
Louis Marshall and Anti-Semitism at Syracuse University

Harvey Strum

Syracuse University, like most other American institutions of higher learning, was unquestionably afflicted by the rampant anti-Jewish prejudice that surfaced in the United States in the 1920's and 1930's, but it managed to resist many of the most blatant manifestations of anti-Semitism—so much so, in fact, that the historian of the Syracuse Jewish community, commenting years afterward on the period under discussion in this article, concluded that Syracuse “at no time . . . impose[d] a quota on the number of Jews who could attend, as was the common practice” elsewhere.

Although the university's commitment to tolerance was by no means as clearcut as this comment implies, its record was nonetheless better than that of most other private colleges and universities.¹ To some extent this was due to the internal factors and values reflected in the nonsectarian policy that Syracuse, founded as a Methodist institution, had adopted in the years before World War I. In addition its administrators enjoyed good relations with both the local Jewish community and the university's numerous Jewish alumni. For the most part, however, credit goes to the efforts of Louis Marshall, donor and trustee of Syracuse University and the State College of Forestry at Syracuse.

Raised in Syracuse, where he was a prominent member of the local Jewish community, Louis Marshall (1856–1929) had built up an outstanding law practice in New York City and served as president of the American Jewish Committee. His activities on behalf of Syracuse University, particularly his lobbying for the establishment of the State College of Forestry there, and his subsequent friendship with Chancellor James Roscoe Day placed him in a unique position to combat anti-Semitism at the university. Fully up to the challenge, Marshall played an important role in stiffening the resolve of the university's administrators during an extremely difficult period.

The Movement to Restrict Jewish College Admissions

In the years following World War I, the United States experienced a great upsurge in social and economic anti-Semitism. This unfortunate development had an almost immediate effect on the admissions policies of many of the nation's foremost universities. Beginning with Columbia and New York University, a large number of colleges in the northeast imposed quotas to restrict Jewish admissions to undergraduate education and advanced professional education in law and medicine. When Harvard announced, on June 1, 1922, that due to the sharp rise in enrollment, "it is natural . . . there should be talk about the proportion of Jews at the college," the restriction movement was given a certain degree of respectability, enhancing the growing pressure to restrict Jewish admissions to higher education.²

The public debate over the Harvard announcement made it evident that anti-Semitism and resentment of the increasing number of Jewish students were commonplace at Harvard and many other colleges. Although Fordham, Pennsylvania, and Chicago refused to go along with the discriminatory trend, many colleges established quotas, usually of 10–15 percent, on the number of Jews they would admit. Some college and university officials, following the lead of A. Lawrence Lowell, the president of Harvard, advocated that their schools openly declare that only a specific number of Jews would be admitted, while other opted for more subtle methods, such as psychological tests, nonacademic criteria, or geographic distribution. Students joined in the academic pogrom by excluding Jews from fraternities, sororities, and other social organizations.³

Anti-Semitism at Syracuse University

In many ways the situation at Syracuse University followed the pattern of increasing anti-Semitism—but in the early 1920's Syracuse publicly resisted efforts to impose quotas. The first instance of postwar anti-Semitism at Syracuse took place in 1919. In the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution, with Russian emigres blaming the downfall of the Tsar on a Jewish conspiracy to destroy Christian nations by promoting disorder and revolution, and with fears of Communism very much in the air, the old anti-Jewish canards of the *Protocols of the Elders of*

Zion gained worldwide currency. In the United States, Henry Ford reprinted the *Protocols* and retailed the most notorious anti-Semitic fabrications in his *Dearborn Independent*. Using the arguments and conspiracy theories of Ford and the *Protocols*, George Zator, a first-year law student at Syracuse, with the assistance of L. Carl Sargent, an instructor of law at the university, wrote an anti-Semitic tract, *A Word About Poland*, which denounced the Jews as pro-German conspirators seeking to undermine Poland and the United States and aid the Bolsheviks in promoting world revolution. In the introduction to the pamphlet, Sargent charged that “the Hebrew, here, as in all countries, [is] a man without a country.”⁴

