Who's Invited? The Desegregation of Emory University, The University of Pennsylvania, and Princeton University

Samantha Rahmin

AN HONORS THESIS

in

History

Presented to the Faculty of the
Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

2017

Dr. Beth Wenger, Honors Seminar Director

Dr. Mary Frances Berry, Thesis Advisor

____

Siyen Fei
Undergraduate Chair, Department of History

To my parents for being the wind beneath my wings.

Acknowledgements

I'm so lucky to have grown up surrounded by the most amazing family. My parents, Iris Kopeloff and Michael Rahmin, and my siblings, Gabrielle Rahmin and Austin Rahmin, have provided me with unconditional love and encouragement to fulfil my dreams.

I'm incredibly grateful that I have the world's best nana, colloquially known to my friends as "super nana," as my best friend and constant source of wisdom. I would not be me if it were not for her influence.

I have learned so much as a student in the department of history at the University of Pennsylvania. Thank you to Dr. Yvonne Fabella for providing me with endless major specific advice. Thank you to Dr. Thomas Sugrue for inspiring me to pursue this topic and helping me start this research. This thesis would not be complete if it were not for the amazing seminar leader, Dr. Beth Wenger. Dr. Wenger's ability to teach me research and writing skills of course were a prerequisite for my ability to write this thesis. However, Dr. Wenger's courses hae also helped me develop as a thinker, and will therefore positively impact every future project that I undertake. Dr. Mary Frances Berry, my thesis advisor, provided me with a wealth of subject specific knowledge, and I am so lucky that this project grew under her guidance. Thank you to my fellow students in my history thesis seminar, and especially my peer group: Chloe Nurik, Hannah Fagin, and John Shinn.

Thank you to Dr. Rogers Smith and his Democracy, Constitutionalism, and Citizenship program for both writing support throughout the project and the necessary funding for the work.

This thesis benefitted immensely from Emory's archives, the University of Pennsylvania's archives, and Princeton's archives. I am fortunate that many archivists took the time to help me find necessary materials.

Finally, I am thankful for the two organizations I have joined at Penn, my sorority, Zeta Tau Alpha, and my branch of student government, the Nominations and Elections Committee. The support of my families at Penn has made me the student (and historian) I am now.

Table of Contents

Introduction.. 10

Chapter 1: The Desegregation of Emory University..11-43

Chapter 2: The Desegregation of The University of Pennsylvania........................44-70

Chapter 3: The Desegregation of Princeton University..71-94

Conclusion..95-102

"In studying the experience of black people with Princeton University—a premiere institution of education—one can better understand how engulfing racism was in this nation's history. By neglecting the histories of African Americans at Ivy League universities, scholars have failed to acknowledge the expanse of the struggle for black freedom.[1]

Who's Invited?

Most basic American history textbooks emphasize that in the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* the Supreme Court ruled to "admit public schools on a racially non discriminatory basis."[2] While this decision is frequently celebrated for its immediate impact, much of its significance stems from the way that it catalyzed a chain of events, and these events eventually sparked desegregation of higher education.[3] As a result of this ruling, court mandates frequently forced public universities to alter their admissions criteria.[4] This switch in policy correlated with a switch in American attitudes: only twenty six percent of Americans thought that "negroes should go to the same schools as whites" in 1942. By 1967 almost seventy percent believed in school desegregation.[5] As the American public began to affirm school desegregation, selective private institutions began transforming their approach to admissions in order to desegregate.

This thesis offers a case study of the desegregation of three private schools: Emory University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Princeton University. The first chapter demonstrates how Emory University fought Georgia's law in order to admit black applicants. The chapter shows that once Emory won the right to desegregate, it accepted a

---

[1] Stefan M. Bradley, "The Southern-Most Ivy: Princeton University from Jim Crow Admissions to Anti-Apartheid Protests, 1794–1969," *American Studies* 51, no. 3-4 (2010), doi:10.1353/ams.2010.0129, 110.
[2] "Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1)," *Oyez*. Chicago-Kent College of Law at Illinois Tech, n.d. Dec 18, 2016. <https://www.oyez.org/cases/1940-1955/347us483>
[3] James T. Patterson, *Brown v. Board of Education: a civil rights milestone and its troubled legacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
[4] Alton Hornsby, "Black Public Education in Atlanta, Georgia, 1954-1973: From Segregation to Segregation." *The Journal of Negro History* 76, no. 1/4 (1991): 21-47. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2717407.
[5] Mildred A. Schwartz, "Trends in White Attitudes Toward Negroes," *National Opinion Research Center at the University Of Chicago*. 1967. http://www.norc.org/PDFs/publications/NORCRpt_119.pdf

similarly small proportion of black applicants as its peers in the North. The next chapter highlights the tension associated with Penn's desegregation process, where administrators struggled to balance the need to admit black students while keeping a high average SAT score. The final chapter shows that while Princeton had the resources to admit black students without sacrificing its reputation, Princeton prevented changing its admissions policies until the emergence of new leadership in the 1960s.

In order to show the motives behind each schools' desegregation process, this thesis relies heavily on materials from each school's archive and each school's major student newspaper: *The Emory Wheel, The Daily Pennsylvania, and The Daily Princetonian,* respectively. At Emory, the archive's Desegregation Collection holds paperwork surrounding a crucial court decision and provocative correspondences between administrators, alumni, and students. Emory's archives include the President's paperwork and admissions files. At Penn's archives, files from the admissions office shed light on the school's desegregation process. Princeton's archives contain much material, but a significant portion is restricted from researchers. Fortunately, each student at Princeton had to write a thesis, and these theses contribute to this work. The source base for each school varied slightly. Yet these sources illuminate the theme that each school delayed desegregation until doing so was convenient for each institution to grow a national reputation.

All three institutions aspired to become well known "national universities." To be a national university, many admissions officers believed they ought to reflect the population of the entire nation. Yet through the 1960s, Emory, Penn, and Princeton each maintained a white student and faculty population in a historically black city. From the

middle of the1960s to the middle of the 1970s, each school desegregated by admitting black students in greater numbers. By definition, desegregation means, "to free of any laws, provisions of practices requiring isolation of members of a particular race in separate units."[6] In his recent, Why Busing Failed, Matthew Delmont defines desegregation as "assignment of students to public schools without regard to race, religion, or national origin."[7] Emory fought to admit students in that manner, and Penn and Emory claimed to do so. However, defact segregation hindered these schools from initially admitting black students in greater numbers. This thesis shows how administrators at each school worked within the confines of federal and state law along with internal school policy to allow more black students to gain entry.

This paper uses the terminology "black students" opposed to "African American students." Race refers to a social classification system broadly correlated with phenotypes, which confers such structural advantage to privileged groups. The term has "African American" has implications regarding ancestral origin which are irrelevant to this paper. This work focuses solely on the plight of black applicants; a limitation to this work is that it does not address if the universities became inclusive to other minorities.[8] Moreover, the biggest limitation of this thesis is that does not attempt to discuss school integration, meaning according to Merriam Webster Dictionary, "to combine (two or more things) to form or create something."[9] Whereas this thesis demonstrates how Emory, Penn, and Princeton allowed more black students to exist in their campuses, it

[6] *The Merriam-Webster dictionary* (Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, 2004).

[7] Matthew F. Delmont, *Why busing failed: race, media, and the national resistance to school desegregation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016), 8.

[8] Stevens, M. L., *Creating a class: College admissions and the education of elites*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 15.

[9] The Merriam Webster Dictionary.

does not begin to explain if the institutions accommodated black students into their larger social fabrics. Imposing dates on attitudinal changes proves challenging if not impossible. However, most of the changes needed for a true integration process occurred out of the scope of this paper's time frame.

Different Phases of the Civil Rights Movement

Scholars cannot place clear start and end dates on the modern Civil Rights Movement, but most concur that it did not occur linearly. [10] Nancy J. Weiss argues that the Civil Rights Movement has two distinct phases: a stage of "direct activism" pre-1965 followed by a stage of internal strife.[11] Joseph E. Peniel upholds a similar argument; he cites the "Meredith March" in 1966 as a turning point in the Movement. Organized by James Meredith, the first black student to attend Ole Miss, the "Meredith March" brought Civil Rights leaders from Memphis, Tennessee to Jackson, Mississippi.[12] Meredith was shot early in the march, and his assassination precipitated the Movement taking a new tone. The "Meredith March" introduced the idea of "Black Power," or "the notion of writing historical wrongs on a whole new, if also more combative, level."[13] Prominent activists, such as Stokely Carmichael fought openly for blacks to be accepted as part of the economic fabric of American society. Martin Luther King represented ideas of civil disobedience, but after his assassination in 1968, Carmichael's more ideological language became more prevalent amongst Civil Rights leaders.

[10] David Levering Lewis, "The Origins and Causes of the Civil Rights Movement," in Lewis, David L., and Charles W. Eagles. *The Civil Rights Movement in America: Essays*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1986.

[11] Nancy J. Weiss, "The Politics of the Mississippi Movement," in Lewis, David L., and Charles W. Eagles. *The Civil Rights Movement in America: Essays*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1986.

[12] Peniel E. Joseph, *Waiting 'til the midnight hour: a narrative history of Black power in America* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 2006).

[13] Ibid, 302.

Civil Rights activism thrived in 1950s Atlanta, and at Emory, the faculty rallied behind the idea of preserving one public school system for both blacks and whites. This unification provided a basis for Emory's desegregation process. The Civil Rights Movement was very active in Atlanta in the 1950s, in part because politicians and the media vilified de jure segregation. Yet mainstream US sosictye still accepted the de facto segregation in the North, so at this time the Movement did not have the same degree of influence in Philadelphia or Princeton. Therefore, Penn and Princeton were not yet pressured to consider desegregation policie. However, once they confronted the issue in the 1960s, the tone of black activism impacted Penn, and Penn admissions mirrored the confrontational tone, adding a degree of urgency.

Thus schools' settings, in terms of both time and location, influenced the degree of confrontation within each school's administration throughout the desegregation process. Civil Rights activism affected different places at different times. Atlanta, the birthplace of Martin Luther King Jr. and arguably of the Civil Rights Movement, was immersed in the movement in its earliest stages. Emory is located in Decatur, a wealthy white area of Atlanta. Likely because of a location that kept it isolated from a large black population and the timing of Emory's desegregation process, Emory's decision to desegregate did not lead to major internal administrative contention relative to the other two schools. Once Emory desegregated, students fought for true integration using nonviolent civil disobedience tactics, such as interrupting church and blocking food lines. These tactics found relative success, and most churchgoers and Sunday lunch eaters felt that the student's message held weight. By 1968, as Emory moved toward integration, Penn's administration had not begun any meaningful conversations about admitting

"Negroes."[14] The Civil Rights Movement had greatest sway on Philadelphia from 1967 to 1970, and at this point Civil Rights activists had a more confrontational approach. By the time Penn admissions realized the need for policy updates, the administration faced external pressures in crafting a different admissions policy. Penn's admissions office was wrought with internal aggression, and the external realities contextualize the high levels of tension. In contrast, being in a small town, Princeton was more sheltered from the Civil Rights Movement. Princeton needed to make subtle shifts in its admissions policy to comply with federal laws, but true change came on its own terms.

Structure Versus Agency

One major question that has preoccupied Civil Rights historians is whether institutions or individual actors provoked change in the national movement for more equality. In their groundbreaking book, *Debating the Civil Rights Movement,* historians Steven Lawson and Charles Payne consider whether the major change agents were federal government agencies (structures) or grassroots movements (agents). Lawson's version of history asserts that government structures shifted societal attitudes, and he highlights how Eisenhower's intervention in school integration was necessary to "prevent anarchy."[15] On the other hand, Payne maintains, "Far from being the solution, American institutions have always played an important role in the creation and maintenance of racism. What happened in the movement was the civil rights activists were able to maneuver around those institutions to alleviate some of the system's worst features."[16] Payne emphasizes unsung heroes (agents), such as Daisy Bates, who worked for the

---

[14] Jonathon Zimman, "Admissions Application: 100 Years of Change," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* July 1, 1974, 9.
[15] Benjamin Fine, "Arkansas Troops Bar Negro Pupils; Governor Defiant," *New York Times,* September 4, 1957.
[16] Steven Lawson and Charles Payne, *Debating the Civil Rights Movement (*Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2006), 115.

NAACP and quietly assured the students' safety if attending an integrated school. Undeniably, structures and agents worked together to play a role in school integration, and this thesis asserts that the prevalence of each force varies based on context.

As historians continue to debate whether structure or agency propelled the Civil Rights Movement, my work will show how both structure and agency impacted each school's desegregation process to various degrees. The communities in which these schools were rooted along with powerful individuals within these institutions shaped each school's desegregation process.

Emory's southern location initially hindered administrators from admitting black students. Aspiring to follow the national trends regarding black admissions, the chairman of Emory's board of trustees and the dean of Emory's law school sued the state in order to be able to admit black students and maintain property tax-exempt status. They won their case, and Emory's leaders successfully emulated the token desegregation of her perceived peer institutions in the north.

Unconstrained by federal or state law, Penn's administration *could* admit black students throughout her history. However, the administration had to contend with financial costs associated with black recruitment and black students' financial aid coupled with the reputational risks of admitting students with lower SAT scores. By the late 1960s, Penn needed to admit more black students to pacify its surrounding black community. Balancing the reputational need to admit more black students and maintain a high average SAT score while on a budget proved challenging. These structural constraints impeded black admissions.

At Princeton, administrators had more freedom to admit black students on their own volition, but the old guard leadership instead prided itself on maintaining stability. Change in leadership in the 1960s engendered inclusive policies. While Princeton was more isolated from direct community influence, once President Goheen came into power, he ushered in a wave of change by choosing a director of admissions who built a system that allowed greater fairness to black students and by hiring the first black administrator as assistant dean of the college, Carl Fields. While different structural constraints inhibited Emory, Penn, and Princeton from admitting black students, the ways that the schools handled these constraints mattered. The students invited to study at these schools were invited into the upper echelons' of American society.

Admissions Historiography

Americans have long been obsessed with the college process. In 2010, Canadian Malcolm Gladwell, a sharp critic of the American preoccupation with obtaining an elite college degree, has observed that an Ivy League education can determine future success. He writes,

> At the heart of the American obsession with the Ivy League is the belief that schools like Harvard provide the social and intellectual equivalent of Marine Corps basic training… getting a degree with that powerful name on it will confer advantages that no local state university can provide.[17]

Selective schools have always shaped who has social capital in American society, so their admissions processes hold significance. Noting this importance, historians have detailed the history of admissions policies, particularly at "the big three," Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. Much of the historiography highlights Jewish admissions. My thesis shows that the methods use to exclude Jews in the 1920s sets a precedent for how these schools

[17] Malcolm Gladwell, "Getting In," *The New Yorker,* August 21, 2013, 5.

limit admission of minority groups.[18] Historian Marcia Synnott's *Half Opened Door,* reveals that America's meritocratic spirit brought about a "Jewish problem," which led Harvard, Princeton, and Yale to adopt a quota system.[19] In 1920, Harvard instituted a merit-based test to determine admissions and by 1922 the school was one-fifth Jewish. Harvard's then President, Lawrence Lowell, along with professors and alumni, feared that the school was becoming "Hebrewized."[20] These men were deeply concern that the school's reputation would plummet if it continued to admit so many Jews. President Lowell worried that it would resemble "The summer hotel that is ruined by admitting Jews meets its fate . . . because they drive away the Gentiles, and then after the Gentiles have left, they leave also."[21] According to Lowell, if Jews over-populated Harvard, the school would lose its essence. He explained to a prominent Jewish alumnus from Cleveland, "If their number should become 40% of the student body, the race feeling would become intense. When on the other hand, the number of Jews was small, the race antagonism was also small."[22] This thesis shows that Emory's, Penn's, and Princeton's administrations held similar fears about admitting too many black students in the 1960s. Malcolm Gladwell explains that these schools all admitted and rejected applicants on the basis of "character," a category used to assure that "to ensure that 'undesirables' were identified and to assess important but subtle indicators of background and breeding such as speech, dress, deportment and physical appearance." [23] In the 1920s, this rhetoric was compiled into a policy used to exclude Jews. Selective schools used these already

---

[18] Marcia Graham. Synnott, *The half-opened door: researching admissions discrimination at Harvard, Yale and Princeton* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982), 160.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Jerome Karabel, *The Chosen: The History of Admissions and Inclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton (*Boston, Mass: Houghton Milton Company, 2006), 110.

[21]Gladwell, 3.

[22] Henry L. Feingold, "Investing in Themselves: The Harvard Case and the Origins of the Third American-Jewish Commercial Elite," *American Jewish History* 77, no. 4 (1988): 537. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23883206.

[23] Jerome Karabel, *The Chosen,* 114.

developed tactics to exclude blacks in the 1960s. Up until the 1960s, blackness was certainly an undesirable mark against character, if not a total barrier for admissions.

Emory, Penn, and Princeton began to view blackness as a desirable characteristic after society came to believe that blacks and whites should be able to learn together.[24] As laws developed throughout the 1960s, school policies did as well. Different ideologies permeate each institution, which impacts each school's desegregation process. Methodist ideals inspired Emory leaders' thinking about race. Leaders at Penn highly value pragmatism, and admitted black students when doing so was pragmatic. Princeton has always prided itself on being conservative in terms of social thinking, with 83% of the student population identifying as Republican in 1963.[25] This tendency allows us to understand why Princeton's leaders were slow to desegregate. Each school held to its own principles and faced its own challenges regarding implementing desegregationist policies. However, leaders at each institution consistently altered admissions policy as needed to maintain national footing. Despite their differences, each school's actions reflect a strong desire to maintain a national reputation.

[24] Schwartz, "Trends in White Attitudes Toward Negroes."
[25] George E. Tomberlain Jr., "Trends in Princeton Admissions," (BA Thesis, Princeton University, 1971), 114.

The Desegregation of Emory University: We're Following the Leaders

"When I arrived at Emory about eleven years ago, I was thrilled by the story of how the University came to integrate before required by Federal law. Also, I was shocked that no attempt had been made to document the history of the situation….. Perhaps someone more scholarly than I will want to edit the enclosed material, and put it to some useful purpose."[26]

Introduction

U.S. District Judge William Bootle effectively dismantled segregation of public higher education in Georgia in 1961. He ruled that the University of Georgia unlawfully rejected two black applicants, and he forced the school to admit the prospective students. The administration of University of Georgia intended to close the school rather allow two qualified black applicants entry, but Judge Bootle insisted that the school continue operating. For the first time in Georgia, black and white students studied alongside one another at the collegiate level.[27] Thus by 1961, Georgia law obligated its public schools to desegregate.[28] However at this time Georgia law forbid private Emory University from accepting black students. [29]

As federal and state laws forced public universities to desegregate and implement more racially inclusive policies, Atlanta's tax laws constrained Emory from doing so.[30] Overt segregation was falling out of favor in US public opinion, and Emory University fought Georgia for ability to admit students of all races in 1962. In a groundbreaking

[26] "Email From Director of Library Don Bosseau To Norman Smith with Subject History of Integration, Emory University," Box 3, Folder 2, The James Harvey Papers, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[27] Alton Hornsby, "Black Public Education in Atlanta, Georgia, 1954-1973: From Segregation to Segregation." *The Journal of Negro History* 76, no. 1/4 (1991): 21-47. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2717407.

[28] Melissa Kean, *Desegregating private higher education in the South: Duke, Emory, Rice, Tulane, and Vanderbilt* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008), 241.

[29] "Supplemental Brief for the Plaintiffs in Error," Box 1, Folder 1, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[30] "Dekalb County Superior Court: Petition for Declaratory Judgment and Injunction," Box 1, Folder 1, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

court case, Emory won the right to accept blacks and whites and keep certain property tax exemptions.[31] Mixing blacks and whites in public schools had been a contentious issue for Atlanta, and the history of this process foreshadows the complications with Emory's desegregation process.

Desegregation of Public Education of Atlanta

This chapter focuses on Emory's desegregation, which climaxed when Emory officials dismantled Georgia's lawsin the court case Emory v. Nash in 1962. Howver, Emory, a private institution, could challenge Georgia law until it permitted public schools to desegregated. In 1954, the Supreme Court mandated integration; however, the Court did not set a timeline.[32] Instead, it ruled that public schools desegregate with "all deliberate speed."[33] Along with many other state governments, Georgia's legislature effectively delayed restructuring the public school system to accommodate the ruling.[34] Rather than working to form a mechanism for desegregation, politicians campaigned on promises that "no, not one" black would enter a white school.[35] These politicians tried to manipulate the law to shift the kindergarten through twelfth grade education system from a public school system to a private school system. If Georgia could completely privatize kindergarten through twelfth grade, the state could perpetuate segregation.[36] Devoted to upholding a segregated education system, Georgia's Governor Ernest championed closing all of Atlanta's public schools.[37] He became increasingly unable to find new

---

[31] Eliot Farber, "The Integration of Emory University," (BA Thesis, Emory University, 1981), 54.

[32] James T. Patterson, *Brown v. Board of Education: a civil rights milestone and its troubled legacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

[33] "Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1)," *Oyez*. Chicago-Kent College of Law at Illinois Tech, n.d. Dec 18, 2016. <https://www.oyez.org/cases/1940-1955/347us483>

[34] Paul E. Mertz, "Mind Changing Time All Over Georgia": HOPE, Inc. and School Desegregation, 1958-1961." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 77, no. 1 (1993): 41-61. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40582653, 43.

[35] Ibid.

[36] "Crisis in the Schools," *Emory Alumnus*, February 1959, Box 1, Folder 2, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[37] Mertz, "Mind Changing Time All Over Georgia," 43.

tactics to evade federal law, and many Atlantans mobilized to save their kindergarten through twelfth grade public school system.

