

THE JEWISH PROBLEM: ANTI-SEMITIC ADMISSIONS QUOTAS IN SOUTHERN U.S.
MEDICAL SCHOOLS, 1920s-1960s

by

Taylor Kristen Marks

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in
History

Charlotte

2020

Approved by:

Dr. Aaron Shapiro

Dr. Heather Perry

Dr. David Goldfield

ABSTRACT

TAYLOR KRISTEN MARKS. The Jewish Problem: Anti-Semitic Admissions Quotas in Southern U.S. Medical Schools, 1920s-1960s. (Under the direction of DR. AARON SHAPIRO)

Anti-Semitism and worldwide Jewish immigration quotas informed the implementation of Jewish quotas in medical schools around the country from the 1920s to the 1960s. While many are aware of immigration quotas and the anti-Semitism that ran rampant in the country, the same cannot be said for informal medical quotas that restricted Jewish students from admission into medical schools and Jewish doctors from employment. Some of the most well-known schools in the South, such as Georgetown University, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Emory University, Johns Hopkins University, Duke University, and Wake Forest College, implemented quotas discriminating against Jewish enrollment in each institution's medical schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to express my deep gratitude to Dr. Aaron Shapiro, who guided me through this thesis and my graduate school experience with enthusiasm and care, making my two years at UNCC much easier to navigate. I would also like to extend my appreciation to my other committee members, Dr. Heather Perry and Dr. David Goldfield, whose expertise and advice greatly helped refine my thesis. I am grateful for the help offered to me by the archivists of the universities I researched, especially Lynn Conway at Georgetown, whose assistance helped me polish my argument. To my peers in the MA History program, thank you for the advice and moral support during the stressful years we spent together. And finally, my greatest thanks to my friends and family, whose love and encouragement gave me the strength and motivation to pursue this degree and finish this thesis despite all of the obstacles I faced.

DEDICATION

To my parents, Ann and Vincent Marks, without whom I none of my success would be possible. Thank you for always supporting me through all of my pursuits and providing endless encouragement and love. You are the reason I am where I am today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| GLOSSARY | vii |
| CHAPTER 1: CONTEXT AND HISTORIOGRAPHY | 1 |
| Context | 2 |
| Why Quotas? | 8 |
| Historiography | 11 |
| General Anti-Semitism | 11 |
| Discrimination in Higher Education | 13 |
| Anti-Semitic Immigration Quotas | 17 |
| Race | 19 |
| CHAPTER 2: RESISTANCE AND CONFRONTATION AT UNC AND GEORGETOWN | 21 |
| The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Morris Krasny | 21 |
| White Supremacy and Anti-Semitism at UNC-Chapel Hill | 27 |
| White Supremacy and Anti-Semitism at Georgetown | 30 |
| Georgetown University and Marvin Lillian | 36 |
| CHAPTER 3: EMORY, JOHNS HOPKINS, DUKE, WAKE FOREST AND THE CLANDESTINE NATURE OF ANTI-SEMITIC ADMISSIONS POLICIES | 42 |
| Emory University and Perry Brickman | 42 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Johns Hopkins University | 52 |
| Duke University and Wake Forest College | 54 |
| CHAPTER 4: CHANGES IN AMERICAN JEWISH LIFE, RECKONING, AND CONTEMPORARY CONSEQUENCES | 60 |
| Assimilation | 60 |
| The Civil Rights Movement | 61 |
| Historically Black Colleges and Universities | 63 |
| Brandeis University | 65 |
| The Anti-Defamation League | 67 |
| Zionism | 69 |
| The Common Application | 70 |
| Reckoning | 71 |
| Conclusion | 74 |
| REFERENCES | 77 |
| Archival Material | 77 |
| Bibliography | 78 |
| APPENDIX: TIMELINE OF EVENTS | 85 |

GLOSSARY

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Quota | A set number or percentage of Jews a medical school would accept per admissions cycle. |
| Jewish | For the purposes of this paper, primarily refers to people of Ashkenazi descent regardless of religious practices or lack thereof. |
| White | For the purposes of this paper, refers generally to white Anglo-Saxon Protestants. |
| Pogrom | Policies, many of them violent, implemented mostly in Europe that dehumanized Jews. |
| Anti-Semitism | Hostile and often systemic prejudice toward Jews. |
| White Supremacy | An ideology that, at its core, maintains that the white race is superior. |
| Canard | Hoaxes and fabrications about Jews commonly used by anti-Semites and white supremacists to justify prejudice. Comparable to tropes but unique to anti-Semitism. |
| Black Lives Matter | Organization and broader movement started in 2014 in direct response to police brutality against Black men. Has since grown to address larger systemic issues in race, gender, and class. Was revitalized in 2020 after a string of police killings. |
| UNC | University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill |
| JHU | Johns Hopkins University |
| ADL | Anti-Defamation League |
| WASP | White Anglo-Saxon Protestant |

HBCU

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

CHAPTER 1: CONTEXT AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

In 1940, the Council of the City of New York formed a special investigative committee dedicated to reviewing claims of racial discrimination at New York medical schools. The American Jewish Congress had been urging the Council to look into this matter for months. More and more top-performing Jewish students had been denied admission to graduate and professional schools in the state, while their white, underperforming peers had been receiving acceptance letters. After a thorough investigation in which the Council tracked the academic progress of top-performing Jewish students, the special committee released a report detailing its findings in 1946. Part of the report read:

Prior to 1920, an applicant for admission to a professional school was required merely to set forth in the application prepared by the school the following information: Name, address, age, place of birth, name of college, years in college, scholastic record and recommendations. Subsequent thereto, the information required of the applicant included a statement concerning his "religion" and "place of birth of father and mother." Thereafter was added the requirement that he furnish a photograph. Some of the schools, apparently because of criticism concerning the requirement that the applicant state his religion, substituted a question concerning the 'racial origin' of the applicant. Thereafter, this question was dropped and applicants were required to state their "mother's maiden name."

The investigation performed by the special committee of the Council of the City of New York confirmed the American Jewish Congress's fears – Jewish students were being targeted and systemically rejected during the admissions process at graduate and professional schools. The committee also found that the medical schools, in particular, had indisputably implemented strict quotas to limit the number of Jews that could be admitted in an admissions cycle. Columbia University and Cornell University were shown to have destroyed all records of applicant

rejections in the years preceding the investigation, leading the committee to believe that embedded in those records was evidence of discrimination that the universities wanted to hide.¹

Unfortunately, the story of restrictive quotas targeting Jewish applicants to medical schools does not stop in New York. The Ivy Leagues, particularly Harvard and Yale, had infamously tried to limit Jewish attendance at their medical schools, which inspired other northern medical schools to do the same. There is an expansive literature regarding the anti-Semitic quotas established at northern medical schools, but very little regarding medical schools in other parts of the country. The southern quota story has not yet been told.

Context

In 1924, the United States passed the Johnson-Reed Act, which ultimately restricted immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe. This Act set quotas that disproportionately affected Jewish immigrants, and made it extremely difficult for Jews fleeing the Holocaust to find refuge in the United States. It made permanent the National Origins Formula, which restricted immigration based on existing proportions of nationalities in the population in an attempt to preserve the ethnic distribution of the country.² The United Kingdom and other Western European nations implemented similar measures, especially during World War II. These formal quotas, while not explicitly targeting Jewish immigrants, disproportionately affected them, as the tightest restrictions were placed on Eastern European nations.³ Because these immigration quotas were implemented shortly after waves of primarily Jewish immigrants

¹ W.R. Hart, *Report of the Special Investigating Committee of the Council of the City of New York* (December 23, 1946), 76-84.

² Mae Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 27.

³ James Walvin, *Passage to Britain: Immigration in British History and Politics* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984), 122-126.

entered the United States in the late 1800s and early 1900s, they fueled nativist, anti-Semitic hysteria by implying that Jewish immigrants were a danger to the interests of the country.

The United States average citizenry was also steeped in unrelenting anti-Semitism. In a poll conducted in the country in the years leading up to Pearl Harbor, the role of national villain was placed squarely at the foot of the Jewish population, with over 60 percent of respondents indicating that Jews, above all else, were the biggest threat to the United States each year. Even the Axis Powers were deemed a less formidable foe than adherents of Judaism. Respondents justified their views by labeling Jews as “pushy,” “greedy,” “dishonest,” common tropes used by anti-Semites to describe Jewish people.⁴

College admissions committees during this period greatly favored white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) male students. While several colleges admitted women, the vast majority did not even allow women to apply. Higher education was viewed as a masculine institution, and women were still grounded in the cult of domesticity with the expectation that they would learn to be good home-makers rather than take up any intellectual pursuits. Women’s colleges, such as Salem College, had been established since the 1770s; however, many women did not attend due to societal pressures to conform to patriarchal gender roles.⁵ In addition, racial discrimination was in full force, and African Americans were largely unable to attend the same colleges as whites, with a few exceptions.⁶ Black scholars, activists, and white allies began to establish universities for Black students, now known as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), during the Reconstruction Era. The decision of the landmark 1896 Supreme Court

⁴ Frederic Cople Jaher, *Jews and the Nation: Revolution, Emancipation, State Formation, and the Liberal Paradigm in America and France* (Princeton University Press, 2003), 203.

⁵ Frances Griffin, *Less Time for Meddling: a History of Salem Academy and College, 1772-1866* (Winston-Salem, North Carolina: J.F. Blair, 1979), 112-125.

⁶ Faustine Childress Jones-Wilson et al., *Encyclopedia of African-American Education* (Wesport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1996), 339.

case, *Plessy v. Ferguson*, established the doctrine of “separate but equal,” upholding the right of states to sponsor segregation.⁷ This decision reinforced the right of universities to bar Black students from applying and motivated the creation of more HBCUs. It was exceedingly easy to get away with discriminating against women and people of color, as, at the time, these policies were so deeply rooted in American social, legal, and cultural infrastructure that they did not register to WASPs as being discriminatory. Women’s colleges and HBCUs attempted to counteract systematic discrimination, with many women’s colleges being among the first to accept non-white students and HBCUs welcoming Jewish students and professors, especially those fleeing the Holocaust. As ambitious and generous as their efforts were, however, many Jewish students were left stranded without educational opportunities, just as many of their marginalized counterparts had been.

Universities at this time also thrived in a culture of intellectual white supremacy. Whiteness was held up as a beacon of superiority, and many campus activities and program curricula revolved around white masculinity and pride. For example, on June 2, 1913, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill hosted an unveiling ceremony for the Confederate monument that would come to be known as Silent Sam, which many students attended. The dedication speech at the ceremony, given by avowed white supremacist Julian Carr, was a tribute to white nationalism, and a way of giving thanks to the University for preserving the purity of whiteness in its halls. Carr declared:

The present generation, I am persuaded, scarcely takes note of what the Confederate soldier meant to the welfare of the Anglo Saxon race during the four years immediately succeeding the war, when the facts are, that their courage and steadfastness saved the very life of the Anglo Saxon race in the South – When ‘the bottom rail was on top’ all over the Southern states, and to-day, as a consequence the purest strain of the Anglo Saxon is to be found in the 13 Southern States – Praise God.

