrimination: Religious (Incl. Jewish)”) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>63</sup> Letter. Mrs. Hugo Oswald Jr. to President Wallace Sterling. February 21, 1961. Lyman (Richard W.), President of Stanford University, Papers 1965-1981 (SC0215, Series 1, Box 11, Folder “Policy: Religion”) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>64</sup> Letter. President Wallace Sterling to Mrs. Hugo Oswald Jr. March 6, 1961. Lyman (Richard W.), President of Stanford University, Papers 1965-1981 (SC0215, Series 1, Box 11, Folder “Policy: Religion”) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

awareness that people had questions about admissions practices as they pertained to Jewish applicants. Both men also dismissed the letter writers' concerns as "rumors" to be dispelled, not sincere concerns about the differential treatment of Jewish applicants.

The correspondence also evidences the close communications between Sterling, Glover, and Snyder with respect to this matter. Sterling copied his responses to Snyder, and Glover read and approved Sterling's response from 1955. Snyder and Glover both knew of Sterling's responses and Sterling indicated that he knew about the other letters of concern. It also seems unlikely that the president of the university would have been left in the dark about an investigation by the Anti-Defamation League.

In spite of these efforts, the public impression that Stanford employed limits on Jewish student enrollments led to a second ADL investigation in 1961. This time, Snyder offered a rebuttal on behalf of his office and his practices, though it differed in strategy and tone. Unlike Glover and Sterling, Snyder did not speak to broad policy issues, choosing instead to focus on the immediate cases at hand. Snyder detailed the reasons for rejecting the two students on whose behalf the complaint was lodged (one was given a place on the waiting list and the other was the result for an "oversight only now discovered"). Understanding that Stanford rejected many qualified candidates each year made his job in this letter relatively straightforward. He relied on policy throughout, turning to both firm benchmarks ("Both girls had high school records below 3.80, whereas all the girls we admitted last year on straight competition had grades above 3.80.") and more qualitative assessments ("Her record of participation other than

academic was not strong and she was given a 'good' but not 'top' committee rating.") to explain his decision.<sup>65</sup>

In responding to the inquiry from the ADL, Snyder cooperated with Glover, drafting a response that received Glover's formal approval. To his reply to Stanley Jacobs, regional director of the ADL, Snyder affixed a handwritten note. "OK Fred? I am holding letter pending a reply from you before I drop it in box!" A reply reads, "Mr. Snyder notified 7/25 that letter is ok."

Despite Snyder and Glover's efforts to deflect such inquiries, the questions persisted, leading to a third inquiry from the ADL in 1966. This inquiry was brought to the administration by Dick Guggenhime, then-president of the Board of Trustees (a position he held from 1964 to 1967). Guggenhime raised the issue again on the basis of "statistics sent to him by the Anti-Defamation League" suggesting that "in the student body at large, in the freshman class of 1965, and in the graduate student body the percentages [of Jewish students] were low and suggested a discriminatory quota."<sup>66</sup> Calling this the "last and least satisfactory inquiry," Snyder prepared a document for Guggenhime documenting the university's history in both admitting Jewish students and in rebuffing claims like this one. Snyder noted that he had information about the number of Jewish students, likely collected by the Chaplain's Office, which indicated

---

<sup>65</sup> Letter. Rixford K. Snyder to Stanley S. Jacobs, Regional Director, Anti-Defamation League. July 26, 1961. Lyman (Richard W.), President of Stanford University, Papers 1965-1981 (SC0215, series 1, Box 10, Folder "Discrimination: Religious (Incl. Jewish)"). A few years later, an office memorandum mentions the family of a Jewish candidate who was rejected who, Snyder believed, "are inclined to think discrimination was involved." Memo. Robert J. Wert, Office of the President to Rixford K. Snyder. May 18, 1964. J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box B4, Folder 1). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>66</sup> Rixford K. Snyder, May 21, 1969. "Comments on the Number of Jewish Students at Stanford." Kenneth S. Pitzer President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0218, Box 1C, Folder "Admissions (General) 69-70.")

that the percentage of Jewish first-year students in the fall of 1965 was between 9.2% and 10%.<sup>67</sup> Snyder noted that the meeting with Guggenhime, which included a Judge Duniway and a Mr. Raab, “had gone satisfactorily.”<sup>68</sup>

Omitted from the document he had prepared was any mention of either the Glover Memo or Snyder’s actions from the early 1950s.

In 1969, at the very end of his tenure as Dean of Admissions, Snyder made a presentation to the Admissions Committee “on the number of Jewish students at Stanford.”<sup>69</sup> In notes prepared for the meeting, Snyder recounted a history of concerns regarding Jewish students at Stanford. He recalled receiving a folder in 1950 “marked ‘Racial Discrimination – lack of it at Stanford’” from Al Grommon. The folder, he said, included a single letter written by Glover in response to an inquiry about “the number of Negro and Jewish students at Stanford.” He recalled responding to Mr. Jacobs of the ADL, adding yet another inquiry from 1963, and he recalled the meeting with Guggenhime, as well.<sup>70</sup> Referring to the implication that Stanford had quotas on Jewish students, he asked rhetorically, “I don’t know how one can answer questions concerning numbers if the assumption is that a particular number is low — what number would be satisfactory?”<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Rixford K. Snyder (n.d. 1966?) “Information gathered for Mr. Guggenhime and Judge Duniway for meeting with Mr. Jacobs and Mr. Raab.” Kenneth S. Pitzer President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0218, Box 1C, Folder “Admissions (General) 69-70.”)

<sup>68</sup> The other participants were Judge Ben C. Duniway, who sat on the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was a graduate of Stanford Law School (1933). Mr. Raab was likely Earl Raab, of San Francisco’s Jewish Community Relations Council. Rixford K. Snyder, May 21, 1969. “Comments on the Number of Jewish Students at Stanford.” Kenneth S. Pitzer President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0218, Box 1C, Folder “Admissions (General) 69-70.”)

<sup>69</sup> Rixford K. Snyder, May 21, 1969. “Comments on the Number of Jewish Students at Stanford.” Kenneth S. Pitzer President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0218, Box 1C, Folder “Admissions (General) 69-70.”)

<sup>70</sup> This brings to four the total number of inquiries by the ADL during Snyder’s tenure.

<sup>71</sup> Rixford K. Snyder, May 21, 1969. “Comments on the Number of Jewish Students at Stanford.” Kenneth S. Pitzer President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0218, Box 1C, Folder “Admissions (General) 69-70.”)

Again, Glover supported Snyder's obfuscations in a cover letter to Ken Cuthbertson accompanying the documentation from the 1969 meeting. Glover explained, "Some Jewish faculty members raised some questions about our admissions policies, and Rix responded in these remarks, made to the Admissions Committee. His comments set forth some facts which we have needed from time to time. *I think our record is an excellent one.*"<sup>72</sup> Snyder's remarks to the faculty omitted any mention of his expression of concern about Jewish students and any indication that he had taken action to suppress the number of students from Beverly Hills High School and Fairfax High School, or that Glover, Snyder, and others close to President Sterling knew about and enabled his efforts.

Snyder's actions had long-lasting effects beyond the campus, as the belief that Stanford limited the number of Jewish students continued beyond his service in the Admissions Office. In his first year as Dean of Admissions, Fred Hargadon sent a particularly pointed note to a concerned parent:

Stanford does not have a Jewish quota. You'll just have to take my word for that, since the kind of "positive proof" you request seems impossible to come up with. We do not ask for ethnic or religious background on our applications, we call each application as we see it, and I have no idea how many Jewish students we've admitted this year or who they are.<sup>73</sup>

Hargadon accurately noted that Stanford no longer asked about religion or ethnicity, adding that Stanford only accepted 1,400 students from some 10,000 applications, and that people attributed their rejections to an array of reasons. There is no evidence to suggest that

---

<sup>72</sup> Memo. Fred Glover to Ken Cuthbertson. May 26, 1969. Kenneth S. Pitzer President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0218, Box 1C, Folder "Admissions (General) 69-70.")

<sup>73</sup> Letter. Dean of Admissions Fred Hargadon to Mrs. Norman Licht. Stanford University, Provost's Office (SC0115, Box 2, Folder "Folder "Admissions Office to 1971"). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

Hargadon employed a quota of any kind on anyone, but the impression that there had been quotas remained nevertheless.

Four years later, claims of quotas had become so widespread that the university found it necessary to address them in the form letter sent to rejected applicants. Written in Hargadon's voice, the letter dismissed claims of quotas as "rumors" and went on to explain, "I do want to state again (as I did in a letter to you before you applied) that we admit students on an individual basis. We do not have quotas for particular schools, particular school systems, or for geographical regions. Nor are there any racial, religious, ethnic, or sex-related quotas of any kind."<sup>74</sup> The letter illustrates just how widely assumed it was that Stanford employed quotas in its admissions decisions.

## Impressions of Quotas

Though letters from Stanford leadership uniformly dismissed such claims as "rumors," the Jewish community did not see it this way.<sup>75</sup> Its belief that Stanford placed restrictions on the number of Jewish students it would admit reflected the reality of their shared experience, particularly among Jews in Southern California, where Snyder focused his efforts. Robin Kennedy, who grew up in Los Angeles and attended North Hollywood High School, recalled, "I also heard when I was in high school that there was a Jewish quota."<sup>76</sup> Mark Mancall, who also

---

<sup>74</sup> Letter. March, 1974. Stanford University, Office of Undergraduate Admissions, Records 1962-1985 (SC1750, Box 1, File 6) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>75</sup> For a retrospective reflection on this phenomenon, see Mia Bruch. "Stanfordiaspora." *The Stanford Daily*, March 8, 1996. Page 5.