Louis Marshall was profoundly alarmed by the pamphlet, seeing it as “a most virulent attack upon the Jews.” Incensed by Zator’s effort to smear Jews with the Bolshevik label and by Sargent’s implication that American Jews were disloyal, he wrote Chancellor Day inquiring whether “these vaporings by a member of the faculty of Syracuse University can pass unnoticed,” and pointing out that the pamphlet had the university’s name emblazoned on its cover, as if to suggest that it had been published with official approval. Day, whose attitudes had undergone a major transformation since the 1890’s, when he had argued that the Jew “sets himself, by his institutions and social tastes, apart from our citizens . . . and will not meet his Gentile neighbors upon a common plane of life,” assured Marshall in reply that the pamphlet did not reflect his views or those of the university. Moreover, he asked the dean of the law school, Frank Walker, to reprimand Zator and Sargent. Walker did so and also warned the two men not to use the Syracuse University name if they wrote any other anti-Semitic tracts.⁵

While Chancellor Day sought to purge the university of socialists and other radicals, he did not equate Jews with Bolsheviks, as Henry Ford and many other postwar anti-Semites did. However, the question of the political beliefs of the increasing number of Jewish students from the New York City area began to trouble Vice-Chancellor Henry Peck, the dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Startled by reports from instructors and his own conversations with students, Peck concluded that the radical ideas professed by many Jews did “more to harm the Jewish people . . . than all of the stuff that Henry Ford has been publishing.” Despite their opposition to political radicalism, however, neither Peck nor Day took any action against the students because of their

political beliefs. In fact, while Chancellor Day was a reactionary on many issues, he took a vigorous stand against anti-Semitism, and in early 1921 he joined with a group of prominent Christians, including Woodrow Wilson and William Howard Taft, in a public statement condemning the postwar wave of anti-Jewish hostility.⁶

The Senior Council's Demand for a Quota

As early as 1920, when some of the alumni, fearful that Syracuse had too many Jewish students, urged the university to unofficially discourage Jews from applying, Chancellor Day and Vice-Chancellor Peck made clear their opposition to any efforts to prevent Jewish applications. Day informed Marshall that he was "glad to have Jews come" to Syracuse and "saw no reason why we should discriminate against Jews . . . or any other race seeking an education." In 1920 only about 4 percent of the student body was Jewish, but during the next three years the number of Jewish students increased to 15 percent. Peck attributed this increase "to the fact that we are more democratic" than any other college in New York. As the movement to restrict Jewish admissions spread from Columbia and New York University to other schools in the early 1920's, ever larger numbers of Jewish students from New York City began to apply to Syracuse. Since some of the students lacked the financial resources to pay for their education, the university administration dipped into funds "raised by collections in the Methodist Churches," and Day urged Marshall to solicit donations for poor Jewish students from the New York Jewish community.⁷

By 1923 Jews and Catholics respectively comprised about 15 percent of the student population at Syracuse. Appealing to the nativist Protestant resentment this aroused, the Ku Klux Klan organized a campus chapter, recruiting over two hundred students and faculty, and holding rallies in full regalia, including the burning cross, just off university property. In February 1923, when a rumor spread among the Protestant students that the Jewish students had sent out a circular describing Syracuse as the "university where they treat the Jewish boy right," some of the student leaders decided to take action. On February 26, after the regularly scheduled meeting of the Senior Council, the editor of the *Daily Orange*, the university newspaper, proposed an informal and secret discussion of the school's "Jewish problem." Sev-

eral members of the council criticized the Jewish students for allegedly not participating in athletics, and the Senior Council decided to send the editor and two other students to meet with Chancellor Charles W. Flint, who had succeeded Day, and persuade him to impose a quota on Jewish admissions. It seems quite certain that the Senior Council was reflecting the dominant student opinion when it took this step, for Vice-Chancellor William P. Graham, Peck's successor, subsequently admitted that the action of the Senior Council represented the sentiments of the majority of the students at Syracuse, and the existence of extensive student hostility toward Jews was confirmed by a survey three years later which revealed that only 9 percent of the non-Jewish students wanted Jews admitted to their fraternities or boarding houses.⁸

When news of the Senior Council's effort to limit Jewish enrollment leaked to the *Syracuse Herald* and then to the other three local dailies, Chancellor Flint, who did not want the story published, appealed to the local press to refrain from printing the story until he could investigate it. Only one of the papers, the *Telegram*, agreed, but the school newspaper did not publish the story, because of the involvement of its editor and because of pressure from the administration.⁹ The story, however, made the front page of the *New York Times*, which gave it such extensive coverage because the 'condemnation of the Senior Council by Flint and Vice-Chancellor Graham was in striking contrast to the recent defense of quotas by President Lowell of Harvard. Graham, according to the *Times* story, made it clear that Syracuse "does not bar Jews and does not intend to do so," and Flint stated, "no such discrimination would be tolerated at the university." The local Syracuse press joined in denouncing the Senior Council's behavior as anti-Semitic and undemocratic.¹⁰