⁷ Supreme Court of the United States, *U.S. Reports: Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537, 1895, Periodical, <https://www.loc.gov/item/usrep163537/>.

This quote was a direct reference to the attempts of Black people and poor white people shortly after the Civil War to form a biracial alliance in North Carolina to topple the white planter elite and seize political power. This was ultimately stopped by the white elites, many of whom were former Confederates that were affiliated with the University that Carr references, by turning poor white people against Black people. Carr also spoke with pride about having “horse-whipped a negro wench until her skirts hung in shreds,” after the woman allegedly insulted a white woman on the street. The woman, according to Carr, ran toward the University for protection only to find it surrounded by 100 Federal soldiers who were unsympathetic to her plight, which Carr took pride in.⁸ Many of the buildings on Chapel Hill’s campus, especially ones dedicated prior to the 1920s, are named after virulent white supremacists, likely to ignite the flames of white pride in its student body at the time of dedication. UNC-Chapel Hill’s story is one of many – Georgetown, Emory, Johns Hopkins, Duke, and Wake Forest all promoted white supremacy on their campuses, all having had buildings named after vitriolic racists and all having had their own Julian Carrs. White supremacy was, during this period, a feature of university life, not a defect.

In addition to making it harder for American Jewish doctors to find employment or study, anti-Semitic medical school quotas also made it more difficult for Jewish doctors fleeing the Holocaust to get back on their feet after arriving in America as refugees. From 1936 to 1943, Dr. Milton J. Rosenau, a Jewish epidemiologist and the founder and dean of the School of Public Health at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, corresponded with Jewish emigres, fleeing *pogroms* - violent anti-Jewish riots - and the 1935 Nuremberg laws that denied Jews many basic human rights, regarding opportunities at the medical school and elsewhere in the

⁸Julian S. Carr, “Unveiling of Confederate Monument at University. June 2, 1913” in the Julian Shakespeare Carr Papers #141, Southern Historical Collection, The Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

field. Emigrants found Rosenau to be sympathetic to their plight and often sent him letters of recommendation as well as extensive resumes and other information out of desperation to find work in America. Unfortunately, Rosenau was forced to tell Jewish refugees that there were no opportunities available as many schools implemented policies barring Jews from hire and admission.⁹

There is a gap in the historiography for southern institutions likely due to a focus on Black-white relations during the era of Jim Crow as it pertains to education. During the time Jewish quotas were established, Black students were fighting for their rights to a fair and equal education, as many southern universities denied Black students the opportunity to even apply, much less gain admission. The issue of anti-Blackness in southern universities has overshadowed the existence of Jewish quotas at southern universities. While northern universities also denied Black students entry, Jim Crow laws were a product of the South, and thus most attention is focused in that region.¹⁰ The anti-Semitic quotas at southern medical schools were not uniquely southern, but instead a neglected portion of a larger national historiography eclipsed by more notorious race relations.

Southern universities were caught in a race to live up to the standards established by northern universities. Northern universities were often considered more esteemed, especially with the establishment of the Ivy Leagues as the pinnacle of prestige. One of the ways in which southern universities attempted to better their reputations was to take in more money. Many southern institutions readily accepted Jewish students to its undergraduate programs, perhaps as

⁹ Records of the School of Public Health #40120, University Archives, The Wilson Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

¹⁰ Joy Ann Williamson-Lott, *Jim Crow Campus: Higher Education and the Struggle for a New Southern Social Order* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2018), 62.

a means of reaping their funds.¹¹ This enabled them to make money off of their Jewish students at the undergraduate level while not risking the reputations of their professional and graduate school programs, which often implemented quotas to restrict Jewish attendance. In addition, Jewish students were known, as will be shown in the coming chapters, to perform very well academically. By accepting Jewish undergraduates, southern universities took advantage of the great minds their Jewish students brought in order to boost these universities' reputations to better match the reputations of their northern counterparts.

Many of the quota systems employed by universities nationwide began to be rolled back after World War II, with the last ending in the 1960s. As discussed by Dan Oren and Jerome Karabel, it is hypothesized that northern universities ended their quotas in order not to appear callous after the atrocities of the Holocaust were more broadly exposed to the public.¹² However, due to the contentious status of Jews as a non-white race, it is possible that the Civil Rights Movement in the late 1940s to the early 1960s could have served as a motivating factor for overturning the quotas. Black Americans fought for their rights to be treated equally in an integrated society and prominent political and cultural leaders, including whites and Jews, began to use their voices to amplify the cause. Many students of all races participated in marches and formed organizations, such as the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), to assist in the movement.¹³ Universities may have begun to see that the optics of their discriminatory policies against Jews could be unappealing to brilliant minds that could help improve their reputation and bring in much needed funds. It is also possible that the passage of

¹¹ Jerry Z. Muller, *Capitalism and the Jews* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 102.

¹² Dan A. Oren, *Joining the Club: A History of Jews and Yale* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 82.; Jerome Karabel, *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*, (Boston: A Mariner Book Houghton Mifflin Company, 2014), 107.

¹³ Iwan Morgan and Philip Davies, eds., *From Sit-Ins to SNCC: The Student Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2013), 62.

the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited racial discrimination in public spaces and provided for the integration of schools, aided in changing the tide.¹⁴ Because universities were barring Jews on the basis of their perceived race, the legality of anti-Semitic quotas in schools that were slow to eliminate the policies likely became much murkier.

Why Quotas?

Universities wished to weed out “undesirable” populations from their student bodies, electing instead to draw a white, male, Protestant crowd. Schools that had large Jewish populations - such as the City College of New York, which had an 80 percent Jewish student body composition - were often branded “undesirable” as a result. The 19th-century saw a surge of immigration from Eastern Europe, a region with a large Jewish minority, into the United States. As with previous waves of immigration, native-born Americans did not welcome their new foreign neighbors with friendliness and acceptance, but rather, with xenophobia and vitriol. The creation of the anti-Semitic quotas in universities coincided with the first years that the children of the 19th-century immigrants would be entering college, meaning a new wave of Jewish undergraduates would threaten universities’ statuses as intellectual and cultural havens for white Protestant males.¹⁵ High Jewish populations, many admissions officers feared, would drive away the wealthy white Protestants that funded their universities, as they would not want to attend a “Jewish college.” Those in charge of admissions policies elected to restrict Jewish admissions so that their universities could return to its mostly homogenous make-up, extinguishing the threat too many Jews posed to their schools’ reputations.¹⁶

¹⁴ Robert D. Loevy, *The Civil Rights Act of 1964: The Passage of the Law That Ended Racial Segregation* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), 63.

¹⁵ Oren, *Joining the Club*, 106.

¹⁶ Karabel, *The Chosen*, 209-213.

It would be remiss to speak on the oppression leveraged by white supremacy on Jews without acknowledging the ways they have, themselves, benefitted from white supremacy. There have been periods over the course of American history, particularly in the South, wherein Jews were afforded conditional whiteness. Conditional whiteness refers to the status of Jews as being considered racially white rather than non-white, given that they uphold the racial hierarchy and act within the social norms of white society. A misstep could easily lead to a Jew's whiteness being stripped from them by gentiles. Contrary to popular belief, there was a sizable population of Jews in the southern United States. While many more were present in the North, Jewish communities in the South were substantial. Some of the first synagogues and Jewish congregations in the United States were founded and populated by both Sephardic and Ashkenazi Jews in Southern states such as Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia. Jews were able to enjoy the same privileges that were enjoyed by gentiles as long as they did not step out of line with white society. Intermarriage with gentiles became more and more common as time went on, signaling "full acceptance" of these Jews as whites. Deviation from the standard practices of whiteness was disastrous to the social order and thus became incredibly taboo. Many Jews felt forced to participate in racist activities lest their lives and businesses be destroyed. Jews, many of whom were merchants, depended on gentile customers to keep their businesses afloat. Jews fought for the Confederacy and for slavery because they believed that doing so was an act of self-preservation. However, once participants, slaveholding Jews enthusiastically participated in the subjugation of Black people. The participation of Jews in enslavement was nearly proportional to the participation of whites in enslavement in the South: the majority of southern Jews were slaveholders or supported the institution of slavery. Like whites, regardless of whether or not they owned enslaved people, southern Jews benefitted socially and financially

from chattel slavery. Jewish participants of white supremacy became active supporters of the Confederacy and its fight to protect slavery from the Union.¹⁷ In fact, one of the first monuments to the Confederate dead was erected by Jewish women. In addition, Judah P. Benjamin, a Jew, was considered “the brains of the Confederacy.” He was Confederate President Jefferson Davis’s right hand man and was responsible for many of the actions taken by the Confederacy.¹⁸ Another powerful Jewish Confederate was David Levy Yulee, a Floridian Confederate senator, plantation owner, and industrialist.¹⁹ Although many Jews suffered and continue to suffer under white supremacy, which is inherently embedded with anti-Semitism, it is impossible to divorce the two. Jewishness and white supremacy were not and are not mutually exclusive.

With the massive influx of Eastern European immigrants in the late 19th century, white American nativists began to fan the flames of xenophobic hysteria, claiming that the predominantly Jewish immigrant population was invading the country in an attempt to take over. This anti-Semitic hysteria reached its peak in the 1920s when the United States government passed two immigration laws - one in 1921 and the other in 1924 - that created restrictive quotas based on national origins. These laws disproportionately affected Jews, as Eastern Europe was the main target of the quotas. Anti-Semitism had already been a huge issue for the American Jewish population, as Christian teachings were largely anti-Semitic, and most Americans devotedly followed a Christian faith tradition. However, immigration quotas, as well as the anti-Semitic beliefs of prominent figures in American culture and politics, worsened already malicious prejudice. State-sponsored anti-Semitism in the form of quotas gave Americans a reason to malign Jews, and well-known anti-Semites fueled the fire. What followed was a period

¹⁷ Anton Hieke, *Jewish Identity in the Reconstruction South: Ambivalence and Adaptation* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 182-201.

¹⁸ Robert N. Rosen, *The Jewish Confederates* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), 356.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, 61.

rife with the reinforcement of anti-Semitic stereotypes, systematic discrimination against Jews, and new conversations about race in America.

Historiography

General Anti-Semitism

Leonard Dinnerstein, in his 1971 monograph, *Antisemitism in America*, gives a broad overview of anti-Semitic sentiment in the United States and pinpoints Christianity as the ultimate cause of anti-Semitism in the country. Commentary on Jews in the Bible, including several instances of Jews being referred to as “the children of the Devil,” informed centuries of anti-Semitic discrimination and genocide around the world. The American colonists brought Christian anti-Semitism with them to the Colonies, especially in the South. While Dinnerstein argued that anti-Semitism in the United States was never as vitriolic as it was in Europe, he also asserted that American anti-Semitism pervaded nearly every inch of American culture and heritage. Dinnerstein suggested that every racial group in America held anti-Semitic beliefs, particularly white Southerners and African Americans due to their affiliations with the Baptist church.²⁰

Like Dinnerstein, Robert Michael argued that the teachings of Christianity were the main contributors to American anti-Semitism in his 2005 monograph, *A Concise History of American Antisemitism*. Unlike Dinnerstein, Michael emphasized the importance of famous, elite individuals in cultivating an anti-Semitic culture in the United States. In 1918, Henry Ford, founder of the Ford Motor Company, purchased his hometown’s newspaper, *The Dearborn*

²⁰ Leonard Dinnerstein, *Antisemitism in America* (New York: Oxford University Press 1971), 126-139.