<sup>76</sup> Kennedy, Robin. (2019) Stanford Historical Society Oral Histories, Stanford University (SC1017).

<https://purl.stanford.edu/xq160wx3636>. Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford

grew up in Los Angeles and who later joined the faculty of Stanford's History Department, recalled a similar understanding. "I was told when I graduated Hollywood High School, 'Don't apply to Stanford, because Jews have a very difficult time getting into Stanford.' I didn't apply to Stanford."<sup>77</sup>

Paul Seaver, who joined the Stanford faculty in 1964, described his impression of the student body as "lily white," a quality he attributed to "the head of admissions [who] had a formula which required some quality called *all around* and *all around* automatically eliminated Jews who weren't *all around*. So it was the blondest place I'd ever seen." Seaver came to Stanford from Reed College, and in weighing his options, took note about what he had heard regarding Stanford's admissions processes. "The kids I knew at Reed said, 'You can't go to that place. They don't admit Jews, certainly not from Los Angeles.' These kids were by and large from Los Angeles. I couldn't believe it but it was true."<sup>78</sup> The point is not whether Seaver's impression of Stanford's admissions processes was accurate, but that the impression was so widespread.

Seaver, Mancall, and Kennedy's recollections were born out in other oral histories conducted for the Stanford Historical Society. New oral histories conducted for this project corroborated the widespread impression that Stanford tried to limit the number of Jewish

---

University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. Page 20. Kennedy also conveyed this understanding in a letter printed in the Stanford Daily, writing "Jewish high school students in Los Angeles were discouraged by their college counselors from applying Stanford in the '60s; it was widely believed that Stanford would not accept more than one Jew from any one high school." The Stanford Daily. May 31, 1996. Page 4.

<sup>77</sup> Mancall, Mark. (2013) Stanford Historical Society Oral Histories, Stanford University (SC1017).

<https://purl.stanford.edu/xq160wx3636>. Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. Page 85.

<sup>78</sup> Seaver, Paul S. (2016). Oral History. Stanford Historical Society Oral History Program Interviews (SC0932). Department of Special Collections & University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

students.<sup>79</sup> One alumna from the Northwest had heard that Stanford employed quotas, but only after she returned home at the end of her first year. Another, who graduated from Fairfax High School, explained that despite his accomplishments in high school, he was denied admission and was only accepted after the extraordinary efforts of his mother to lobby for a transfer admission. Another testified that she did not apply to Stanford because she understood that there had been quotas on Jewish students, adding that it was “common knowledge” among her Jewish friends at her Los Angeles public high school.

Stanford could deny claims of quotas because, technically, the university did not have them. In the early 1950s, the language of quotas had become the popular shorthand for systematic biases in institutions, especially in higher education. Quotas had long existed but in the late 1940s, the Anti-Defamation League’s “Crack the Quota” campaign drew new attention to the problem quotas and led the charge with new efforts to expose them.<sup>80</sup> Among its first efforts was a collaboration with the American Council on Education to “determine whether a

---

<sup>79</sup> New oral histories were conducted with the promise of confidentiality, so no names are attributed and no direct quotations provided. Previously conducted oral histories that note the pervasiveness of impressions of quotas include Bienenstock, Arthur (2010). Stanford Historical Society Oral Histories, Stanford University (SC1017). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. Bienenstock attributed Fred Hargadon’s recruitment efforts with bringing more Jewish students to Stanford. Page 19. See Also Abernathy, David (2009). Stanford Historical Society Oral Histories, Stanford University (SC1017). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. Abernathy mentions knowing about “Jewish quotas” as well. Page 24. Harvey, Van Austin (2012). Stanford Historical Society Oral Histories, Stanford University (SC1017). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. Harvey noted, “Stanford was so known throughout California as being, if not anti-Semitic, at least not enthusiastic about having Jewish faculty or students. There were rumors that there were quotas on admissions.” Page 24.

<sup>80</sup> Crack the Quota was a massive effort and resulted in a few meaningful successes and numerous publications. These included Belth, N.C. 1958. *Barriers: Patterns of Discrimination against Jews*. New York, NY: Friendly House Publishers; Forster, Arnold. 1950. *A Measure of Freedom*. New York, NY: Doubleday and Company; Ivy, A.C., and Irwin Ross. 1949. *Religion and Race: Barriers to College?* Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 153. New York, NY: Public Affairs Committee, Inc. with the Cooperation of the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith.

given applicant to an American college will be admitted by that college, or rejected.”<sup>81</sup> For the project, pollster Elmo Roper sampled 10,000 high school seniors across the country and another 5,000 who lived in large cities, all of whom were slated to graduate high school in 1947.<sup>82</sup> He concluded that Jewish students in the Northeast faced greater discrimination than did Catholics or Protestants. “It does appear from the findings of this study that a certain sort of discrimination against Jewish students applying to certain types of colleges in a particular part of the country is a demonstrated fact.”<sup>83</sup>

The Roper Report confirmed what many already suspected: that colleges and universities employed unspecified procedures designed to disadvantage Jewish applicants. It also concluded that the practices were more widespread and systematic than was previously known. But its findings, while broadly accurate, also acknowledged important regional differences. “With other applicants and particularly those from the South and West, the religion factor seems to be of negligible influence, at least when compared to sex, legacy, and quintile rating. The frequent charge against the colleges that they discriminate against Jewish students seems, then, to be proven, but only in part and perhaps not nearly to the extent which is frequently charged.”<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Roper, Elmo, American Council on Education, and Committee on a Study of Discriminations in College Admissions. 1949. *Factors Affecting the Admission of High School Seniors to College*. Washington: American Council on Education. iii. Emphasis added. Funds for the project were provided by B’nai B’rith, the parent body of the ADL at the time.

<sup>82</sup> Citing dramatic regional differences between the experiences of “negro” and white students in Northern and Southern schools, as well as the relatively low incidences of “negro” students applying to college, the study excluded responses of African American students and it does not appear to highlight responses from Latinx or Asian American students. Roper. *Factors Affecting the Admission of High School Seniors to College*. iii. The Roper Report was cited regularly in books, articles, and other publications from B’nai B’rith, the Anti-Defamation League, and the American Council on Education.

<sup>83</sup> Roper. *Factors Affecting the Admission of High School Seniors to College*. LII.

<sup>84</sup> Roper. *Factors Affecting the Admission of High School Seniors to College*. LIV.

Quotas, however, were not the only means used by universities against Jewish students or applicants. Riv-Ellen Prell has documented how the leadership of the University of Minnesota employed “antisemitism without quotas,” documenting formal and informal efforts to suppress or marginalize Jewish students.<sup>85</sup> Similarly, Andrei S. Markovits and Kenneth Garner’s history of Jewish students at the University of Michigan documents the ways in which university president Alexander Ruthven used concerns about politics to temper a student body that he thought was growing too politically active.<sup>86</sup> Neither Minnesota nor Michigan employed quotas, but in both cases, campus leaders used concerns about politics to action against students that they also knew to be Jewish.

Snyder’s efforts resembled the approaches of these two midwestern universities in eschewing formal quotas and taking advantage of permissive policies regarding other actions. As a result of this strategy, Stanford did not appear in the numerous volumes, reports, and conferences organized in the wake of the Roper Report, neither did it feature in the ADL’s reporting on its efforts to eradicate quotas in higher education.<sup>87</sup> This may have been because it was still not a particularly desirable school for Jews on the East Coast (who represented the

---

<sup>85</sup> Prell, Riv-Ellen. 2021. “Antisemitism without Quotas at the University of Minnesota in the 1930s and 1940s: Anticommunist Politics, the Surveillance of Jewish Students, and American Antisemitism.” *American Jewish History* 105 (1–2): 157–88. See also “A Campus Divided: Progressives, Anticommunists, Racism and Antisemitism at the University of Minnesota 1930-1942,” an exhibition curated for the University of Minnesota by Riv-Ellen Prell. Available online: <http://acampusdivided.umn.edu/index.php/about/>

<sup>86</sup> Markovits, Andrei S., and Kenneth Garner. 2020. *The Boundaries of Pluralism: The World of the University of Michigan’s Jewish Students from 1897 to 1945*. Ann Arbor, MI: Maize Books.

<sup>87</sup> Braverman, Harold, and Morton Puner. 1951. “The Barriers Are Coming Down.” *The ADL Bulletin*, January 1951; Jewish Telegraphic Agency. 1949. “Top U.S. Universities Open Parlay Today on Discrimination in College Admissions;” *The ADL Bulletin*. 1949a. “What Are Your Chances of Getting into College?,” March 1949; ——. 1949b. “The Professors Are out to Crack Quota Barriers,” December 1949; ——. 1951. “The Maciver Report: What’s It All About?,” November 1951; Tumin, Melvin M. 1961. *An Inventory and Appraisal of Research on American Anti-Semitism*. New York, NY: Freedom Books; Waldman, Lester. 1957. “New Barriers to Higher Education.” *The ADL Bulletin*, October 1957; Yinger, J. Milton. 1964. *Anti-Semitism: A Case Study in Prejudice and Discrimination*. New York, NY: Freedom Books.

great majority of the American Jewish population at the time) or simply that Stanford did not technically have a quota to crack. In any event, Stanford's approach to admissions evaded the attentions of the ADL's organized efforts, formulated as they were to change policy by leveraging a combination of research and public opinion.