The Syracuse Jewish community also castigated the Senior Council. Joseph Bondy, a lawyer, condemned the Senior Council as anti-Semitic and un-American, arguing that "no college should tolerate a bunch of ignorant ignoramus who would take such action." Together with Rabbi Stephen Wise of the American Jewish Congress, Louis Marshall publicly expressed confidence in Flint's determination to "nip in the bud such a manifestation of ignorance," but privately, to stiffen his resolve, Marshall informed Flint of his outrage. The Senior Council, Marshall warned, sought to "induce Syracuse University to join

Henry Ford, the Ku Klux Klan, Hitler, the ignorant brutes of Hungary, and President Lowell . . . in their anti-Semitic propaganda,” and he advised Flint against permitting the “narrow, bigoted prejudices” of the Senior Council to determine the university’s admissions policies.¹¹

While Vice-Chancellor Graham assured Marshall of the university’s opposition to discrimination, both Graham and Flint sought to shift the issue from anti-Semitism at Syracuse to yellow journalism in the reporting of the incident. Flint, seemingly more upset about the publicity given the Senior Council’s action than about the action itself, threatened to suspend the student who had leaked the story to the press. In an effort to blunt the bad publicity, Flint demanded not only that the Senior Council repudiate its actions but also that it publish a denial in the school newspaper of ever “taking steps to bar Jewish students from entering” Syracuse University. To calm Jewish alumni the official *Alumni Record* also denied that “any such action was taken and if taken would be . . . turned down by the administration.” The university would never discriminate against Jews, it insisted, because “some of our best students and some of our finest graduates are Jewish men and women.” After this series of denials that the attempt to limit Jewish enrollment had ever taken place, Graham advised Flint that the “Jewish agitation is in some danger of being kept alive by the newspapers, but if left alone will rapidly die out.” Following Graham’s advice, the chancellor decided to say nothing more about the issue, hoping the furor would fade away.¹²

Chancellor Flint also decided to take no action against the Senior Council. When a Presbyterian alumnus, angered by the anti-Jewish behavior of the Senior Council, suggested that “if they continue in their propaganda they should be expelled from Syracuse University,” Graham replied coldly to the idea. He appeared more sympathetic to the anti-Semitic diatribes of another alumnus, who told him of the problems large companies in New York City faced when they hired Jews, and of the decline in the reputation and academic standing of the City College of New York because it admitted too many Jews. Not wanting the same situation to develop at Syracuse, the alumnus recommended limiting Jewish enrollments to between 10 and 20 percent, preferably 10 percent. He also urged Graham not to discipline the members of the Senior Council.¹³

After assuring the alumnus that the administration did not plan to

punish the Council, Graham added, "I am familiar with the situation, as you outline it, among larger employers of labor." On the issue of admitting Jews, Graham informed the alumnus, "we have a real problem and Chancellor Flint is not unaware of its existence. Any help that the Alumni may be able to give will be appreciated." This statement contradicted the university's public denunciation of discrimination as well as the private assurances the administration had given Louis Marshall.¹⁴

Discrimination in Social Organizations

The administration of Syracuse University also revealed its ambiguous attitude toward discrimination in its handling of the discriminatory practices of fraternities, sororities, and other campus social organizations. Jewish fraternities sprang up at Syracuse because of "the unwillingness of the older fraternities to admit Jews." Campus fraternities also barred blacks and Catholics. Besides limiting Jewish enrollment, the Senior Council had sought to prevent the establishment of additional Jewish fraternities. The administration cooperated in this endeavor by discouraging the formation of new Jewish fraternities and by refusing to do anything to end existing discriminatory policies. When a Methodist woman complained about sororities refusing to accept Jews as members, Vice-Chancellor Graham told her that the administration would not intervene because fraternities and sororities determined their own membership policies. While the university regulated every other activity of fraternities and sororities, it refused to take action against discrimination.¹⁵

Discrimination also thrived in the student societies of the medical and law schools, as was admitted in 1928 by Paul S. Andrews, the dean of the law school, acknowledging "there are already one or two societies in the law school which barred Jewish students." Andrews encouraged the Jewish students to form their own organization, to be called the Louis Marshall Law Society. Incensed that "Christian students deliberately exclude their Jewish classmates from folkship in societies devoted to the discussion of jurisprudential problems," Marshall expressed his reluctance to sanction a separate Jewish organization. By permitting the use of his name, he said, he would indirectly "approve what I regard to be a deplorable condition now

prevailing in American colleges, namely, the exclusion of Jewish students." Furthermore, he did not want the Jewish students at Syracuse "to meekly resign themselves under the cover of my name to submit to the insults inflicted upon them." In spite of Marshall's protests, the dean did nothing to end the existing discriminatory practices, and the Jewish students did establish a separate Louis Marshall Law Society.¹⁶