Independent, and transformed it into one of the loudest broadcasters of anti-Semitic hysteria in the country. Every week, Ford published articles about Jews' "evil schemes" against America, along with "evidence" proving his claims. *The Dearborn Independent* focused on the elevated status of Jews in spite of their inferior status in the States, using their preeminence in the fields of business, medicine, and other important and elite fields as proof that Jews were part of a new world order that aimed to control all non-Jews while enjoying great wealth. Some of the most popular and hostile articles were compiled into a set of booklets called *The International Jew*. While the newspaper and booklets were published in Dearborn, Michigan and distributed in Ford's factories, most of which were located in the North and the Midwest, the paper was sold across the country, and its stances were disseminated throughout the country. The paper was also credited with inspiring several Nazi leaders, including Baldur von Schirach and Adolf Hitler, himself, to execute the Holocaust.²¹

Rhetoric such as Ford's contributed to the anti-Semitic stereotype that Jews rose to prominence in order to take control of the world. Ford inspired another famous anti-Semite, Reverend Charles E. Coughlin (known primarily as Father Coughlin), to use his massive platform to spread anti-Semitic propaganda. In the late 1920s, Father Coughlin established a popular radio show to discuss politics. In 1930 the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) picked up the show for national broadcast, and Coughlin soon amassed over thirty-million listeners. In the late 1930s, prior to the start of World War II in 1939, Coughlin began to use his broadcast to attack Jews and show support for Adolf Hitler's hatred of Jews and violent pogroms.²² Like Ford

²¹ Robert Michael, *A Concise History of American Antisemitism* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield 2005), 72-80.

²² *Ibid*, 112-114.

and other preeminent anti-Semites, Coughlin was able to infiltrate an already prejudiced nationwide audience and fuel anti-Semitic hysteria.

Focusing on the anti-Semitic views of individuals who, for the most part, were famous for other accomplishments is new to the historiography. Early historians on the topic, like Dinnerstein, focused primarily on the religious aspects of anti-Semitism rather than doing an in-depth analysis on the individuals who created a culture that allowed anti-Semitism to spread.

Discrimination in Higher Education

Leon Solokoff, medical historian and professor of pathology at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, wrote an essay in 1992 analyzing the use of informal quotas to restrict the number of Jews attending medical school.²³ This was an article published in an academic journal rather than a monograph, but is the only major piece of research published that focused solely on anti-Semitic quotas in medical schools and is the closest to presenting a definitive history on the quotas. He pinpointed a few institutions, such as the Ivy Leagues and several universities in New York state, that were particularly infamous for their restrictive quotas. He mainly described statistics about the quotas, as well as the legal battles that ensued. The main lawsuit against quotas that he discussed came in 1945 in New York City, put forth by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise against Columbia University. Wise believed that the New York City Tax Commission was obligated to cancel Columbia's tax-exempt status due to allegations that Columbia's College of Physicians and Surgeons discriminated against Jewish students. The New York State Supreme Court heard the case, and ruled against Wise because he was not a victim in

²³ Leon Sokoloff, "The Rise and Decline of the Jewish Quota in Medical School Admissions," *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 68, no.4 (1992), 499.

the case and therefore was not qualified to be a plaintiff. Although the complaint was rejected, it spurred proposals for legislation in the Northeast, which Solokoff details further in his piece.²⁴

Some monographs that focus on discrimination in higher education at large briefly mention anti-Semitic quotas in medical schools. Dan A. Oren presented Yale's anti-Semitic past through the voices of Jewish students who enrolled at the university in *Joining the Club: A History of the Jews at Yale*.²⁵ These interviews revealed that Yale's anti-Semitic discrimination ran deep through the institution, resulting in precise quotas that extended from the liberal arts college to the medical school. Jews who were accepted, Oren argued, had to work twice as hard as their white, Protestant counterparts to even have a chance at acceptance. Oren went as far as to suggest that Jews were more heavily discriminated against than blacks or Catholics, citing admissions statistics and enrollment numbers. Jews were labeled "untouchables" by both the student body and faculty, leading to Jewish students' exclusion from on-campus organizations, such as fraternities, athletics, and clubs. Oren explicitly linked the anti-Semitic quotas to discrimination in hiring faculty, as Jewish professionals were excluded from positions in Yale's faculty even when overqualified and having extraordinary recommendations. However, in typical fashion, Jews were not altogether barred from hire - Milton Winternitz, a Jew, was selected as the Dean for Yale Medical School in 1920.²⁶ The hiring of Winternitz was likely a tactic Yale used in order to deflect any criticism or accusations of anti-Semitic discrimination. Winternitz likely served as a token Jew to protect the University's reputation. Oren argued that Yale's Medical School in particular suffered under anti-Semitic quotas in the 1940s and 50s, as some of

²⁴ Ibid, 510.

²⁵ Dan A. Oren, *Joining the Club: A History of Jews and Yale* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 106.

²⁶ Winternitz's role as a token Jew hire was similar to Milton J. Rosenau's role as a token Jew hire at UNC.

the most brilliant Jewish minds in medicine were barred from admission simply due to their ethnoreligious status.²⁷

Similarly, Jerome Karabel, in his monograph *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*, analyzed the processes and details behind discrimination in the admissions processes at the three most well-known Ivy League universities in the country - Harvard, Yale, and Princeton.²⁸ Karabel singled out Harvard as having been a center for anti-Semitic exclusion. A. Lawrence Lowell, the president of Harvard University from 1909 to 1933, proposed a quota restricting Jewish admissions to only fifteen percent of the entering class in 1922 after Jewish enrollment soared from six percent of the student body in 1908 to twenty-two percent of the student body in 1922. This swell of Jews in the student body was likely due to the surge of Eastern European immigrants in the late nineteenth century, as the children born of these immigrants would have reached college-age at the time. Lowell feared that the rising Jewish population at Harvard would deter wealthy white elites from sending their children, and their money, to the university. His original plan to implement a quota failed after being exposed by the *Boston Post* and drew immediate disapproval from the Jewish communities in Boston and New York. Harvard's Committee on Admissions was intimidated enough to reject Lowell's proposal. Lowell circumvented the Committee on Admissions' initial decision in 1926 by creating coded questions on admissions applications that would determine, with some accuracy, whether or not an applicant was Jewish. These included questions about the origins of family members and the applicant's personal values. The Committee on Admissions approved the addition of these questions, and created a

²⁷ Ibid, 263-345.

²⁸ Jerome Karabel, *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton* (Boston: A Mariner Book Houghton Mifflin Company, 2014), 209-213.

new policy requiring passport-sized photographs to be attached to applications, as well as a policy that favored legacies. These policies were subtle enough to not be deemed discriminatory, which is why the Committee on Admissions gave their approval. Yet the goal of their implementation was explicitly to identify possible Jewish applicants via stereotypical physical and character traits.

Favoring legacies guaranteed that every newly admitted freshman class would be predominantly Protestant, as most alumni of Harvard were. The new policies were successful in restricting Jewish attendance at Harvard and ultimately decreased the Jewish population from twenty-two percent of the student body to just ten percent in 1933. Similar tactics were used at Yale University, Karabel argued, to keep the Jews from driving away potential donors and the children of the wealthy. Karabel echoed David Oren in his analysis of discrimination at Yale, using *Joining the Club* as a reference for his analyses. Karabel, like Oren, concluded that Yale Medical School, and the medical community as a whole, were worse off as a result of the quotas hindering exceptional prospective Jewish doctors from completing their education.²⁹

The analysis of anti-Semitic discrimination in higher education has a rather sparse source base, with Sokoloff, Oren and Karabel's works being three of the only ones to focus mainly on the Jewish experience. Published twenty years after *Joining the Club*, Karabel's *The Chosen* expands on Oren's work, analyzing institutional discrimination against Jews in three universities rather than focusing on one as a case study. Karabel painted a larger picture about systematic anti-Semitism, as well as postulated that this discrimination was later used as a basis for the "meritocracy" that exists in the admissions process today. Oren's arguments were restricted to Yale, while Karabel's arguments were broad enough to cover the university system as a whole.

²⁹ Ibid, 126-157.

Anti-Semitic Immigration Quotas

Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America by Mae Ngai placed the creation of the idea of the “illegal alien” squarely at the foot of the 1924 Johnson-Reed Act.³⁰ Although the monograph focused on Asian immigration, Ngai discussed the plight of Jewish immigrants briefly, stating that Jews were disproportionately affected by the quotas set to restrict European immigration. Because the Act set quotas based on population, only about one hundred immigrants were permitted to enter the US from each Eastern European country. Many of these countries were predominantly Jewish and had small populations when compared to the rest of Europe. Ngai argued that the quotas were purposely created with population-based restrictions in order to slow the flow of undesirable immigrants, both Jewish and Asian, into the country.

Ngai also argued that the Act redefined American racial boundaries. Unwanted groups of immigrants that had previously been considered white were suddenly not considered white after the passing of the Act. Jews in the United States had always existed on the fringe of whiteness, Ngai argued, but the Johnson-Reed Act added uncertainty to the racial classification of Jews. The racial ambiguity of American Jews is important for understanding the implementation of anti-Semitic quotas, as many universities wished to preserve the whiteness of their student bodies while also keeping Jews at bay. The de-facto classification of Jews as non-whites, as described by Ngai, gave admissions officers another good reason to discriminate against Jews instead of relying solely on anti-Semitic tropes as justification for the quotas.³¹ Discrimination against people of color was easier to justify than discrimination against Jews because American laws

³⁰ Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*, 27.

³¹ *Ibid*, 138-190.

codified racial discrimination, but generally prohibited religious discrimination due to the protections enshrined in the First Amendment of the Constitution.

Maddalena Marinari, Madeline Hsu, and Maria Cristina Garcia, editors of *A Nation of Immigrants Reconsidered: US Society in an Age of Restriction, 1924-1965*, argued that the militant enforcement of the Johnson-Reed Act was directly responsible for the United States' refusal of thousands of Jewish refugees fleeing the Third Reich.³² Much like the victims of the anti-Semitic quotas implemented in universities, it took Herculean accomplishment for Jewish refugees to be accepted into the US under immigration quotas. For example, Jews like Hans Bethe, Albert Einstein, and Edward Teller possessed indispensable scientific knowledge that the United States could potentially utilize, which would aid the country's aims to maintain world supremacy. Their potential contributions to the US in the realm of science outweighed their Jewishness, which is why they were allowed to enter while average Jews were not. Even when quota spaces were available, US officials would turn away refugees, supposedly out of fear that allowing Jewish refugees in would bring spies and saboteurs into the country.