In a sense, the ADL's effort was too successful in framing the problem in higher education around quotas. One unintended consequence was that the term became something of a convenient if inexact shorthand for more subtle exclusionary practices of all kinds, despite some disagreement about the size of the quota and its application.<sup>88</sup> Despite the ADL's successes with its Crack the Quota campaign, the term proved too narrowly technical to apply to Stanford's efforts, especially in a context in which some schools employed actual, measurable, policy-level quotas on Jewish students, even in the years following World War II.<sup>89</sup> Whatever people suspected Stanford of, they tended to refer to it as a "quota," which gave the university a semantic escape hatch.

Suspicious of limits on the number of Jewish students outlived and ironically contributed to what may have initially been a limited action by Snyder, exerted against specific high schools during a discrete period of time. Whether or not he carried this practice through the remainder of his tenure as Director and Dean of Admissions misses the larger point. The force of his

---

<sup>88</sup> Estimations of the quota on Jewish students range from 3% to 22%. The 3% quota can be found in the oral history of Robin Kennedy. Stanford Historical Society Oral Histories, Stanford University (SC1017) <https://purl.stanford.edu/xq160wx3636>, page 89. Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. The 22% quota can be found in Synnott, Marsha Graham. 1986. "Anti-Semitism and American Universities: Did Quotas Follow the Jews?" In *Anti-Semitism in American History*, edited by David A. Gerber, 233–74. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. Fn 38, p. 271.

<sup>89</sup> Kalman, Jason. 2010. "Dark Places Around the University: The Johns Hopkins University Admissions Quota and the Jewish Community, 1945-1951." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 81: 233–79; Weitzman, Steven. "American Biblical Scholarship and the Post-War Battle against Anti-Semitism." (forthcoming).

actions, reinforced by denials that they took place, lodged themselves in the experiences and perspectives of American Jews, particularly among those who lived in Southern California.

Snyder's actions, however limited they may have been, dissuaded some Jewish students from applying in the first place. The impression of Stanford's restrictions outlived whatever actions Snyder had taken.

## Stanford's Jewish Population

Stanford has had Jewish students since its earliest years.<sup>90</sup> Even the most parsimonious accounting of Jewish students at Stanford finds a few each year dating back to the turn of the 20th century. But the population was never very large. Until 1947, the last year for which we have regular data, the Office of the Chaplain surveyed students for their "religious preference." The Chaplain's survey never found more than about 5 percent of Stanford students who identified as Jewish (or "Hebrew," as the Chaplain's annual reports defined it).<sup>91</sup>

Available data suggests that the number of Jewish students remained fairly small, even by the university's own account. Even the Glover Memo does not assert that Jews accounted

---

<sup>90</sup> Annual Reports of the President of the University regularly included the results of the "Chaplain's survey," which identified small numbers of Jewish students each year among members of the incoming class. Dr. Charles Petersen generously compiled a table of available data and shared it via a link in his Substack newsletter. Making History (blog). August 8, 2021. <https://charlespetersen.substack.com/p/stanfords-secret-jewish-quota>.

<sup>91</sup> The Office of the Chaplain conducted annual surveys of student "religious preference," which were dutifully reported until 1947 by the Dean of Memorial Church, Elton Trueblood. When Trueblood left, subsequent Chaplains were less assiduous about submitting their annual reports and the results of their annual surveys. There is reason to doubt the accuracy of their surveys in any event, as Jewish students may not have wanted to identify themselves as Jewish to a staff member of the Church. Or, as Snyder suggested to Stanley Jacobs of the ADL in 1961, "You are probably better able than I to assess how Jewish students might re-act (sic) to this question." Letter. Rixford K. Snyder to Stanley S. Jacobs, Regional Director, Anti-Defamation League. July 26, 1961. Lyman (Richard W.), President of Stanford University, Papers 1965-1981 (SC0215, series 1, Box 10, Folder "Discrimination: Religious (Incl. Jewish)").

for a significant proportion of all students on campus. “Rix is concerned that more than one quarter of the applications from men are from Jewish boys. Last year we had 150 Jewish applicants, of whom we accepted 50.”<sup>92</sup> That year, Stanford fielded 1630 applications from males; 150 Jewish male applicants would have accounted for 9.2% of the overall pool.

Admitting 50 Jewish males would have meant they accounted for approximately 6.1% of 1952’s 810 openings in the incoming class.<sup>93</sup> This hardly represented an overwhelming proportion of the student body. Whatever the actual size of Stanford’s Jewish population had been, both survey data and oral histories attest that it was never very large.

By comparison, a B’nai B’rith report from 1963 found that 13.9% of UC Berkeley students were Jewish. USC claimed to have a student body that was 12% Jewish, and Reed College reported that 10.3% of its students were Jewish.<sup>94</sup> The report did not include data from Stanford.<sup>95</sup>

The most reliable data available about the number of Jewish students at Stanford comes from a report released in February of 1967 by Stanford’s Counseling and Testing Center. The

---

<sup>92</sup> Memo from Fred Glover to Wallace Sterling February 4, 1953. J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box 7, Folder 14). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>93</sup> Snyder, Rixford K. “Admissions Standards: Tough but Flexible.” *Stanford Review* (January 1958), 13-15. Stanford University News Service (SC0122, Box 3, Folder 1). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>94</sup> The data on the percentages of Jewish students were collected by B’nai B’rith Hillel, and were based on reports of local Hillel directors. They do not reflect data gathered by the leadership of the campuses. Jospe, Alfred. 1963. *Jewish Students and Student Services at American Universities*. Washington D.C.: B’nai B’rith Hillel Foundation. 6-9.

<sup>95</sup> It is uncertain why Stanford was not included, as it did have a Hillel at this time. There was some skittishness about reporting student religious identity to an off-campus entity, as evidenced in a memo by Fred Glover in response to a request from B’nai B’rith Hillel in 1965. Citing Stanford’s Founding Grant, Glover wrote, “Note is being made of this in view of Founding Grant admonition that no profession of religious faith shall be exacted of anyone for any purpose. We have always felt that expression of religious preference, in Chaplain’s survey, did not violate this provision.” “Memo to files.” Fred Glover. December 3, 1965. Lyman (Richard W.), President of Stanford University, Papers 1965-1981 (SC0215, series 1, Box 11, Folder “Policy: Religion”).

study was part of an American Council on Education study of first-year students, which was administered at 307 campuses nationwide and led at Stanford by psychology professor John D. Black. The report found that 6.8% of first-year students identified as Jewish, as compared to 14.4% who identified as Catholic and 66.1% who identified as Protestant; 6.1% of students identified as “other” and another 6.5% said they had no religion.<sup>96</sup> But the report called the “picture on religious background ... confusing,” noting that “We enroll a higher percentage of Jewish students than all institutions combined, but a substantially lower percentage than other private universities. We also enroll a far higher percentage of students listing no religious background than any other type of institution.”<sup>97</sup>

Black noted that part of this story was demographic, and general trends support his analysis. In overall numbers, the Jewish population of California grew during the 1950s and 1960s, accounting for a slightly larger share of U.S. Jews, overall. In 1948, California accounted for 6.7% of American Jews, rising to 11.9% by 1971. But even though the Jewish population of California grew rapidly during the 1950s and into the 1960s, it largely kept pace with the state’s overall population growth, amounting to 3.3% of Californians in 1950 and 3.4% in 1967 (see Appendix G for Jewish population data).

Black’s observation of Stanford’s own comparatively small Jewish population contained a kernel of irrefutable truth: As long as the university continued to draw predominantly from the West Coast, and largely from California, it would likely never draw significant numbers of

---

<sup>96</sup> Report. Black, John, D. “Some Personal and Background Facts about Entering Stanford Freshmen.” February 1967. Cuthbertson (Kenneth M.) Papers 1941-1994 (SC0582, Box 97, Folder “Admissions 1967-1968”) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>97</sup> Report. Black, John, D. “Some Personal and Background Facts about Entering Stanford Freshmen.” February 1967. Cuthbertson (Kenneth M.) Papers 1941-1994 (SC0582, Box 97, Folder “Admissions 1967-1968”) Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif. Page 13.

Jewish students.<sup>98</sup> The 1955 alumni directory provided data about Stanford alumni since the university's founding. The directory identified only 66 graduates from New York City, still home to the largest Jewish community in the United States, while it conferred degrees on hundreds of students from Los Altos and Menlo Park.<sup>99</sup> Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, Stanford took only a handful of students from New York City high schools, both private or public, virtually omitting the largest Jewish population in the United States at the time.<sup>100</sup>

A good regional university in California that drew large numbers of its students from its immediately surrounding counties, Stanford was not drawing from an applicant pool that included a lot of Jews. It is impossible to determine whether the low numbers of students from New York public schools is evidence of a bias on the part of the university or the fact that it was an unattractive destination for those students, but it is clear that in the 1950s and 1960s large numbers of students from New York public schools were not traveling west to attend Stanford. As a result, the size of Stanford's Jewish population was limited both by larger demographic patterns and by broader impressions of the university by California Jews. Snyder's efforts to reduce the number of Jewish students by curtailing acceptances extended to graduates from Beverly Hills High School and Fairfax High School certainly did not help.

---

<sup>98</sup> In 1954, 65% of Stanford students came from in state. In 1960, that number decreased to 54%. Frederic Glover to Wallace Sterling. August 4, 1961. "Increasing Number of Out-of-State Students." J. E. Wallace Sterling, President of Stanford University, Papers (SC0216, Box B1, Folder 1). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

<sup>99</sup> Stanford Alumni Association, ed. 1956. Stanford University Alumni Directory. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

<sup>100</sup> "Admissions Report" The Stanford Daily. Friday May 19, 1967, 8. The article questioned Stanford's approach to recruiting in the North East, noting that Stanford did not include a single New York City public school in its recruiting efforts, adding that "Surely the University could defray the additional expense of having a representative stop in New York on the way back from his visit to 34 New England prep schools."