Marshall also failed in his efforts to eliminate anti-Semitism in the medical school, where Jews were also barred from the student society and had formed a separate Jewish medical fraternity. When anti-Semitism played a role in the dismissal of two Jewish medical students, and he proved unable to persuade the administration to reconsider, Marshall considered resigning from the university's board of trustees in protest but then changed his mind.¹⁷

Discrimination in the Dormitories

While the instances of anti-Semitism at Syracuse described so far were essentially of an informal and nonofficial nature, matters took a different course in the area of university housing, and in this sphere an official anti-Semitic policy developed during the late 1920's and early 1930's. Throughout this period black students were not permitted to live in university housing. Jewish students initially lived in the dorms on the same basis as all other white students, but when the Dean of Women's Office, in its annual report for 1926-27, recommended that Jewish women be segregated in a separate dormitory, the university established separate housing for Jews. Soon afterward, during the 1930-31 academic year, the Dean of Women's Office closed the cottage "reserved for them [Jews] exclusively" and assigned Jewish women to "all cottages in a basis proportional to the percentage of Jewish women on campus."¹⁸

Although the dean's report indicated that integrating the cottages did not create the "racial" problems she had feared, primarily due to "strenuous measures" to ensure that the number of Jews (or as she put it, "a certain racial group") in each dormitory was kept down to 10 percent, the experiment in permitting Jewish women to live with other students was short-lived. During the 1934-35 academic year the university reverted to segregated housing. Needless to say, the Jewish students affected by this policy change were quite resentful, and as

was noted by Eunice Hilton, the new dean of women, they "raised the question of discrimination to such an extent" that Jewish women friendly to the housing authorities voiced their concern over the issue. In November 1934, the Senior Class Guides, a group of university-picked student advisors from which the former dean of women had excluded Jews and Catholics, voted to end separate housing for Jews, and that same month the Jewish women held a protest meeting against the university's housing policies. Six months later, in May 1935, Dean Hilton urged the abolishment of separate housing "as rapidly as is possible," recommending that "it not be allowed to develop again." This ended the segregation of Jewish students in university housing.¹⁹

Did Syracuse Impose an Informal Jewish Quota?

While it lasted, the separate housing of Jewish women apparently had an effect on the university's admissions policies. In December 1933, the dean of women recommended against admitting any more Jewish women in the middle of the academic year. After conferring with her, the director of admissions asked the chancellor whether he should admit any more Jewish students in 1933-34 or postpone their admission until the following year. The dean of women also urged a restriction of 10 percent on the admission of Jewish women.

Concurrent with these developments, the Jewish enrollment at Syracuse underwent something of a decline. In the mid-1930's, perhaps coincidentally, the percentage of Jewish women admitted to the university hovered around the 10 percent level proposed by the dean of women. Moreover, the university's overall Jewish complement, which had been 15 percent in 1923, fell to 9 percent by 1938, while in 1939 only 7 percent of the new freshman class were Jewish. Since Syracuse was one of the few private colleges publicly committed to tolerance, and quotas continued to thrive elsewhere, its Jewish enrollment should presumably have increased, not declined. However, there undoubtedly were pressures within the university to reduce Jewish enrollment. As was mentioned above, the dean of women in the early 1930's wanted to restrict the admission of Jews, and the director of admissions apparently agreed. Chancellor Flint opposed formal or official quotas, but also wanted to preserve the university's Protestant character. Vice-Chancellor Graham, who succeeded Flint in 1937,

seems to have seen anti-Semitism primarily as a public relations problem, as shown during the Senior Council episode in 1923. While he often condemned anti-Semitism, he also concurred with the prejudiced views of the unnamed alumnus mentioned earlier and was unwilling to take direct action against prejudice on campus, as when he refused to do anything about discrimination in fraternities and sororities. In light of all this, it is not unreasonable to suggest that Syracuse University may have quietly reduced the percentage of Jews admitted in the late 1930's even though it did not follow the example of Harvard and Princeton by adopting a formal quota system.²⁰