This incident contributes to Emory's desegregation process because the public school closure scandal carried immense reputational risk. Emory officials faced challenges associated with administering a university in a state without a public school system. Georgia's lack of public school system would discourage people from moving there and to impose a hefty economic burden on white parents.[38] Understanding the negative ramifications of closing Georgia's public schools, affluent white parents created the non-profit organization, HOPE, Help our Public Education. To garner broad support HOPE explicitly supported the concept of public education and claimed neutrality in the matter of desegregation.[39] The group circulated petitions and lobbied Congress to spread their message. HOPE played an important role in guaranteeing the security of Atlanta's public schools. [40]

HOPE attempted to appear uncontroversial. In order to do so, HOPE maintained an exclusively white membership. The organization nuanced its message to assure that while it supported the concept of public education, it did not explicitly advocate for integration. Thus HOPE attempted to tailor its rhetoric to assuage white fears.[41] Indeed, Emory alum and the Chairman of the Hope's Legal Counsel reminded Georgia's white citizens that, "Desegregation does not mean all out racial inter-mixing." [42] Officials at Emory were proponents of this message throughought the public school closure issue and its own desegregation conversations.

[38] "Must We Integrate to Educate?," *Emory Alumnus*, November 1959, Box 1, Folder 2, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
[39]Mertz, "Mind Changing Time All Over Georgia," 44.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Farber, "The Integration of Emory University," 14.
[42] "There is Hope For Public Schools," *Emory Alumnus*, December 1959, Box 1, Folder 2, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

Emory's faculty and administrators unified around the concept of public schools in response to the potential for public school closure.[43] Their rationale was grounded in the negative impact the closures would have on the city of Atlanta opposed to a progressive racial ideal, and this rationale proved more effective. Emory faculty mimicked HOPE's message in many letters and petitions, and they used this type of vague language when fighting for Emory's integration. In each of the various petitions, Emory's faculty implicitly support an integrated Kindergarten through twelfth grade educational system by advocating the maintenance of the public schools. However, in most instances, they do not clearly reveal themselves as proponents of integration. A number of Emory officials signed a petition that reads, "We, who are full time members of the faculties of Emory University are opposed to the closing of the public schools in any section of the United States."[44] Their statement explains that closing public schools would impede growth of Atlanta's economy, which in turn would hinder Atlanta's ability to become a prominent American city.[45] Since Emory's leaders aspired for their school and city to have national influence, this scandal incited apprehension that Atlanta would no longer be a thriving city. Members of Emory faculty wrote a statement that appeared in the *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, proclaiming, "We wish to point out the irreparable damage that will result from the closing public schools, not only to the people of any particular community, but also to the state and the nation at large. "[46] In this statement, the faculty emphasized that Atlanta's students would take their skills

---

[43] "Letter to President Martin From the Secretary Pro Tem of the Legislative Council of the College and Arts and Science," Box 1, Folder entitled Desegregation Documentation- James Harvey Young, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[44] "Text of The Statement By Emory Faculty," Published in The Atlanta Journal and Constitution 11/30/1958, Box 1, Folder entitled Desegregation Documentation- James Harvey Young, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Text of The Statement By Emory Faculty," Published in The Atlanta Journal and Constitution 11/30/1958, Box 1, Folder entitled Desegregation Documentation- James Harvey Young, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

elsewhere if they were not guaranteed a public school system. This talent void could cause the state to suffer economically. Emory's faculty not only feared school closure's impact on Atlanta, but also school closure's international consequence. Emory officials feared precedent for school closure in Atlanta could spark legal precedent for school closure elsewhere throughout the nation. The United States was waging the Cold War, and competing with Russia educationally. Many Americans worried Russia's' education system would eclipse ours, and threats of school closures heightened these anxieties. [47]

The risk to Atlanta's school system led Emory's administration to become etrenched in the national conversation about race. Emory struggled to retain upper echelon faculty because professors refused to move to a city without guaranteed public schools. The *Emory Alumnus* reported that, "Emory has had turndown after turndown from young able teachers it has wanted to employ from colleges in other states. They simply do not want to bring their children into a climate where the future of public education is uncertain. Nor will Professors at Emory stay if the situation grows much worse."[48] Emory faculty at the Candler School of Philosophy issued a "Minister's Manifesto," in which they called for Emory to take legal action in order to protect Atlanta's public school system.[49] This Manifesto provoked the faculty at Agnes Scott and Atlanta Area Doctors to release similar statements.[50] Emory's stakeholders ideologically gathering around the concept of public integration, which precipitated allowing Emory

---

[47] Ibid.

[48] "The State of the University," *Emory Alumnus*, February 1960, Box 1, Folder 2, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[49] "Ministers Manifesto, November 1958" Box 1, Folder 2, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[50] "Statement Issued By the Faculty at Agnes Scott, December 1958," Box 1, Folder entitled Desegregation Documentation- James Harvey Young, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

admissions to be open to “any qualified student… regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.”[51]

Being Black in Atlanta

When Georgia’s politicians mobilized to destroy the public school system, groups of middle class black parents counterattacked to fight these discriminatory policies.[52] Black parents shared concerns regarding the possibility of public school closure. A group of black parents filed suit in 1958 to demand that Atlanta conserve a public school system. Given the stipulations of *Brown v. Board of Education*, they likely would have succeeded in this case if it ent to the Supreme Court. However, other forms of advocacy worked preserved Atlanta’s public school system prior to its hearing. Still these black parents did have the capacity to make a political impact in Atlanta.

In contrast to other American cities, Atlanta’s black population possessed the political capital necessary to execute policy changes.[53] After the Civil War, Atlanta evolved into an important location for American blacks.[54] Newly freed slaves managed to develop social, economic, and cultural institutions. Historically black colleges educated a growing black middle class.[55] Black students prided themselves in attending their parents’ alma maters, which possibly led fewer black students to apply to Emory.[56] Atlanta’s educated, black middle class formed a thriving business community. A street named Auburn Avenue, otherwise known as “Sweet Auburn Avenue,” served as the

[51]“A Brief Documentary Account of Integration at Emory University,” Box 1, Folder entitled Desegregation Documentation- James Harvey Young, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
[52] Farber, “The Integration of Emory University,” 42.
[53] Douglas S. Massey and Nancy A. Denton, *American Apartheid: segregation and the making of the underclass* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993).
[54] Karen Ferguson, *Black polmoreitics in New Deal Atlanta* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).
[55] Founded in 1926, The Atlanta University Center was at the time comprised of Clark University, Morehouse College, Morehouse School of Medicine, Spelman College, Morris Brown College, and the interdenominational Theological Center.
[56] Tiwanna Simpson, “Historically Black Colleges in Atlanta,” (Lecture, Morehosue College, March 10, 2016.).

community hub.[57] There, black workers found jobs, black merchants treated black customers respectfully, and former black slaves made fortunes creating insurance companies and banks to serve a black clientele.[58] These structures provided a "false sense of racial progressivism" in Atlanta throughout the 1900s.[59] The black middle class appeared opulent in Atlanta, but this prosperity obscured their ceiling.

While their business success allowed Atlanta's black community to flourish, other laws set barriers that limit Atlanta's black citizens from acquiring economic and social capital. For example, residential segregation would have prevented meaningful public school integration, even if Georgia had complied with federal integration laws.[60] While the Georgia Supreme Court had deemed residential zoning regulations illegal, these precedents remained unofficially enforced through the 1980s, restricting the potential for true integration.[61] Blacks had power in their communities, but in Atlanta's white areas, blacks remained at the bottom of the economic structure. For example, Emory University is located in Decatur, a primarily white and affluent suburb of Atlanta. During the 1940s, blacks frequented the campus, but only as unskilled workers.[62] Any black student who dared to apply to Emory simply had his or her materials returned. Throughout Emory's history, the admissions office would not read black applications.[63]

Attitudes at Emory in the 1940s- 1950s

---

[57] Victoria J. Gallagher, "Remembering together: Rhetorical integration and the case of the Martin Luther King, Jr. memorial," *Southern Communication Journal* 60, no. 2 (1995): , doi:10.1080/10417949509372968.

[58] Ronald A. Bayer, "Atlanta: The Historical Paradox," in *The Atlanta Paradox*, ed. David L. Sjoquist (Atlanta, GA: Russel Sage Foundation, 2000), 49.

[59] Ronald A. Bayer, "Atlanta: The Historical Paradox," in *The Atlanta Paradox*, ed. David L. Sjoquist (Atlanta, GA: Russel Sage Foundation, 2000), 43.

[60] Ronald A. Bayer, "Atlanta: The Historical Paradox," in *The Atlanta Paradox*, ed. David L. Sjoquist (Atlanta, GA: Russel Sage Foundation, 2000), 40.

[61] David L. Sjoquist, "The Atlanta Paradox: Introduction," in *The Atlanta Paradox*, ed. David L. Sjoquist (Atlanta, GA: Russel Sage Foundation, 2000).

[62] "Testimony from Hank Ambrose," Mary Odem: Experiencing Race, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[63] Kean, Desegregating Private Higher Education in the South, page 33.

Emory University began as a small Methodist Episcopal School in Oxford, Georgia in 1836. Emory struggled financially throughout the 1800s but established a secure financial base by the 1900s.[64] Emory leaders had a history of speaking out on racial issues in progressive ways, and as Emory grew in regional influence these attitudes attracted more attention.[65] In 1881, Emory President Atticus Haygood instructed white Southerners to treat African Americans in a more Christian manner.[66] In 1902, a Latin Professor Andrew Sledd demanded Southerners give African Americans political voices.[67] By 1914, Emory's administration was looking to expand the school. Simultaneously, the Methodist Episcopal Church, which had founded Central University (now Vanderbilt) in 1872 hoped to reinvigorate a Georgian university. At this time, Emory's President was connected to the Coca Cola dynasty.[68] The Coca Cola Company and Methodist Episcopal Church contributed financially to allow Emory to secure land in Atlanta, and the university gained more secure footing as a regional institution.[69]

By the 1940s, Emory sustained a strong regional presence but lacked national name recognition.[70] At this time, the north and the south used different mechanisms to conserve segregation. Policies in many northern cities facilitated "de facto" segregation, meaning racial separation was a result of whites self-selecting each other on a voluntary basis.[71] On the other hand, southern cities still supported laws that forced "de jure" segregation, or separation by law. Emory was steeped in its regional, southern tradition,

---

[64] F. Stuart Gulley, *The Academic President as A Moral Leader (*Macon, Mercer University Press, 2001), 101.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Turner, William B. "The Racial Integration of Emory University: Ben F. Johnson, Jr., and the Humanity of Law." *Article Draft: Accessed Through Emory Website with help of Archivists*: 1-65. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1007261, 14.
[67] Turner, The Racial Integration of Emory University, 15.
[68] Thomas, English H. *Emory University, 1915-1965: A Semi centennial History* (Atlanta: Emory University Press, 1966). 72.
[69] "Candler History | Emory University | Atlanta, GA." Candler School of Theology | Emory University. Accessed December 19, 2016. http://candler.emory.edu/about/history/index.html.
[70] F. Stuart Gulley, *The Academic President as A Moral Leader (*Macon, Mercer University Press, 2001), 103.
[71] William H. Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina, and the Black Struggle for Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

and throughout the 1940s and 1950s, Emory's administrations could not afford to implement policies that would isolate its Southern benefactors, students, and faculty.[72]

Until the eruption of the public schools closure threat, the Emory community was strictly segregated and had no conversations regarding attempting to change those policies. Emory's President from 1942 to 1957, Goodrich White, seemed to understand the salience of race in his time. He assessed, "The Negro problem has been *the* problem of the South throughout virtually its entire history. The problem cuts across every aspect of our life."[73] Given the massive nature of the race problem in America, White did not seem to believe he could build an integrated Emory, and therefore he did not think desgergeation was a worthwhile mission. He noted Georgia's "gross inequality of opportunity, economic, and educational."[74] In accordance with the principles of his time, White attempted to address racialized problems through a "separate but equal" solution.[75] Instead of thinking whites and blacks should learn together, President White presumed Atlanta whites needed to protect the black population.[76] He took a paternalistic approach to race relations, and true to his beliefs, White tried to help the black community by serving on the board of Clark University, an all-black institution, for most of his adult life.[77]

Despite White's apathy for change, Atlanta's public schools, students at the Candler School of Theology pushed forward openly integrationist ideas after the school closure crisis. These ideas became the basis for Emory's successful challenge of

---

[72] "Statement Made To the Freshmen By Vice President Judson C. Ward Jr.," Box 1, Folder 7, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[73] "Draft on Reminiscences," Box 31, The White Papers, Emory University President's Office, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[74] "Speech to Meeting of Church Related Colleges, July 26, 1948," Box 25, White Papers, Emory University President's Office, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[75] Ibid.

[76] Kean, Desegregating Private Higher Education in the South, page 29.

[77] Ibid.

Georgia's laws in the 1962 court case, *Emory v. Nash*. In the late 1960s, these students identified strongly with their Methodist faith, and they were keenly aware that most other theological schools in the South had already integrated; as an example, Vanderbilt's theological school integrated in 1957.[78] Wanting Emory's policy to align with its peer institutions, the President of the Candler School's Student Council, wrote a letter directly to the Board of Trustees, explaining, "We, Student Council of the Candler School of Theology, feel it incumbent upon us to share with you our deep-rooted desire concerning Emory University and the question of admission of Negroes. Occasional polls of our student body have indicated a strong feeling in favor of integrating the Theology School."[79] One such poll in 1951 asked, "Would you be willing to have Negroes attend the Candler School of Theology"? The poll illuminated that of two hundred fifty four students polled, two hundred thirty four favored integration, seven were undecided, and thirteen opposed.[80] Students at the Candler School of Theology wrote to the Board indicating, "We pledge ourselves to remain in prayer for them on that day, that by their faith, courage, and wisdom, all racial discrimination in the University's admissions policy may be brought to an end."[81] Affirming their Methodist principles of equality, in 1962, the Board of Trustees released a statement declaring, "pride in the Methodist tradition" and mainstream Methodist ways of thinking, which at this time held a pro-integration stance.[82]

In light of this larger university context, students at Emory's undergraduate school began contemplating the consequences of admitting black students. The student

---

[78] Gary S. Hauk, *A legacy of heart and mind: Emory since 1836* (Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 1999), 36.

[79] "Statement of Policy Approved By the Gentlemen of the Board of Trustees" May 3, 1961, Box 1, Folder 1, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[80] "Statement of 91 Theology Students to the Board of Trustees, May 3, 1961" Box 1, Folder 1, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[81] A Brief Documentary Account of Integration at Emory University," 6.

[82] Turner, The Racial Integration of Emory University, 16.

newspaper, *The Emory Wheel*, ran an article entitled, "Negroes Should be Admitted to Graduate Schools on a Limited Basis,"[83] which said Emory students by and large would not object to having a few Negroes sit in their classrooms." Clearly, the tone and title of this article reflect that Emory's students were not considering full-scale integration, but merely acquiescing the same degree of token de facto desegregation that existed at similar northern universities. These students were merely agreeable to a few black students sitting in their classrooms. In 1948, the editor of *The Emory Wheel* authored a column entitled "Emory could Help Negro Education,"

> Emory could show it is one of the South's more liberal private universities by aiding the Southern Negro's adjustment by the restricted admission of Negroes to some of its schools. Such a program could be started by allowing students from Atlanta University of some other nearby Negro school to take courses on the campus, or the selection of certain outstanding Negro students for graduate work at Emory. [84]

This author wanted society to perceive Emory as liberal, and he was comfortable having black students on campus. "Liberal" at this time meant having a token number of black students on campus. The author also indicates that he was not in favor of structural changes that would allow blacks access to the fabric of the schools' social structure.[85] As the meaning of liberal evolved over the decdes, so to would opinion at Emory. Perhaps Emory students felt that only a few black students would meet the school's qualifications. Once black students were admitted in the 1960s, articles in *The Emory Wheel* harped on the fact that the admitted black students were academically on par with the admitted white students.[86] Notably, while this conversation was important, this article indicates that Emory students did not initially consider whether blacks should attend their

---

[83] "Negroes Should be Admitted to Graduate Schools on a Limited Basis," *The Emory Wheel*, January, 27, 1950, 1.
[84] Tim Spivey, "Emory Could Help Negro Education," *The Emory Wheel*, February 28, 1948, 1.
[85] For example, Emory would not have considered engaging in conversations about changing the curriculum.
[86] "University Policy Attracts 9 Negroes," *The Emory Wheel*. September 26, 1963, 2.

undergraduate institution. Instead, they focused their debate on whether Emory's graduate schools ought to admit blacks.

General faculty consensus at Emory also held that graduate schools should be desegregated prior to the undergraduate institution. Those at Emory's law school and theology school believed most passionately in integration.[87] Graduate schools received more black applicants, and presumably admitting these qualified students would generate revenue.[88] Additionally, leaders at the theology school conceded that the segregationist admissions policy were hypocritical. They expressed the sentiment, "Emory has a golden opportunity to do something really good for race relations in the South and to demonstrate the Christian Principles which she preaches and yet dares not practice."[89]

The admissions policy posed a deeper practical problem for Emory's law school. The Association of American Law Schools threatened to withhold accreditation from segregated law schools, which prompted Emory's law professors to prioritize discussions about integration. [90]As further events will demonstrate, law professors saw the legal roadblocks along with the tremendous opportunity for Emory as an institution to decide, "she can afford to be great."[91]

The association of American Law School's regulations reveal that the country was shifting in its attitude toward integration. Yet as the country became more inclusive, given the political climate of Georgia, Emory community's engagement in conversations about race was avant-garde. Georgia's officials tried to limit free speech on this topic, but Emory alumni called for "the right to argue either side [of the integration question], and

---

[87] Ben Johnson, "Comments on the Case," *Emory Alumnus*, February 1959, Box 1, Folder 2, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
[88]"Emory Nursing School Accepts Two Negroes For January Term," *The Emory Wheel*, October 18, 1962, 1.
[89] Elkin, Taylor, *The Emory Wheel*, October 7, 1954.
[90] Kean, Desegregating Private Higher Education, 60.
[91] "Emory Can Face Racial Strain By Casting Aside Segregation," *The Emory Wheel,* September 30, 1963, 1.

we covet the right for everyone else: conservative, moderate, or liberal….A person who openly advocated any degree of integration of the white and Negro race was branded- and by the highest public officials- an idiot or a lunatic."[92] Undeterred by the mainstream Southern opinion, Emory's students and faculty boldly expressed their opinions. The most grandiose display of opinion would come in 1962, when Emory's legal counsel dismantled the Georgia law that undermined segregation.

Steadfast in his belief that promoting desegregation was not worthwhile, Emory's President White did not want to guide the school through these complex times. He believed the fabric of southern society is such that black students in Emory's graduate schools will have their lives made into a "living hell."[93] President White and others knew that merely admitting a small number of black students would not substantially improve America's race problem—and doing so could even exacerbate the problem if black students were unwelcome at Emory. For example, in the 1950s, Louis Armstrong performed at a dance, but afterwards could not purchase food.[94] This incident garnered negative publicity and revealed the extent to which integrating Emory carried reputational risk. As these tensions grew throughout the 1950s, President White announced that he would be stepping down as President. Dr. Walter S. Martin, former faculty member at the University of Georgia, was inaugurated as President in 1957, and he remained in the post until 1962 at which point integration was on the forefront of Emory's agenda. Emory elitists deemed the University of Georgia to be a "cow college," and Martin was an unpopular choice for President.[95] He expressed little interest in helping

---

[92] "In the Family," *Emory Alumnus,* Feb 1959, Box 1, Folder 2, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
[93] "Sound Thinking," *The Emory Wheel,* October 12, 1950, 1.
[94] "Race Barrier Creates Unavoidable Incident," *The Emory Wheel*, May 1, 1959, 1.
[95] Kean, Desegregating Private Higher Education, 155.

Emory gain a national reputation, even though gaining such prominence was the explicit goal of many Emory leaders.[96] Martin was more interested in preserving Emory's Methodist traditions than building academics. His social life revolved around his church community, whereas most faculty members formed their own unique social circle.[97] In the aftermath of the public school crisis, conversation about race temporarily subsided, and for a while Martin was not forced to confront issues of race.

Attitudinal Change at Emory in the Early 1960s

President Martin did not envision Emory as a leader regarding integration of southern schools. However, by the 1960s, other powerful Emory leaders wanted the entire institution to be a leader in removing segregationist laws. Member of the Board of Trustees, Harris Purks, wrote to President Martin in 1961, asking him "to proceed to eliminate from admissions practices any inflexible criteria relating solely to racial backgrounds of applicants." [98] According to Martin's records, it appears that President Martin did not respond to this letter. President Martin continued to receive pressure than from prominent Emory men. Distinguished historian and secretary of the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences, J. Harvey Young, wrote to President Martin in 1960, asking

> Emory University to take the initiative in bringing together representative faculty and administrates from church-related and other private colleges in the Atlanta areas, both white and Negro. Such a meeting would serve primarily to explore the directions of development that are seen to be desirable by both white and Negro educational institutions….[99]

---

[96]Ibid.

[97] Ibid.

[98] "Board of Trustees Communication To President Martin" Box 10, Folder 8, The Walter Martin Papers, Emory University President's Office, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[99] "Letter From James Harvey Young to President Martin," Box 13, Folder 6, The James Harvey Young Papers, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

The phrasing of this request clarified that it was not asking for major change, but simply for the school to take a role in gathering prominent professors to share ideas—the supposed function of a university. Professor Young chooses careful language to push an integrationist agenda without putting forward radical proposals.[100] He wanted Emory to take a small step in order to move with the times toward more integrationist educational systems. After writing this letter, Young submitted a resolution to Board calling for said meeting, but the Board of Trustees denied this seemingly simple request, instead creating a task force to try to address the issue.[101] In lieu of a meeting, Chairman of the Board and head of General Counsel for the university, Henry Bowden, started a five-person committee to review the university policy on racialized admissions and recommend any changes it feels proper. [102] This committee's resolution climaxed in the 1962 *Emory v. Nash* case in which Emory won the right to desegregate.