However, the US government's intentions became clear when congressmen blocked a vote on the Wagner-Rogers bill, which would have allowed 20,000 Jewish refugee children entry. The bill was introduced in 1939 as a direct response to the horrific Kristallnacht attacks in Germany. Citing Ngai's *Impossible Subjects*, Marinari, Hsu, and Garcia argued that the bill's blockage was indicative of the United States government's anti-Semitic attitude in the years preceding the Holocaust - the same attitude that inspired the Johnson-Reed Act in 1924. The aforementioned Leon Sokoloff argued that the immigration quotas that Marinari, Hsu, and

³² Maddalena Marinari, Madeline Hsu, and Maria Cristina Garcia, eds, *Nation of Immigrants Reconsidered: US Society in an Age of Restriction* (University of Illinois Press, 2018), 248-257.

Garcia discussed helped fuel anti-Semitic sentiment in the country, which, in turn, contributed to the implementation of the quotas.³³

Race

As insinuated by Marinari, Hsu, and Garcia, Jews were also sorted into a gray racial category, not quite white but not quite Black, the two major racial categories in the country at the time. Matthew Jacobson wrote about this “racial otherness” in his 1998 monograph, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Jacobson argued that, until the mid-20th Century, European immigrants were separated into distinct racial categories rather than being sorted into ethnic groups. He asserted that any European that was not Anglo-Saxon had their own race, and, as such, Jews were a race entirely separate from white people and Black people. Jews had to “earn” their whiteness by properly assimilating into white culture, economics, and politics, which was not accomplished until after World War II. However, because Jews are an ethnoreligious group or, at this time, a racial religious group, there was a lot of gray area in terms of discrimination. While others have discussed the in-between racial status of Jews during this time period, they reinforce Jacobson’s arguments and focus on other groups, discussing Jews very briefly. Jacobson’s work is considered the authority on this particular aspect of the historiography of anti-Semitism, which includes works by David Roediger and Thomas A. Guglielmo.³⁴ Universities that implemented quotas took advantage of the racial otherness of Jews, including questions of racial identity in application forms that included “Jew” as a race.

³³ Ibid, 267-275.

³⁴ Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003) 166-178.

This thesis will discuss the advent of anti-Semitic quotas at some of the premier medical schools on the east coast of the southern United States and will analyze the role of white supremacy in the imposition of quota systems in the South, how Jewish students responded to anti-Semitic admissions policies, and how the quotas were carried out.. The selected universities were chosen due to their prestige and wealth of source material. The sources researched were primarily university documents, consisting of personal papers, admissions records, correspondence, and student statistics. Other sources include newspapers, government records, and first-hand accounts recorded in books. These sources were thoroughly analyzed to develop a narrative of events for each university. The second chapter of this thesis covers the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Georgetown, where students were able to successfully confront the quotas established at the medical schools. The third chapter discusses how the quota systems were often implemented in a surreptitious manner, particularly at Emory University, Johns Hopkins University, Duke University, and Wake Forest College. The secretive nature of the quotas resulted in debates about whether or not quotas had actually been implemented at these universities. A former student at Emory University was able to expose the quotas and other anti-Semitic policies at the dental school decades after falling victim to them, but the status of the other schools remains a mystery. The final chapter analyzes the effects of the quotas and how Jews reacted to and resisted these policies outside of academia, and concludes with the findings of this research.

CHAPTER TWO: RESISTANCE AND CONFRONTATION AT UNC AND GEORGETOWN

Despite the quotas at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) and Georgetown being typical for medical schools of their prestige, the aftermath was anything but. Two quota victims from these universities would go on to confront the deans of the medical schools and demand answers, disrupting the system and claiming victory over systemic anti-Semitism. In the case of UNC, the quotas were overturned completely. These two stories are unique in that no other southern schools faced such direct resistance to their quotas. White supremacy was embedded into the administrative and student culture at each university, forming the framework for university officials to establish the quotas with little backlash expected. However, these officials did not account for students like Morris Krasny or Marvin Lillian.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Morris Krasny

In 1933, a Jewish student named Morris Krasny received his second admissions denial from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Medicine. Krasny was immediately suspicious, as he believed he had no reason to be denied admission twice. Believing anti-Semitic discrimination had played a role in his denial, Krasny sought the counsel of a well-known Durham attorney, Reuben Oscar Everett.³⁵ Everett was a highly respected lawyer, taking on the roles of president of the Durham Bar Association, senior member of the North Carolina Bar Association and American Bar Association, representative in the State House of Representatives for five terms from 1921 to 1933, and member of the UNC Board of Trustees for

³⁵ Edward C. Halperin, "Frank Porter Graham, Isaac Hall Manning, and the Jewish Quota at the University of North Carolina Medical School," *The North Carolina Historical Review* 67, no. 4 (1990): 394.

twenty years. Although he was a devoted Episcopalian and UNC alumnus, Everett agreed to help Krasny appeal his denial and demand fair treatment.³⁶

Shortly after he took on Krasny's case, Everett appealed to the Dean of UNC's School of Medicine, Isaac Manning, to reverse Krasny's admission decision. However, this effort failed. After his appeal fell through, Krasny met with a group of UNC alumni living in Durham and asked that they vouch for his admittance, hoping that the approval of UNC alumni, an important group of donors, would sway Manning to reverse his admission decision and allow him to enroll in the medical school. The alumni wrote Krasny a letter of support and signed a petition declaring that Krasny should be allowed entry. Krasny sent this letter and petition to UNC President Frank Porter Graham. Graham was known to be progressive when compared to other UNC administrators. Krasny believed that Graham, as president of the University, could take matters into his own hands and finally allow Krasny to enroll. When Graham received the letter and petition, he called for Krasny and Manning to meet in his office to have a discussion about the matter.³⁷

According to newspaper reports, during the meeting Manning admitted to enacting a quota directly targeting Jewish applicants to the School of Medicine. The quotas restricted Jewish attendance to ten percent, which, according to those familiar with the medical school enrollment numbers, meant only four Jews were admitted in 1933.³⁸ Manning claimed that he had "no prejudice against Jews as such," but defended the implementation of the quota.³⁹ In the

³⁶ Diary 1923-1929, R. O. (Reuben Oscar) Everett Papers, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Duke University; Diary 1930-1936, R. O. (Reuben Oscar) Everett Papers, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Duke University.

³⁷ Halperin, "Frank Porter Graham, Isaac Hall Manning, and the Jewish Quota at the University of North Carolina Medical School," 395. Everett was known to be a friend to the Durham Jewish community, defending Jews against anti-Semitism and making a sizable donation to the construction of Beth El Synagogue in 1921.

³⁸ Halperin, "Frank Porter Graham, Isaac Hall Manning, and the Jewish Quota at the University of North Carolina Medical School," 390.

³⁹ Ibid, 392-393.

1930s, UNC's School of Medicine only offered a two-year course, after which medical students were transferred to other universities to finish their degrees.⁴⁰ Manning argued that he had trouble placing Jewish medical students in programs at other universities, and thus had to establish a quota to prevent Jews from being rejected and left with only partially completed degrees. Graham vehemently disagreed with the policy, maintaining that he believed the quotas to be discriminatory and that there was not to be "racial discrimination in the admission of students to the University."⁴¹ After this meeting, Manning and Graham took their disagreement to the public stage.

The battle between Isaac Manning and Frank Porter Graham rocked the University and sent shockwaves through the nation's many alumni groups. Newspapers from across the country covered the story. Students of Manning's, both prior and current, spoke out against claims that Manning was anti-Semitic. One notable argument in favor of Manning was that Manning's brother, Dr. John M. Manning, treated Jews, and therefore Isaac Manning could not be anti-Semitic. Faculty and alumni groups argued that even if Manning *was* anti-Semitic, he was such a prolific physician from such a distinguished white family that "attacking" him was unacceptable. Even several Jewish alumni from the School of Medicine threw their support behind Manning, with one calling him "a man of great honesty and character."⁴² In addition to the claims that Manning was not capable of being anti-Semitic, many of Manning's defenders relied on anti-Semitic arguments to justify the quotas. The argument which gained the most traction was that Manning's admissions policies to restrict Jewish attendance was protected by "academic

⁴⁰ "Good for Frank Graham." *Statesville Record and Landmark*, October 3, 1933.

⁴¹ Halperin, "Frank Porter Graham, Isaac Hall Manning, and the Jewish Quota at the University of North Carolina Medical School," 396.

⁴² Leonard Rogoff, *Homelands: Southern Jewish Identity in Durham and Chapel Hill, North Carolina* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2001), 160.

freedom.” In short, they argued, Manning was allowed to prevent Jews from attending to protect white students from Jewish students. These same supporters also argued that excluding Jews was “a matter of professional standards,” implying that Jewish doctors lacked professionalism and would harm the reputation of UNC.⁴³ The basis for this claim is unclear, but it likely stemmed from white supremacist biases in regards to professional standards.

Frank Porter Graham’s defenders included many Jewish groups and individuals, but these supporters were not as vocal as Manning’s supporters. Graham ultimately decided to reverse Manning’s decision and admit Krasny, saying, “I will have to overrule you [Manning], and the young man will be admitted to your school.” As a result, Manning resigned as the Dean of the School of Medicine, but remained on the faculty.⁴⁴ Graham’s decision drew support from Jewish groups and individuals, as well as non-Jews. An unknown writer for the *Statesville Record and Landmark* approvingly reported on the decision:

The university head very properly took the position that the discrimination was not justified, that the university must admit any qualified student not barred by law. And that was the only sound position he could take, as a matter of justice and right as well as law. That a State educational institution, supported by public taxation, would undertake to discriminate among the white race on the basis of religious and racial prejudices is unthinkable... We don’t want any Hitlerism in North Carolina or anything approaching it.⁴⁵

It is especially interesting that the writer implied that Jews were part of the “white race,” as many considered Jews to be of their own “Jewish race.” In fact, neither Graham nor Manning believed Krasny to be white, as Graham believed Krasny was a victim of racial discrimination and Manning wrote in his memoirs that Krasny had “married a member of his own race [a Jewish woman] in Durham.” The fact that the writer viewed Jews as being part of the “white race”

⁴³ Ibid, 161.

⁴⁴ Halperin, “Frank Porter Graham, Isaac Hall Manning, and the Jewish Quota at the University of North Carolina Medical School,” 399.

⁴⁵ “Good for Frank Graham,” 12.

presented a conundrum: if the writer had not viewed Jews as being white, would the writer still have applauded Graham's decision?⁴⁶ It is also notable that the writer invoked the name of Hitler, as this article was written in early October of 1933, just a few months after German law restricted the number of Jews that were able to attend universities, with several local laws banning Jews from attending medical school altogether.⁴⁷ Referring to Nazi anti-Semitism to defend Jewish students was a common trend among Graham's supporters. In a letter to Graham, E.J. Evans, a former student, praised the decision to admit Krasny, writing, "You have earned the undying respect and admiration of millions of Jews throughout the nation... At a time like this when Hitler and Nazis have ground under their heels the lives and hopes of... people whose only wrong was their Jewish blood, your action brings a breath of joy to despairing people."⁴⁸ Evans thanked Graham on behalf of all Jews, citing Hitler's reign as a source of anxiety in the Jewish community that was temporarily alleviated by Graham's benevolence.