## Conclusion

In the early 1950s, under the leadership of Rixford Snyder and with the awareness of many in Stanford's administration, Stanford Admissions acted to restrict the number of Jewish students enrolling at Stanford. Written in 1953, the Glover Memo reported Snyder's intentions to act against Jewish students. It also revealed the complicity of Glover and others in the Office of the President. Subsequent enrollment patterns reveal a sharp decline in Stanford students who graduated from two high schools known to have significant populations of Jewish students: Beverly Hills High School and Fairfax High School.

The impact was immediate and striking. Between the Glover Memo that expressed Snyder's concern about the number of Jewish students in February 1953 and the Registrar's Report of enrolled students from that fall, the number of students from Beverly Hills High School and Fairfax High School began to decline. How sharp that decline or whether a similar one was in evidence regarding graduates from other high schools remains unknown. But Snyder clearly knew of these two high schools, and the number of students they sent to Stanford dropped precipitously in the years that followed the Glover Memo. While admissions from individual schools always fluctuated, no other public school experienced such a quick and dramatic decline in the number of students it sent to Stanford.

Perhaps even more corrosively, in the years that followed the Stanford administration employed the technical term "quota" to deny and dismiss claims that the university acted with intention to suppress the number of Jewish students. In letters and in public, campus leadership asserted that Stanford did not have a "quota," while top members of the administration had full knowledge of the policies in place that were designed to allow the

Director of Admissions to act to suppress the number of Jewish students admitted. They misled alumni, the Anti-Defamation League, at least one trustee, and faculty.

Snyder acted in accordance with extant policy governing Stanford admissions that afforded him a great deal of discretion. He also operated with the support, tacit and explicit, of others in the administration. Snyder expressed his concerns to Glover, who relayed them to Sterling. Glover explicitly condoned Snyder's employment of an effort to suppress the number of Jewish students at Stanford. No record exists of Sterling's response, but the demonstrable decline in the number of students from Beverly Hills High School and Fairfax High School indicates that people at the highest levels of Stanford's leadership, including the Provost and the assistant to the President, did nothing to stop Snyder from acting.

How long this practice remained in place is also unknown. If it was ever committed to writing, those memos did not survive. But the impact lasted for decades, largely refracted through the understanding, popular among Jews in Southern California, that Stanford limited the number of Jewish students it would admit. The impression that Stanford limited the number of Jewish students it would accept, though refuted and dismissed a number of times during the 1950s and 1960s, also discouraged Jewish students from applying, further stoking the impression that Stanford limited the number of Jewish students. Thus, what might have been a fairly limited action had far-reaching effects both on the size of Stanford's Jewish population and on the reputation of the school among California Jews.

The damage to Jewish high school students in the 1950s and 1960s who were unduly denied admission and to Stanford's reputation cannot be undone. Neither can the damage brought by decades of denials. Though Sterling, Snyder, and Glover dismissed suspicions of

anti-Jewish admissions policies as “rumors,” the concerns turned out to have reflected a larger truth and the university’s responses have had effects far beyond the incoming classes of 1953 or 1954.

This report has endeavored to establish and clarify this historical narrative, and hopefully it has succeeded in clarifying the historical record. With this effort, Stanford’s leadership has demonstrated that it is prepared not just to meet the specifics of this particular case, but to do so within the larger historical context of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century. This report is a small contribution to the larger effort of Stanford, among other leading American institutions, to take account of its history and to construct a future informed by it.

## Recommendations

In that spirit, we offer the following recommendations for enhancing the experiences of Jewish students at Stanford. Admittedly, this is a difficult undertaking because the efforts to suppress the number of Jewish students at Stanford in the 1950s do not map easily onto contemporary expressions of antisemitism. There are, however, continuities, and they provide an opportunity for the university to learn from its history and to inaugurate new directions for addressing some of the core concerns shared by both the past and the present. In Judaism, the process of תשובה (teshuva) implies both reflection on the past and the initiation of different action in the future. Thus, our recommendations begin with an acknowledgement of the university's past misdeeds to build toward a better future for the whole Stanford community.

The recommendations took shape around the historical research that was supplemented by preliminary interviews and focus groups with students that took place during the 2022 Winter and Spring quarters. Mostly Jewish, the students with whom we spoke hold a variety of identities with respect to nationality and citizenship, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and race. They differ in their political orientations and academic interests, and they differ in whether or not they identify as religious. Some have non-Jewish parents or partners. They disagree about what it means to be Jewish and they share an array of definitions of antisemitism. They also offered a diverse accounting of what it means and how it feels to be a Jewish student at Stanford. All of the students with whom we spoke for this project, however, shared a concern about antisemitism in the United States, around the world, and in the Stanford community. These recommendations reflect their concerns.

## Recommendation #1: Acknowledge and Apologize.

We recommend that Stanford publicly acknowledge its participation in admissions practices designed to discriminate against Jewish students. We see this as directly connected to other efforts to explore and address the history of Stanford, including those to rename campus features. Currently, the Diversity Statement of Stanford IDEAL powerfully commits the university to a vision of social justice. At present, it includes a paragraph that reads:

Stanford is built on land that was originally inhabited by the Muwekma Ohlone peoples. Senator Stanford's wealth that was used to found the university was built with the labor of Chinese immigrant workers. Though the university was co-ed from its founding, Jane Stanford imposed a quota on women students in 1896. It was not until 1972 that the Board of Trustees voted to remove the gender quota entirely.<sup>101</sup>

This paragraph should be amended to include a statement about the actions taken in the early 1950s to restrict the number of Jewish students and of the university's sustained efforts to mislead those who raised questions and concerns about those very efforts.

Furthermore, we recommend that current university administration publicly apologize for the actions taken by its predecessors.<sup>102</sup> We recommend the apology focus on two specific actions documented in this report. First, we recommend an apology for enabling actions in the Stanford Admissions Office that sought to knowingly suppress the number of Jewish students on campus. Second, we recommend an apology for intentionally misleading those who expressed concerns or suspicions about such actions.

---

<sup>101</sup> <https://ideal.stanford.edu/about-ideal/diversity-statement>

<sup>102</sup> One possible analogue is the approach taken by Emory University, which discovered that "Jewish students in Emory's dental school were failed or forced to repeat courses at a rate disproportionate to their numbers from 1948 to 1961." Emory responded to the discovery in 2012 with a formal apology for its actions. <https://emoryhistory.emory.edu/issues/discrimination/dental-school.html>

## Recommendation #2: Undertake a comprehensive study of contemporary Jewish life at Stanford.

In order to develop a fuller sense of how best to enhance Jewish life at Stanford, we recommend a comprehensive, thorough, and systematic study of Stanford's Jewish community. This study would explore issues related to the campus climate for Jewish students, staff, and faculty, including, but not limited to access to religious and cultural opportunities and programs, current policies and processes for religious accommodation including academic, housing, and dining accommodations, and experiences of bias and antisemitism on campus.

Not reducible to a religion, an ethnicity, a culture, a nation, or a linguistic group, Jews can be difficult to identify using standard methods for assessing campus climate. For example, Jewish students shared with members of the task force that they did not feel the campus 2021 IDEAL diversity, equity, and inclusion survey adequately captured their experiences as Jews owing, in part, to the complexity of Jewish identities and the limitations of the survey tools and method.<sup>103</sup> For some, this felt doubly exclusionary. First, the survey instrument failed to capture their experiences, and second, the survey results left the university with no insights into the lives of its Jewish students and thus no way to take steps to improve it.

---

<sup>103</sup> In May 2021, Stanford completed its first IDEAL diversity, equity, and inclusion survey. The survey included one opportunity for Jewish students to identify themselves as Jews, as a response option to the prompt, "Please check all the religious or spiritual groups with which you identify. (Mark all that apply)." The question likely failed to capture the identities and experiences of many Stanford students, because younger American Jews are quite likely to identify as Jewish and claim to have no religion. In failing to capture the range of ways in which Jews identify as Jewish, the IDEAL survey missed an opportunity to account for the experiences of Jewish members of Stanford's community. Question 17. Stanford University, "IDEAL Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Survey." Technical Report, page 5. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1JnUJoqx2MQ4WJEXhmV5uyzPTwDQA4K5h/view>. 40% of American Jews ages 18-29 say that they have "no religion." Pew Research Center. 2021. "Jewish Americans in 2020." Washington D.C.: Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewforum.org/2021/05/11/jewish-americans-in-2020/>. Page 8.