In anticipation of the committee's findings, a number of students called for "admissions of Negroes as soon as it is legally and practically feasible…" by signing a petition in *The Emory Wheel*.[103] At this critical juncture, student attitudes remained grounded in the belief that Emory should take whatever action would serve its best on a national stage. Some students argued "Civil inequality is holding the South and America back in many respects. We must catch up with the rest of the nation."[104] These students encouraged Emory leaders to update race policy in order to stay align with the nation. Others assert, "Being an educational institution, we should move slowly- with the tide of

---

[100] Ibid.

[101] "Report of Special Committee to Review University Policy on Admissions," Box 1, Folder 7, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[102] Turner, The Racial Integration of Emory University, 15.

[103] "Emory Must Take Leadership Position," *The Emory Wheel*, November 9, 1961, 1.

[104] "Wheel Urges Wise Policies," *The Emory Wheel*, November 17. 1960, 1.

public opinion, not in front of it."[105] This view also wants Emory officials to base policy decisions on US opinion. Both these views indicate that Emory should update its policy in accordance with national policies. The disagreement stems from determining the general national sentiment.

Students used *The Emory Wheel* as a forum to develop opinions on various types of race policy. They debated questions: Can Emory students invite a group of black students to a talk on campus?[106] Can Emory's glee club stay overnight to perform at an all black school? While Bowden's committee tried to formulate answers to these questions, President Martin answered both questions with a hard no. [107]

Instead of addressing student concerns, President Martin preferred to sidestep the issue of racial integration entirely. In 1962, he announced to the faculty, "As I see it, the University's role is neither to perpetuate segregation nor to promote integration….it seems that the exponent of each differing opinion often wish the University to sponsor, or somehow back <u>their</u> position. This is very human—but it is not Emory's role."[108] President Martin articulates a clear desire to remain silent, and silence tends to uphold the current social order. Moreover, silence was becoming infeasible because racial tensions engulfed the nation. Students grew frustrated with Martin's inaction, and they acknowledged, "Emory will save herself a great deal of embarrassment and undesirable publicity if she will dictate her own moves rather than moving only with pressure from others. Will she continue to stand in silent agreement?"[109] For the moment, the answer was affirmative. Fearful about the financial ramifications of integration—both from the

---

[105] ,Kermit E. Mackenzie, "Response Continues Concerning Pickets," *The Emory Wheel,* December 1, 1960, 5.
[106] Leonard Nelson, "Response Continues Concerning Pickets," *The Emory Wheel,* December 1, 1960, 5.
[107] Kean, Desegregating, 152.
[108] "Statement to the Faculty From President Martin, Concerning Race Relations at Emory March 31, 1960," Box 1, Folder 8, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
[109] "Emory Should Move Forward," *The Emory Wheel,* January 19, 1961, 1.

state and alumni—Martin reminded those on the Board of Trustees, the students, and the faculty, "We are not as private as you think."[110] Addressing the faculty's request for meetings with blacks, Martin decided, "we cannot schedule 'open meetings' with Negroes, and that we must not have integrated meals or provide housing or sleeping for Negroes on the campus" without leaving room for more discussion.[111] President Martin tried to ignore the pressing issues of his time and keep Emory grounded in the ways of the past.[112]

Given the growing internal advocacy for integration, President Martin publicly subsequently addressed Emory's race policy. President Martin did not tailor his remarks to reflect the national attitude on race relations, even though Emory's admissions office became fixated on trying to establish a reputation for the school throughout the United States.[113] Instead of emphasizing US tradition, President Martin harkened back to Emory's Southern rooting, reminding, "Emory University is subject to the customs and laws of Georgia. Some of you may wish that Emory was elsewhere, it is in the South. We simply cannot get too far out in front of the community we live, or else we ruin ourselves."[114] Tellingly, President Martin chose to highlight that Emory is in South rather than Atlanta, preferring to plant the roots of the university in the conservative Georgia as opposed to the more progressive city of Atlanta. Attitudes of Atlantans reflected considerably greater support for integration than those of Georgians as a whole, and professors at Emory even argued, "To some extent, Atlanta had always been different, a

---

[110] Ibid.
[111] Ibid.
[112] "Emory Asks Ruling for Fall Integration," *The Emory Wheel,* April 5, 1962, 1.
[113] Ibid.
[114] "Statement to the Faculty From President Martin, Concerning Race Relations at Emory March 31, 1960."

northern city in the South."[115] Therefore unsurprisingly, just as Martin struggled to connect with the faculty at Emory, he also lacked interest in grounding Emory with this Atlanta community.[116]

Throughout these events, chairman Bowden's committee sought to determine how Emory should consider race in admissions, without giving much credence to Martin's view. Other leaders at Emory, such as Professor Young and Board of Trustee member Purks, were no longer willing to dismiss the question of desegregation. Throughout Emory's history, the university sought to shed its reputation as a regional university and to gain a more visible national presence.[117] Doing so would require Emory to admit a like number of black students as other national universities. As evidence of this mission, Emory officials worked to attract students from across the country. For example, Charles Watson, the Director of Admissions, cites as an achievement that his office had undertaken "more out of state high school visits." [118] Seeing the admissions office strive for a national reputation motivated professors, such as Young, and Board of Trustee members, such as Purks, to advocate for desegregation. As Emory's national outreach grew, preventing qualified students of any race from enrolling at the school could only harm the school on a national stage. They thought Emory had the chance to gain positive national reputational recognition if the school broke down the legal barriers upholding de jure segregation.

Opinions on integration spoke to how people identified: those wanting to identify with Southern traditions held on to segregationist ideals. On the other hand, those who

---

[115] Kean, Desegregating, 155.
[116] Ibid.
[117] "Annual Reports to the President 1964-1965, Vol 2," Box 17, The Walter Martin Papers, Emory University President's Office, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
[118] Ibid.

wanted race relations at Emory to reflect those of the more liberal Atlanta pushed for further integration.[119] While many prominent people at Emory fell into the latter group, President Martin fell into the former. He resigned in 1962 to accept a job to become the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the University System of Georgia.[120] The University' Board of Trustees jointly appointed three men known as the triumverate: Chancellor Goodrich C. White, Executive Vice President and Dean of Faculties Judson Ward, and Chair of the Board Henry Bowden. The triumverate functioned as President of the University during the search for President.[121]

Meanwhile, Chairman Bowden had still been working with a committee to study race relations at Emory. The Committee expected to formulate a more concrete position on race relations for the institution. It determined that "the Charter, By Laws, and Organic Law of Emory University contains no provisions whatsoever which limit or restrict the admission of any group to any particular race, creed, or religion."[122] The Committee observed that Emory admitted students of the Asiatic race in addition to those of the white race.[123] Thus, the committee concluded the university did not need to change any of its policies in order to be able to admit black students.[124] The committee found that Emory's policies were colorblind, so theoretically, Emory should be able to admit students of any race. The triumverate endorsed this position because they believed it would benefit Emory's reputation because schools in the North technically did not

---

[119] Ibid.

[120] "Emory History and Traditions, Emory History and Traditions." Sidney Walter Martin | History and Traditions | Emory University. Accessed December 19, 2016. http://emoryhistory.emory.edu/facts-figures/people/presidents/profiles/martin.html.

[121] "Emory History and Traditions, Emory History and Traditions." The Troika | History and Traditions | Emory University. Accessed December 19, 2016. http://emoryhistory.emory.edu/facts-figures/people/presidents/profiles/troika.html.

[122] "Report of Special Committee to Review University Policy on Admissions."

[123] My primary sources use the term Asiatic.

[124] Ibid.

consider race in admissions.[125] President Martin's departure meant he was not longer a barrier to desegregation. Given this opportunity, as a result of Bowden's committee, Emory's leadership decided Emory was ready to admit black students.

Emory V. Nash

In theory, at this juncture Emory should have been able to admit students of all races. In practice, Georgia's tax code limited the school's volition. A number of Georgia's laws, such as those relating to property tax, prevented desegregation throughout the state. In this case, the Georgia State Constitution only confers tax-exempt status to segregated private institutions. With regards to property tax, Georgia's constitutional provision details,

> The following described property shall be exempt from taxation, to with… all buildings erected for and used as a college, nonprofit hospital, incorporated academy, or other seminary of learning… as are open to the general public… provided further that all endowments to the institution, established for white people, shall be limited to white people, and all endowments to institutions for colored people, shall be limited to colored people.[126]

Without this tax-exempt status, Emory would suffer severe financial consequence, and likely would not have been able to maintain operations.[127] At a Board meeting in May of 1961, Bowden's Committee found that "as long as the restriction of the constitutional tax exemption continued to exist, Emory University could not afford to jeopardize its tax exempt status."[128] The exact amount of money that Emory would owe to the state without the exemption was never calculated. However, the estimated amount of the annual taxes that Emory would have needed to pay if it could not keep its tax exempt status ranged

[125] Ibid.

[126] "Emory University et. Al Plaintiffs in Error vs. W. Fred Nash Et. Al, Defendants in Error, Supplemental Brief for the Plaintiffs," Box 1, Folder 7, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[127] Ibid.

[128] Ibid.

from $250,000 to $750,000.[129] Emory could not pay this sum of money, so the Board of trustees concluded that Emory literally could not afford to desegregate.

Five days after the Board meeting, the Legislative Council of the College of Arts and Sciences passed a resolution expressing its disappointment with the Board's inaction. Bowden continually reminded the Emory community, "Emory could not continue to operate according to its present standards as an institution of higher education, of true University grade, and meet its financial obligations, without the tax exempt privileges which are available to it so long as it conforms to the aforementioned constitutional and statuary provisions."[130] However, these empty words did not pacify the Emory community, which wanted to lead the South into a new era. This resolution instigated members of the Board of Trustees to gain autonomy over their admissions processes. Bowden openly announced, "When and if it can do so without jeopardizing constitutional and statutory tax- exemption privileges essential to the maintenance of its educational program and facilities, Emory University will consider applications of persons desiring to study of work at the University without regard to race, color, or creed….designed to assure… the fulfillment of its mission of as an institution of Christian Higher Education."[131] Emory could not set its own admissions rules because Georgia's laws constrained these individuals modus operandi. Bowden saw great promise in the opportunity to showcse the hypocrisy of Georgia's policy, and he prepared to fight Georgia's tax code in court in order to win the right to desegregate.

Dean of Emory Law School, Ben Johnson, contended that the Board's statement and Bowden's decision was an absolute watershed moment. He argued that Bowden's

---

[129] A Brief Documentary Account of Integration at Emory University," 3.

[130] Ibid.

[131] "A Statement of Policy Approved by the Board of Trustees at Emory University on November 3, 1961," Box 1, Folder 7, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

legal actions that followed merely put words to actions.[132] Johnson underestimated the many ways that Emory could have very simply hidden behind the law. The easier choice for Emory would have been to maintain segregationist admissions policy, while still asserting that Emory wanted desegregation. Instead of hiding behind those words, Johnson and Bowden worked together to change the law.

Attorneys Henry Bowden (Chairman of Emory's Board) and Ben Johnson (Dean of Emory's Law School) challenged tax commissioner Fred Nash through the Superior Court of Dekalb County, the County in which most of Emory University is located. Douglas Aaron Rucker, a qualified prospective black student, applied to Emory's dental school, and Emory wanted to admit him, but could not do so if it would jeopardize their tax exemption. With the support of the Board of Trustees, most faculty, and most of the student body, Bowden and Johnson filed suit to cite Georgia;s segregationist laws.[133]

Acting as their own legal counsel, Bowden and Johnson argued that Georgia's law was self-contradictory.[134] According to the law, an institution had to be both "open to the general public" and limited to only whites or only colored peoples to meet the requirements for the tax exemption. The first aspect of Bowden and Johnson's argument claimed that an institution could not meet both conditions at the same time. How could Emory be open to the general public and restricted by race? If Emory refused to admit qualified black candidates, how could it be considered to be open to the general public?[135]

Bowden and Johnson deconstructed other pillars of Georgia's constitution as well. For example, they asserted Emory could not be subject to the aforementioned law

---

[132] Ben Johnson, "Comments on the Case," *Emory Alumnus*, February 1959, Box 1, Folder 2, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[133] "Emory University et. Al Plaintiffs in Error vs. W. Fred Nash Et. Al, Defendants in Error, Supplemental Brief for the Plaintiffs,"

[134] Ibid.

[135] Ibid.

because its founding documents did not indicate that it was created solely for either white people or colored people. Additionally, Bowden and Johnson emphasized inconsistencies with this tax code and other Georgia laws. Since the laws were variable, Bowden and Johnson demonstrate that Emory is not beholden to any of them, writing, "since none of its [Emory's] endowment is limited to use of persons of a particular color, this proviso can have no effect on Emory."[136] Next, they contested that private schools could not be required to segregate because private schools should not be accountable to state authorities. They explain, "The very essence of private school education is freedom from government control; this is no post 1954 innovation."[137] Finally, the attorneys pointed out that this tax code violated the fourteenth amendment, equal protection under the law.[138]

Emory's counsel lost at the county level, but they appealed to the Georgia Supreme Court. The men used the same arguments, and they won the case in the middle of 1962. The court ruled,

> As we view these two provisos, the first one standing alone means that no private school is entitled to a tax exemption unless it is open to the general public without regard to race or color; and the second one, standing alone, means that a private school would not be entitled to a tax exemption unless it operated on a segregated basis as to the white and colored races. Since there is unquestionably an irreconcilable conflict between these two provisos, they completely neutralize and destroy each other. [139]

A year after the case, the American University Press Association awarded Henry Bowden its sixth annual Meiklejohn Award, which is presented to a University affiliate in recognition for outstanding contribution to academic freedom. Clearly in the liberal circles that Emory'es leaders wanted to impress, Bowden's actions were considered

---

[136] Ibid.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Ibid.
[139] Ibid.

extraordinary.[140] Bowden craved this type of publicity for Emory, and this case received the desired attention.[141]

Emory Desegregates

Having won the right to integrate, Emory admissions—particularly the graduate schools— used the opportunity to token desegregate. Emory did not begin conducting outreach to potential black students. Graduate programs admitted a limited number of blacks.[142] Douglas Aaron Rucker, the student who served as the focal point of *Emory vs. Nash*, had enrolled in a historically black dental program by the time the case was resolved.[143] In 1962, Mrs. Nervada E. Jackson became Emory's first black student. Mrs. Jackson had been a laboratory assistant in the anatomy lab, but given her newfound ability to take courses at Emory, she enrolled in an education course for no credit. Subsequently, a black high school teacher in Decatur enrolled in a credit bearing class with twelve white teachers. He became the first black graduate at a major private school in the deep south. [144] In January of 1963, the nursing school enrolled two full-time black students.[145] The nursing school deans accented that the nurses enrolled "quietly," which demonstrates that the administration valued preserving normalcy within the programs. A year after *Emory vs. Nash*, in 1963, the Dean of Admissions extended offers of admissions to three undergraduates.[146]

Knowing that the decision to admit black undergraduates could cause controversy, Vice President Judson Ward addressed the decision to the freshmen class.

---

[140] "Award to Bowden," Box 5, Folder 12, The Henry Bowden Papers, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[141] Ibid.

[142] "Two Negroes Start Classes Quietly at Emory 1/3/63," Box 1, Folder 7, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[143] Ibid.

[144]A Brief Documentary Account of Integration at Emory University," 9.

[145] "Two Negroes Start Classes Quietly at Emory."

[146] "Annual Reports to the President 1962-1963, Vol 1," Box 17, The Walter Martin Papers, Emory University President's Office, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

He explained that desegegregation was necessary in order for Emory to become a truly great national institution. He stated, "… in the long run Emory could never be the truly great national University we all want to be if it denied admission to qualified students on illogical or irrelevant grounds."[147] Ward focuses his remarks on the potential prestige for Emory, which gets at the heart of the administration's motive. In order for Emory to have a larger national presence, Emory admissions needed to parallel schools with large name recognition. Ward's remarks indicated that he aspired to this parallel, and the remarks acknowledge the need for black students on campus to be able to shape the campus culture.[148]

Faculty and the students alike strived to minimize the impact of having black students on campus. They intended to demonstrate racial equality in their daily interactions. Emory admissions highlighted that they granted these students admission "without regard to race."[149] Given America's historym can any process in this nation happen without regard to race? The admissions office made no changes to their practices; they did not offer any special status to black applicants. When nine blacks came to Emory in 1963, one of the deans of admission reminded, "No difference will be made between the Negro and white students enrolled in the University. All students are admitted on their probability to succeed in the school in which they enroll."[150] Similarly, when asked about why they chose Emory, one black student responded, "All I want to do is get an education."[151] Officials at Emory had wanted to desegregate, but they did not want to acknowledge differences in experience between black and white students. The

---

[147] "Statement Made To the Freshmen By Vice President Judson C. Ward Jr.."
[148] Ibid.
[149] Ibid.
[150]" University Policy Attracts 9 Negroes."
[151] Ibid

admissions office intended to admit black students without causing any major changes to the typical university operations.

Alumni Reaction

While most correspondences involving race policy wielded more coded language, Director of Alumni Walter Davis revealed in explicit terms that Emory planned to keep the number of "Negro" students very low. When an alumna wrote him scared about the admission of "Negroes," Davis replied, "Emory intends, in accordance with its original statement on the matter… to admit only a very few Negroes."[152] The Director understood that some donors resisted integration as he relied on their monies. He pacified these donors by promising that Emory would not admit many black students. He contended that the racial composition of Emory would reflect that of prestigious schools in the North. He explains,

> However, it is my informal understanding that Princeton University, with a student body comparable size to Emory's, has only about nine Negroes enrolled, so I suspect that the number of Negro applicants who will qualify from both an academic and financial standpoint will be relatively few at least in the foreseeable future.[153]

Race can confer social status within the United States. Emory hoped to garner a reputation akin the Princeton's, so it follows that Emory would strive to mimic Princeton's racial composition. Indeed, dhairman of Emory's Board, Bowden, revealed that he could mince his words to push forward his more liberal agenda while still using coded language to appease conservative alumni. To placate the more conservative alumni, Bowden stressed "No obligation exists for Emory to admit a student because of his race or to reject any student because of his race. Emory has assumed no responsibility

[152] "Letter From Director of Alumni Walter Davis to Robert N. Cline," Box 10, Folder 5, The Henry Bowden Papers, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
[153] Ibid.

to educate a mass of people.... Or initiate mass reforms."[154] Communications to alumni included carefully crafted language intended to comfort alumni who felt Emory's reforms were too progressive, and this attempt proved somewhat successful.

Despite their best efforts, officials at Emory understood that they would have to accept that they could not please the entire alumni base. They decided to neglect certain facets of alumni opinion to grow as an institution. Bowden's committee dedicated to studying race at Emory reported, "As long as Emory follows its present basic development as a national institution, controversy will be inevitable. A good many alumni are not going to agree with every decision that is made. The committee urges the alumni to be certain of the facts before judging the decision made by the University."[155] In this light, a study entitled "Where is Emory Headed?" gives very positive results. The President of Emory's Alumni Association undertook surveyed alumni opinion about their thoughts on the direction of the school. The survey concluded that many alumni believed Emory was "too liberal."[156] Still, they perceived that Emory "is in good hands with its present administration and trustees."[157] With relative alumni confidence at this critical juncture, the triumverate revived their efforts to find a new university president.

Token Desegregation

Henry Bowden spearheaded the process to find a new university president, and naturally Bowden looked for someone who shared his ideologies. He selected Sanford S. Atwood, who had previously Provost at Cornell University. Atwood accepted the post in

[154] "Letter Signed By Henry Bowden From the Special Committee," Box 5, Folder 12, The Henry Bowden Papers, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
[155] Ibid.
[156] "Where is Emory Headed? A Special Interim Report to The Alumni From the Alumni Self Study Committee" Box 1, Folder 8, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
[157] Ibid.

1963, declaring, "While Harvard is half as good as it thinks, Emory is twice as good."[158] President Atwood shared Bowden's aspiration to make Emory a national university, and recruiting him from Cornell in New York shows that Emory's leaders desired to model the educational patterns of the North.[159]

Penn and Princeton each had marginal numbers of back students in the middle of the 1960s, and Emory effectively copied these patterns. Emory continued to admit black students in small numbers, but the administration did not support changing institutional structures to accommodate those students. For example, black students struggled with vendors where Emory students purchase most goods, "Emory village." While students boycotted these vendors on occasion, certain merchants consistently refused to serve black students.[160] Black students were seemingly allowed to be at Emory. However, merchants were not willing to shift in their ways to make that space accommodating to the basic needs of black students. Throughout the middle of the 1960s, there was one "racial demonstration" in the Methodist Church, and the facts surrounding this event are not entirely clear from *The Emory Wheel*. Indeed, the newspaper focused most of its articles about the incident on the coverage of the demonstration, opposed to the demonstration itself.[161] Emory leaders asserted the university's policies reflected a liberal ideology because they "integrated." But did Emory truly integrate?