Summary

While James R. Day and Charles W. Flint both took firm public positions against religious intolerance in the 1920's, it continued to exist at Syracuse University during the 1920's and 1930's. Until his death, in 1929, Louis Marshall played a major role in fighting against anti-Semitism and defending the rights of Jewish students at the university. During the 1920's the university's Protestant student majority shared the anti-Semitism rampant throughout the United States. The presence of a Ku Klux Klan chapter on campus, the effort to "rid the hill of Jews" in 1923, the 1926 survey of student attitudes, and the exclusion of Jews from student social organizations reflected this intolerance.²¹

Administration officials reinforced the existing intolerance by refusing to take a stand against the exclusion of Jews from social organizations and by discouraging criticism of discriminatory practices. Expressions of sympathy for the diatribes of anti-Semitic alumni did not foster tolerance. Anti-Semitism also surfaced in the expulsion of two students from the medical school and in the segregation of Jewish women. It may have led to the reduction in Jewish enrollment in the late 1930's. In the context of the period, Syracuse University had a better record than Columbia or Harvard, but it did not live up to the image of tolerance created by Flint's public condemnation of anti-Semitism in 1923. After the death of Louis Marshall no one emerged to defend Jewish rights against the administration's flirtation with anti-Semitism in the 1930's.²²

Harvey Strum is an instructor in American history at University College of Syracuse University.

Notes

1. John Higham, "Social Discrimination Against Jews, 1830-1930," in *Send These to Me* (New York, 1975), p. 160; Bernard Rudolph, *From Minyan to Community* (Syracuse, 1970), p. 239.
2. *New York Times*, June 17, 1922, January 16, 1923; Nathan Belth, *A Promise to Keep* (New York, 1979), p. 99. The writer would like to thank Mr. James Marshall for permission to use the Louis Marshall Papers at the American Jewish Archives, and Dr. Abraham Peck, Associate Director of the American Jewish Archives, for his assistance in researching this article. Chancellor Melvin Eggers kindly permitted access to restricted records of Syracuse University for 1930-38, and Amy Doherty, University Archivist of the George Arents Research Library, spent a great deal of her time answering the extensive research requests of this writer. In exchange for permission to use restricted records, the university required submission of the manuscript for clearance.
3. Marcia Synnott, *The Half-Opened Door* (Westport, Conn., 1979); Harold Wechsler, *The Qualified Student* (New York, 1977); Stephen Steinberg, "How Jewish Quotas Began," *Commentary* 52 (September 1971): 67-76; John Higham, *Strangers in the Land* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1955), p. 278.
4. Louis Marshall to James R. Day, February 13, 1919, Louis Marshall Papers, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati Campus of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (AJA).
5. *Ibid.* James R. Day, "Letter," *American Hebrew*, April 4, 1890, p. 173; Michael Dobrowski, *Tarnished Dream* (Westport, Conn., 1979), pp. 145-146; Frank Walker to Louis Marshall, February 17, 1919, Box 4, Frank Walker Papers, Records of the College of Law, Record Group 11, Syracuse University Archives, George Arents Research Library at Syracuse University. Zator's public anti-Semitism did not prevent Walker from writing the student a favorable recommendation (Frank Walker to Miller and Hubbell, January 14, 1922, in the Walker Papers); W. Freeman Galpin, *Syracuse University* (Syracuse, N.Y., 1960), vol. 2, p. 386.
6. Henry Peck to James R. Day, January 27, 1921, Box 11, James R. Day Papers, Records of the Chancellor's Office, RG 1, Syracuse University Archives; *New York Times*, January 17, 1921; Day's toleration had its limits. In 1916 he tried to prevent the appointment of a Catholic, Walter Patrick, to the faculty.
7. James R. Day to Louis Marshall, April 15, 1920, Box 7, James R. Day to John D. Rockefeller, December 11, 1916, Box 7, Henry Peck to James R. Day, January 27, 1921, Box 11, James R. Day Papers, Records of the Chancellor's Office, RG 1, Syracuse University Archives; Peck's statement exaggerated the extent of democracy, because in 1915 the College of Forestry denied academic honors to a Jewish student, Sol Feinstone. Many years later the university awarded him an honorary doctoral degree.
8. *Syracuse Post Standard*, February 28, 1923; *Syracuse Daily Orange*, December 19, 20, 1922 (Ku Klux Klan activity); *Syracuse Journal*, February 27-March 1, 1923; *Syracuse Herald*, February 27-March 1, 1923; *Syracuse Telegram*, February 28, 1923; and *New York Times*, February 28-March 1, 1923, contained accounts of the incident. Floyd Allport, an instructor at Syracuse, surveyed 4,248 students on May 10, 1926. Floyd Allport and Daniel Katz, *Student's Attitudes* (Syracuse, 1931), p. 148.
9. *Syracuse Telegram*, February 28, 1923; William Graham to Ernest Clowes, March 7, 1923, Box 9, Flint-Graham Papers, Records of the Chancellor's Office, RG 1, Syracuse University Archives.
10. *New York Times*, February 28, 1923; *Syracuse Journal*, February 27, 1923; *Syracuse Post-Standard*, February 28-March 1, 1923; *Syracuse Herald*, March 1, 1923.