In interviews and focus groups conducted as part of the research for this report, the task force found that members of the Stanford community have experienced antisemitism, which is one area that appears ripe for redress. But antisemitism is a complex phenomenon, insofar as it both resembles and looks distinct from other forms of systemic bias, prejudice, and hatred, and even American Jews disagree about how to define it.<sup>104</sup> It is an expression of hate that has proven to be a consistent feature of both White Nationalist thinking (on the political right) and some forms of conspiracy theorizing (on the political left).<sup>105</sup> To cast it as purely a religious concern overlooks both its historical origins and its contemporary forms, but to racialize it also omits some of the ways in which antisemitism is woven deeply through certain strands of Christian theology.<sup>106</sup> Similarly, the perpetuation of stereotypes that American Jews are wealthy and powerful both derive from long-standing antisemitic claims and serve to undercut efforts to call attention to antisemitism as a problem in need of redress.<sup>107</sup> Still others fail to

---

<sup>104</sup> There are, at present, at least three “working definitions” of antisemitism that have emerged from Jewish communities within the past two decades. There are others offered in more extensive works of scholarship. The diversity of opinion on this matter is not evidence of terminological confusion but of the wealth of perspectives on the matter and the likelihood that not everyone will ever agree on what it is, how it looks or sounds, and how best to fight it. The IHRA definition can be found here: <https://holocaustremembrance.com/resources/working-definitions-charters/working-definition-antisemitism>; The Jerusalem Declaration can be found here: <https://jerusalemdeclaration.org/>; for a working definition from the Association for Jewish Studies: [https://www.associationforjewishstudies.org/docs/default-source/ad-files/a-working-report-from-the-ajs-task-force-on-antisemitism-and-academic-freedom.pdf?Status=Master&sfvrsn=5c4d54d\\_5](https://www.associationforjewishstudies.org/docs/default-source/ad-files/a-working-report-from-the-ajs-task-force-on-antisemitism-and-academic-freedom.pdf?Status=Master&sfvrsn=5c4d54d_5)

<sup>105</sup> The popular press is brimming with stories, commentary, and accusations about these concerns. Two recent articles that address them are: Grenell, Alexis. 2022. “How the Left Alienates Jews,” January 12, 2022. <https://www.thenation.com/article/society/bds-dsa-antisemitism-israel/>; Ward, Eric. 2017. “Skin in the Game.” Political Research Associates. Accessed April 7, 2022. <https://politicalresearch.org/2017/06/29/skin-in-the-game-how-antisemitism-animates-white-nationalism/>

<sup>106</sup> The literature on this is vast. Carroll, James. 2001. *Constantine’s Sword: The Church and the Jews: A History*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin; Favret-Saada, Jeanne. 2014. “A Fuzzy Distinction: Anti-Judaism and Anti-Semitism (An Excerpt from *Le Judaïsme et Ses Juifs*).” *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4 (3): 335–40. <https://doi.org/10.14318/hau4.3.021>; Heschel, Susannah. 2006. “From Jesus to Shylock: Christian Supersessionism and ‘The Merchant of Venice.’” *The Harvard Theological Review* 99 (4): 407–31; Ruether, Rosemary R. 1974. “Anti-Semitism in Christian Theology.” *Theology Today* 30 (4): 365–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004057367403000407>.

<sup>107</sup> Schraub, David. 2019. “White Jews: An Intersectional Approach.” *AJS Review* 43 (2): 379–407. Many of these stereotypes can be traced to the infamous forgery known as the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. Katz, Steven T., and Richard Landes. 2012. *The Paranoid Apocalypse : A Hundred-Year Retrospective on The Protocols of the Elders*

recognize antisemitism in their midst and seek to explain away events that American Jews might experience as antisemitic. Our preliminary interviews revealed this as a particular point of concern for Jewish students.<sup>108</sup>

Understanding antisemitism is further complicated by its entanglement in political debates about Israel and Palestine. We understand the sensitive nature of that sphere of political discourse and we respect and uphold the university's commitment to academic freedom and the right to free speech. Additionally, we appreciate the vital role that activism plays in the formation of students' political and civic attitudes. The State of Israel, like all sovereign states, deserves careful scrutiny and its policies deserve robust debate and discussion. Yet, preliminary interviews with students revealed that in some cases campus discourse around Israel and Palestine made claims about Jews that students felt were antisemitic in their impact.

Antisemitism, like so many American prejudices, thrives in the darkness. Some 70 years ago, Snyder, Glover, and others dismissed concerns that they had acted against Jewish applicants, even though they knew the truth. An appropriate response to these events and to the contemporary moment would be to undertake a full exploration of Jewish life on campus so that we might better understand how Jews at Stanford are impacted by antisemitism in our

---

of Zion. Elie Wiesel Center for Judaic Studies Series. New York: NYU Press; Whitfield, Stephen. n.d. "Why the 'Protocols of the Elders of Zion' Is Still Pushed by Anti-Semites More than a Century after Hoax First Circulated." The Conversation. Accessed May 4, 2022. <http://theconversation.com/why-the-protocols-of-the-elders-of-zion-is-still-pushed-by-anti-semites-more-than-a-century-after-hoax-first-circulated-145220>; Zipperstein, Steven J. 2018. Pogrom: Kishinev and the Tilt of History. First edition. New York ; London: Liveright Publishing Corporation; Zipperstein, Steven J. 2020. "The Conspiracy Theory to Rule Them All." The Atlantic. August 25, 2020. <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2020/08/conspiracy-theory-rule-them-all/615550/>.

<sup>108</sup> Rosenberg, Yair. 2022. "Why So Many People Still Don't Understand Anti-Semitism." The Atlantic. January 19, 2022. <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2022/01/texas-synagogue-anti-semitism-conspiracy-theory/621286/>.

community, and so that we might better understand it and work toward exposing and minimizing it.

Recommendation #3: Develop and include modules addressing Jews and Jewish identity in appropriate future educational trainings, seminars, and programs intended to make ours a more equitable, inclusive, and just community.

Inasmuch as the campus seeks to honor and engage its members across a range of diverse identities, we recommend that the university include Jews and Jewishness within these efforts. Jews are a diverse and distinct diasporic community whose specific histories are often elided, marginalized, or misrecognized. Misrecognition can sometimes foster antisemitic beliefs about Jews and can easily apply old and surprisingly durable stereotypes to historical and contemporary realities. Allowing these beliefs to continue to circulate unaddressed exacerbates the challenges we face as a campus community and as global citizens.

Failing to address Jews and antisemitism in specific campus-based educational efforts intended to embrace the diversity of the Stanford community sends everyone the message that Jews are not an American minority that still faces systematic hatred. This, in turn, reinforces the sense that antisemitism is not an issue worthy of attention and that serves as tacit support for or tolerance of antisemitic beliefs or actions. This posture can also have the effect of allowing claims about antisemitism to be met with opposition or disregard instead of curiosity, concern, or support.

We are aware that the administrative structure and particular mechanisms for cultivating the strength of Stanford’s diverse community will change. We are aware that the needs of the community will change as well. Therefore, we are not making a recommendation in favor of a specific programmatic intervention. Instead, we recommend that careful attention to the experiences of Jewish community members be integrated into campus efforts, whatever forms they might take.

Recommendation #4: The ASSU should enforce the Undergraduate Senate’s “Resolution to Recognize Anti-Semitism in Our Community,” (UGS-W2019-23).

Adopted by unanimous approval of the Undergraduate Senate on February 29, 2019, the Resolution instituted a required annual anti-antisemitism training for the Undergraduate Senate.<sup>109</sup> It reiterated that the ASSU had, in 2016, heard a “Resolution to Recognize and Reaffirm the Fight Against Anti-Semitism” (UGS-S2016-1)<sup>110</sup>, which included a clause requiring the Undergraduate Senate to “commit to actively fighting anti-Semitism on campus” and “to commit to one anti-Semitism training session per year about the history of anti-Semitism and current manifestations, that will be led by the Jewish Studies Department and various members of student (sic) and faculty from the Jewish community, that will consult the Anti-Defamation League.” Despite some technical issues in the wording of the two resolutions, the charge to

---

<sup>109</sup> [https://docs.google.com/document/d/17SvDX8wf-XP3cNmfgfPYrmr7\\_NWunJntyh8J3JpwsGCC/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/17SvDX8wf-XP3cNmfgfPYrmr7_NWunJntyh8J3JpwsGCC/edit)

<sup>110</sup> <https://docs.google.com/document/u/1/d/1ApeqGz1gZncWPZbr00160LobMJiPcTqsB8QksyirIoU/pub>

require engagement with the faculty in Jewish Studies was included in UGS-W2019-23 and should be enforced.<sup>111</sup> To date, it has not been.

Enforcing the Resolution will hold student leadership to their own commitment to fighting antisemitism on campus and it will, hopefully, expand their understanding of antisemitism both past and present. Advancing this educational measure in collaboration with the faculty of the Taube Center for Jewish Studies will aid the university's efforts to address the concerns of Jewish students when such issues arise, and to build a culture of student leadership that will prevent them, hopefully, from arising in the first place.

**Recommendation #5:** Schedule the opening of the school year so that it does not coincide with the Jewish High Holidays and specifically Yom Kippur and Rosh Hashana.

Archival sources going back to 1965 reveal that this has been an ongoing concern.<sup>112</sup> The scheduling conflict puts Jewish students in a position to choose whether to observe the holiday or attend class. Regardless of student levels of observance or adherence to Jewish law or tradition, this is not a choice that students, faculty, or staff should have to either make or explain. Scheduling the first day of classes on the High Holidays communicates the message that the university is prepared to pit students' desires to participate in their distinctive

---

<sup>111</sup> It is unclear if UGS-S2016-1 was adopted by the Undergraduate Senate; Stanford does not have a Jewish Studies Department; and the author certainly meant "anti-antisemitism training."

<sup>112</sup> See Henry Briggs, "Record Register." *The Stanford Daily*, September 29, 1965, 1. The short article noted, "Because of the holiday, the late registration fees will not be in effect."; See also "A Petition to the University Ombudsman, Mrs. Lois Amsterdam, and the Stanford Board of Trustees." Nov 4, 1971. Stanford University, Provost's Office (SC0115, Box 1, Folder "University calendar/holidays 1971-1972"). Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif.

communal rituals against their commitments to the institution. This is likely much worse for first-year students. For decades, the university has put students in this position, which has perpetuated the sense that the campus is less than eager to accommodate the needs of Jewish students. It also sends the message to the larger community about the value of their Jewish peers' commitments to Jewish practice. Despite efforts by students, faculty, and Hillel (including a letter writing campaign that probably dated from the 1980s), the university still schedules important events on the dates of Jewish holidays. At the time of this writing, the first day of classes for the Fall Quarter of 2022 is scheduled to coincide with the first day of Rosh Hashana (September 26, 2022).