Movement Toward Integration

By 1967, approximately ten black students attended Emory.[162] None of these students were admitted to any Greek organizations, which constituted a crucial social

[158] Bill Zedawski, "Atwood Becomes Sixteenth President," *The Emory Wheel*, September 26, 1963, 1.
[159] Ibid.
[160] "Council Represents Students, Assumes Responsibility," *The Emory Wheel* Thursday October 10, 1963, 4.
[161] "Misrepresentation of Facts Draws Letter, Invalid Critique," *The Emory Wheel,* February 27, 1964, 1.
[162] Annual Reports to the President 1966-1967, Vol 1," Box 18, The Martin Papers, Emory University President's Office, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

network for most students. Black students were “black balled,” and they were instantly cut at rush events, even if members of the Greek community would greet and interact with them in other settings.[163] Black students not only lacked access to Greek life, they also lacked access to certain housing options, psychological services, and other resources that white students utilized.[164] Lacking other networks, these students created a Black Student Association (BSA) because they wanted a community and were not accepted into preexisting networks.[165] In the early 1960s, the Emory administration openly aimed to admit black students. It was not until the late 1960s, however, that black students at Emory organized, and subsequently the administration began reacting in ways to make Emory more equitable.

Martin Luther King’s impact in Atlanta shaped Emory’s integration process. Atlanta’s crisis of public school desegregation unfolded just as Martin Luther King began to assume prominence in the Civil Rights Movement. By 1960, King had gained recognition by leading the Montgomery Bus Boycotts, starting the Southern Christian Leaders Conference, and becoming the co-pastor of Atlanta’s Ebenezer Baptist Church alongside his father. King articulated a clear strategy for placing civil rights on the white agenda by creating a social crisis that demanded attention. This strategy insisted, “Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue.”[166] Emory’s leaders admired this tactic, and they wielded such principles through signing petitions, crafting resolutions, and going to court. Desegregation of higher education in

---

[163] Testimony from Hank Ambrose,” Mary Odem: Experiencing Race, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[164] “Correspondence Between Rena Price and Stanford Atwood, Letter entitled “Dear Miss Price,” Box 1, Folder 8, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[165] Ibid.

[166] James A. Colaiaco, "Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Paradox of Nonviolent Direct Action." *Phylon (1960-)* 47, no. 1 (1986): 16-28. doi:10.2307/274691.

Atlanta occurred during the phase of the movement when civil disobedience was the preferred tactic, and as Emory Law Professor Benjamin Turner emphasizes "any decision about racial integration at a southern institution in 1962 necessarily took place against the backdrop of larger events in the African American Civil Rights Movement."[167] King had a direct influence on actors at Emory, such as Henry Bowden, who served as Chairman of Emory's Board and Head of General Counsel. Bowden corresponded regularly with King and attended the party that honored King for winning the Nobel Peace Prize in Atlanta.[168] Emory's administration formed a scholarship in King's name to "demonstrate their commitment to his principles of nonviolence."[169]

Martin Luther King's assassination in 1968 inspired black students at Emory to mobilize more effectively.[170] BSA sought to draw attention to their issues on campus in a respectful manner. Club members thought about the repercussions of various ideas, and they concluded that peacefully making a statement during church would be the most effective way to politely draw attention to their issues.[171] The university chaplain conducts a service on Sundays at Durham Chapel, and most members of the Emory community attend this event routinely. On Sunday May 25, 1969, approximately thirty black students intruded into the service, just as the Chaplain was about to begin his sermon. The black students stood in the aisle of the church and presented four charges:

1. Emory is a racist institution.
2. The Christian Community at Emory – the white liberals – represent one of the most outstanding forms of racism.
3. Their presence at the chapel that morning should not be viewed merely as an isolated instance, but was in fact the beginning of more to come.

[167] Turner, The Racial Integration of Emory University, 15.
[168] "Correspondence Between Martin Luther King, Jr. and Henry Bowden," Box 5, Folder 12, The Henry Bowden Papers, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University
[169] "Martin Luther King Scholarship Winner," *The Emory Wheel,* October, 28, 1970, 2.
[170] "Testimony from Hank Ambrose," Mary Odem: Experiencing Race, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
[171] Ibid.

4. The role of the whites in the congregation was no longer to be involved in the ghettos or in working with blacks; rather our – the white man's – role is to now to work to destroy racism in our own communities. [172]

Overall, the congregation received these messages well. Only about one-fourth of the congregation was offended by the interruption; the remainder perceived the message as crucial and the setting as optimal. The Chaplain confirms, "the black students themselves behaved with dignity."[173] Afterwards, the congregation gathered at Cox Hall for lunch. There, thirty black students stood in silence around the lunch line, careful not to deliberately block access to food. The students carried signs to nuance their message. These signs included pictures of cafeteria staff and other workers, showing that the students' demonstration was not only to express their own grievances. Throughout her history Emory housed a large number of black staff who were not always treated fairly. The BSA linked their cause to that of the black dining staff because BSA members understood that their plight was inherently connected to that of the working class, due to the complex relationship between race and class in the United States. After a few hours of standing in silence, the students dispersed without intent for further protest at the time.

This peaceful demonstration violated the Emory Code of Conduct; consequently, both Chairman of the Board of Trustees Henry Bowden and President Stanford Atwood were in a difficult situation regarding whether they decide to enforce the Code. Both men admired the black students' efforts, but they did not want to overlook their rules. After a large-scale faculty meeting, President Atwood instead decided he would convene an open rally to discuss the incident. President Atwood remained in contact with BSA and the Student Government Association, and he relied on both groups to help him form his

---

[172] "A Summary of Events of May 25-28, 1969, On the Emory University Campus Concerning Student Demonstrations And Subsequent Actions By University Faculty and Administration," Prepared and Assembled By the Office of Development and Planning," Box 2, Folder 2, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[173] Ibid.

remarks. According to Student Body President, Charles Haynes, President Atwood did not understand the significance of racism, and Atwood intended to say, "Black racism exists to the same degree as yellow, red, or white racism."[174] None of President Atwood's public correspondences imply a lack of understanding regarding racism. On Tuesday March 27th, President Atwood declared, "Whereas racism exists at Emory University. Be it resolved that all members of the University Community, students, faculty, and administration openly admit to its existence and commit themselves to its eradication."[175] President Atwood took a step towards making Emory more equitable by admitting to a problem. Atwood's emission proved very significant because it empowered BSA to ask for the resources they deserved.[176]

Subsequently, BSA President Hank Ambrose authored a letter containing nine specific requests: a statement from admissions explaining the policy of admitting black students; a demand that Emory not exclude black students on the basis of SAT scores or high school background; a request for designated spaces where black students could feel comfortable in the university; a call for the hiring of a black administrator and a black psychiatrist, a desire to create an Afro-American studies program; a request that black scholars from the Atlanta University Center be involved with teaching at Emory, and finally a demand for an Afro-American reading room.[177] President Atwood addressed each point: he assured that black students that he would welcome their help in recruiting more African American students and that Emory would admit any qualified black applicant. He insisted that a "Black House" would run contrary to the Civil Rights Act of

---

[174] "Testimony from Charles Haynes," Mary Odem: Experiencing Race, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[175] "Black Students Present Demands," *The Emory Wheel,* May 27, 1969.

[176] "University Pledges Racism's End," *The Emory Wheel,* May 30, 1967.

[177] "Correspondence Between Henry Ambrose and Stanford Atwood, Letter entitled "Dear Mr. Atwood, Attached Includes Detailed List of Demands," Box 1, Folder 8, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

1964, but promised ongoing discussions about the creation of black programs within the university. He offered equal opportunity for the employment of black faculty members, signaled that he would work with the Atlanta University Center, and finally declared that the library was integrated. President Atwood delegated a faculty member to work on each task, and he scheduled follow up meetings with each faculty member.[178] By 1969, Emory had desegregated, and its President seemingly made a commitment to aspire to integration. [179]

Conclusion

This chapter tells the story of Emory's desegregation process in 1962. This chapter argues that acquiring a national reputation was Emory's primary motive for desegregation. Whether or not Emory integrated since then is highly debatable. Society continues to discuss whether some of Ambrose's requests, such as designated spaces and affirmative action, are prerequisites for integration. Fifty years after Ambrose's letter, many of these inquiries still remain unmet, and some evoke passionate debate.

---

[178] "Correspondence Between Henry Ambrose and Stanford Atwood, Letter entitled "Dear Mr. Ambrose, Attached Includes Detailed List of Demands with Atwood's Annotated Responses," Box 1, Folder 8, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

[179] "Correspondence Between Henry Ambrose and Stanford Atwood, Letter entitled "Dear Mr. Ambrose," Box 10, Folder 3, The Stanford Atwood Papers, Emory University President's Office, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

The Desegregation of the University of Pennsylvania: Confrontation in Admissions

Joe Potential Ivy is a high school senior on the Eastern Sea Board who has attended a public school and has been rated in the top two-fifths of his graduating class. His high school very well may be Central high school, which has had the largest number from any high school of the University undergraduate matriculates in the past four years. Or it could be Cheltenham High School or Overbrook High school which vied for the number two spot.[180]

Introduction

Unlike Emory, Penn was *technically* desegregated in the 1960s. Penn admissions officers considered applications from students of any race. Penn *could* admit black students, but its admissions process conformed to norms within the Ivy League, and Ivy League schools were primarily white institutions. Through the late 1960s, Penn did not admit black students in significant number. Penn—and as the next chapter will show, Princeton—needed to alter admissions policy in order to desegregate in any meaningful way. At Emory, faculty rallied behind changing property law to allow for the admission of black students. None of Philadelphia's laws regulated race in admissions, so there was no single legal change that shifted racialized admissions. Moreover there was no single unifying moment that garndered Penn community support for desegregation. Efforts to promote black admissions were concentrated to a smaller number of university officials implementing internal structures to assure larger university policy changes.

Based on the photographs included in Penn's yearbook, it appears that four black students graduated from Penn throughout the 1960s.[181] This chapter begins the story of Penn's desegregation process in the late 1960s, considerably later than the story of

[180] James P. Kartell, "Joe Potential: Inside Admissions," *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, May 10, 1960, 1.
[181] University of Pennsylvania Yearbook Class of 1960, Found in University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

Emory's desegregation process. Analysis of *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, the main student newspaper, demonstrates that the Penn community was not openly debating issues surrounding race until the middle of the 1960s. Whereas *Daily Pennsylvanian* searches of words such as "black," "negro," or "African American" do not garner results in the early 1960s, the idea of "Negroes" attending the Penn seemed to have become a prevalent topic of discussion by 1965. In this year, the word "Negro" began appearing more frequently.[182] That same year, the total number of black applicants reached a record high, and Penn admitted over forty black applicants. Black students comprised a measly two percent of the class, which was still the largest percentage in Penn's history to date.[183]

As Americans began to favor school integration, Penn struggled to appropriately update its admissions policies in a way that both preserved its reputation and reflected national sentiment. To stay competitive in the Ivy League, Penn needed to implement an admissions policy that appeared racially just while maintaining both a high average GPA and SAT score. Ivy League admissions have long hinger on the idea of grooming future US leaders.[184] Excellent academic scores and the appropriate social signifiers, such as race, are crucial prerequisites to selecting an appropriate class of students. Throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s, Penn admissions officers strived to balance the way that SAT scores should factor into admissions, the methods behind allocating funds, and the viability of an affirmative action policy that favors black applicants.

History of Penn Admissions

In contrast to Emory, Penn admissions has always been competitive, and socioeconomic status has consistently played a crucial role in Penn admissions. The

[182] *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* April 20, 1969.
[183] Barbara Slopak, "University accepts 230 blacks," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* April 21, 1969, 1.
[184] Malcolm Gladwell, "Getting In," *The New Yorker,* October 2005, 2.

methodology surrounding admissions decisions impacts the race and class compositions of the incoming freshmen. The significance of socioeconomic status in this metric has held constant over time. An article titled "100 Years of Change" appeared in *The Daily Pennsylvanian* in 1974, but ironically, it highlights the similarities between admissions processes in the 1870s and the 1970s.[185] To apply to Penn in 1874, applicants would send a letter to Penn's provost to indicate interest. The most critical piece of any application to Penn was the prominence of the applicant's "sponsor," or the applicant's father, a Trustee, or a "man of substance."[186] The applicant's sponsor's name and bank account number were both listed at the top of the application. The sponsor consented to pay the student's tuition if the student defaulted from paying the twenty-dollar fee.[187] This system illustrates the role of money in applications. Through the 1970s, applicants had the opportunity to list a sponsor on the top of the application, in a box immediately following the applicant's address and immediately prior to the applicant's transcript.[188] During the 1970s, President Meyerson kept a separate record of students with significant sponsors. His personal notes contained two columns: one entitled sponsor and the other with the name of the applicant. Examples of sponsors include applicants' fathers, their recommenders from Exeter, and their relationship with trustees and faculty.[189]

The system benefits applicants with money and connections, and in America in the 1960s those with money and connections were more likely to be white. Forty-six of the ninety-five applicants who applied from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds in 1965 were offered financial aid to meet all demonstrated need. Without

---

[185] Jonathon Zimman, "Admissions Application: 100 Years of Change," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* July 1, 1974, 9.
[186] Ibid.
[187] Ibid.
[188] Note from the Desk of Martin Meyerson, 1970, Box 231, Folder 1, A Guide to the Office of the President Records, 1970 – 1980 (administration of Martin Meyerson), University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.
[189] Ibid.

revealing an exact number, Dean of Admissions William G. Owen claimed that most of these recipients were "Negroes."[190] Over the course of one hundred years, Penn did develop a system in which they could consider applicants without sponsors or financial capital; however, those who could pay tuition had advantage in the admissions process.[191] Until the late 1960s, Penn lacked pressing impetus to encourage changing their admissions policy to consider race. Only by the late 1960s did the West Philadelphia community provide the necessary force to impact Penn's admissions policies.

The Civil Rights Movement in Philadelphia

Philadelphia is not traditionally viewed as a home the Civil Rights Movement; but there has been Civil Rights activism in Philadelphia since colonial times.[192] In the 1940s and the 1950s, Civil Rights advocates strived to promote fair hiring practices through government agencies, but by the late 1950s, increased residential and school segregation led black communities to lose belief in the potential for government action.[193] Philadelphia lawyer Cecil B. Moore encouraged Philadelphians to engage in nonviolent civil disobedience through boycotts of white owned stores and protests for integration, particularly the integration of Girard College.[194] Through the 1960s, The Civil Rights Movement brought less tangible change to Philadelphia and many other Northern cities relative to Southern cities, such as Atlanta.[195] However, Martin Luther King's assassination in 1968 catalyzed a more militant strand of the Civil Rights Movement within Philadelphia.

---

[190] *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* April 20, 1965.
[191] Zimman, "Admissions Application: 100 Years of Change," 9.
[192] Matthew Countryman, *Up South Civil Rights and Black Power in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 1.
[193] Ibid.
[194] Ibid, 2.
[195] Ibid, 3.

When Philadelphia's Civil Rights leaders engaged in more confrontational tactics, the city saw a greater degree of social change.[196] The movement climaxed in late 1960s Philadelphia. Even at its peak, it maintained a decentralized nature, allowing different aspects of the movement to change a variety of Philadelphia's structures, such as the education system, the welfare system, and the criminal justice system. For example, three thousand five hundred students marched on the Philadelphia School Board in order to protest aspects of the curricula and the lack of black leadership. Philadelphia's first Welfare Rights Organization formed. Finally, in 1970, the Police Advisory Board overthrew the violent and prejudiced Federation of Police. As the movement tackled these varieties of issues, and members of the West Philadelphia community felt empowered to bring forward their grievances as well.[197]

Leaders of public schools in West Philadelphia mobilized to address space segregation in their community, and they called for Penn to open its facilities to the local black community. West Philadelphia school principals and superintendents met with leaders in the Penn community, including members of the Board of Trustees and University President Dr. Harnwell. These men negotiated a plan for room utilization so that community members could gain access to labs, studios, and classrooms when the rooms would otherwise be vacant.[198] Both parties appreciated the outcome of this meeting. West Philadelphia blacks were able to engage with new resources, and the University of Pennsylvania received positive publicity. The productive nature of this meeting convinced leaders within the West Philadelphia community to engage with

---

[196] Ibid.
[197] Ibid, 531.
[198] "Loose ends on the West Philadelphia High School space request and black admissions, 10 June, 1969," Office of Admissions Records, Box 231, Folder 15, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

Penn.[199] This local engagement created a feedback loop that provoked Penn admissions to accept more black students.

President Harnwell was particularly interested in maintaining a stable relationship with the local community because he understood that poor relations had the potential to garner negative media attention.[200] Philadelphia newspapers carefully followed black student admissions in the late 1960s because problems had erupted at Swarthmore College. Students at Swarthmore in the Swarthmore African American Students Society (SASS) reacted with anger when Swarthmore admitted the same number of black students in 1969 as in 1968. The SASS wrote an angry letter to the dean of admissions questioning the College's commitment to black students.[201] Upon arriving back in campus in January, the SASS demanded that the admissions office explain its rationale on all admissions decisions, have blacks involved in all levels of policy making, increase its number of black students in the aforementioned manner, and assure that no disciplinary action ever be taken against black students.[202] When they did not receive immediate answers, the SASS protested by locking themselves in the admissions office without adequate supplies of food and water. During the protest, Swarthmore's President Smith died of a heart attack, forcing the incident to a halt. While his death brought the crisis to an end, the confrontation loomed large in the academic community.[203] These events encouraged Penn to reassess its admissions policy to prevent similar negative attention.

Change in Penn Admissions in the Late 1960s

---

[199] Ibid.

[200] There are clippings of the Swarthmore events in his materials in the archives.

[201] Russ Benghiat, Doug Blair, and Bob Goodman, "Crisis '69: Semester of Misunderstanding and Frustrations," *Swarthmore College Phoenix,* January 29, 1969, 4. Office of Admissions Reords, Folder on Black Admissions, Box 231, Folder 6, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

[202] Ibid.

[203] Ibid.

As Penn received a growing number of applicants, Penn admissions reformulated the framework through which it evaluated applicants. By the late 1960s, Penn's administration recognized the need for a more systematic procedure. Wharton Professor Dan McGil chaired a Committee on Admissions, and that committee produced the McGil Report.[204] This report detailed a variety of "highly refined policies" to improve Penn admissions so that each accepted student would be the best person to contribute to society, the local community, their future professions, and the University itself.[205] The committee proposed a plan for Penn Admissions to design a "well rounded" entering class. The committee determined a more formulaic method to evaluating applicants, as shown below.

Criteria	Effective	Weights
Subjective		
a) Special talents and Creativity	30	
b) Motivation and Commitment	15	
c) Leadership and Activities	15	
d) General Personality	10	70
Extrinsic		
a) Background (Diversity)	20	
b) Institutional considerations	10	30
Total		100

Figure 1. Chart from McGil Report[206]

As a result of this report, for the first time in Penn's history, diversity became a cornerstone of each admitted class.[207]

---

[204] "McGil Report: Admissions Policy For the University of Pennsylvania," University of Pennsylvania Archives, accessed December 19, 2016, http://www.archives.upenn.edu/primdocs/upa/upa4/upa4b183McGil.pdf

[205] Ibid.

[206] Ibid.

[207] The report does not define diversity, which can invite problems in attempting to determine the intention of that category. The percent that is "is to be admitted primarily because they are outstanding athletes, socially and economically deprived, children of faculty and staff, and alumni children." Therefore, diversity in this context seems to be coded language for those who would not be accepted without special circumstances.

The report reveals that diversity was to some extent coded language for black admissions. The committee focused on black admissions because members knew that their peer institutions were wrestling with the question of black admissions. A major aim of the committee was to standardize Penn admissions so that Penn could admit a class with the same racial compositions as its peer institutions ech year. The McGil report notes, "The plight of the Negro student is receiving the attention of many organized groups, national and local."[208] Since other institutions began valuing black applicants, Penn admissions felt compelled to do so as well. In order to accept more black applicants, the McGil report articulated an affirmative action plan. The Committee believed in instituting a quota system for black applicants to assure that Penn attracted applicants of all "cultures."[209] Penn admissions desired to have more black students at the university. The report details,

> The Committee suggests that up to 3 per cent of the spaces in each year's entering class (i.e., 30 per cent of the spaces available under the special admission procedure) be reserved for applicants from economically and culturally deprived backgrounds. At the present time the number of applicants in this category, principally Negroes, who can meet the minimum standards of acceptability is much smaller than this allotment would accommodate. However, the University is committed to a policy of actively recruiting Negroes and to admitting all those minimally qualified. Thus, these--and perhaps more--spaces may eventually be needed for this group. In the meantime, it would not seem advisable - or consistent with expressed University policy - to place any restrictions on the number of risk cases that could be approved within this general allotment of spaces. In assessing the treatment of economically and culturally deprived applicants in the over-all admission process, one should note that they will be credited with 20 points for "background" in the regular admissions procedure.

The report shows that the committee had a paternalistic view of these black applicants. Instead of appreciating the perspectives that black applicants could bring to the

---

208 Ibid.

209 Ibid.

University, the committee viewed them as "risks." Yet the report also expressed unequivocal desire to attract more black students to Penn. Like many primary sources, its intent is difficult to analyze in modern times.