However, President Graham's ruling drew ire from the university community. On September 30, 1933, UNC's student newspaper, *The Daily Tar Heel* (DTH), published a front-page report on the circumstances surrounding Manning's resignation, as well as an editorial about the situation. Prior to these pieces, the DTH had not reported on Krasny's case or the brewing fight between Graham and Manning, and had written favorably about both men in regards to other matters. However, Graham and Manning's public disagreement about Jewish quotas changed this sentiment. In an editorial titled "Regarding Manning's Resignation," the editor of the DTH essentially absolved Manning of any wrongdoing in the case. The editorial

⁴⁶ The fact that the writer of the *Statesville Record and Landmark* quote believed that Jews were white rather than people of color was unusual for 1933. Please see page 5 of the historiography section for more information.

⁴⁷ "Law Limits Jews in Public Schools," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum), accessed July 29, 2020, <https://www.ushmm.org/learn/timeline-of-events/1933-1938/law-limits-jews-in-public-schools>.

⁴⁸ E.J. Evans to Frank Porter Graham, October 6, 1933, Frank Porter Graham Papers #1819, Southern Historical Collection, The Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

summed up what was assumed to be the general sentiment of UNC students, alumni, and faculty toward the case and toward Manning's resignation. The editor wrote:

Racial discrimination and other charges will be hurled against the administration and against Dr. Manning himself by those who are narrow-minded enough to overlook the true and underlying facts of the case. It is a national situation and not a local one. Universities all over the country refuse to take Jewish medical students beyond a certain number... In the present situation Dean Manning simply followed the policy he has adhered to unswervingly for the past 28 years... The resignation of Dr. Manning is simply an example of a man's devotion to his principles and ideals. Nothing personal caused him to reject any student, simply his love for the medical school and his desire to maintain its high standing.⁴⁹

The author of this quote attempted to discredit Manning's opponents by declaring that they were too "narrow-minded" to comprehend the situation and had only a surface-level understanding of the circumstances that led Manning to establish Jewish admissions quotas. By directly denouncing those who were accusing Manning of racial discrimination and anti-Semitism, the writer of this piece implied that President Graham was too obstinate to judge the case. The editor also used the fact that Jewish admissions quotas were a nationwide phenomenon to justify their implementation at UNC, insinuating that UNC *had* to have their own to fit in with the trend and maintain their status as an elite university.

Even in what was meant to be the straight reporting of the ordeal, the DTH clearly favored Manning and the implementation of the quotas in an article printed on the same day as the quote above. The author of the report wrote:

The number of Jewish boys to be allowed for this year had been filled when another application was received by Dr. Manning early in the summer. The applicant, who had also applied last year when the number had been set, was informed of the situation and told to return later in the summer so that he might take advantage of any opening that could possibly have appeared. When he returned, Manning informed him that none of the original applicants had dropped out and that it would be impossible for the medical school to accept his application... Dr. Manning, because of the policy which he has observed for the past 28 years, felt that his resignation was the only answer [to Graham admitting Krasny]. Under the former Dean's guidance, the University medical school has

⁴⁹ "Regarding Manning's Resignation," The Daily Tar Heel, September 30, 1933.

come to be regarded as one of the best two year medical schools in the country. The fact that any members of the school who cannot be placed in other colleges after their work here, lower the rating of the school is the prime reason for Dr. Manning's refusal to accept an additional Jewish student. He has always judiciously guarded entrance requirements, that the school may be assured of high quality work.⁵⁰

Much like the editor, the author of this report faithfully defended Manning on the basis of his accomplishments for the University and shut down any possibility that Manning's quotas were due to anti-Semitic dogma. The quotas were instead portrayed by the DTH as a valiant effort by Manning to protect the caliber of the University. Both the author of this report and the editor who wrote the aforementioned editorial focused on Manning's achievements as Dean of the School of Medicine rather than on the case itself, painting a picture of Manning as a heroic figure without whom the medical school would not have flourished and whose policies did not deserve criticism. Despite the defense of Manning, Krasny's public confrontation of the anti-Semitic quotas present at UNC led to the resignation of the prominent Manning, which effectively ended the implementation of the quotas.

White Supremacy and Anti-Semitism at UNC-Chapel Hill

Although it may be true that Manning was attempting to protect UNC's rating when implementing the quota, evidence points toward anti-Semitic and often white supremacist beliefs as an underlying motivation. In an unpublished memoir written in 1940, Manning wrote about the Krasny incident in a manner that contradicted his defenders' insistence that he was not anti-Semitic. In regards to quotas restricting Jewish medical school attendance in general, Manning wrote, "The problem of the Jewish student had become a serious one for all medical schools in the country. Shortly after the World War (WWI) large numbers were applying for admission -

⁵⁰ "Dr. Isaac H. Manning Resigns," The Daily Tar Heel, September 30, 1933.

enough as a matter of fact to practically swamp the schools.”⁵¹ The allegation that Jews would “swamp the schools” was a belief that many administrative elites in universities held. While it was true that many more Jews were applying for college at the end of World War I as a result of their parents immigrating to the United States from Eastern Europe at the end of the nineteenth century, the idea that Jews would “swamp” and suffocate schools was a result of the anti-Semitic canard that Jews were working toward world domination. This, along with suggesting that Jews were a “serious problem” for medical schools, hinted that Manning held a common anti-Semitic and white supremacist belief that Jews would essentially outnumber whites and deprive whites from receiving an education.

While Manning’s general anti-Semitic sentiments could have offered a glimpse into Manning’s motive for creating the quotas, his thoughts about UNC Medical School’s Jewish problem were even more illuminating. He wrote:

A considerable number had entered the college of the University, registering in the pre-medical courses in the hope of ultimately getting into the Medical School. Many of them were exceedingly objectionable students. Very few were North Carolinians and in no instance had a North Carolina Jewish student been refused admission to the Medical School if he met the entrance requirements. There was no prejudice against the Jews as such in the Medical School.⁵²

Manning claimed in his memoir that anti-Semitism did not play a role in the establishment of the quotas and was not present in the culture of the medical school, and instead attributed the quotas to the threat to UNC’s rating. However, he contradicted this by calling Jewish students “exceedingly objectionable,” and on page 151, a few pages after this section, he called Jews “undesirable students.” His aforementioned belief that Jews would “swamp” the school also shows that anti-Semitism did, in fact, exist in the medical school. Considering that Manning,

⁵¹ Isaac H. Manning, Volume 1, Isaac Hall Manning's History of the U.N.C. School of Medicine, 1879-1937; 1940 #4369, Southern Historical Collection, The Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 146.

⁵² Ibid, 146-151.

himself, created the quota policy, it is likely that the sentiments he expressed in his memoirs influenced his decision to limit Jewish attendance. He also later added that Jews needed to be accepted in pairs because “...in several of the laboratories the students worked together in couples and only rarely would a Jew and a Gentile work at the same table.”⁵³ This, again, contradicts his claim that “there was no prejudice against the Jews” at UNC’s medical school. Manning admitted that whites refused to work with Jews in classes, underscoring the culture of anti-Semitism that was, contrary to Manning’s claims, present in the medical school.

The overall culture on UNC’s campus was also rife with white supremacy. Although not explicitly anti-Semitic, one of the best examples of UNC’s white supremacist culture was the aforementioned dedication ceremony for Silent Sam. On June 2, 1913, UNC-Chapel Hill hosted an unveiling ceremony for the Confederate monument that would come to be known as Silent Sam. As discussed in Chapter 1, Julian Carr was invited to give the dedication speech at the unveiling, and the speech was filled with white supremacist sentiment. Although Carr’s speech does not directly target Jews, his focus on the “welfare of the Anglo Saxon race” and glorification of “the purest strain of the Anglo Saxon” points to the same kind of white supremacist sentiment that served as the motivation behind anti-Semitic admissions quotas.⁵⁷ Silent Sam served as a symbol of the University’s commitment to uplifting the Anglo-Saxon race while dehumanizing and committing acts of violence against people of color. The goal of Silent Sam was to ignite the flames of white pride in UNC’s student body at the time of dedication and for decades to follow, and likely played a role in the anti-Semitism and white supremacy that was potent on campus when Jewish quotas were enacted in the 1930s.

⁵³ Ibid, 146-147.

⁵⁷ Carr, “Unveiling of Confederate Monument at University. June 2, 1913.”

White Supremacy and Anti-Semitism at Georgetown

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill was far from being the only Southern university to implement anti-Semitic quotas with ties to white supremacy and anti-Semitism. Georgetown historian Robert Emmett Curran discussed student demography and the path to Jewish quotas at Georgetown in the 1930s, during a period when Georgetown attempted to “Catholicize” administration, faculty, and students. The Jesuits, a Catholic organization, appointed a Superior General to oversee Georgetown’s operations since the Jesuits first established the college in 1789, lending it the label of a Catholic university. However, as time went on, the Catholic influence within Georgetown began to wane. Wlodimir Lédochowski, the Superior General of the Jesuits in the 1930s, sought to prioritize Catholicism and accordingly issued a letter to regional Superiors pressing Georgetown to maintain a heavily Catholic administration and faculty. Lédochowski’s letter led to attempts by Catholic administrators to oust non-Catholic heads of departments at the medical school, such as the surgery and obstetrics departments. However, not many Catholics were available to head departments, so Catholics remained in what Curran deemed a “distinct minority.” Only one-third of research and teaching positions in the medical school faculty were maintained by Catholics.⁵⁸

Despite the lack of Catholic department heads, the student composition at Georgetown became more heavily Catholic at the beginning of the 1930s. University officials maintained a majority-Catholic student body throughout the decade as a result of Catholicization efforts. Most of the students attending the medical school had completed their undergraduate work at Catholic universities, either at Georgetown or in the Middle Atlantic region, an area with large numbers of

⁵⁸ Robert Emmett Curran, *A History of Georgetown University, Vol. 2: The Quest for Excellence, 1889-1964* (Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press, 2010), 166.

Catholics. Catholic students accounted for more than sixty percent of Georgetown's student population on any given year in the 1930s, according to Curran.⁵⁹

Like UNC-Chapel Hill, Georgetown also harbored a culture of white supremacy and anti-Semitism. This is exemplified by a 1932 letter from Martin O'Nolan, an Irish Catholic medical student, to Father John Gipprick, Regent⁶⁰ of the Georgetown Medical School. In the letter, O'Nolan called Judaism a "profound privation of ethics, moral and social," and alleged that two professors in the medical school, at least one of whom was Jewish, were using their religion to harm Catholic students and faculty. O'Nolan wrote:

We anticipated a Christian, if not a Catholic environment; we expected to find strict ethical principles prevailing in a Jesuit medical school; we expected to hear everywhere proclaimed the rules of sound Christian morality; we anticipated that Jesuit authority had a decided ascendancy over the actions of the faculty, and as a result of that ascendancy, we expected to feel that influence directing our lives and minds. The Church has taught us the true significance of truth and the meaning of true liberty, and in so doing gave us a proper place in society, but this human right, given to us by the Church, is being taken away from us by the dishonest and unethical practices of some members of the medical faculty who are out of sympathy with Catholic philosophy.⁶¹

O'Nolan detailed what he believed to be the purpose of the Georgetown medical school — to provide Catholic students with a Christian, if not solidly Catholic, environment and education. But he alleged that his expectations were not met due to "some members of the medical faculty" who were neither Catholic nor Christian. He went on to accuse the medical school physiologist — likely Dr. Jacob Markowitz, a Jewish professor of physiology in 1932⁶² — of spreading anti-Catholic philosophy. O'Nolan said he was "subjected to the grossest and most unethical system

⁵⁹ Curran, *A History of Georgetown University*, 166-168.