Aligning the academic calendar so that it does not conflict with the Jewish Holidays might seem like a simple or even largely symbolic act, though that would not explain why it still happens, despite past efforts. Nevertheless, altering the academic calendar to prevent conflicts with the Jewish High Holidays would be a significant step toward honoring the needs of Stanford's Jewish community.

## Recommendation #6: Provide for student religious and cultural needs in housing and dining.

Religiously observant students have a unique set of needs and concerns that run from the maintenance of dietary laws (kashrut or "keeping kosher") to prohibitions on operating electrical devices on the Sabbath (which prohibits using electronic "key cards" to open doors on the holiday). Student requests for such accommodations have, in recent years, been ignored and flatly declined, forcing Jewish students to either advocate for their needs with additional

time and effort or abandon their concerns and learn to work around them.<sup>113</sup> The needs of Jewish students in this regard touch on some fundamental considerations about where one lives, how one eats, and how one navigates the campus. These needs should not compromise considerations for safety of people and buildings, nor should they conflict with the campus' vision for rich residential educational experiences. But failing to address these needs creates an environment that can make it difficult for observant Jewish students to thrive at Stanford.

### Recommendation #7: Clarify the relationship between the university and Stanford Hillel.

It is beyond the scope of this task force to recommend what such an agreement would entail, but it is clear that Hillel does much of the work on campus caring for and serving Jewish students and students interested in Jewish life. Yet, Hillel's status as a non-Stanford entity means that it is not included in campus discussions with other identity-based community centers, and that neither Hillel nor the university are beholden to one another in any formal way. On campuses like Stanford, Hillel stepped into the historical breach, raising funds and gathering resources to serve Jewish students. At Stanford, this resulted in a thriving student-facing organization that was not "on campus" either physically or geographically.<sup>114</sup> It developed successfully but on its own, effectively becoming the largest service provider for Jewish students at Stanford, which meant that the university could (and still sometimes does)

---

<sup>113</sup> The task force has emails from Jewish students asking for religious accommodations and being told that Stanford does not make accommodations for religious needs. They can be shared at the Administration's request.

<sup>114</sup> Stanford's first Hillel was a student group, established in 1949. A decade later, it evolved into a Hillel Foundation, and for the ensuing years operated out of an apartment above an auto-repair shop on Emerson Avenue.

refer Jewish students to Hillel when issues arise without, at the same time, affording Hillel access or authority to resolve some of these issues.

This peculiar relationship has placed a good deal of stress on Hillel, on the university, and on students. When the university administration refers students to Hillel or asks that Hillel address certain problems presented to Jewish students, it can seem like the university is not treating Jewish students fairly or fully as members of the campus community. With its mission to serve Jewish students, Hillel is prepared to respond. The arrangement is functional but not ideal and its shortcomings often emerge at precisely the moments of greatest stress on campus. Though it is beyond the scope of this task force to outline the exact nature of this relationship, we strongly recommend that Stanford's leadership and Hillel's respective leadership begin a process toward a more defined, mutually beneficial arrangement that reflects Stanford's broad commitment to honoring and including students of all backgrounds.

## Appendix A: The Glover Memo

February 4, 1953

Dear Wally:

Rix Snyder came in to report that admission applications, compared with those at this date last year, were 10 more for men and 190 for women. This trend last year led to a class of 1750 men and 1100 women.

Rix is concerned that more than one quarter of the applications from men are from Jewish boys. Last year we had 150 Jewish applicants, of whom we accepted 50. This condition appears to apply one [sic] to men; there does not seem to be any increase in applications from Jewish girls.

As things look to Rix now, he will be able to pick 500 men, equal in caliber to last year's fresh class, but there will be a high percentage of Jewish boys in the 300 freshmen who will be at Stanford village.

Rix said that he thought that you should know about this problem, since it has very touchy implications. He pointed out that the University of Virginia has become largely a Jewish institution, and that Cornell also has a very heavy Jewish enrollment. Harvard and Yale stick strictly to a quota system. Rix has been following a policy of picking the outstanding Jewish boys while endeavoring to keep a normal balance of Jewish men and women in the class.

There are, he said, a number of high schools in Los Angeles — Beverly Hills and Fairfax are examples — whose studentbody [sic] runs from 95 to 98% Jewish. If we accept a few Jewish applicants from these schools, the following year we get a flood of Jewish applications. Rix says that apparently the information as to who is accepting or rejecting Jewish students travels fast though [sic] the underground. Rix also has had trouble on this score in Portland, where at one high school he met with a group of students and parents interested in Stanford and found that the whole group was Jewish.

Rix feels that this problem is loaded with dynamite and he wanted you to know about it, as he says that the situation forces him to disregard our stated policy of paying no attention to the race or religion of applicants. I told him that I thought his current policy made sense, that it was a matter requiring the utmost discretion, and that I would relay these highlights of our conversation to you and let Rix know if you had different views.

FG

## Appendix B: Methodology for Historical Research

The research for this report was largely archival in nature. We began, however by reading broadly in four areas of scholarship: histories of Stanford University, admissions in American higher education, post-war American Jewish history, and the historical study of antisemitism in the United States. Our work was informed more broadly by the expertise of the task force in these areas, as well.

The bulk of our research efforts focused on the archives of Stanford University. We examined the collections of The Admissions Office, The Academic Secretary (Donald Winbigler), President Richard Lyman, Professor Robert Rosenzweig, the Academic Senate Council, the Office of the Registrar, Provost Fred Terman, Fred Glover, President J. E. Wallace Sterling, the Sterling-Pitzer transition papers, Ray Lyman Wilbur, ATO (Fraternity), Memorial Church, Student Affairs, the Stanford University News Service, The Stanford Study of Undergraduate Education, Don Carlson, and Kenneth Cuthbertson.

We also examined Stanford University publications including The Quad (Stanford's annual yearbook), the Stanford Review (alumni magazine), Annual Reports to the President, the Stanford Bulletin, and the Stanford Daily. We also read publications that emerged from Stanford's two self-studies: The Undergraduate in the University (1957) and the Study of Education at Stanford (1968).

In order to round out our understanding of American Jewish life in the decades following World War II, we consulted with colleagues at the American Jewish Archives, the Magnes Collection of Jewish Art and Life at the University of California, Berkeley, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Historical Society, and the archives of the Anti-Defamation League. Jewish population data was compiled from population estimates published annually in the American Jewish Year Book.

Finally, we conducted 21 interviews with Stanford alumni from the 1950s and 1960s, as well as 5 supplementary interviews with people who were Jewish high school students in Los Angeles during the 1950s and 1960s. To inform the recommendations, we held two focus groups, one with graduate students and one with undergraduate students, as well as 10 individual interviews. Most of the interviews were held on Zoom.

## Appendix C: Methodology for Quantitative Analysis

The Registrar’s Reports presented data on student admissions annually. With respect to the public high schools whose graduates enrolled in Stanford, the Registrar published data as the sum of enrollments over the span of three years. The Registrar’s Report for 1952 included student enrollment totals for 1950, 1951, and 1952 combined. The Registrar’s report for 1953 presented student enrollment data for 1951, 1952, and 1953 combined, and so forth. This was the convention for each of the Registrar’s Reports to which we had access. Although this practice obscured annual totals, a key for calculating possible combinations of enrollments could be identified in the three-year totals.

We focused on Fairfax High School and Beverly Hills High School because Glover called them out by name in the memo he wrote to Sterling. The 1955 and 1956 Registrar’s Reports indicated that only a single student from Fairfax had enrolled at Stanford in each of those three-year spans. This meant that one student had enrolled in the years 1953, 1954, and 1955 combined. And, it also meant that only one student had enrolled in the years 1954, 1955, and 1956 combined. Because the aggregate reported value declines to a relatively small number in reports from 1955 and 1956, we are able to exhaustively determine all possible combinations of admitted students for any individual year. Through this method we report a range in the number of admits from between the years of 1950 and 1958, inclusive.

Because the number of enrollments from Fairfax declined to only a single student for two consecutive reporting periods, there were only three possible combinations of annual admissions. For students from Beverly Hills High School, there were 125 possible combinations.

The following table represents the calculations, with the shaded cells indicating the first wave of calculations required to generate the three-year totals presented in the Registrar’s Reports. Once we established these as the only possibilities, we looked forward and back in time to calculate what other three-year combinations of enrollment numbers might total the amount in the Registrar’s Reports for a given year.

**Table 1: Initial Calculations for Fairfax High School**

Year of Report	1953	1954	1955	1956
Years included in the report	1950-1953	1951-1954	1952-1955	1953-1956
<b>Number of enrollments reported</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Possible combination #1</b>	0	1	0	0
<b>Possible combination #2</b>	0	0	1	0
<b>Possible combination #3</b>	1	0	0	1

We followed the same procedure for calculating enrollments from Beverly Hills High School, though in this instance, the key number was 13, which appeared in both the 1955 and 1956 Registrar’s Reports. We began by generating a list of all possible three-number combinations

that total 13 and putting them into a spreadsheet, with each number corresponding to a possible number of enrollments from a given year. We knew that the number of enrollments in 1953, 1954, and 1955 totaled 13, as did the number of enrollments in 1954, 1955, and 1956. Based on the relationships between the annual tallies and the three-year totals we were able to tabulate all of the possible combinations and establish a range for annual enrollments.