In the aftermath of this report, President Harnwell had the opportunity to choose a new Dean of Admissions. Perhaps unsurprisingly, President Harnwell chose someone who was committed to increasing the number of black admits and advocating for the local black community. President Harnwell selected Dean Schlekat, whose fervent desire to enact change served as an instrumental force in pressing Penn admissions to implement a more equitable admissions policy.[210] Prior to his appointment at Penn, Dean Schlekat worked at the Educational Testing Services (ETS) where he saw firsthand the ways that standardized testing contributes to structural inequality, and he grew to recognize the importance of financial aid.[211]

Dean Schlekat advocated for reshaping the admissions process with a strong sense of urgency. His passion possibly stemmed from his uncanny belief in his own agency. Perhaps overstating his own power, he asserted that his job as Dean of Admissions was to "correct the social maladies of our urban society" by integrating black students into campus life.[212] Dean Schlekat wholly trusted in the power of universities to change social norms to an extent that neglected other societal realties. Dean Schlekat believed that a university could singlehandedly to teach students how to be humane people. Dean Schlekat strived to "bring to its undergraduate student body a diversity of human beings" because he thought that changing the racial composition of Penn's incoming class would change how all white people viewed all people of color. Dean Schlekat asserted that

[210] Slopak, "University accepts 230 blacks," 1.
[211] George Schlekat, "The Urban University in Crisis: A Challenge for Admissions," *The Pennsylvania Gazette,* November, 1969, 17. Folder on George Schlekat, Box 231, Folder 27, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania, 18.
[212] Schlekat, "The Urban University in Crisis: A Challenge for Admissions," 17.

schools must overturn the biases of the older generation so that young people could reshape society. Dean Schlekat concluded that if whites attended Penn alongside blacks, those white students would expect to see blacks in positions of power in the next stage of their lives. Schlekat explains, "To achieve a decent life, blacks and all of poor must enter universities; enter the gateways of professions over which officers of admission hold total control. The control is acknowledged in the policy statement on admissions written by the faculty of the University."[213] Grounded in this lofty belief, Dean Schlekat was empowered by his individual ability to change the racial structure of society as the dean of admissions at a selective school. Schelekat used this control to address other prejudices as well, and tried to admit more women, more applicants from rural communities, and more humanities students.[214]

Enthusiastic to address the systematic societal problems, Dean Schlekat admitted two hundred thirty black students in 1969. This action strayed from the McGil report, which proposed consistent admission of thirty black students.[215] Dean Schlekat's actions appear to be a major shift from the forty admitted students four years earlier.[216] However, deeper analysis reveals that the shift increase aligned with other institutions. Penn's administration was comfortable with the shift because increased acceptance of Black applicants was a clear trend amongst the other presitigous Ivies and "Seven Sisters."[217] The most notable increase came from Wellesley College, which had a three hundred thirty five percent increase.[218] Dean Schlekat effectively moved Penn along with the

---

[213] Ibid. 19.
[214] Ibid.
[215] "McGil Report: Admissions Policy For the University of Pennsylvania."
[216] Slopak, "University accepts 230 blacks," 1.
[217] Ibid.
[218] Ibid.

general direction of the Ivy League, and Penn's administration praised him for these actions.

Like other Ivy League admissions offices, Penn admissions created the position of a minority recruitment officer to show a sustained commitment recruiting a diverse class.[219] Dean Schlekat hired William Adams, who was black, in order to conduct outreach to potential black applicants. Creating the position benefited Penn because Dean Adams was able to network with other minority recruitment officers throughout the Ivy League. For example, Adams worked closely with Harvard's minority recruitment officer, David Evans. Both men discussed black applications together, and they regularly forwarded the applications of rejected applicants to other universities that might be a better fit if the black applicants were unqualified for their schools.[220]

Hiring a minority recruitment officer demonstrates Penn's commitment to keeping pace with other schools surrounding issues pertaining to black admissions. Creating this position shows that when possible Penn put money toward black admissions. However, by the time the administration allowed such developments, they were not radical within the Ivy League. Penn did institute sustainable processes to improve black admissions, and Penn did allocate resources to these processes when the school could afford to do so. But it is worth noting that Penn did not pioneer these techniques. Given Penn's proximity to the local black community, Penn needed to innovate admissions techniques to avoid negative media attention.

Problems With the West Philadelphia Community

[219] Ibid.
[220] Lee Levine, "Minority Bids Expected to be Sent Elsewhere," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* July 1, 1973, 6.

The local context forced Penn admissions to put into practice policies unique to Penn. Despite Dean Schlekat's initial efforts, the black West Philadelphians felt that Penn continued to mislead them in terms of potential for admissions. In 1969, Carlton Godwin, President of West Philadelphia High's Student Government, spearheaded the formation of a City Wide Ad-hoc committee that challenged Penn's admissions processes. The committee insisted that, "the university had displayed an arrogant disposition toward the black community as a whole"[221] because it did not admit all students who met what the local community felt to be seemingly reasonable standards. Members of West Philadelphia High were under the impression that thirty two students were qualified to gain admission in 1969, but Penn only accepted ten.[222] In this meeting Dean Schlekat made an effort to avoid conflict at all costs by abandoning some of his previous protocols.[223] At the conclusion of a meeting held in April, Dean Schlekat and the adhoc committee agreed that black candidates who maintained SAT scores of nine hundred fifty or better, B average or better, standing in the top twenty five percent of their class, and outstanding leadership would be admitted to Penn.[224] As a result of the misunderstanding in 1969, Dean Schlekat accepted all thirty two black students. Throughout this situation, Dean Schlekat and the Penn administration's primary goal was to avoid negative media coverage.[225] Penn's administration feared publicity that would paint them as a foe to the local black community. In order to prevent future conflict, Dean Schlekat laid out explicitly clear numerical guidelines for black applicants. This policy was employed

[221] Minutes of the Meeting Between University Staff and West Philadelphia High School and Community Representative, 25 April, 1969, Box 231, Folder 15, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

[222] Ibid.

[223] Schlekat, "The Urban University in Crisis: A Challenge for Admissions," 18.

[224] Ibid.

[225] Report on the circumstances surrounding the admission of West Philadelphia High School Students to the University of Pennsylvanian for the Fall of 1969, 8 August, 1969, Office of Admissions Records, Box 231, Folder 15, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

because "the committee wants a commitment by the university to follow a consistent policy in its admission of black students—a policy that will make unnecessary any future confrontations."[226]

Financial Constraints Halt Black Admissions

As a result of these new numerical guidelines, more black students attended Penn. Under Dean Schlekat, the class of 1973 enrolled one hundred thirty and the class of 1974 enrolled one hundred fifty three black students.[227] Dean Schlekat had the unencumbered ability to admit large numbers of black students, but Penn proved unable to provide these students with necessary financial resources. Dean Schlekat's admissions office tried to usher in too many changes to quickly, which created problems for the university. Schlekat's admissions office stayed loyal to the mission of increasing the number of black student admits. Yet in trying to enact such a great amount of change, Dean Schlekat invited frustration from black students.[228] Wanting to promote new initiatives, Dean Schlekat tried to secure funding for a Black Student Committee on Recruitment so that he could send black students around the country to aid in recruiting efforts. Despite his best efforts, Dean Shlekat could not secure this funding. A number of black students had been excited by the potential for this initiative, and they were now irritated that Penn would not support the effort. Therefore, in December 1969, number of Penn's black students burned effigies of Dean Schlekat and Dean of Students Alice Emerson on College Green

---

[226] Ibid.

[227] Penn to Admit More Coeds for Fall Term," The Evening *Bulletin Philadelphia*, March 30, 1970, 14B. Folder on Admissions, Box 231, Folder 5, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

[228] "Blacks at Penn Burn Effigies of 2 Officials," *The Bulletin,* December 12, 1969. Folder on George Schlekat, Box 231, Folder 27, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

while screaming “black power!” in order to demand more funds for the New Black Student Committee on Recruitment.[229]

While Penn’s administration was not opposed to either the aforementioned initiative or changing admissions methodology, they could not find the money to allocate to such effort.[230] Dean Schlekat needed more money in order to follow through with his agenda. This conflict of interest led to tensions. Penn’s administration understood the reputational risks associated with denying Dean Schlekat the resources that he claimed to need to carry forth an equitable admissions process. Penn’s peer institutions, such as Princeton, were able to afford to spend money at this effort.[231] Penn administration felt great pressure to retain a higher number of black students. The prior events at Swarthmore heightened the reputational risks because other schools were keenly focused on events in the greater Philadelphia area.[232]

Dean Schlekat had a strained relationship with the administration as a result of conflicting agendas. Dean Schlekat aspired to increase diversity, and he wanted money to do so. While the newly appointed President Meyerson would never oppose, he prioritized avoiding external conflict and struggled to balace the whole budget. Dean Schlekat could not promote diversity to the extent he desired under his current budget. To try to ameliorate this issue, Dean Schlekat wanted to admit a smaller class size, below the nineteen hundred minimum. With a smaller class, he could give greater amounts of financial aid to a smaller absolute number of students. Yet Penn’s administration had no appetite for reducing the class size, which in turn would reduce its amount of received tuition money. Contrary to Dean Schlekat’s wishes, President Meyerson increased the

---

[229] Ibid.
[230] Mitchell Berger, “University Starts Year with $6 Million Debt,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, September 17. 1974, 1.
[231] Don Oberdorfer, *Princeton University: the first 250 years* (Princeton, NJ: Trustees of Princeton University, 1995), 61.
[232] Russ Benghiat, Doug Blair, and Bob Goodman, “Crisis ’69,” 5.

number of students in the incoming class without raising the aid budget.[233] Dean Schlekat commented that in 1971 that many of the seven thousand six hundred applicants—five hundred of which were black—would be disappointed with their financial aid packages.[234] Dean Schlekat grew dissatisfied with Penn's policies because he strived to change not only the ideology behind admissions but also the way that the university allocated its resources. Raising the class size while cutting the aid budget was a change counterproductive to providing a more equitable admissions process.

Dean Schlekat resigned in controversy in 1974. Sources affirm that he was forced to leave Penn. In response to this allegation, President Meyerson told *The Daily Pennsylvanian* that Dean Schlekat has caused "problems," but there had not been significant confrontations.[235] President Meyerson continued, "I'd like to keep him here in some type of a capacity, some kind of a role. He's a lively member of the staff."[236] Vice Provost Reitz insisted that, "George is a dedicated and devoted administrator in admissions and financial aid. His contributions have given us a firm base for the future and those who have worked with him expressed their gratitude and good wishes."[237] He added that Dean Schlekat had "never discussed the reasons for leaving with me and I have seen no administrative pressure."[238] However, other reports seem to call into question Meyerson's and Reitz's testimonials.

On the same page of *The Daily Pennsylvanian* that reported Schlekat's peaceful resignation another article stated that the provost made a thirty and a half percent cut in

[233] Stephanie Marmon, "Harnwell Okays Larger Class, Aid Limit," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* March 6, 1970.
[234] Ibid.
[235] Claudia Cohen and Jonathon Talmadge, "Schlekat Resigns Admissions Post; Gives No Explanation for Decision: Dean's Years Stressed Increase Diversity & Sparked Criticism," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* March 11, 1971, 7.
[236] Ibid.
[237] Ibid.
[238] Ibid.

the financial aid budget.[239] In 1970, the office of financial aid assisted eight hundred sixty seven freshmen. Four years later, only eight hundred ten received financial aid.[240] The policy seemed to have a detrimental impact on students receiving larger amounts of financial aid. The policy also minimized the amount of scholarship money that Penn could give any student. One student strongly disapproved of the policy, stating, "The combination of these changes indicates that the intention of President Meyerson is to place the heaviest burden for solving the financial crisis on the students."[241] Such changes likely triggered Dean Schlekat's resignation and revealed the university's inability to stay committed to black applicants.

In their reporting, many Philadelphia newspapers claimed that Dean Schlekat resigned because of the budget cuts. One newspaper reported, "Dr. George A. Schlekat, who resigned as dean of admissions at the University of Pennsylvania because of cutback in aid to freshmen." Another newspaper quote Schlekat exclaiming, "I'm not damning the University. I'm not sure there are any choices.""[242] Several newspapers cited his statement that, "I personally do not feel I can stay in my position and retain integrity in light of what must happen-- a cutback in financial aid."[243] Clearly, finances played a role in Schlekat's decision to resign. He pronounced that he did not harbor resentment toward Penn, but he wanted to return to his commitment to Educational Testing Services. He lamented that Penn's policy reflected a growing national trend: "All private institutions

---

[239] Mark McIntyre, "Provost Makes 13.5% Cut in Frosh Aid," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* March 11, 1971, 1.

[240] Ibid.

[241] Ibid..

[242] Berl Schwartz, "Penn Cuts Student Aid; Admissions Dean Quits," *The Bulletin,* Mach 11, 1971. Folder on Admissions, Box 231, Folder 5, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

[243] "Pennsylvania Dean May Quit Post," Lewistown, PA: Sentinel, March 12, 1971. Folder on Admissions, Box 231, Folder 5, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania; "Freshman Aid Cutback Slated," Tyler Texas: Courier Times, March 12, 1971.Folder on Admissions, Box 231, Folder 5, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania; "Dean Resigns in Cutbacks," Erie Daily Times, March 16, 1971. Folder on Admissions, Box 231, Folder 5, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania; "Record Roundup," Dunn. N.C. Record, March 12, 1971.Folder on Admissions, Box 231, Folder 5, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

are going to be forced to accept students with the ability to pay in the next five years and overlook good students."[244] Finding sustainable funding is an inescapable burden for all instutions. Penn admissions was wrestling with the need to admit enough students who could afford to pay so it could maintain operations while also considering diversity factors.

Financial Constraints Prevent Functional Admissions Processes

Penn administration's inability to reallocate resources to recruit black students became the major limiting factor in the mission. However, members of the larger Penn community had other issues with the changing color of the student body. Reflecting a larger age based division throughout American society, many alumni believed Penn's racial composition was changing too quickly. The admissions office was under fire for using the guaranteed three percent quotas for blacks students.[245] Additionally, according to Philadelphia newspapers, "some faculty members have said they feel that academic quality is being sacrificed by admitting students who rank high on the 'diversity' scale but possess minimal academic qualifications."[246] Given that "diversity" was coded language for "black," implicit in this rhetoric is the idea that black students were inferior to white students. In this climate, President Meyerson sought a new director of admissions who would select students based on academic qualifications.

In light of these sentiments and a desire to cut costs, President Meyerson did not emphasize the significance of racial diversity in his search for Penn's next dean. He avoided direct responsibility and buried the decision in layers of bureaucracy. President Meyerson appointed a five person advisory committee with the task of naming a five

---

[244] Ibid.
[245]Ibid.
[246]Ibid.

person search committee, and he chose five more people to sit on the search committee so in total ten people would make the decision. After a protracted process, the committee decided that Peter T. Seely, former associate director of admissions at Yale, would become the dean of admissions at Penn at the start of the 1970 academic year.[247]

Dean Seely's tenure at Penn was riddled with tension because his admissions team could not follow the trends under the current budget. Seely vowed to stress "intellectual" qualifications, meaning higher grades and SAT scores, as opposed to "diversity" factors.[248] Only a month later, he reversed course and instead stressed the importance of "subjective" criteria, presumably because he realized he could not maintain a high average SAT score given the current applicant pool.[249] Some alumni and professors had blamed the lack of "academic credentials" on the emphasis of "diversity factors."[250] However, in actuality, it appeared the applicants' lower test scores were not the result of the approach in admissions, but the result of a less qualified pool of applicants.

Unlike other Ivy League schools, Penn could not afford to spend money in recruiting applicants, so Penn did not have as much student selection as other schools. Penn did not have as large an endowment as the schools it aspired to consider its peer institutions, especially Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. Penn did not have the finances to send admissions officers to travel extensively doing outreach or hire a larger staff to run statistics.[251] Consequently, Penn could not recruit the same caliber of applicants as other Ivy League schools. Dean Seely explains,

[247] Lee Levine, "The Seely Years," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* September 16, 1974, 3.
[248] Ibid.
[249]Ibid.
[250] Ibid.
[251]"McGil Report: Admissions Policy For the University of Pennsylvania."

> The next ten years will be tough for places like Penn with its huge overhead and shrinking pool. Penn has never been able to resolve its own identity in relation to Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. It persists in seeing itself as not as good at them… at the bottom of the Ivy League...[252]

Fewer students could pay Penn's full ticket price, yet Penn's overhead was becoming increasingly expensive. Dean Seely understood that the primary issue at hand was a lack of funding, but asking for money became a fruitless effort.[253] Dean Seely needed strategies to showcase the clear problem: a lack of money to recruit quality students—both black and white.

As one of his efforts to acquire more money for recruiting and to stay in touch with the larger Penn community, Dean Seely released a plan to have faulty members and students serve on the admissions committee.[254] The effort did not last because the students found the dynamics between different administrators too toxic. However, over the course of the short time that students were in the admissions office, they observed that Penn needed more money for financial aid to recruit diverse students. The admissions office gave explicit preference to those who could pay tuition so the school could profit. Dean Seely insisted that only increased funding allowed Penn both to attract a diverse array of students and compete in the Ivy League.[255] The students in the office helped Dean Seely spread this message through the *Daily Pennsylvanian* and University Council, a forum that serves as an advisory body to the present. Recognizing the necessity to grant the admissions office more funding, Provost Curtiz Reitz accepted an

---

[252] David Martin, "Past Administration: Seely: From Dean of Admissions to Following Voltaire's Advice," February 19, 1976.

[253] Lee Levine, "The Seely Years."

[254] Jim Kahn, "The Bitter Legacy of Peter Seely," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* September 16, 1974, 4.

[255] Ibid.

admissions office request for funding for academically superior students February of 1972.[256]

Penn admissions proceeded to budget the newly promised money with cautious optimism. Dean Seely remarked in March, “Given past history, however, we [Admissions Office] doubt the money will be easily obtained.”[257] Seely’s instinct was accurate; the administration announced a “roll back” on financial aid. Vice Provost Reitz instructed Seely to cut all funding levels, with the exception aid to blacks, athletes, and commonwealth residents.[258] Allowing the admissions office to continue funding black admissions did help negate the impact of the “roll back.” The programs were not funded well from the outset, so the situation remained problematic. Moreover, without having money for merit scholarships, Penn could not retain students with very high SAT scores.[259] Without these students, Penn admissions did not have the flexibility to take black students with lower SAT scores. The money cuts still did a disservice to black students. While the Vice Provost did not directly cut funding from black students, fewer black students came to Penn because of the “roll back.”[260]

In addition to the lack of diversity, SAT scores dropped a full thirty points as a result of the roll back; they had been six hundred fifty math/ six hundred ten verbal but they became six hundred thirty math/ six hundred verbal. In this University Council meeting, Seely explained, "We have to link financial aid to academic quality."[261] His emphasis is logical because the average SAT score dropped as financial aid became

---

[256] Ibid.
[257] Jim Kahn, “Reports Fault Administration On Admissions, Financial Aid,” *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* September 27, 1972, 1.
[258] Kahn, “The admissions situation,” 2.
[259] Ibid.
[260] Levine, “The Seely Years,” 3.
[261] Ibid.

unavailable, and Dean Seely did not have the resources to recruit stronger students. Admissions served as the scapegoat for the larger institutional problem.

Entering 1974, Penn had major budget difficulties. Penn's administration halted construction of the high rises in order to maintain basic university operations.[262] The University was stretching its resources in order to sustain the hospital.[263] Since the Graduate Hospital $400,000 in dept, President Meyerson the Board of Trustees directed any excess monies to the hospital. [264] Given this climate, the Board of Trustees viewed allocating money to admissions as low priority.[265]

Unfortunately, Penn's admissions office also could not afford to preserve basic operations. Since 1961, Penn held a six-week orientation for one hundred black students attending Penn.[266] The goal of the program was to provide support to students who need the help adjusting to Penn, and the program had proved successful over the years.[267] However, in 1974, the admissions office could not secure the necessary funding to continue its summer tutorial program. If the administration withheld funding, the current minority recruitment officer, Carol Black, threatened to resign and Dean Seely threatened to roll back forty to fifty acceptances to black students because he knew they would not have the necessary financial aid.[268] Such dramatics provoked Penn's administration to give the admissions office the funding, but shortly afterwards the administration forced Dean Seely to admit an additional fifty students who could pay Penn's full tuition in

---

[262] Berger, "University Starts Year with $6 Million Debt," 1.
[263] Ibid.
[264] Ibid.
[265] Ibid.
[266] "UNIVERSITY HISTORY," Timeline of Diversity at Penn, 1916-1966, University of Pennsylvania University Archives, , accessed December 19, 2016, http://www.archives.upenn.edu/histy/features/diversity/timeline2.html.
[267] Ibid.
[268] Larry Field, "Admissions Office Expects 1850 Freshmen to Enroll," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* July 1, 1974, 1.

order to pay for the program.'[269] The money problems brewing under the surface were bound to come to a climax.

As the 1974 academic year commenced, *The Daily Pennsylvanian* reported that the administration made budget cuts to most Penn programs, including admissions. Although Vice Provost Reitz denied the claim, *The Daily Pennsylvanian* reported that he slashed $100,000 from the admission's offices recruitment budget. Dean Seely responded immediately explaining that withholding the money would compel him to "cut the hell out of all recruiting programs."[270] Against his wishes, Dean Seely had to cut funding from the minority recruitment program in order to pay his staff's salaries. Minority Recruitment officer Carol Black refused to accept her budget cut, and "castigates" Dean Seely for disproportionately reducing funds for her programs.[271] Seely responded with detailed budget information.[272] Dean Seely accused Black of lying about his actions to provoke a student response.[273] Vice-Dean Bill Brest agreed with Dean Seely, and both emphasized that Black's funding constituted one third of the recruitment budget—a sign of Penn's commitment to minority admissions. Brest added, "We are doing everything we can do to respond to the institutional commitment for minority recruitment."[274] Unfortunately, while Penn admissions hoped to conduct an equitable admissions process, it needed money to do so. Yet Penn was $2.2 million dollars in debt, and even the best of intentions could not improve the system.

Penn could not afford to do appropriate outreach to black applicants an from the 1974-1975 school year to the 1975-1976 school year, and as a result the number of black

[269] Lee Levine, "The Seely Years," 3.

[270] "Peter Seely Resigns as Dean of Admissions," 8.

[271] Larry Field, "Announcement Catches Officials by Surprise," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* September 16, 1974, 1.