11. *Syracuse Journal*, February 27, March 1, 1923; Louis Marshall to Charles W. Flint, February 28, 1923, Louis Marshall Papers, AJA.

12. William Graham to Louis Marshall, March 2, 1923, Box 33, Flint-Graham Papers, Records of the Chancellor's Office, RG 1, Syracuse University Archives; *Syracuse University Daily Orange*, March 1, 1923; *Alumni Record*, February 28, 1923, p. 815; William Graham to Charles Flint, March 1, 1923, Charles Flint to William Graham, March 9, 1923, Box 11, Flint-Graham Papers.

13. William Graham to George Brower, March 5, 1923, Student Life, Box 23, Alumnus to William Graham, March 6, 1923, William Graham to Alumnus, March 14, 1923, Hendricks Chapel, Box 5, W. Freeman Galpin Papers, RG 13, Syracuse University Archives.

14. *Ibid.*

15. Louis Marshall to Charles Flint, February 28, 1923, Louis Marshall Papers, AJA; *Syracuse Journal*, March 1, 1923; William Graham to Tracy Slade, September 22, 1933, Fraternities, Box 12, W. Freeman Galpin Papers, RG 13, Syracuse University Archives. F. Franklin Moon, dean of the College of Forestry, complained in 1923 to Chancellor Flint about the exclusionary policies of university honorary societies, but the chancellor did nothing about it (F. Franklin Moon to Charles Flint, March 15, 1923, Charles Flint file, F. Franklin Moon Papers, F. Franklin Moon Library, State College of Forestry and Environmental Science at Syracuse University).

16. Charles Reznikoff (ed.), *Louis Marshall* (Philadelphia, 1957), vol. 1, p. 272; Paul Andrews to Louis Marshall, October 3, 1928, December 26, 1928, Louis Marshall to Paul Andrews, December 12, 1928, Box 6, Paul Andrews Papers, Records of the College of Law, RG 11, Syracuse University Archives.

17. Morton Rosenstock, *Louis Marshall, Defender of Jewish Rights* (Detroit, 1965), p. 245; Louis Marshall to Herman Weiskotten, September 20, 1924, Louis Marshall Papers, AJA.

18. Dean of Women, Annual Report, 1926-27; Annual Report, 1933-34, p. 31, Box 39, Annual Reports to the Chancellor, RG 1; Report of the Associate Dean of Women, May 20, 1931, Box 21, W. Freeman Galpin Papers, RG 13, Syracuse University Archives.

19. Dean of Women, Annual Report, 1934-35, pp. 12-13, Box 39, Annual Reports to the Chancellor, RG 1. For discrimination against Catholics, see the Annual Report of the Dean of Women, 1932-33, p. 9, Box 4, Flint-Graham Papers, Records of the Chancellor's Office, RG 1, Syracuse University Archives. The *Daily Orange*, May 20, 1932, reported discrimination against blacks. A Jewish faculty member, Herbert Abraham, leaked the story, and this ended his career because publication of the facts angered Flint. James Wechsler, *Revolt on Campus* (New York, 1935), exposed some of the anti-Semitic policies of the Dean of Women's Office.

20. Surviving evidence makes it clear that the university discriminated against blacks (Eugene Bradford to William Graham, October 11, 1922, Graham to Bradford, October 11, 1922, Box 1, Flint-Graham Papers, Records of the Chancellor's Office, RG 1, Syracuse University Archives) and had quotas on the admission of women (Chancellor William Graham to Frank Bryan, November 16, 1937, Box 1, Flint-Graham Papers).

21. Stephen Steinberg, *The Academic Melting Pot* (New York, 1974), p. 20.

22. Chancellor Graham approved of Father Charles Coughlin, the anti-Semitic radio priest (William Graham to Frank Harrington, January 24, 1939, Box 22, W. Freeman Galpin Papers, RG 13, Syracuse University Archives).