Mathematically, the process can be represented like this:<sup>115</sup>

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_{1950} \\ V_{1951} \\ V_{1952} \\ V_{1953} \\ V_{1954} \\ V_{1955} \\ V_{1956} \\ V_{1957} \\ V_{1958} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{1952} \\ A_{1953} \\ A_{1954} \\ A_{1955} \\ A_{1956} \\ A_{1957} \\ A_{1958} \end{bmatrix}$$

Since we have the constraint that  $V \geq 0$  this limits the system of equations in such a way that, whereas it is still not solvable, we can feasibly report a range for each  $V_t$ .

For Fairfax HS, and BHHS, respectively, the righthand sides of the system of equations are:

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{1952}^F \\ A_{1953}^F \\ A_{1954}^F \\ A_{1955}^F \\ A_{1956}^F \\ A_{1957}^F \\ A_{1958}^F \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 20 \\ 15 \\ 9 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} A_{1952}^{BH} \\ A_{1953}^{BH} \\ A_{1954}^{BH} \\ A_{1955}^{BH} \\ A_{1956}^{BH} \\ A_{1957}^{BH} \\ A_{1958}^{BH} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 67 \\ 47 \\ 29 \\ 13 \\ 13 \\ 16 \\ 24 \end{bmatrix}$$

There are  $(A_t+2/2)$  distinct, nonnegative, integer-valued vectors  $[V_{t-2}, V_{t-1}, V_t]$  which satisfy  $A_t = V_{t-2} + V_{t-1} + V_t$ . For Fairfax HS, note that  $A_{1955}^F = 1$ , and therefore there are only  $(3/2) = 3$  possible such vectors  $[V_{1953}, V_{1954}, V_{1955}]$ . Due to the recursive definition of  $A_t$ , there therefore are only 3 such vectors for all values of  $[V_{t-2}, V_{t-1}, V_t]$ . For BHHS, however,  $A_{1955}^{BH}=13$ , and therefore there are  $(15/2) = 105$  possible such vectors for all values of  $[V_{t-2}, V_{t-1}, V_t]$ .

<sup>115</sup> With special gratitude to Izzy Aguiar, PhD candidate in Computational and Mathematical Engineering at Stanford, for checking our calculations and deriving the mathematical basis for our conclusions in this section.

## Appendix D: Enrollment Data from Selected Public High Schools as Presented in Registrar's Reports 1952-1960

Year of Registrar's Report		1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1957-1958	1958-1959	1959-1960	1960-1961	1961-1962	1962-1963	1963-1964	1964-1965	1965-1966	
Years Covered in the Report		1949-1952	1950-1953	1951-1954	1952-1955	1953-1956	1954-1957	1955-1958	1956-1959	1957-1960	1958-1961	1959-1962	1960-1963	1961-1964	1962-1965	1963-1966	
Bay Area Public High Schools	Burlingame	Burlingame	44	45	46	51	47	39	31	39	39	33	19	11	9	8	9
	Palo Alto	Palo Alto	98	103	95	83	76	72	79	68	56	56	71	75	78	66	74
	Sequoia Union	Redwood City	53	58	55	42	34	21	22	19	18	11	7	2	4	4	4
	Piedmont	Piedmont		56	54	50	47	38	33	25	20	15	13	12	9	7	7
	Lowell	San Francisco	87	82	70	60	47	31	25	24	22	24	17	15	14	15	15
Southern California Public High Schools	South Pasadena	Pasadena	83	99	88	97	28	53	28	10	10	11	14	13	8	2	8
	University High School	Los Angeles	55	53	42	31	77	31	29	29	32	29	22	12	8	10	8
	Beverly Hills	Beverly Hills	67	47	29	13	13	16	24	25	21	10	7	7	6	8	6
	Fairfax	Los Angeles	20	15	9	1	1	2	4	6	5	4	5	6	7	5	5
	Alexander Hamilton	Los Angeles	4	5	9	8	12	8	16	18	19	10	8	9	9	5	1
	Hollywood	Los Angeles	19	4	12	14	12	12	10	11	11	11	11	12	9	10	5
	North Hollywood	North Hollywood	9	10	11	14	13	16	17	18	22	21	20	9	15	7	9
	Santa Monica	Santa Monica	19	16	13	16	19	20	15	13	16	19	20	20	7	13	12
Herbert Hoover	Glendale	8	20	17	18	20	15	14	15	17	14	11	8	13	7	8	
Selected Public High Schools Outside of California	Garfield	Seattle, WA	10	8	9	9	4	9	7	8	5	6	3	2	2	4	
	Queen Anne	Seattle, WA	7	15	18	14	10	11	11	3	9	11	11	6	1	3	6
	Lincoln	Portland, OR	31	7	28	18	16	12	17	19	20	16	10	8	4	5	7
	U.S. Grant	Portland, OR	18	30	23	21	27	27	27	20	24	21	18	15	12	13	7
	Washington	Portland, OR	5	23	11	9	7	4	6	5	5	3	3	5	5	3	1
New Trier	Winnetka IL	14	15	19	24	29	27	20	20	18	28	22	29	28	39	36	

\* The ranges presented in the Registrar's Reports cover three academic years, though they span four calendar years. For example, the Registrar's Report of 1943-1944 covers enrollments from the academic years 1941-1942, 1942-1943, and 1943-1944. The archives did not contain Registrar's Reports for 1945-1946, 1948-1949, 1950 and 1951.

## Appendix E: All Possible Combinations of Annual Enrollments at Stanford from Fairfax High School, 1950-1958

<b>Year of Registrar's Report</b>	<b>1950</b>	<b>1951</b>	<b>1952</b>	<b>1953</b>	<b>1954</b>	<b>1955</b>	<b>1956</b>	<b>1957</b>	<b>1957-1958</b>
<b>Years Covered in the Report</b>	--	--	<b>1949-1952*</b>	<b>1950-1953</b>	<b>1951-1954</b>	<b>1952-1955</b>	<b>1953-1956</b>	<b>1954-1957</b>	<b>1955-1958</b>
<b>Number of Enrollments Reported</b>	--	--	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
Possible combination #1	5	7	8	0	1	0	0	2	2
Possible combination #2	5	6	9	0	0	1	0	1	3
Possible combination #3	6	7	8	1	0	0	1	1	2

\* The ranges presented in the Registrar's Reports cover three academic years, though they span four calendar years. For example, the Registrar's Report of 1952 covers enrollments from the academic years 1949-1950, 1950-1951, and 1951-1952.

## Appendix F: All Possible Combinations of Annual Enrollments at Stanford from Beverly Hills High School, 1950-1958

Year of Registrar's Report	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1957-1958
Years Covered in the Report	--	--	1949-1952*	1950-1953	1951-1954	1952-1955	1953-1956	1954-1957	1955-1958
Number of Enrollments Reported	--	--	67	47	29	13	13	16	24
Possible combination #1	20	22	25	0	4	9	0	7	17
Possible combination #2	20	23	24	0	5	8	0	8	16
Possible combination #3	20	24	23	0	6	7	0	9	15
Possible combination #4	20	25	22	0	7	6	0	10	14
Possible combination #5	20	26	21	0	8	5	0	11	13
Possible combination #6	20	27	20	0	9	4	0	12	12
Possible combination #7	21	21	25	1	3	9	1	6	17
Possible combination #8	21	22	24	1	4	8	1	7	16
Possible combination #9	21	23	23	1	5	7	1	8	15
Possible combination #10	21	24	22	1	6	6	1	9	14
Possible combination #11	21	25	21	1	7	5	1	10	13
Possible combination #12	21	26	20	1	8	4	1	11	12
Possible combination #13	21	27	19	1	9	3	1	12	11
Possible combination #14	22	20	25	2	2	9	2	5	17
Possible combination #15	22	21	24	2	3	8	2	6	16
Possible combination #16	22	22	23	2	4	7	2	7	15
Possible combination #17	22	23	22	2	5	6	2	8	14
Possible combination #18	22	24	21	2	6	5	2	9	13
Possible combination #19	22	25	20	2	7	4	2	10	12
Possible combination #20	22	26	19	2	8	3	2	11	11
Possible combination #21	22	27	18	2	9	2	2	12	10
Possible combination #22	23	19	25	3	1	9	3	4	17
Possible combination #23	23	20	24	3	2	8	3	5	16
Possible combination #24	23	21	23	3	3	7	3	6	15
Possible combination #25	23	22	22	3	4	6	3	7	14

Possible combination #26	23	23	21	3	5	5	3	8	13
Possible combination #27	23	24	20	3	6	4	3	9	12
Possible combination #28	23	25	19	3	7	3	3	10	11
Possible combination #29	23	26	18	3	8	2	3	11	10
Possible combination #30	23	27	17	3	9	1	3	12	9
Possible combination #31	24	18	25	4	0	9	4	3	17
Possible combination #32	24	19	24	4	1	8	4	4	16
Possible combination #33	24	20	23	4	2	7	4	5	15
Possible combination #34	24	21	22	4	3	6	4	6	14
Possible combination #35	24	22	21	4	4	5	4	7	13
Possible combination #36	24	23	20	4	5	4	4	8	12
Possible combination #37	24	24	19	4	6	3	4	9	11
Possible combination #38	24	25	18	4	7	2	4	10	10
Possible combination #39	24	26	17	4	8	1	4	11	9
Possible combination #40	25	26	16	4	9	0	4	12	8
Possible combination #41	25	18	24	5	0	8	5	3	16
Possible combination #42	25	19	23	5	1	7	5	4	15
Possible combination #43	25	20	22	5	2	6	5	5	14
Possible combination #44	25	21	21	5	3	5	5	6	13
Possible combination #45	25	22	20	5	4	4	5	7	12
Possible combination #46	25	23	19	5	5	3	5	8	11
Possible combination #47	25	24	18	5	6	2	5	9	10
Possible combination #48	25	25	17	5	7	1	5	10	9
Possible combination #49	25	26	16	5	8	0	5	11	8
Possible combination #50	25	18	23	6	0	7	6	3	15
Possible combination #51	26	19	22	6	1	6	6	4	14
Possible combination #52	26	20	21	6	2	5	6	5	13
Possible combination #53	26	21	20	6	3	4	6	6	12
Possible combination #54	26	22	19	6	4	3	6	7	11
Possible combination #55	26	23	18	6	5	2	6	8	10
Possible combination #56	26	24	17	6	6	1	6	9	9
Possible combination #57	26	25	16	6	7	0	6	10	8
Possible combination #58	27	18	22	7	0	6	7	3	14