[272]Peter Seely, "The Reasons Why…" *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* September 16, 1974, 4.

[273] Ibid.

[274] Larry Field and Mitchell Berger, "Seely Intends to Resign; Cites Lack of University Support," 1.

applicants decreased from seven hundred four to six hundred fifty.[275] In protest to the lack of funding, Black chose to suspend her program until the long-term problems were resolved and her budget could be restored to $18,000 per year. She boldly declared that she would not do a "half assed"[276] job, and she temporarily put all her recruiting programs on hold.

Influenced by Philadelphia's Civil Rights Movement and national concerns, Penn's priority in admissions focused on generating an increase in black students.[277] Penn admissions could not even further that mission, and other minority applicants got lost in the shuffle. Three Puerto Rican students announced their intent to file a complaint with the federal government because the admissions office was not recruiting Puerto Rican students. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare began its investigation of the suit, and there is no evidence that they found anything significant. Yet the situation reveals the extent to which minority students felt unwanted at Penn, and these students still directed their feelings towards the admissions office.[278]

In the midst of these crises, Dean Seely resigned from his position. Newspapers throughout the region cite that blamed his resignation on Black's disrespect.[279] Yet the story is deeper than the newspapers imply: Dean Seely claimed that he was forced to compromise his integrity multiple times in his role, and he no longer felt comfortable in this position. For example, Dean Seely alluded to the situation where he had to admit fifty extra students to cover budgetary costs. Seely told *The Gazetter* that he resigned

---

[275] Carol Hutchinson, "Black Applicant Pool Continues to Decrease," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* March 8, 1976, 1.
[276] Larry Field, "Announcement Catches Officials by Surprise," 5.
[277] McGill Report: Admissions Policy For the University of Pennsylvania."
[278] Levine, "The Seely Years."
[279] "Dean Quits In Protest," *Sun Gazette: Williamsport, PA,* September 18, 1974. Folder on Peter Seely, Box 141, Folder 34, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

because of "irreconcilable differences over policy."[280] In the wake of the crisis, Dean Schlekat came to Seely's defense, and warned the Penn community that financial considerations not admissions standards constituted the key obstacle to minority recruitment. When Schlekat resigned, he pointed out that

> with the rising cost of a Penn education and the University's unwillingness to significantly raise its financial aid budget, the school simply could not compete with more prestigious private universities and cheaper state schools.[281]

Without resources, Penn could not recruit a strong pool of applicants. Without a strong pool of applicants, the factors stressed in the selection process became irrelevant.

In the early 1970s, *The Daily Pennsylvanian* and numerous Philadelphia newspapers followed Penn admissions' inherently political process. Likely realizing the extent of this negative coverage, President Meyerson attempted to find someone noncontroversial to fulfill the role of admissions officer. He selected the Chaplain, Stanley Johnson. When Johnson accepted the post, Vice Provost Stellar raised the recruiting budget by $25,000 and the publicity budget by $15,000.[282] With this money, Penn admissions could better emphasize minority admissions. *The Daily Pennsylvanian* reported on admissions significantly less after Johnson accepted the role. Johnson restored a sense of stability to the admissions process, and with excess funding he was better able to achieve his goals.[283]

Movement Toward Integration

Throughout the 1970s, Penn's administration attempted to desegregate; however, once at Penn students faced new challenges with integration. Just as Penn lacked

---

[280] "Peter Seely Resigns as Dean of Admissions," *Pennsylvania Gazette,* November 1974, 8. Folder on Peter Seely, Box 141, Folder 34, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

[281] Field and Berger, "Seely Intends to Resign," 3.

[282] Ibid.

[283] Ibid.

resources to devote to minority admissions, the school lacked the resources to devote to minority students on campus. Once at Penn, black students often felt marginalized because they were left out of the school's social fabric. Housing was a "barrier" to equitable admissions.[284] Penn did not have enough on campus housing to guarantee housing to upperclassmen, and the landlords who maintained property immediately around Penn's campus frequently discriminated against blacks.[285] Since the University did not guarantee four years of housing, finding housing in upperclassmen years became a major stress on black students. To remedy the problem, Penn opened the Dubois House, to provide housing for black students. While the house provided a safe communal living situation for minority students, it was often under investigation by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on charges for segregating students on campus.

Ruth Ann Price, a black student at the University in 1973, wrote in the *Daily Pennsylvanian* about her struggles at Penn and her ongoing difficulties with the work-study office and the department of financial aid. She explained that when black students asked the department of financial aid for assistance to buy books, they received a reply of "we can't help you."[286] Price sarcastically reported that since the work-study office often failed to pay students on time, "the correlation between eating and academic success has escaped them."[287] She identified overt instances of racism, writing that "The residence officials at night, for example, may ask a black student is he or she a resident or to see his key … seven times a night for four months…For black men, it is advisable to keep

[284]Ibid

[285]Ibid.

[286] Ruth Ann Price, "Being Black and Being at Pennsylvania: No Longer Fashionable, But Still Not Easy," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* July 1st, 1973, 20.

[287] Ibid.

identification on you at all times."[288] Black students faced complex issues unknown to their white peers.[289]

Further, the story regarding the creation of the black studies program highlights the extent of marginalization surrounding black issues. In 1969, Penn's faculty put forward concerted effort to create a black studies department, likely because around five hundred other schools in the nation were creating such departments.[290] These faculty members placed the project in the hands of a student, Cathy Barlow.[291] By 1970, members of an adhoc committee established through the University Council "ruled out" the potential for the program, and Cathy Barlow quietly resigned from her position.[292] The students intended to form a black studies major.[293] However, in 1974, *The Daily Pennsylvanian* ran an article claiming there was no interest in this major because it was seem as "anti- intellectualism." A Harvard Professor told *Newsweek*, "Most of the departments have no intellectual integrity, no grounding in the disciplines." As Penn tried to tow the line within the Ivy League, this perception impacted how Penn's administration viewed the discipline, and the department of Africana Studies was not created until 2012.[294]

Conclusion

This chapter tells the story about the tension in Penn's admissions office once the university began admitting a greater number of black students in the late 1960s and early 1970s. This chapter argues that the major constraint on black admissions initially

---

[288] Ibid.

[289] Levine, "The Seely Years," 3.

[290] John Riley, "Group is Named on Black Studies," September 30, 1969, 1.

[291] Ibid.

[292] Anita Sama, "Faculty Rejects Separate School of Black Studies; Asks Major Instead," *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* October 21st, 1970, 1.

[293] Anita Sama, "Black Studies Releases Report; Favors Two-Year School," April 27, 1970, 1.

[294] "University of Pennsylvania AfricanaStudies." About the Department | Africana Studies. Accessed December 19, 2016. https://africana.sas.upenn.edu/department/about.

involved balancing finances with academic prestige. As Penn's financial situation became direr, money had a greater role in limiting Penn admissions. This chapter concludes by briefly showcasing that even after black students gained admission to Penn, they remained excluded from the social fabric of the institution.

The Desegregation of Princeton University: The Power of Agency

Princeton in the late 1960s and early 1970s was doing what the other Ivy League Institutions were doing. The administration felt that the opportunity they were offering Black students was a chance to mingle with the brightest white students in the country. [295]

Introduction

As my previous chapters reveal, Penn's and Emory's administrations lauded Princeton's admissions policies as a model which they could follow to gain greater prestige. Administrators at Princeton acknowledged their role as a leader in the admissions arena; a report from the admissions office to the faculty notes, "Certainly Princeton must do a great deal more… it may provide some stimulus to other colleges to say, if a place like Princeton can do it, maybe we should."[296] Princetonians had sufficient opportunity to be a model for desegregation, but officials did not seize the opportunity.

Since its founding. Princeton had been bestowed with ample wealth. The university has been in this fortunate financial situation since its earliest graduates.[297] Therefore, concerns regarding future funding did not limit Princeton's admissions officers. Three stated objectives of Princeton admissions include "superior academic and intellectual ability, national representation, and diversity," showing that Princeton's admissions cared for maintaining a national footprint in the same manner as Penn and Emory.[298] Unconstrained by financial concerns, officials at Princeton had a unique opportunity to shape their view of "national representation." Given the lack of structural pressures, these men had immense power in impacting black admissions. Initially, these

---

[295] Toni Yvette McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy: The Question of Diversity," (BA Thesis, Princeton University, 1985), 85.

[296] "1968 Report From Admissions Office to Faculty," Carl Fields Papers, Box 14, Folder 10, University Archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

[297] Don Oberdorfer, *Princeton University: the first 250 years* (Princeton, NJ: Trustees of Princeton University, 1995), 31.

[298] McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy," 5.

administrators did not use their power to admit blacks tudents and implement change. At Emory, administrators tried to change Georgia's law to enact meaningful change. At Princeton, both New Jersey and federal law forced small-scale change until the emergence of administrative turnover.

The national Civil Rights movement did not impinge on Princeton, New Jersey with the same force as either Atlanta or Philadelphia. Like Emory and Penn, Princeton is a historically white university in a historically black town. Unlike Penn and Emory, Princeton is not in a city but a small town. Princeton prides itself on being a walking campus surrounded by a few blocks of vendors where students can find restaurants, shops, and a movie theatre. Through the 1940s, blacks from the surrounding area existed on Princeton's campus exclusively as employees of these shops, chefs and servants to students and faculty. Princeton is less accessible than both Emory and Penn, and the campus was not directly influenced by Civil Rights activism. The Atlanta context impacted Emory's approach to school desegregation. One factor provoking confrontation in Penn's desegregation is the West Philadelphia location. Just as Princeton's financial success gave agents more control over its desegregation process, Princeton's geographic seclusion allowed these men a greater degree of freedom to promote stability or change as they saw fit. Princeton's leaders faced fewer reputation threats from the surrounding area, and in turn they had more agency in choosing when to add desegregation to the institution's agenda.

Group Exclusion

Princeton's entire Board of Trustees determined admissions decisions through 1922. As the number of applicants increased, that system became unsustainable.

Therefore, the Board of Trustees made two executive decisions. They capped the number of students at 2,000 per class, and they named former English Professor Radcliffe Heermance as Director of Admissions. The Board selected Heermance because he would foster their vision of an ideal class.[299] Heermance became very influential at the university. The *Nassau Sovereign*, an undergraduate magazine, reported in 1950, "the Princeton of the last 25 years has probably been more influenced by Dean Radcliffe than any other person or factor."[300] This statement is slightly misleading because Princeton's President and Board of Trustees supported Dean Radcliffe's admissions ideology, and without this backing his agency likely would have been hampered.[301] Still, Dean Heermance personally approved or refused each admit to Princeton University, and he refused to implement any process that might limit his own power.[302] Heermance's policies intentionally restricted the types of people received at the school.

Class has always mattered in admissions. Dean Heermance further privileged wealthy applicants by relying increasingly on filling Princeton's incoming class with students from a small number of private preparatory schools. Each of these private schools had its own high tuition rate. Throughout the 1930s, over eighty percent of Princeton's incoming class was drawn from a select number of these private schools, and therefore fewer than twenty percent of students came from any public school.[303] As Dean Heermance limited Princeton's outreach to students at public schools, they stopped applying.[304] Consequently, Princeton admissions further favored students from its feeder

---

[299] Oberdorfer, *Princeton University*, 118.
[300] Ibid.
[301] Ibid.
[302] George E. Tomberlain Jr., "Trends in Princeton Admissions," (BA Thesis, Princeton University, 1971), 114.
[303] Ibid.
[304] Oberdorfer, 119.

schools, exacerbating the cycle and creating an incoming class increasingly slanted toward private school applicants.

Dean Heermance developed contradictory policy in order to exclude members of unwanted groups, most notably Jews. This thesis highlights the plight of Jews at Princeton because Jewish exclusion at Princeton served as a model that admissions deans could use to prohibit black admissions through the 1960s. Harvard, Yale, and Princeton crafted admissions criteria around creating coded language to forbid Jews. These three schools formed a language to admit the men the perceived to have the correct social signifiers to become future national leaders.[305]

In 1915, Harvard, Yale, and Princeton each abolished their own internal testing system in order to rely on the same standardized test, the College Board's Entrance examination.[306] When schools adopted a standardized admissions test, the number of Jewish admits rose substantially.[307] Wanting fewer Jews on campus, Princeton, along with Harvard and Yale, changed the definition of merit to one that better suit their vision for their incoming class, a vision that excluded Jews.[308] Jews were stereotyped as "too smart and too bookish" to attend Princeton.[309] Before Heermance became admissions director, the number of Jews matriculating had been twenty five per class. Two years into his reign, the number dwindled to thirteen, and within ten years that number decreased to five.[310] The number would not rise above twenty five again until after World War II. Director Heeermance passionately denied the existence of a quota system, writing, "We

[305] Malcolm Gladwell, "Getting In," *The New Yorker,* October 2005, 10.

[306] Michael Schudson, "Organizing the 'Meritocracy': A History of the College Entrance Examination Board," *Harvard Educational Review* 42, no. 1 (1972): 34-69. Accessed December 19 2016. doi:10.17763/haer.42.1.l5772104r6108v01.

[307] Gladwell, "Getting In," 3.

[308] Jerome Karabel, *The Chosen: The History of Admissions and Inclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton (*Boston, Mass: Houghton Milton Company, 2006), 110.

[309] Gregg Lange, "Rally 'Round the Cannon: The Not Chosen People, Part 1 | Princeton Alumni Weekly," Princeton University, accessed December 19, 2016, https://paw.princeton.edu/article/rally-%E2%80%99round-cannon-not-chosen-people-part-1.

[310] Gladwell, 4.

have never discriminated on any basis whatsoever, we abhor quota systems."[311] Historian Marcia Graham Synnott reveals otherwise, finding a letter that reads, "I hope the Alumni will tip us off to any Hebrew candidates."[312] These anti-Semitic admissions policies were particularly significant because they correlated with an uptick in anti-Semitism throughout 1930s America.[313] Princeton's admitted class mirrored how the nation viewed the religious minority, and the applicant's religious status outweighed academic ability.

Princeton administrators manipulated rhetoric so they could design policies to prohibit a variety of unwanted minority groups. The anti-intellectual stereotype became clearly coded language to select against Jewish applicants. President Woodrow Wilson was careful to prevent downplaying intellect too much because he cited Negro intellectual inferiority as a reason that blacks could not attend Princeton.[314] President Wilson feared the repercussions if Princeton promoted too much anti-intellectualism. While such rhetoric may effectively exclude Jews, this system would include blacks. Most Princeton officials believed were inherently academically inferior, and they wanted to maintain an all white institution.[315] In order to create a system that privileges the admission of white, Protestant applicants, Princeton admissions officers claimed to seek "well rounded" students from the 1920s to the 1960s.[316] Such policies allowed Princeton admissions to justify their decisions to exclude Jews, blacks and other minorities.

Excepting a few students from the 1800s, Princeton was strictly segregated through the 1930s. In 1904, President Wilson explained, "While there is nothing in the

---

[311] "Dean Heermance Denies Quota System Used Here," *Daily Princetonian*, March 24, 1948.

[312] Marcia Graham. Synnott, *The half-opened door: researching admissions discrimination at Harvard, Yale and Princeton* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982), 160.

[313] Ibid.

[314] McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy," 1.

[315] Gregg Lange, "Rally 'Round the Cannon: The Not Chosen People, Part 1," *Princeton Alumni Weekly,* March 29 2016, accessed https://paw.princeton.edu/article/rally-'round-cannon-not-chosen-people-part-1

[316] Ibid.

law of the University to prevent a negro's entering, the whole temper and tradition of the place are such that no negro has ever applied for admission, and it seems extremely unlikely that the question will ever assume a practical form."[317] Wilson's language implicitly justifies segregation by implying that blacks and whites simply belong in different places. Princetonians, such as former Presidents Woodrow Wilson and other officials pronounced that Princeton lacked blacks students because they "just don't seem to want to come."[318] This assertion ignores facts. President Wilson instructed his secretary to write to a poor black South Carolinian applicant interested in attending the theology seminary that he should not attend Princeton, but Harvard, Dartmouth, or Brown instead because he would be more welcome at those schools.[319] Officials at Princeton took pride in being a part of a University steeped in significant Southern tradition in which where blacks were unwelcome. In his undergraduate thesis, George Tomberlain actually equated the word "Southern" to "anti-negro."[320] Even in the late 1960s, Princeton admissions officers highlighted that while they make take small steps to recruit black students, they still prided themselves on a "southern, conservative, upper class image."[321] This image did not leave room for black applicants.

Like Wilson, Heermance put much effort into keeping Princeton white. Although no tangible proof exists, Dean Heermance was rumored to have a "bottom drawer" in which he put applications that he claimed to have not received, such as applicants from black students.[322] Unaware of this particular student's race, Dean Heermance accidentally admitted a black student in the 1930s. When the student arrived to register for classes,

---

[317] Oberdorfer, "Princeton University," 141.
[318] Ibid.
[319] Ibid.
[320] Tomberlain, "Trends in Princeton Admissions," 136.
[321] "1968 Report From Admissions Office to Faculty," Carl Fields Papers.
[322] Tomberlain, "Trends in Princeton Admissions," 137.

Dean Heermance told him, "If you're trying to come here, you're going someplace where you're not wanted."[323] After this conversation, the student packed his belongings and went home. Dean Heermance wrote the student follow up letter explaining, "I have had very pleasant relations with your race…. A number of Southern students enrolled in the college…. My personal experience would enforce my advise to any colored student that he would be happier in an environment with others of his race." [324] Dean Heermance minces his words because he is trying to frame his deliberate exclusion of blacks as an action in the best interest of blacks. Clearly Princeton officials strived to preserve a strict view of segregation. Heermance's action shows that he was willing to go to great lengths to assure that not one black student entered Princeton. Maintaining this strict segregation meant that Princeton denied admission to qualified black applicants, such as the one admitted by mistake.

Dean Heermance strived to balance the various goals of Princeton admissions so that the process would not become constricted to the point of unsustainability. Under Deen Heermance, Princeton admissions reported three objectives: " We aim for national representation/ Not academic standing alone- we want a well rounded man…./ We want alumni sons to increase over the years."[325] Princeton did not lose sight of these ambitions, and the policies adopted over the years sought to enact these goals to different extents. Initially, these three aims worked in tandem. In 1936, Director Heermance articulated the desire to become a "national" university by increasing geographic diversity in the student

[323] April C. Armstrong, "Princeton University Does Not Discriminate: African American Exclusion at Princeton," Princeton University, accessed December 19, 2016, https://blogs.princeton.edu/mudd/2015/02/princeton-university-does-not-discriminate-african-american-exclusion-at-princeton/.

[324] Ibid.

[325] McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy," 15.

body.[326] Creating the institution's first affirmative action program, Heermance and his team agreed to admit less qualified students from the South and the rural East. While students applying from the North had to take the College Board Entrance Exam, Princeton waived the exam requirement for applicants from the South, the rural East, and the West.[327] Princeton alumni supported this change because many of them were from the South, and they wanted Princeton to admit men with backgrounds similar to their own. Moreover, this policy would help their sons gain admission. Seeking geographic representation, Princeton admissions selected higher numbers of legacy and devoted resources to recruiting men from the South.

As the "national" university shifted from meaning a school that prides itself on geographic diversity to a school that is open to everyone in the nation, Princeton struggled to achieve "national representation."[328] Policy guaranteed that certain groups were excluded from the university. Additionally, race and class worked together to constrict Princeton's applicant pool. Following Heermance's retirement, C. William Edwards (C'36) assumed the post as Director of Admissions. He recognized that some in the admissions office felt "growing concern that the decreasing of the application list represented a narrowing geographically, economically, socially, and even academically."[329] Moreover, Princeton could not possibly represent the national population given that admissions officers still purposefully excluded black students.[330]

Legality

[326] McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy," 16.
[327] Ibid.
[328] Ibid.
[329] Oberdorfer, 119.
[330] McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy," 15.

Blackness in the United States gained different meaning after World War II. A number of American blacks waged what one cafeteria worker coined as the "Double V" campaign.[331] American blacks connected the idea of defeating fascism abroad to that of defeating racism at home.[332] World War II highlighted the hypocrisy of America championing anti-discrimination abroad while promoting bigotry at home. World War II precipitated national policy changes, which in turn effected the racial composition of Princeton's student body.[333] World War II carried Princeton into the new times. Historian Stefan Bradley elucidates, "Although Princeton University and its peers are among the oldest and leading American universities, like most other institutions of higher learning, they had to be led into a new era of freedom for black people and social justice."[334]

Federal mandates initially obliged Princeton to admit black students in the 1940s, and these policies brought Princeton its first black students of modern times. Initially, the Princeton community opposed the war effort. In 1941, Princeton students voted Adolf Hitler the "greatest living being."[335] Attitudes quickly shifted after Pearl Harbor, and Princeton joined the war effort by supporting the Navy Training School Program, known as V-12.[336] The United States Navy began a program to supplement the number of officers in the Navy. These potential new officers would take classes and earn degrees at college before while the Navy at officer rank. The Navy opened a school at Princeton in 1942, through which around 750 officers lived in dorms took an intensive two-month

---

[331] Patrick S. Washburn, "The Pittsburgh *Courier's* Double V Campaign in 1942," *American Journalism* 2, no. 3 (1986): 73.

[332]Ibid.

[333] Armstrong, "Princeton University Does Not Discriminate."

[334] Stefan M. Bradley, "The Southern-Most Ivy: Princeton University from Jim Crow Admissions to Anti-Apartheid Protests, 1794–1969," *American Studies* 51, no. 3-4 (2010), doi:10.1353/ams.2010.0129, 112.