⁶⁰ The position of Regent at Georgetown was a similar position to Dean at other universities.

⁶¹ Letter from Martin O'Nolan to Father John Gipprick S.J., 12 May 1932, TN: 6268, Box 83, Addenda to Archives of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus 1914-1945, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Georgetown University Archives, Georgetown, Washington, D.C., 1.

⁶² Curran, *A History of Georgetown University*, 274. Markowitz is mentioned as being a physiologist at the School of Medicine in the 1930s.

of grilling” by Markowitz, and that Markowitz had “deplorable deficiency in moral training and is certainly not conducive to the good morals of a student” and fostered an anti-Christian spirit, which was “eating away the Catholic sensibilities” of the medical school.⁶³

O’Nolan further denounced Markowitz as being “morally unfitted to occupy a responsible chair in a Catholic medical school.” This was because, in a class of 150 students, he purportedly advocated “behaviourism” — a theory in psychology and physiology that, in the mind of many Christians, denied the existence of the soul and was inherently anti-Christian. Markowitz also allegedly investigated the “professional, the moral, and private life” of another faculty member via another student. These particular accusations fell in line with anti-Semitic canards that allege that Jews are incapable of being loyal to any person, nation, or institution that is not Jewish.⁶⁴

Later in the letter, O’Nolan moved on from Markowitz and accused the bacteriologist, whose name is unknown, of being dishonest and prejudiced. He claimed that the professor refused to mark final exam papers correctly and purposely gave students low grades if the students were “not of the same race as himself.” O’Nolan also accused the bacteriologist of dishonestly selling Georgetown property, perpetuating the anti-Semitic stereotype that Jews were fraudulent and profiteering.⁶⁵

While O’Nolan focused on denigrating individual non-Christians in his letter, he also targeted non-Christians as a whole, particularly Jews. He accused Jews of dishonesty, partiality, racial prejudice, lies, rumors, and “blackguardly” or deceptive practices, and asserted that those things affected Catholic students more than non-Catholic students. O’Nolan wrote, “We are

⁶³ Letter from Martin O’Nolan to Father John Gipprick S.J., 12 May 1932, 1.

⁶⁴ Ibid, 2.

⁶⁵ Ibid, 3.

powerless to restrain those who are inclined to indulge their cruelty and passions; we are at the mercy of Jews, pagans, and Freemasons.”⁶⁶ This insistence that Jews in particular wielded an unprecedented, dangerous power against Christians was a common anti-Semitic trope pushed by white supremacists.

O’Nolan also believed Georgetown itself was perpetuating un-Catholic ideas. In his letter, he accused the university of giving “ascendency” to “un-Christian and ungodly” faculty, meaning that O’Nolan believed the university was handing out faculty appointments and promotions to non-Catholics who did not deserve them. O’Nolan declared these appointments the root cause of unspecified problems at Georgetown. These men were “immune to Jesuit authority” and were “slowly breaking down our moral defense.” He wrote, “[t]he student is at the mercy of prejudiced, dishonest and anti-Christian men,” and asserted that Christian morality was no longer regulating Georgetown and that Christian ideas were dying under “toxic [un-Christian] influences.”⁶⁷ The threat of cultural and religious destruction by Jews was a common fear-mongering tactic utilized by white supremacists to demonize Jews.

O’Nolan condemned the “anti-Catholic and un-Christian system which prevails in our school,” and accused Markowitz and the bacteriologist of defeating the purposes of the medical school and threatening Catholic students. O’Nolan pleaded for Gipprick to get rid of the offending professors. He claimed that they were “incapable of influencing toward good, therefore their influence must be bad,” that “[h]ardness of heart has become the patrimony of the school,” and insisted that many of his peers in the medical school felt similarly and would co-

⁶⁶ Ibid, 1-2.

⁶⁷ Ibid, 3.

sign the letter in spirit. To close out the letter, he called the un-Christian men a “regime,”⁶⁸ referring to the anti-Semitic canard that Jews strive for world domination.

Two months after his initial letter, O’Nolan wrote to Father Phillips, a Georgetown administrator, saying he was returning to Wexford, Ireland, because his first letter had earned him the “enmity” of the faculty he accused.⁶⁹ Phillips responded, saying he disapproved of the activities O’Nolan accused the offending faculty of carrying out and would investigate.⁷⁰ It is unknown if an investigation was executed by Phillips, and a lack of later records about the matter and O’Nolan’s second letter discussing his move back to Ireland indicated that the professors in question were not punished by the University. Despite Georgetown’s inaction on what were likely baseless claims, O’Nolan’s first letter highlighted the anti-Semitic sentiments of white Catholic students in Georgetown Medical School toward Jews as well as prejudice toward non-Catholics. While O’Nolan included other groups of non-Catholics in his accusations, such as pagans and Freemasons, he relied on anti-Semitic tropes to push his belief that non-Catholics were poisoning the operations of the medical school. His focus on anti-Semitic stereotypes, many of which stemmed from white supremacist ideology, demonstrated that he was targeting Jews more than any of the other groups he listed. His insistence that many of his peers were of the same opinion painted a picture of an anti-Jewish and white supremacist student body at Georgetown Medical School in the 1930s.

In 1934, two years after Martin O’Nolan sent his anti-Semitic rant to the Regent of the Medical School, Georgetown established a Jewish quota, limiting admittance to the medical

⁶⁸ Ibid, 3-4.

⁶⁹ Letter from Martin O’Nolan to Father Phillips, July 1932, TN: 6268, Box 83, Addenda to Archives of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus 1914-1945, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Georgetown University Archives, Georgetown, Washington, D.C.

⁷⁰ Letter from Father Phillips to Martin O’Nolan, August 1932, TN: 6268, Box 83, Addenda to Archives of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus 1914-1945, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Georgetown University Archives, Georgetown, Washington, D.C.

school to five Jews maximum. Unlike other medical schools such as Harvard and Cornell that were dealing with a heavy influx of Jewish students and wished to cast them out as a corrective measure, Georgetown's medical school established the quotas as a preemptive measure to prevent the student body from becoming too Jewish.⁷¹ William Coleman Nevils, President of Georgetown University from 1928 to 1935, was instrumental in implementing the quotas in both the College of Arts and Sciences and the Medical School. There were only a handful of Jews in attendance at the time and he wished to keep it that way. Curran explains that, while the ultimate goal of the aforementioned Catholicization was to maintain a Catholic-majority student body and staff, Nevils targeted Jews specifically as undesirables. Although Catholicization efforts and Jewish quotas at Georgetown could be traced to the anti-Catholic sentiment that was present in the US in the 1930s,⁷² there is little evidence to suggest that Catholics faced discriminatory quotas at other universities. Thus, it is likely that Nevils' quotas were purely anti-Semitic in nature. In 1934, Nevils wrote, "[w]e don't want to build up our Medical and Dental School with the foreign element, particularly with a large number of the Semitic element."⁷³ This mirrors Isaac Manning's fear that Jews would "swamp the schools" and clearly points to anti-Semitic and white supremacist doctrine as the prime instigator that pushed Nevils and top administrators at Georgetown's medical school to implement anti-Semitic policies that restricted Jewish attendance. While it is not clear whether or not O'Nolan's letter had any influence on the decision to enact quotas, its proximity is notable and not to be understated.

⁷¹ Curran, *A History of Georgetown University*, 168.

⁷² Mark Stephen Massa, *Anti-Catholicism in America: The Last Acceptable Prejudice* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2005), 184.

⁷³ *Ibid*, 167.

Georgetown University and Marvin Lillian

In the 1940s, nearly a decade after O’Nolan’s letter, Georgetown’s Catholicization efforts, and Morris Krasny’s battle with anti-Semitic admissions quotas at the UNC School of Medicine, a Jewish student named Marvin Lillian found himself in a similar position as Krasny. He had received two rejections from Georgetown’s medical school, despite his belief that he was more than qualified. Much like Krasny, Lillian was suspicious about the reason for his denials, and decided the best course of action would be to confront the Dean of Georgetown Medical School. In a letter addressed to his mother and father, Lillian narrated his confrontation with the Dean and provided valuable insight into the justification and effects of anti-Semitic admissions quotas.

Lillian began by mentioning his rejections and his plans to meet with the Dean. He discussed thinking that Georgetown was giving him the “run-around” after a secretary told Lillian upon his first visit to call back the next day. But, much to Lillian’s surprise, the next day he got an appointment with the Dean of the Medical School, Father Paul McCauley.⁷⁴ Lillian called McCauley “sir,” “Dr.,” and “Dean” rather than “Father” because, as Lillian put it, he was Jewish, not Catholic, and did not see why he would need to call McCauley “Father.” This confirmed Lillian’s ethnoreligious status as a Jew. Lillian’s defiance seemed to take McCauley aback and set the stage for the rest of the meeting.⁷⁵ Lillian wrote out his conversation with the Dean word for word:

Well, Dean McCauley, on the 22 of August I received a letter of rejection from this school. This is the second time in two successive years. If I may, I’d like you to

⁷⁴ Correspondence from Marvin Lillian to his mother and father, 12 September 1941, TN: 6294, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Georgetown University Archives, Georgetown, Washington, D.C., 1. There is no access to documentation regarding McCauley’s firsthand account of the events or his opinion on the matter, only Lillian’s commentary and quotes.

⁷⁵ Ibid, 2.

reconsider my application. For, although I applied here a week before Christmas in 1940, my application didn't receive consideration until 15 of August. This last fact I know because I wrote to the Registrar and asked why I hadn't heard from him. And he wrote back to the effect that my application hadn't been acted upon because there wasn't a picture of myself furnished with my application. Now, sir, is that very just making me lose almost a half year of priority in applying for admission because my picture was mislaid [*sic*] by one of the mail clerks. It seems to me that I could easily have been contacted and asked to furnish a nother [*sic*] picture. But I wasn't. And I don't think I got a square deal.⁷⁶

Lillian quoted the discussion he had with McCauley in the letter to his parents. In reply to the above, McCauley said, as written by Lillian:

Well, that's only incidental, Mr. Lillian. I presume you want to know just why you were rejected. Now I'm not going to beat around the bush, I'm not going to give you a whole lot of bosh. I am going to be Brutally frank with you. Here goes: Georgetown is a Catholic School. The Medical School was intended for the education of young, Catholic men who want to become doctors. We do take in some non-Catholics. Our class has but seventy-five places. We get anywhere from 700-1200 applications for those seventy-five places. I'd say that 40% were from Jewish boys. They have top grades. If we were to admit solely on the basis of grades, we'd have only Jewish boys here although this is supposed to be a Catholic School. That can't be. So we have to limit the number of non-Catholics. Now we have accepted about 6 or 7 Jewish boys. They have almost perfect grades; better than yours. Now you come to me and ask me for a place. It's almost impossible. Two reasons: 1) you're Jewish and we have taken our quota 2) you come from a School with a very bad name.⁷⁷

Lillian's transcript of this exchange reveals a wealth of information regarding the reasoning and justification behind Georgetown's quotas and how they were justified. McCauley declared that almost half of the applications received at the medical school were from Jews. This seems plausible because, at this time, many of the children and grandchildren of Jews who had immigrated to the US in the late 1800s were reaching college age in the 1940s.⁷⁸ In addition,

⁷⁶ Ibid, 3.