Possible combination #59	27	19	21	7	1	5	7	4	13
Possible combination #60	27	20	20	7	2	4	7	5	12
Possible combination #61	27	21	19	7	3	3	7	6	11
Possible combination #62	27	22	18	7	4	2	7	7	10
Possible combination #63	27	23	17	7	5	1	7	8	9
Possible combination #64	27	24	16	7	6	0	7	9	8
Possible combination #65	28	18	21	8	0	5	8	3	13
Possible combination #66	28	19	20	8	1	4	8	4	12
Possible combination #67	28	20	19	8	2	3	8	5	11
Possible combination #68	28	21	18	8	3	2	8	6	10
Possible combination #69	28	22	17	8	4	1	8	7	9
Possible combination #70	28	23	16	8	5	0	8	8	8
Possible combination #71	29	18	20	9	0	4	9	3	12
Possible combination #72	29	19	19	9	1	3	9	4	11
Possible combination #73	29	20	18	9	2	2	9	5	10
Possible combination #74	29	21	17	9	3	1	9	6	9
Possible combination #75	29	22	16	9	4	0	9	7	8
Possible combination #76	29	18	19	10	0	3	10	3	11
Possible combination #77	29	19	18	10	1	2	10	4	10
Possible combination #78	30	20	17	10	2	1	10	5	9
Possible combination #79	30	21	16	10	3	0	10	6	8
Possible combination #80	31	18	18	11	0	2	11	3	10
Possible combination #81	31	19	17	11	1	1	11	4	9
Possible combination #82	31	20	16	11	2	0	11	5	8
Possible combination #83	32	18	17	12	0	1	12	3	9
Possible combination #84	32	19	16	12	1	0	12	4	8
Possible combination #85	33	18	16	13	0	0	13	3	8
Possible combination #86	20	28	19	0	10	3	0	13	11
Possible combination #87	21	28	18	1	10	2	1	13	10
Possible combination #88	22	28	17	2	10	1	2	13	9
Possible combination #89	23	28	16	3	10	0	3	13	8
Possible combination #90	20	29	18	0	11	2	0	14	10
Possible combination #91	21	29	17	1	11	1	1	14	9

Possible combination #92	22	29	16	2	11	0	2	14	8
Possible combination #93	20	30	17	0	12	1	3	12	9
Possible combination #94	21	30	16	1	12	0	1	15	8
Possible combination #95	20	31	16	0	13	0	0	16	8
Possible combination #96	23	28	16	3	10	0	3	13	8
Possible combination #97	22	28	17	2	10	1	2	13	9
Possible combination #98	21	28	18	1	10	2	1	13	10
Possible combination #99	20	28	19	0	10	3	0	13	11
Possible combination #100	22	29	16	2	11	0	2	14	8
Possible combination #101	21	29	17	1	11	1	1	14	9
Possible combination #102	20	29	18	0	11	2	0	14	10
Possible combination #103	21	30	16	1	12	0	1	15	8
Possible combination #104	20	30	17	0	12	1	0	15	9
Possible combination #105	20	31	16	0	13	0	0	16	10
Possible combination #106	20	21	26	0	3	10	0	6	18
Possible combination #107	21	20	26	1	2	10	1	5	18
Possible combination #108	22	19	26	2	1	10	2	4	18
Possible combination #109	23	18	26	3	0	10	3	3	18
Possible combination #110	20	20	27	0	2	11	0	5	19
Possible combination #111	21	19	27	1	1	11	1	4	19
Possible combination #112	22	18	27	2	0	11	2	3	19
Possible combination #113	21	19	28	0	1	12	3	1	20
Possible combination #114	21	18	28	1	0	12	1	3	20
Possible combination #115	21	17	29	0	0	13	0	3	21
Possible combination #116	23	18	26	3	0	10	3	3	18
Possible combination #117	22	19	26	2	1	10	2	4	18
Possible combination #118	21	20	26	1	2	10	1	5	18
Possible combination #119	20	21	26	0	3	10	0	6	18
Possible combination #120	22	18	27	2	0	11	2	3	19
Possible combination #121	21	19	27	1	1	11	1	4	19
Possible combination #122	20	20	27	0	2	11	0	5	19
Possible combination #123	21	18	28	1	0	12	1	3	20
Possible combination #124	20	19	28	0	1	12	0	4	20

Possible combination #125	20	18	29	0	0	13	0	3	21
<p>* The ranges presented in the Registrar's Reports cover three academic years, though they span four calendar years. For example, the Registrar's Report of 1952 covers enrollments from the academic years 1949-1950, 1950-1951, and 1951-1952.</p>									

## Appendix G: Jewish Population Data

	Jews in California*	California overall^	% of California population that is Jewish	Jews in California	Jews in US	% of American Jews who live in CA
<b>1948</b>	302,200	10,060,000	3.0%	302,200	4,500,000	6.72%
<b>1949</b>	308,200	10,340,000	3.0%	308,200	---	---
<b>1950</b>	348,379	10,680,000	3.3%	348,379	---	---
<b>1951</b>	---	11,130,000	---	---	---	---
<b>1952</b>	---	11,640,000	---	---	---	---
<b>1953</b>	428,658	12,250,000	3.5%	428,658	5,000,000	8.57%
<b>1954</b>	426,118	12,750,000	3.3%	426,118	---	---
<b>1955</b>	430,500	13,130,000	3.3%	430,500	5,197,000	8.28%
<b>1956</b>	521,408	13,710,000	3.8%	521,408	---	---
<b>1957</b>	514,350	14,260,000	3.6%	514,350	5,255,000	9.79%
<b>1958</b>	498,450	14,880,000	3.3%	498,450	5,261,550	9.47%
<b>1959</b>	523,805	15,470,000	3.4%	523,805	5,367,000	9.76%
<b>1960</b>	529,260	15,870,000	3.3%	529,260	5,531,500	9.57%
<b>1961</b>	530,300	16,500,000	3.2%	530,300	5,510,000	9.62%
<b>1962</b>	572,850	17,070,000	3.4%	572,850	5,585,000	10.26%
<b>1963</b>	568,060	17,670,000	3.2%	568,060	5,600,000	10.14%
<b>1964</b>	629,870	18,150,000	3.5%	629,870	5,660,000	11.13%
<b>1965</b>	667,485	18,580,000	3.6%	667,485	5,720,000	11.67%
<b>1966</b>	650,085	18,860,000	3.4%	650,085	5,720,000	11.37%
<b>1967</b>	653,585	19,180,000	3.4%	653,585	5,800,000	11.27%
<b>1968</b>	693,085	19,390,000	3.6%	693,085	5,869,000	11.81%
<b>1969</b>	693,085	19,710,000	3.5%	693,085	5,869,000	11.81%
<b>1970</b>	---	19,970,000	---	---	---	---
<b>1971</b>	721,045	20,350,000	3.5%	721,045	6,060,000	11.90%

All data was compiled from population estimates presented in the American Jewish Year Book.  
Empty cells indicate missing data.

## Acknowledgements

We wish to express our gratitude to the alumni and students of Stanford university who spoke to us over the course of this project. This report could not have had the depth and texture that it does without the generosity of those who gave of their time and shared their experiences with us.

We wish to express our gratitude to our colleagues in and beyond Stanford whose input, insight, and assistance has deepened and enriched our efforts. Their contributions are invaluable. They include: Izzy Aguiar, Karen Bartholomew, Max Baumgarten, Lila Corwin Berman, Seth Brysk, Nathaniel Deutsch, Hasia Diner, Kirsten Fermaglich, Bradley Hart, Shelley Hebert, Dana Herman, Etan Kelman, Helen Kim, Maggie Kimball, Rachel Kranson, Shira Kohn, David Labaree, James Loeffler, Bernie Meyler, Tony Michels, Roxanne Nilan, Pam Nadell, Charles Petersen, Bruce A. Phillips, Riv-Ellen Prell, Jon Reider, Fred Rosenblum, Sara Smith, Miriam Spector, Jeff Wachtel, Howard Wolf, Laura Yares, and Steve Zipperstein.

Of particular note and with deepest appreciation, we wish to acknowledge the leadership of Tiffany Steinwert, Stanford's Dean of Religious and Spiritual Life, and Patrick Dunkley, Vice Provost for Institutional Equity, Access and Community.

Finally, the work of the task force would have been impossible without the generosity, collegiality, assistance, curiosity, and patience of Josh Schneider, Stanford's University Archivist, and Tim Noakes, the Head of Public Services in the Department of Special Collections. Josh and Tim were essential partners on the research and we cannot understate their contributions to this report.