[335] April C. Armstrong and Allie Lichterman, "One thought on "Princeton University During World War II", Princeton University, accessed December 19, 2016, https://blogs.princeton.edu/mudd/2016/01/princeton-university-during-world-war-ii/.

[336] Ibid.

course. After this course, the officers would have the ability to operate a moderately sized amphibious Navy craft. Students in this program were admitted without regard to race.

Princeton archivist explains April Armstrong explains, “Like the rest of America, Princeton University never returned to what it knew as “normal” before World War II. Instead, the effects of the worldwide conflict reverberated for generations and left a legacy that permanently reshaped what it meant to be a Princetonian.”[337] At Princeton, World War II’s legacy shifted the color composition of the class, and therefore Navy program required Princeton to admit black students. Controlling its own admissions process, the Navy’s program admitted blacks. Effectively, a government presence at Princeton led the school to admit blacks. As a result of this program, four black students attended the institution, and three continued to earn degrees.[338] These students became Princeton’s first black students in modern times, and they provoked the admissions office to admit a sparing number of blacks students on its own volition without association to the program.[339] In 1947, Princeton admitted an undergraduate during peacetime, and he graduated in 1951.[340]

New Jersey law also forced changes to the racial makeup of Princeton’s student body. In the 1950s, New Jersey passed an anti-discrimination law that demanded small-scale integration.[341] New Jersey’s law required that private schools admit at least two black students per year. When unable to evade the law, Princeton President Dodds demanded that the university avoid legal trouble and admit black applicants, likely as an attempt to avoid the backlash that would ensue should Princeton openly challenge the

---

[337] Ibid.

[338] April C. Armstrong, "9 thoughts on “African Americans and Princeton University”," Princeton University, accessed December 19, 2016, https://blogs.princeton.edu/mudd/2015/05/african-americans-and-princeton-university/.

[339] Princeton graduated a few blacks in the 1800s.

[340] Armstrong, "Princeton University Does Not Discriminate.”

[341] Ibid.

law.[342] As a result, three black students were admitted the following year, and at most two black students matriculated to Princeton between 1948 and 1962.[343] While this policy did theoretically token desegregate Princeton, the university accepted only two black applicants a year. Therefore, this policy did not promote any form of integration in a meaningful way.[344]

The government necessitated change at a rate uncomfortable for Princeton's administration. In 1952, New Jersey passed another anti-discrimination law. New Jersey's legislature deemed demanding that an applicant list his or her religion on an application illegal. Dean Heermance did not want to comply with such policy, so he retired that same year.[345] In a similar vein, President Dodds retired so he could devote more time to his board membership of the Rockefeller Foundation. At the conclusion of his tenure, Dodds made an "unorthodox boast," namely that "in its basic philosophy, Princeton "has not changed in the least in the last 20 years."[346] In the 1950s, Dodds proudly proclaimed that "Hitler, F.D.R., Conant and I all came into power at the same time, and I'm the only one still doing what I was."[347] Whereas the times were changing and Hitler, F.D.R. and Conannt strived to alter the course of history, Dodds succeeded bringing stability to Princeton.

Change in Leadership Precipitates Change in Greater University Policy

In selecting a new president, Princeton's Board of Trustees searched for someone who would meet two crucial qualifications. They sought a President who would remain in

---

[342] Don Oberdorfer, *Princeton University: the first 250 years* (Princeton, NJ: Trustees of Princeton University, 1995), 120.
[343] Ibid.
[344] Suzanne Mettler, *Soldiers to Citizens: The GI Bill and the Making of the Greatest Generation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
[345] Langg, "Rally Around the Cannon, Not the Chosen People Part 1."
[346] Ibid.
[347] Ibid.

the position for a number of years and who was a preeminent scholar. Seemingly by accident, the Board chose someone who would make the university more inclusive. In 1957, the Board of Trustees selected a young classics scholar who met their two qualifications, Robert Francis Goheen. While Goheen was well known for his classics publications, he was not entrenched in Princeton politics. [348]

President Goheen quickly had to prove that he could maintain university relations and handle Princeton politics. Within his first year of office, Goheen immediately had to contend with a major media mishap because more than half of the Jewish students at the Princeton were denied access to eating clubs.[349] New Jersey newspapers followed the story; *The Daily Princeton* referred to it as "Princeton's worse media debacle in decades."[350] Goheen denied any charges of anti-Semitism, and he did not directly address the issue with the major news outlets. However, he instituted procedures so that Princeton would become more amiable to religious minorities. Through the 1960s, Princeton's students were required to attend biweekly chapel services. President Goheen challenged this tradition by dismissing sophomores, juniors, and seniors from this requirement. President Goheen received pushback from alumni for loosening the restrictions on chapel attendance, but he remained steadfast in his decision. The Jewish story at Princeton is significant because it laid the foundation for many policies toward minority groups. Princeton had not only closed its doors to black applicants, but also to many different groups of people—women, certain public school applicants, a number of religious minorities. While these stories are not central to this thesis, President Goheen intended to shape Princeton so that it would be more congenial to minorities.

---

[348] David Elkind, "Goheen Years," *Daily Princetonian,* May 1971, Special Issue, 2.
[349] Ibid.
[350] Ibid.

During Goheen's early years, crafting admissions policies equitable to black students was not at the forefront of his agenda. In the beginning of his tenure, Princeton's Director of Admissions, C. William Edwards, defended the official policy: the university did not discriminate against blacks, but any sort of special treatment would be unfair to other applicants.[351] A Princeton International Relations student explains in her senior thesis, "In fact when the first instances of civil rights legislation were being deliberated and society was beginning to consider the question of race, Princeton was still sluggish to change the complexion of its campus."[352] Each year Princeton admitted two black students to stay in compliance with New Jersey's law, which would appear to indicate that Princeton had a quota of two black students per cycle. However, Edwards argued, "There is no discrimination or prejudice against Negroes…. [I] would take objection to mentioning any quota."[353] He maintained that starting a program to recruit "Negros" would be "wrong" because separation is unfair when there is "no direct discrimination against Negros."[354] Princeton's admissions history includes personally asking a black student to leave the campus, so direct discrimination is certainly a piece of the legacy. Yet just as former President Wilson refused to acknowledge that black students applied to Princeton, Edwards proved unwilling to recognize the discrimination.

To downplay the significance of racial discrimination at Princeton, Edwards emphasized the interplay between race and class. The United States tends to be more accepting of classist views than racist views, so Edwards implied that race and class work

---

[351] "Plan to Increase Negro Enrollment Described as 'Wrong' by Edwards," *Daily Princetonian,* January 1962, Special Peace Corps Issue 19.
[352] McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy," 26.
[353] Ibid.
[354] Ibid.

in tandem to prevent black students from gaining admission to Princeton.[355] After asserting that Princeton does not discriminate against black students, Edwards explains, "In many areas, it still feels like you need one million dollars to attend Princeton."[356] Edwards highlights that many factors are a piece of admissions decisions, including race, class, and the intersection thereof.

Obviously, if Edwards decides which applicants meet the definition of "well rounded," he can decide the poor black applicants do not meet these credentials. Moreover, Edwards claimed that he was acting in a humane way by denying these students admissions because allowing them access to Princeton was akin to setting them up for failure. There is validity to his claim; many black students did leave Princeton throughout the 1960s. Yet hiding behind this logic exacerbates society's problem. Princeton stalled desegregation because the university had no interest in meaningful integration.

Serving as director of admissions had become an increasingly demanding job as the baby boomers reached college age. Problems culminated in Princeton admissions surrounding how to handle Princeton legacy. Edwards set out to decrease the number of admitted Princeton sons; by 1966 the percentage of children of Princeton graduates decreased by half. Only 46% of legacy applicants were admitted, in contrast to nearly 70% in the early 1960s.[357] The *New Yorker* Cartoon about this episode follows below. The cartoon shows an admissions officer talking to a prospective student, who is holding a child size shirt that says "Princeton 1966." The cartoon demonstrates that it is absurd

[355] Michèle Lamont, *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper-middle Class.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
[356] McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy," 27.
[357] Ibid.

for legacy to expect instant admissions to Princeton because their fathers attended a generation prior.

"The fact that your father gave it to you when you were six can, I'm sorry to say, in no way influence us in regard to your possible admission next fall."

Taken from The New Yorker, February 10, 1962

Figure 2. Cartoon from *New Yorker*[358]

Edwards lacked interest in balancing the demands from minority groups, alumni sons, and other interest groups, such as engineers.[359] In 1962, Director Edwards resigned, presumably to pursue business interests and spend time with his family.[360] Sources do not indicate that Edwards was pushed out of his position. There is no record that Edward was involved in policy disputes with anyone at Princeton, and Edwards was clearly entrenched in the Princeton bureaucracy. Upon announcement of Edwards' departure, President Goheen explained, "It is with deep regret that we have accepted Mr. Edwards' decision to relinquish his post. To him… belongs the credit for the success Princeton has achieved in evolving admissions principles and practices commensurate with the aspirations and needs of a growing college-age population."[361] While President Goheen did not try to alter Edward's admissions policies, President Goheen had the chance to choose a Director of Admissions who would be an ally in promoting his agenda of inclusion upon Edwards' resignation.

Change in Leadership Precipitates Change in Admissions Policy

By 1962, Princeton's acceptance rate of black students lagged significantly behind that of Harvard and Yale.[362] In 1963, with Princeton alum Alden Dunham selected as director of admissions, Princeton drafted its first official statement for minorities. Princeton officially declared "the role of the University as an educating institution for all

---

[358] *The New Yorker,* February 16, 1962.

[359] 1968 Report From Admissions Office to Faculty," Carl Fields Papers

[360] "Plans to Resign; Dunham Named Successor Director Will Devote Efforts To Family Business Interests," *Daily Princetonian,* April 23, 1962.

[361] Ibid.

[362] McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy," 47.

qualified students without regard to race or religion."[363] President Goheen noted, "For the past decade, we have been terribly concerned with what we could do for students from underdeveloped countries. It took a shock (the civil rights crisis) to make us realize our problems at home."[364] Director Dunham agreed, stating in his 1963 admissions report that it was Princeton's "responsibility"[365] to admit "negroes" for two reasons. First, he believed that Princeton ought to bring all types of people together to learn from their different backgrounds outside the classroom. Additionally, he felt "at this particular point in American History, it behooves all educational institutions to do what they can towards upgrading the status of the Negro in our free society."[366] After Dunham secured commitment form the Board, more substantial change occurred.[367]

Unlike Edwards, Director Dunham took the step to "aggressively recruit young African Americans" by shifting the goal of admissions.[368] The idea of admitting a poor black boy was incompatible with the idea of admitting a well-rounded boy, so Dunham altered the stated policy.[369] In the early 1960s, a faculty study decried the idea of being "well rounded" as anti-intellectual and harmful to the student body. Dunham's administration shifted its mission in accordance with such findings. Princeton no longer advocated for admission of well rounded boys, but instead supported the notion of a well-rounded class with sharp individuals, leading "plenty of room for home-schooled piano

---

[363] McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy," 35.
[364] Elkind, "Goheen Years," 7.
[365] "Princeton Admissions Report," The Office of Admission's Report to the Faculty- 1962-1963, Admissions Office Reports, Box 5, Folder 5, University Archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
[366] Ibid.
[367] Ibid.
[368] Allie Wenner, "Lives: E. Alden Dunham '53 | Princeton Alumni Weekly," Princeton University, accessed December 19, 2016, https://paw.princeton.edu/article/lives-e-alden-dunham-%E2%80%9953.
[369] Dunham used the term boy.

virtuosi and 12-year-old polymaths as well as football captains from Exeter," but also a room for black students.[370]

Director Dunham improved practices in the admissions offices in ways that promoted increased access to Princeton. For example, he recruited faculty to travel across the country and reach out to potential applicants.[371] He implemented a new rating system whereby applicants were rated one through five on both academic and non academic qualifications.[372] He remained committed to clarifying Princeton's admissions aims. Princeton's admissions officers prepared a list of twenty-three policy aims to present to the board in October of 1963; unfortunately, the list was not published. Admissions reports from this time are either inaccessible to researchers or exclusively accessible as illegible documents.[373] From these documents, we can gleam that the admissions office privileged certain groups of students that otherwise would not be qualified for admissions.[374] These groups included engineers, Princeton sons, National Merit Scholars, NROTC candidates, and Negroes.[375] As these numbers rose throughout the 1960s, President Goheen maintained, "that he strongly favors "the admission of well-qualified Negro students to Princeton" but that they should be admitted "as individuals" and not as "social statistics."[376] Goheen's assumption that he could promote racial diversity while admitting blacks as individuals is inherently flawed. In attempting to desegregate by ignoring race and admitting qualified "negro individuals," President Goheen ignores how an admissions policy aimed at accepting individuals while ignoring group status

[370] Gregg Lange, "Rally 'Round the Cannon: The Not Chosen People, Part 2 | Princeton Alumni Weekly," Princeton University, accessed December 19, 2016, https://paw.princeton.edu/article/rally-%E2%80%99round-cannon-not-chosen-people-part-2.

[371] Tomberlain, "Trends in Princeton Admissions," 106.

[372] Ibid.

[373] Ibid.

[374] "Admissions Office Records," Committee on Admissions Minutes, Box 5, Folder 3, University Archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

[375] Ibid.

[376] Bob Durkee, "A New Era For the Negro At Princeton," *The Daily Princetonian,* October 17, 1967.

preserves societal norms.[377] Dunham's first year in office yielded five black students, and Dunham expressed that he wanted to take more black students had there been more qualified black applicants.[378] As a result of Dunham's efforts, eighteen black students matriculated to Princeton in 1966, Dunham's last year.[379] Even more significantly, all of these admitted students received the financial aid necessary to attend.

These black students themselves began recruiting for Princeton, and by 1967 Princeton received a steady stream of black applicants. Any dearth of applicants could be attributed to tokenism or untapped sources.[380] Therefore, the Director of Admissions, Jack Osander, worked with Princeton's first black administrator, Carl Fields, to put together a Faculty Task Force to research how to best recruit more black applicants. Osander and Fields succeeded at reaching black students from primarily black high schools for the first time.[381] Unfortunately, this Task Force did not yield plentiful suggestions or make as big of an impact as those at Princeton would have hoped.[382]

In the late 1960s, Princeton's admissions office felt internal pressure to admit black students for the first time. As black students began feeling more comfortable on campus, they held their institution accountable for admitting other members of their race.[383] For the first time at Princeton, desegregation had an air of immediacy. Additionally, previously Princeton had always maintained a need blind financial aid policy. However, the university's financial situation was worsening and the second waive of applicants could not receive as much money, which impacted black applicants. [384]

---

[377] Ibid, 7.
[378] Tomberlain, "Trends in Princeton Admissions," 142.
[379] Tomberlain, "Trends in Princeton Admissions," 148.
[380] Tomberlain, "Trends in Princeton Admissions," 145.
[381] 1968 Report From Admissions Office to Faculty," Carl Fields Papers.
[382] Tomberlain, "Trends in Princeton Admissions," 138.
[383]Ibid.
[384] Tomberlain, "Trends in Princeton Admissions," 147.

Again, federal and state pressure ultimately forced large-scale change. A federal report, entitled, the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, and a state report, entitled, The Report for Action of the Governor's Select Commission on Civil Disorder each commanded that Princeton commit itself more fully to black American applicants. These government agencies wrote reports to target Princeton because "What an institution such as Princeton does will determine what less prestigious institutions will do."[385]

As a result of the internal and external pressures, Princeton named a minority recruitment coordinator, Frank Moore, in 1969. Mr. Frank Moore served in his role from 1970 to 1980 to complete outreach to minorities, coordinate hosting programs, and travel the country to personally meet with different students.[386] Princeton aggressively admitted black students throughout the 1970s, until black students represented up to ten percent of the total class. By admitting seventy six black students in 1970 Princeton tripled the number of black undergraduates at Princeton.[387] The office grew into a separate recruitment effort from 1980 through 1984, at which point the admissions office deemed the minority recruitment office unnecessary.[388] Princeton permanently eliminated the office in 1984 in order for admitting a diverse class to become a more integrated effort.[389] At this time, the number of black students at Princeton levelled off, possibly because of the elimination of the minority recruitment office.[390] Without a structure in place to encourage racial diversity in the admissions office, it would not remain a priority. Sociologists Bobo and Smith explain, "A key link between changing and structural

[385] 1968 Report From Admissions Office to Faculty," Carl Fields Papers.
[386] McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy," 39.
[387] Stephen L. Dreyfuss, "Scholarship money runs out for first time & Osander discloses tripled black admission," *Daily Princetonian*, Aprl 11, 1968.
[388] Ibid.
[389] McCall, "Princeton University Admissions Policy," 40.
[390] Ibid.

conditions and attitudes of public are those prominent social actors who articulate, and frequently clash over and debate the need for new modes of social organization."[391] Without any structures to begin shifting the traditional methods of social organization, racial policies on Princeton's campus were stagnant. The admissions office dedicated itself to promoting socioeconomic diversity instead of racial diversity.[392] This mission is certainly noble, but it does not fulfil one of the goals of affirmative action, granting people of color access to opportunities.[393]

Movement Toward Integration

Black retention at Princeton can largely be accredited to Princeton's first black administrator, Carl Fields. Fields was instrumental at changing the campus' complexion. Having been one of the first black students at St. John's University, Fields professed to understand the plight of black students. He worked to redefine the term "national university,"

> I argued that, if Princeton wanted to be a national institution, its student population should be representative of the nation. This was accepted in principle, but the admissions officers maintained that with their best efforts, they could not find that kind of representation. I argued that their criteria for achievement were not broad enough to include the kinds of things, other than academic marks, that blacks and other minorities could present as credentials. After several meetings, it was decided to include "work experience"—that is, real work experience of the kind necessary for survival—in addition to the kind more affluent students did for other reasons. [394]

Princeton is a more inclusive school because of these policies. When Fields assumed his post, Princeton was home to twelve black undergraduates. When he left in 1971,

---

[391] Bobo, Lawrence D. and Ryan A. Smith. "From Jim Crow Racism to Laissez-Faire Racism: The Transformation of Racial Attitudes," in *Beyond Pluralism: The Conception of Groups and Group Identities in America*, edited by Wendy F. Katkin, Ned Landsman, and Andrea Tyree (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 185.

[392] Ibid.

[393] William G. Bowen and Derek Curtis Bok, *The Shape of the River: long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 80.

[394] 1968 Report From Admissions Office to Faculty," Carl Fields Papers.

Princeton was home to over three hundred black undergraduates. Fields' first priority was ensuring black student retention. He created what he coined as the "Family Sponsor Plan. " The plan assigned admitted blacks students to families in the neighboring area so all the black students would have mentorship. Princeton was struggling to retain black students; prior to 1962, 25% transferred out by the end of their first year.[395] Fields conjectured that the school might have a higher retention rate if the students found support within the local black community. He sought to admit and retain students by creating a genuine community, but he found that other administrators "were not interested in changing a damn thing."[396] Fields had to fight to create this program—and even to have a formal organization for a black community on campus—but through his work he succeeded in creating a vibrant, if small, African-American subculture.

The program found success because while not all blacks came from the same culture or community, in Princeton being black assured many mutual experiences. For example, one black student explained, "people were looking at you like well, you only got in here because you're black. And that really irked us because we had to pass the same test they had to pass. They may have looked at our credentials and gave us a break, but when we got there we had to do the same thing they did."[397] The black students collectively felt similar disdain from the majority white student body.[398] In 1967, *The Daily Princetonian* reports, "There are 56 Negroes on campus and each has his own distinct story and his own understanding of what it is like to be both a student at Princeton and black. But every Negro at Princeton is challenged by the same kinds of

---

[395] Tomberlain, "Trends in Princeton Admissions," 144.
[396] Bowen and Bok, "The Shape of the River," 81.
[397] Durkee, "A New Era For the Negro At Princeton," 8.
[398] Rossy Mendez, "Power to the People: Princeton's Black Activism Movement | Mudd Manuscript Library Blog," Princeton University, accessed December 19, 2016, https://blogs.princeton.edu/mudd/2015/09/power-to-the-people-princetons-black-activism-movement/."

questions about his identity within a white community. Each is, to some extent, a child of the same heritage and a victim of the same stereotypes."[399] For blacks at Princeton, their skin color was a centralized piece of their identity because so many of their experiences were racialized.

Such experiences bonded many of the black students together, and the coalesced around the organization the Association of Black Collegians (ABC). Remarkably, the black student body was incredibly unified, and ABC served as their home. Charles Fields served as an advisor to the ABC, and this very significant organization that played a role in shifting the university's politics by protesting George Wallace and memorializing Martin Luther King.[400] By title, Fields was "assistant Dean of the College," but in practice his role consisted of creating a black community that provided a safe space for otherwise isolated incoming black students.[401] According to the students, Fields played a huge role in each of their daily lives by serving as the organization's advisor. He helped the students with any situation, ranging from explaining Princeton's grading system to where they could get their haircut.[402] The students wielded these skills to advocate for themselves, and at Princeton the students influenced admissions, aid, counselling services, curriculum changes, and dining plans.[403]

Fields strived to make black students feel more comfortable at Princeton, the southern-Ivy that was openly hostile to blacks for most of its history, and many of the students attribute their success at Princeton to his mentorship.[404] After two failed

[399] Durkee, "A New Era For the Negro At Princeton," 8.
[400] Carl A. Fields, *Black in Two Worlds (*Princeton, Red Hummingbird Press, 2006), 35.
[401] Ibid.
[402] Mendez, "Power to the People,"
[403] Francis P. Sharry, "Student Activism at Princeton," (BA Thesis, Princeton University, 1978), 113.
[404] Mendez, "Power to the People."

attempts, Fields and ABC succeeded in creating the black studies program in 1969.[405] He created a black musical group, poetry group, and dance group so black students could have exposure to extra curricular activities. However, Fields wanted to balance the needs for black students to have a safe space and also have high levels of integration. Therefore, he convinced the University to assure that each black student was in a suite with white students and to build the Third World Center (now Fields Center) as a hub for minorities on campus. Fields explains the significance of having a place where minorities are welcomed. He shares, "How do you feel when you have to go back for your Commons card if you forget it while others who forget theirs can use their U-Store Cards as identification? How do you feel? You feel like a Negro at Princeton."[406]

Conclusion

Carl Fields' ability to promote integration shows that at Princeton, individuals had unparalleled ability to lead the nation in the desired direction. Instead of leading higher education into toward integration, officials at Princeton delayed change. Upon the arrival of President Goheen, Princeton began to evolve with the national trends and desegregated in due time but without a sense of urgency.