⁷⁷ Ibid, 4.

⁷⁸ Frederic Cople Jaher, *Jews and the Nation: Revolution, Emancipation, State Formation, and the Liberal Paradigm in America and France* (Princeton University Press, 2003), 203.

McCauley said that, generally, Jewish applicants had outstanding academic achievements that would put them above the general Georgetown fare — white Catholic males. But in order to make it to Georgetown, Jews had to have “perfect grades.” This supports the conclusions of historians that Jews had to perform at a vastly higher level than their white, Anglo-Saxon counterparts to have even the slightest chance at medical school admission.⁷⁹ Lillian seemed to know this, as he wrote that he had spent the majority of his time studying and dedicating himself solely to having excellent grades. McCauley confirmed that Lillian had excellent grades, but they were not “perfect.” Although Lillian outperformed most of the Catholic students that were accepted, he was not admitted simply based on his Jewish heritage.

During the confrontation, McCauley also hid behind Georgetown’s status as a Catholic university to justify the implementation of anti-Semitic quotas. The aforementioned historian Robert Emmett Curran asserted that Georgetown was not intended to be an exclusively Catholic school. In fact, Curran estimated that, prior to Catholicization efforts, one-fifth of the student body was Protestant, another fifth of the student body was from the Caribbean (a largely Protestant population), and a significant portion consisted of non-Jewish, non-Catholic European immigrants and Napoleonic War refugees.⁸⁰ Curran’s estimates blow a hole in McCauley’s argument that Georgetown was created solely for Catholics, as nearly forty percent of the student body was non-Catholic for the majority of its existence. McCauley’s insistence that a Catholic majority student body be preserved in the Medical School was the prime factor in Lillian’s rejection was a poor attempt to hide anti-Semitic policies. In addition, according to Curran, the

⁷⁹ Karabel, *The Chosen*, 209-213. ; Oren, *Joining the Club*, 106.

⁸⁰ Curran, *A History of Georgetown University*, 390.

medical school enrolled over three hundred students from 1940 to 1941, the years when Lillian had applied — a far cry from the seventy-five McCauley originally claimed.⁸¹

Not only did McCauley attempt to hide Georgetown's anti-Semitic policies when confronted face-to-face, he also lied to Lillian about the number of spots open to Jewish students. Taking McCauley's numbers into consideration, if only six or seven Jews had been offered admittance, they would have comprised only two percent of the medical school student population. It is unclear whether or not the limit of five Jews, which was established in 1934, was still in place at the time. Thus, it is unknown if McCauley inflated the true number of Jews admitted to the school, or if six or seven was an accurate number. It is also unclear what school "with a very bad name" McCauley was referring to, but it was possibly a majority Jewish college based on the historical context of the conversation. Most colleges that had a majority Jewish student body were considered inferior institutions by white Anglo-Saxons.⁸²

In response, Lillian pleaded with McCauley to reconsider, asserting his passion for medicine and desire to be a doctor. To justify his eligibility for a spot, Lillian discussed how he "led a singularly sedentary political life," meaning that he did not involve himself in political matters or groups. He was likely referring to the fear of socialism in the United States, which many Americans associated with politically active Jews. Lillian was attempting to assure McCauley that he was a "good Jew" that was not involved in socialist politics.

Lillian went on to say that, after a "second unsuccessful year" of attempting to get into medical school, he had received thirty-seven letters of rejection. He said that as a result he was "hopeless, sad, and just wretchedly miserable." While Lillian does not state the reason for the thirty-seven letters of rejection, it can be implied that it was due to his Jewish heritage.

⁸¹ Ibid, 396.

⁸² Sokoloff, "The Rise and Decline of the Jewish Quota in Medical School Admissions," 5-7.

McCauley conceded that Lillian had good grades, suggesting that academic performance was not a factor in his rejection.⁸³ McCauley suggested that Lillian study instead for his Master's degree in Organic Chemistry and said he should try to apply for the Master's program the next year, but Lillian countered that he was leaving for Boston to attend Harvard's Medical School for his Master's degree in medical sciences. It is not clear if Lillian had actually been accepted to Harvard, which, given Harvard's history of anti-Semitic quotas, seems unlikely. He may have been trying to use Harvard as leverage, but it is hard to say as Lillian neither confirms nor denies the legitimacy of his claim.⁸⁴

McCauley, Lillian says, was impressed by his perseverance, as few rejected students would have requested an audience with the Dean of the College. McCauley told Lillian he would give him a spot at Georgetown by Friday evening at the close of business if one was opened. A few days later, Lillian got an acceptance letter in the mail and said his heart "leaped with joy." He told his parents he would give them his plans soon but did not say in the letter whether or not he would accept the offer. A New York Times article indicates that Marvin Lillian did, in fact, accept the offer and attended Georgetown's medical school.⁸⁵ At the end of the letter, he stated that he was going to frame his acceptance letter. Because it was difficult for Jews to get into medical schools at the time, a single acceptance letter was a huge achievement to be celebrated.⁸⁶

⁸³ Correspondence from Marvin Lillian to his mother and father, 12 September 1941, 3-4.

⁸⁴ Ibid, 4.

⁸⁵ "MIRIAM FEINSON ENGAGED: Danbury Girl Is Fiancee of Dr Marvin Lillian of New Haven," February 12, 1951, *The New York Times*, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times, 17.

⁸⁶ Ibid, 5.

Two Jews nearly a decade apart faced very similar circumstances: being denied admission twice to two of the best medical schools in the country. Both Jews directly confronted the Deans of these medical schools, and both exposed the anti-Semitism that belied the Jewish quotas that had been established. One played out on the public stage, and one in private through a letter, but both ultimately resulted in these students gaining admittance to their preferred schools. Morris Krasny and Marvin Lillian courageously resisted the institutional anti-Semitism and white supremacy that sought to keep them from succeeding. Krasny and Lillian represent unique cases in the history of anti-Semitic quotas in medical schools. Two Jewish students with nearly identical circumstances fought to overturn their denials and were ultimately successful, with Krasny's case resulting in the reversal of the offending policy. During a period in which many American Jews watched Hitler dehumanize European Jews and suffered at the hands of American anti-Semitism and white supremacy, Krasny and Lillian's stories showed that institutional prejudice was not infallible.

CHAPTER THREE: EMORY, JOHNS HOPKINS, DUKE, WAKE FOREST AND THE CLANDESTINE NATURE OF ANTI-SEMITIC ADMISSIONS POLICIES

The existence of anti-Semitic quotas at the medical schools of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill was laid bare after Morris Krasny confronted those implementing the policies. However, the quotas at most medical schools in the South were never fully uncovered. In the case of Marvin Lillian, Georgetown quietly admitted him after he confronted the dean about his rejections. In some schools, such as the Emory School of Dentistry, it took decades for the truth of the extent of anti-Semitic policies to be made public. But in most others, such as Johns Hopkins University, Duke University, and Wake Forest College, documentation verifying the existence of quotas is far and few between, and whether these medical schools implemented policies restricting the number of Jews that could be admitted is still debated by researchers. Former students insist that anti-Semitic policies were enforced, but with no hard evidence to back these claims, the truth remains uncertain, demonstrating the furtive underbelly in which these quotas endured.

Emory University and Perry Brickman

While not technically considered a medical school, the School of Dentistry at Emory carried similar prestige to a medical school. It was one of only three dental programs in the South and one of only thirty-nine in the country.⁸⁷ Jewish prospective students' parents, often immigrants from Eastern Europe, pushed them to study medicine. Many ultimately decided to study dentistry, as the oral branch of medicine, to fulfill their wishes. Students from all over the country applied to Emory to attend its dental school, including many Jewish students from northern states. Prior to 1948, Emory was not known to be particularly discriminatory toward

⁸⁷ "Dental School Discrimination," History and Traditions | Emory University, accessed June 11, 2020, <http://emoryhistory.emory.edu/issues/discrimination/dental-school.html>.

Jews. After John E. Buhler began his tenure as Dean of the School of Dentistry in the 1940s, Emory's reputation began to change.

From 1948 to 1961, failure rates for Jewish students at Emory's School of Dentistry in Atlanta, Georgia had skyrocketed to sixty-five percent. The Anti-Defamation League (ADL), an organization committed to combatting anti-Semitism, gathered data on these failures and found that Jewish students were disproportionately failed or forced to repeat courses. However, when the ADL presented this data to Emory in 1961, administrative officials denied anti-Semitic discrimination played a role in the mass failures. John Buhler resigned as the dean of the dental school shortly after the ADL presentation, though Emory insisted that this had nothing to do with claims of anti-Semitic policy.⁸⁸

Perry Brickman, a former student of Emory College and Emory University School of Dentistry, was one of the many Jews intentionally failed out of the School of Dentistry as a result of Buhler's policies. Brickman's entering class in 1951 consisted of only four Jews, and all four were flunked out of the program by 1953. Brickman was stunned by the letter he received telling him that he had failed out of the program. He thought he had been doing well and earning good grades, and was never told he was at risk of failing. Although Brickman eventually went on to graduate with honors from the School of Dentistry at the University of Tennessee, he never forgot about his mysterious failure at Emory. His frustration led him to five years of researching Emory's anti-Semitism and finding other Jews who had been failed out of the School of Dentistry from 1948 to 1961.⁸⁹ He compiled his findings into the 2012 documentary, *From Silence To Recognition: Confronting Discrimination in Emory's Dental School History*, and later

⁸⁸ Perry Brickman, *Extracted: Unmasking Rampant Antisemitism in America's Higher Education* (New York: Morgan James Publishing, 2019), 5.

⁸⁹ *Ibid*, 20-22.

into his 2019 book, *Extracted: Unmasking Rampant Antisemitism in America's Higher Education*.