---

[405] Sharry, "Student Activism at Princeton," 90.
[406] Durkee, "A New Era For the Negro At Princeton," 8.

Conclusion

Throughout the 1960s and early 1970s, Emory, Penn, and Princeton altered their admissions processes. Each school desegregated; however, they faced constraints preventing further integration, including finances, alumni resistance, along with federal and state laws. In 2016, the question of whether or not theseschools are integrated remains contentious.

At Emory, administrators fought the state of Georgia for the right to desegregate and to acquire more autonomy over their admissions processes. Those administrators at Emory recognized that they were losing talented individuals—both black and white—as a result of their segregationist policies. After the school one the right to integrate in the Georgia Supreme Court, Emory's few black students fought to bring their particular struggles to the attention of university officials.

Penn's admissions officers waged many contentious battles in order to determine how to allocate resources to recruit minority students effectively. The university struggled to attract students who had a high SAT score and met their newfound diversity standard. Penn's administration wanted to maintain the same level of diversity as other Ivy League schools but lacked the resources to do the same level of outreach. Consequently, throughout the early 1970s, Penn admissions office was wrought with tension.

Princeton resisted minority admissions progress until the tenure of President Goheen. He recognized that to maintain a their reputation throughout the country, Princeton had to admit black students at a pace that reflected national trends. Thus Princeton began to admit more black students and minority students in higher numbers.

By the 1970s, Emory, Penn, and Princeton admitted and graduated both black and white students in the sense that students of both races took courses alongside eachother. . Today, the schools remain desegregated. Atlanta's black middle class continues to attend Emory in relatively high numbers, showing that socioeconomic status continues to impact the composition of the student body. Within Emory's current freshmen class, 18.7% of students characterize themselves as black.[407] While Penn has not yet released its statistics for the students in the class of 2020, only 7% of Penn's class of 2019 shares this racial identity.[408] Similarly, at Princeton 8% of the class of 2020 self identifies as black.[409]

Race- Based Affirmative Action

Selective schools do not use a quota system, according to their policies yet they admit strikingly similar racialized proportions of students each year. For example, the number of Asian applicants applying to selective schools has doubled over the past ten years, but Harvard, Yale and Princeton still admit a class that is 20% Asian. As one Princeton student observed in 2015, "That looks a lot like a quota. That looks exactly like a quota. That looks so much like a quota that the only defense for it is 'holistic admissions,' which is the reason a former president of Harvard gave to defend a racial quota."[410] How does society reconcile various degrees of racial privilege?

To date, society continues to debate the merits of using race in admissions. In their book *Shape of the River*, Princeton's William Bowen and Harvard's Derek Bok

---

[407] "Office of Undergraduate Admission >> Emory University," Office of Undergraduate Admission >> Emory University, accessed December 19, 2016, http://apply.emory.edu/index.php.

[408] "Facts and Figures," Penn Diversity Facts and Figures, accessed December 19, 2016, http://diversity.upenn.edu/diversity_at_penn/facts_figures/.

[409] "Princeton Admissions." Princeton University. Accessed December 19, 2016. https://admission.princeton.edu/applyingforadmission/admission-statistics.

[410] Charles Kyungchan Min | Dec 19, 2016 6:22pm, Daily Princetonian Staff | Dec 18, 2016 4:01pm, Marcia Brown | Dec 17 2016 9:44pm, Katherine Wang | Dec 15 2016 3:36pm, Jessica Li | Dec 15 2016 9:46pm, and Rose Gilbert | Dec 14 2016 10:43pm. "Princeton admissions and its racism." The Princetonian. Accessed December 20, 2016. http://www.dailyprincetonian.com/article/2015/02/princeton-admissions-and-its-racism.

show that affirmative action policies have successfully shifted the racial composition of selective institutions of higher education. They concede that affirmative action is flawed because it generally yields more minority applicants from relatively wealthy families, thereby addressing racial inequalities while ignoring class disparities. They also acknowledge that admitting minority students under affirmative action policies perpetuates the perception that minority students are not as qualified as white students. Finally, Bowen and Bock reveal that affirmative action can accentuate differences and therefore intensify prejudices. Yet when implemented correctly, they assert that affirmative action can lead to a more true form of integration.[411] Currently, institutions of higher education are required to implement a form of affirmative action to gain any degree of federal funding.

Emory, Princeton, and Penn Today

Events on college campuses today reveal that these universities have not yet become the gateways for racial justice in the way Dean Schlekat hypothesized. Therefore, black students continue to plaace demands on their respective institutions.

Emory seemed to be embracing integration in the late 1960s. In a special interim report, Emory's alumni self study committee detailed, "Emory must be viewed in light of the present events and attitudes across the nation….as long as Emory follows its basic development as a national institution, controversy [about race] will be inevitable."[412] President Atwood' acknowledged that this tension was pervasive thoughout the institution. In a groundbreaking speech in May of 1969, President Atwood proclaimed,

---

[411] William G. Bowen and Derek Curtis. Bok, *The Shape of the River: long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000).

[412] "Letter From President Stanford Atwood to Chairman of the Board Henry Bowden," Box 1, Folder 8, Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

"Racism exists at Emory," and President Atwood listened to the needs of the Black Student Alliance. He hired Emory's first black administrator, Marvin Arrington, in 1969.[413] In contrast with Northern universities, by this time, Atwood was already actively diverting campus resources to create a black studies program and mutually exchanging faculty with the Atlanta University Center to ensure a black presence in his faculty.[414]

Events at Emory today reflect national racialized tensions. In the 1960s, Emory's Black Student Association called on the university to follow through with particular initiatives. As the political climate shifted in 2015, black students at Emory again called for similar reform on their campus. These Emory students demanded recognition that traumatic racialized violence had occurred and ought to be addressed—a striking parallel to the demands of the 1960s. Again, black students aligned with black workers, demanded acknowledgement of racialized problems on campus, and fought for an increase in black personnel on campus along with an increase in pay for black workers serving in both Emory's faculty and staff.[415] University leadership wrote a statement addressing these demands, but this statement did not resolve these students' needs, revealing persistent problems. While impacted by Atlanta's history and Emory's Methodist tradition, problems at Emory are grounded in the greater national context.

Princeton's racial tensions are compounded by its troubling history. This thesis shows how Woodrow Wilson's racist beliefs formed the basis for Princeton admissions until the Goheen administration. The University still has not fully grappled with Wilson's complicated legacy, as evidenced by current issues.[416] Princeton's administration decided

---

[413] "Emory History and Traditions Emory History and Traditions." Timeline: 1833 - Present | History and Traditions | Emory University. Accessed December 19, 2016. http://emoryhistory.emory.edu/facts-figures/dates/timeline.html.

[414] "Letter From President Stanford Atwood to Chairman of the Board Henry Bowden."

[415] Ibid.

[416] By The Office of Communications, "President Eisgruber sends message on recent discussions about campus climate,"

to change the "house masters" to the "deans of the college" because the word "master" carries a negative connotation as it invokes the image a slave master. On the same day, Princeton's Black Justice League fought to remove Woodrow Wilson's name from many buildings. One student stood on the steps of Nassau Hall, one of the most significant buildings on campus, broadcasting through a megaphone, "We demand you acknowledge the racist legacy of Woodrow Wilson and how it impacted the climate at Princeton." [417] Princeton students implored the administration to wrestle with the school's history.

Students in Princeton's Black Justice League advocated for a number of the same issues as those at Emory. For example, they called for faculty sensitivity training and a course requirement that would teach the history of marginalized peoples. Fifty years after each school began the process to create black studies curricula systematic issues within each schools' curriculum had yet to be addressed. Tensions at schools across the country climaxed given the emphasis on racialized police brutality, including incidents in Ferguson, Missouri. Princeton students marched to President Eisgruber's office, asking that he sign a document that stipulated their mandates. He refused, saying, "I appreciate where your demands are coming from, and I agree with you that Woodrow Wilson was a racist, but I cannot sign your document."[418] The students slept in sleeping bags in Nassau Hall for the night in protest, exemplifying the divisiveness of racialized legacies. Subsequently, he issued a statement, promising, "I care deeply about what our students are saying to us, and I am determined to do whatever I can, in collaboration with others, to improve the climate on this campus so that all students are respected, valued, and

---

Princeton University, 2015, accessed December 19, 2016, https://www.princeton.edu/main/news/archive/S44/82/14K15/index.xml?section=topstories.

[417] Ibid.

[418] Ibid.

supported as members of a vibrant and diverse learning community."[419] Eisgruber explained that the Board of Trustees determines how the school recognizes Wilson, and they would put together a process to reevaluate the school's history.

Symbols impact a student's sense of belonging. Therefore, Princeton's Black Justice League asked for a safe space on campus, and they wanted to choose its name so that it did not remind them of "a white benefactor or person with bigoted belief," as so many buildings on Princeton's campus bore these names.[420] As the United States grows more multicultural, both admissions practices and campus cultures will need to accommodate students with different racial identities. One student at Princeton reported anonymously,

> As a student of mixed ethnicity at Princeton, I felt very alone and unsupported fitting neither into the majority nor into the minority groupings at hand… I missed out on a sense of belonging while at Princeton, and I have since realized that though people of mixed race are a most rapidly growing minority in America and the world, and are making huge accomplishments, they are highly underrepresented at Princeton, both in admissions representation and in faculty and support. [421]

Again, the country is changing, and selective schools are not keeping pace.

Black students at Penn also feel marginalized in light of national racism and police brutality as well. Just as at the other two schools, black students at Penn have made similar demands from the administration. This October in a University Council meeting, a representative from UMOJA—an umbrella organization that works to unite student groups of the African Diaspora at the University of Pennsylvania—asked for a statement of solidarity, sensitivity training for professors, training for the Penn police, and training

---

[419]Ibid,

[420] Ibid.

[421] Anonymous Alumnus. (2001). Retrieved From: https://inclusive.princeton.edu/advocate-learn/make-your-voice-heard/we-are-listening.

for on-campus therapists.[422] Penn's President Gutmann responded in solidarity, but administrator's attitudes cannot shield from the national context.

Events at Penn reveal the degree to which schools are intertwined with the external events. As this thesis shows, these schools do not exist in a vacuum, and national attitudes impact campus contexts. On November 14th, every black freshman at Penn was added to a racist groupme entitled "nigger lynching."[423] The University underwent an investigation to determine how such event could occur. An individual who had been accepted to Penn, and therefore added to the Facebook group, obtained the names of each black individual through the class of 2020 Facebook Group, and used this information to create the groupme. Penn's administration immediately condemned the racism, but in a political climate where the majority of Americans accept such rhetoric, students remain uniquely unprotected.

Integration?

While these school's administrations openly condemn racism, racial tensions still permeate the universities.[424] This thesis details the factors impacting school desegregation, but it does not deconstruct the challenges associated with integration. The first chapter of this thesis began with the quote, ""When I arrived at Emory about eleven years ago, I was thrilled by the story of how the University came to integrate before required by Federal law. Also, I was shocked that no attempt had been made to document the history of the situation… Perhaps someone more scholarly than I will want to edit the

[422] "University Council: Minutes of the Meeting of October 5 2016," accessed from "University Council." Penn: University Council. Accessed December 19, 2016. https://secure.www.upenn.edu/secretary/council/.
[423] Amy Gutmann, "Latest Update to Racist Messages Directed to Penn Students," Email, 2016.
[424] Ibid.

enclosed material, and put it to some useful purpose."[425] This thesis started analysis surrounding school desegregation, but—along with this Emory librarian—this thesis implores further research surrounding issues of integration in higher education.

[425] "Email From Director of Library Don Bosseau To Norman Smith with Subject History of Integration, Emory University," Box 3, Folder 2, James Harvey Papers, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

Bibliography

Primary

Admissions Office Reports, Princeton University, University Archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

The Brandon Holt Collection, University Archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

Carl Fields Papers. University Archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

Desegregation Collection, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

The Daily Pennsylvanian, 1960-1975.

The Daily Princetonian, 1955-1975.

Emory Alumnus, January 1952-January 1972.

The Emory Wheel, January 1950- December 1975.

Emory University Annual Reports to the President, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

Emory University Center for Research and Social Change Collection, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

Fine, Bejamin. "Arkansas Troops Bar Negro Pupils; Governor Defiant." *New York Times,* September 4, 1957.

The George Schklekat Papers, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

Farber, Eliot. "The Integration of Emory University." BA Thesis. Emory University, 1981.

A Guide to the Office of the President Records, 1970 – 1980 (administration of Martin Meyerson), University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

Gutmann, Amy. "Latest Update to Racist Messages Directed to Penn Students." Email, 2016.

The Henry Bowden Papers, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

The James Harvey Papers, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

Mary Odem: Experiencing Race Collection, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

McCall, Toni Yvette. "Princeton University Admissions Policy: The Question of Diversity." BA Thesis, Princeton University. 1985.

McGil Report: Admissions Policy For the University of Pennsylvania," University of Pennsylvania Archives, accessed December 19, 2016, http://www.archives.upenn.edu/primdocs/upa/upa4/upa4b183McGil.pdf

Munger, Robert. "The Impact of Black Students at Princeton." BA Thesis, Princeton University, 1979.

Office of Admissions Records, University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

Pickus, Joshua. "Admissions and the Role of Race." BA Thesis, Princeton University, 1983.

Sharry, Francis P. "Student Activism at Princeton." BA Thesis, Princeton University, 1978.

The Stanford Atwood Papers, Emory University President's Office, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

Tomberlain, George E. Jr.. "Trends in Princeton Admissions." BA Thesis, Princeton University, 1971.

The University of Pennsylvania Yearbook, 1960. Found in University Archives and Records Center, University of Pennsylvania.

The Walter Martin Papers, Emory University President's Office, Emory University Archives, Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

William B. Turner, "The Racial Integration of Emory University: Ben F. Johnson, Jr., and the Humanity of Law." *Article Draft: Accessed Through Emory Website with help of Archivists*: 1-65. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1007261.

Secondary

Allen B. Ballard. *The Education of the Black Folk: The African American Struggle for Knowledge in White America*. New York: Harper Row Publishing, 1973.

Arrington, Marvin S. *Making my mark: the story of a man who wouldn't stay in his place*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2008.

"ARCHE Home." ARCHE Home. Accessed April 28, 2016. http://www.atlantahighered.org/Default.aspx.

Axtell, James. *The Making of Princeton University From Woodrow Wilson to the Present*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2006.

Bradley, Stefan M.. "The Southern-Most Ivy: Princeton University from Jim Crow Admissions to Anti-Apartheid Protests, 1794–1969." *American Studies* 51, no. 3-4 (2010), doi:10.1353/ams.2010.0129.

Bond, Julian. Time to Speak, a Time to Act: The Movement in Politics. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Bowen, William G. and Derek Bock. *The Shape of the River*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Chafe, William H. *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina, and the Black Struggle for Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Countryman, Matthew, *Up South Civil Rights and Black Power in Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Dudziak, Mary L.. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

"Emory University - Leading Research University in Atlanta, GA." Emory University – Leading Research University in Atlanta, GA. Accessed December 20, 2016. http://www.emory.edu/home/index.html.

Ferguson, Karen. *Black polmoreitics in New Deal Atlanta*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Fields, Carl A.. *Black in Two Worlds*. Princeton, Red Hummingbird Press, 2006.

Feingold, Henry L. "Investing in Themselves: The Harvard Case and the Origins of the Third American-Jewish Commercial Elite." *American Jewish History* 77, no. 4 (1988): 530-53. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23883206.

Gallagher, Victoria J.. "Remembering together: Rhetorical integration and the case of the Martin Luther King, Jr. memorial." *Southern Communication Journal* 60, no. 2 (1995): , doi:10.1080/10417949509372968.

Gladwell, Malcolm "Getting In," *The New Yorker,* August 21, 2013.

Gilmore, Glenda Elizabeth. *Defying Dixie: The Radical Roots of Civil Rights, 1919-1950*. New York: W.W. Norton &, 2008.

Gulley, F. Stuart. *The Academic President as A Moral Leader*. Macon, Mercer University Press, 2001.

Harmon, David Andrew. Beneath the Image of the Civil Rights Movement and Race Relations: Atlanta, Georgia, 1946-1981. New York: Garland, 1996.

Harris, Leslie M., "(Re)Writing the History of Race at Emory," *Academe* 92 no. 4 (2006).

Hauk, Gary S. *A legacy of heart and mind: Emory since 1836*. Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 1999.

Hauk, Gary S., and Sally Wolff. *Where courageous inquiry leads: the emerging life of Emory University*. Altlanta, GA: Emory University, 2010.

Hornsby, Alton. "Black Public Education in Atlanta." *Black Power in Dixie*, 2009, 210-38. doi:10.5744/florida/9780813032825.003.0009.

Karabel, Jerome. *The Chosen: The History of Admissions and Inclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Boston, Mass: Houghton Milton Company, 2006.

Kean, Melissa. *Desegregating private higher education in the South: Duke, Emory, Rice, Tulane, and Vanderbilt*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008.

Kluger, Richard, *Simple Justice*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1976.

Lawrence D., Bobo and Ryan A. Smith. "From Jim Crow Racism to Laissez-Faire Racism: The Transformation of Racial Attitudes," in *Beyond Pluralism: The Conception of Groups and Group Identities in America*, edited by Wendy F. Katkin, Ned Landsman, and Andrea Tyree (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000).

Lawson, Steven and Charles Payne, *Debating the Civil Rights Movement*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2006.

Lewis, David L., and Charles W. Eagles. *The Civil rights movement in America: essays*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1986.

Iluzzi, Michael J. "Lincoln's Race of Life is Not the American Dream of Equal Opportunity," *American Political Thought* 3 (2014).

Margo, Robert A. "Segregated Schools and the Mobility Hypothesis: A Model of Local Government Discrimination," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 106 (1991), 61-73.

Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton, *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of an Underclass*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1993.

The Merriam-Webster dictionary (Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, 2004).

Mertz, Paul E.. "Mind Changing Time All Over Georgia": HOPE, Inc. and School Desegregation, 1958-1961." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 77, no. 1 (1993): 41-61. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40582653.

Mettler, Suzanne. *Soldiers to Citizens: The GI Bill and the Making of the Greatest Generation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

McNeil, Genna Rae. *Groundwork: Charles Hamilton Houston and the struggle for civil rights*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.

The New Yorker, February 16, 1962.

Noguera, Pedro A.. "Creating Schools Where Race Does Not Predict Achievement: The Role and Significance of Race in the Racial Achievement Gap". *The Journal of Negro Education* 77 (2). Journal of Negro Education: 90–103. (2008). http://www.jstor.org/stable/25608673

Oberdorfer, Don. *Princeton University: the first 250 years*. Princeton, NJ: Trustees of Princeton University, 1995.

Omi, Michel and Howard Winant, "Racial Formation in the United States," In Wesley Longhofer and Daniel Winchester (Ed.), *Social Theory Rewired: New Connections to Classical and Contemporary Perspectives,* New York: Routledge, 1985: 355.

Patterson, James T. *Brown v. Board of Education: A Civil Rights Milestone and Its Troubled Legacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Peniel E., Joseph. *Waiting 'til the midnight hour: a narrative history of Black power in America*, New York: Henry Holt and Co., 2006.

"Princeton University." Home. Accessed December 19, 2016. http://www.princeton.edu/main/

Robinson, Michelle Levaugn "Princeton Education Blacks and the Black Community," *Politico.com* 1895, http://www.politico.com/pdf/080222_MOPrincetonThesis_1-251.pdf.

Sanua, Mariane. "Stages in the Development of Jewish Life at Princeton University," *American Jewish History* 79 no. 4 (1987).

Schwartz, Mildred A. "Trends in White Attitudes Toward Negroes." *National Opinion Research Center at the University Of Chicago*. 1967. http://www.norc.org/PDFs/publications/NORCRpt_119.pdf

Michael Schudson. "Organizing the 'Meritocracy': A History of the College Entrance Examination Board." *Harvard Educational Review* 42, no. 1 (1972): 34-69. Accessed December 19 2016.

Sjoquist, David L. *The Atlanta paradox*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2000.

Simpson, Tiwanna. "Historically Black Colleges in Atlanta." Lecture, Morehosue College, March 10, 2016.

Synnott, Marcia Graham, *Half-Opened Door* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1979).

Thomas, English H. *Emory University, 1915-1965: A Semi centennial History* (Atlanta: Emory University Press, 1966).

Tucker, William H. *Princeton Radicals of the 1960s*. Jefferson: MacFarland & Company, Inc., 2015.

"University of Pennsylvania." Home. Accessed December 19, 2016. http://www.upenn.edu/.

Washburn, Patrick S. "The Pittsburgh *Courier's* Double V Campaign in 1942." *American Journalism* 2, no. 3 (1986): 73-95.

Zumeta, William, David W. Breneman, Patrick M. Callan, and Joni E. Finney, *Financing Higher Education in the Era of Globalization*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press, 2014.