Brickman's book largely focuses on his own experiences at Emory's dental school as he navigated through a culture of white supremacy and anti-Semitism, and his discussions about his Jewish colleagues' experiences there emphasized the lengths the school went to keep as many Jews away as possible. In *Extracted*, Brickman recalled his experiences with the culture of white supremacy on Emory's campus. He wrote:

The predominant culture at Emory exuded white Southern pride and superiority throughout the university. While the collegial atmosphere developed over the past hundred years did now allow overt expressions of discrimination, it was easy to detect. If you were a student walking down Fraternity Row, you could see and feel it. If you picked up a copy of the *Campus* yearbook, you could read it. When an article on the members of the Board of Trustees appeared in the weekly *Emory Wheel*, you didn't have to read the names or look at the faces to know that you were not represented. [...] there was not a single Jewish member on the Emory faculty.⁹⁰

The atmosphere of white supremacy that Brickman described was similar, if not identical, to the atmospheres described at other prestigious institutions that implemented quotas, particularly the rejection of being openly discriminatory. Brickman also discussed the anti-Semitic culture of Emory's fraternities. One of Brickman's friends, Pete, was non-Jewish but had grown up with mostly Jewish acquaintances. Brickman and his other Jewish friends attending Emory had decided to pledge AEPi, one of Emory's two Jewish fraternities, and Pete was considering doing the same to join his friends if he was accepted to Emory's medical school. Because Pete was not Jewish, upperclassmen members of AEPi, all Jews, urged him to reconsider his decision.

Brickman wrote:

Carefully and with much sensitivity, the AEPi upperclassmen told Pete that his future was of prime importance, and that his chances to gain acceptance to Emory medical

⁹⁰ Ibid, 51.

school would be lowered if he was affiliated with a Jewish fraternity. They felt obligated to insist that it would be in his best interest to join a non-Jewish fraternity.⁹¹

Brickman noted that this event was what triggered his awareness of the systemic inequalities that were present at Emory, and what ultimately led him years later to discovering that Emory's dental school and medical school had implemented Jewish quotas.⁹² Through this revelation, he also learned about Emory's undergraduate college quotas, as well as a policy barring Jewish faculty members from being hired.⁹³ However, Brickman did not uncover the full reality of Emory's discriminatory policies until decades after he had been intentionally failed from the dentistry program just one year after enrolling.

Later in *Extracted*, Brickman described the application form he was asked to complete for admission to the dental school. Like many other schools' applications, the form asked for demographic information about the applicant's parents, specifically the applicant's father's birthplace. However, the form differed from the others in that it directly asked for the applicant's religion, as well as the religion of the applicant's father. Applicants also had to supply three letters of reference, but one of the letters was required to be from the applicant's church pastor. Brickman also found an application form that had been sent out a few years later, and discovered that Buhler had edited the form to add a question asking the applicant for their race, with the choices "CAUCASIAN, JEW, or OTHER," a subtle but telling departure from the previous forms.⁹⁴

⁹¹ Ibid, 53.

⁹² Although Brickman briefly mentions that he found evidence of quotas being implemented at Emory's medical school, he focuses on his experiences at the dental school. It is difficult to find primary and secondary material exclusively discussing the medical school quotas, as the dental school quotas are much more infamous and there is much more detailed information about them.

⁹³ Ibid, 60.

⁹⁴ Ibid, 71.

As part of his exposé, Brickman sought out Jews that had been rejected by Emory during the time that Buhler had implemented the quotas and interviewed them for *Extracted*. Norman Trieger, a Jewish Bronx native and one of Brickman's acquaintances and a member of AEPi at Emory during his undergraduate career, had applied to study dentistry at Emory, NYU, Columbia, and Harvard. All but Emory⁹⁵ had accepted him, despite his excellent performance at Emory as an undergraduate. Much like Morris Krasny of UNC and Marvin Lillian of Georgetown, Trieger was confused about his rejection and confronted the unnamed dean of admissions. Trieger described the interaction to Brickman, saying, "The dean leaned back and stretched his long legs over his desk. 'Don't take it [personally], son. We just don't take any [northerners].'"⁹⁶ Unlike Krasny and Lillian, Trieger accepted this explanation, only years later suspecting that his rejection was based on his Jewishness. Similarly, Frank Fox, a Jew from Brooklyn, had studied and excelled at Emory as an undergraduate and decided to apply to Emory's dental program. After his perplexing rejection, Fox went directly to Buhler's office in an effort to get an explanation, suspecting his Jewish heritage was to blame. Fox told Brickman:

Dean Buhler was disturbed when, without an appointment, I knocked on his door and entered his office at the dental school downtown on Courtland Avenue. I knew I wouldn't be allowed to stay very long, so I asked him directly if he had a Jewish problem. 'Who says we don't take Jews,' he quickly responded. Off the top of his head, he named three or four Jewish students in the school and demanded that I leave.⁹⁷

Fox's recollection of his confrontation with Buhler, particularly Buhler's refusal to admit that anti-Semitic discrimination was occurring, echoes the denials offered by deans of other Southern medical schools when asked about it. Many flat out denied that anti-Semitism was a factor in

⁹⁵ By this time, most universities had reversed their Jewish quotas.

⁹⁶ Ibid, 73.

⁹⁷ Ibid, 74.

admissions decisions, and others danced around the question. The motivation for this secrecy was unclear, which made it all the more difficult to accept for the Jewish students affected.

Brickman wrote about how three of his Jewish classmates and friends during undergrad at Emory - Ross Sterner, Beryl Tenenbaum, and Ed Wolf - had also been refused admission to Emory's dental school, which led to shame affecting not only the applicants who had been rejected, but also those who had been accepted. Brickman recalled feeling like he had to avoid public celebration after he was accepted to Emory's dental school because his friends had been rejected.⁹⁸ Along with Brickman, three other Jews had been accepted into Emory's dental program, all of whom had attended Emory for their undergraduate careers: Art Burns, Herman Levin, and Allen Shaw. Despite his initial feelings of shame, Brickman decided to enroll in Emory's dental school.⁹⁹ Brickman had never felt targeted by discrimination at Emory during his undergraduate years and was unaware of the secret anti-Semitic policies John Buhler was implementing at the School of Dentistry. Brickman accepted his admission, not knowing that he and his three colleagues were doomed to fail from the start.

Admission was only the first hurdle Jewish students faced at Emory's School of Dentistry. Once enrolled, Jews found themselves the targets of constant harassment by Dean Buhler and members of the faculty. One student recalled Buhler telling him, "Why do you Jews want to go into dentistry? You don't have it in the hands." Other students remembered being falsely accused by faculty of cheating, and even being called "dirty Jews" by professors.¹⁰⁰ Dr. Harold Black, a student at the School of Dentistry in 1955, specifically recalled being accused of losing a tooth model in an interview with *Connect Savannah*. After not being able to locate the

⁹⁸ Ibid, 76.

⁹⁹ Ibid, 77.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, 80-87.

model, Black stayed up all night painstakingly carving a new one. The next day, the original model had been recovered, though no one had notified Black. He believed the model was intentionally taken and hidden for the purposes of humiliating him, as such harassment occurred frequently to him and the other Jewish students. Despite the anti-Semitic prejudice he endured, Black managed to graduate from the program after four years.¹⁰¹ Countless other Jewish students endured targeted discrimination during their time at Emory's School of Dentistry, but many of their stories have been lost to time, denial, or trauma. As Brickman wrote, many of the Jewish students affected by the admissions rejections, intentional failures, and harassment were able to move on after Emory, but not before facing years of humiliation and confusion that made them unwilling to discuss their experiences.¹⁰²

Perry Brickman credits Art Levin, who worked with the ADL, and Marvin Goldstein, a dentist in Atlanta, with collecting and preserving the evidence of anti-Semitic discrimination by Emory.¹⁰³ This evidence showed that, while dean of the School of Dentistry, Buhler implemented two policies that significantly curbed Jewish attendance. One, previously described by Brickman in *Extracted*, was the adoption of a new admissions application that asked students to designate themselves as "Caucasian, Jew or Other." This application question was similar to those enacted at Ivy League schools; however, instead of asking questions that would be indicators of a student's race and ethnicity, Emory asked the question directly and openly. The other policy was much more discreet - intentionally failing Jewish students in the hopes that they would either leave Emory of their own accord or be forced to withdraw due to poor academic

¹⁰¹ Jessica Leigh Lebos, "Dr. Harold Black Talks about the Rotten Tooth in Emory's History," Connect Savannah (Connect Savannah, March 5, 2020), <https://www.connectsavannah.com/savannah/the-rotten-tooth-in-emorys-history/Content?oid=2329335>.

¹⁰² Brickman, *Extracted*, 91.

¹⁰³ Ibid, xxv.

performance. Intentionally failing the few Jews admitted into Emory's dental school when so many others had been rejected may have been an attempt for Emory to take these students' money, pocketing their tuition and fees while having no intention of allowing them to finish their degrees to keep the dental school as white as possible. Buhler found that the faculty of the School of Dentistry were sympathetic to his cause, with many of them expressing anti-Jewish sentiment. Not only would professors intentionally fail Jewish students in their classes for no reason other than their ethnoreligion, they would also keep the new policy a secret.¹⁰⁴ The anti-Semitism entrenched in the city of Atlanta also contributed to the policy's secrecy, as it is likely that WASP citizens did not want to sabotage Emory's efforts to rid itself of Jews.

Atlanta Jews often think of two distinct events as defining anti-Semitism in Atlanta: the lynching of Leo Frank in 1915 and the Emory School of Dentistry scandal. These two events, Brickman analyzes, hold equal weight in regards to their impact on the Jewish community, despite one being a gruesome and violent event and the other happening in secret.¹⁰⁵ Leo Frank was, many believed and still believe, falsely accused and wrongfully convicted of the murder of a young white girl, Mary Phagan, due to his Jewish heritage. The press largely fueled the flames of anti-Semitic hysteria in the city, pointing fingers at Frank despite having little evidence to prove his guilt. When his death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment by Georgia Governor John M. Slaton, an armed mob of white men, angry that Frank would not be executed, stormed the prison Frank was being held in and abducted him. They handcuffed his arms and legs and eventually hanged him from a tree. Georgians from the area flocked to the tree to celebrate, cut off parts of his clothes to take as souvenirs, and take pictures. The photos that were

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, 103.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid, 317.

taken of Frank's body and later sold as postcards throughout the city.¹⁰⁶ Historian Amy Louise Wood also discussed the possibility of films of the lynching being distributed around Atlanta despite U.S. censorship boards prohibiting the film from being shown on the news.¹⁰⁷ A white supremacist group that had come to power during Frank's trial, the Knights of Mary Phagan, convened after the lynching to aid in the return of the Ku Klux Klan, which felt emboldened by the reign of terror at the hands of Georgia's whites on the Jewish community.¹⁰⁸ As a result of Frank's lynching and Atlanta's anti-Semitic fervor, an estimated 3000 Jews fled Georgia. Those that remained boarded up their homes and their businesses out of fear, and many moved north of the city. The Jewish community that remained came to the consensus to never mention the Frank trial, and the topic became a taboo. The hostile anti-Semitic atmosphere in Atlanta following the Frank lynching discouraged Jews from participating in politics, and for well over a decade no Jewish Atlantans ran for public office in the city.¹⁰⁹

The anti-Semitism surrounding the Leo Frank case and eventual lynching struck fear into the hearts of Atlanta Jews and forced them into hushed silence. That Atlanta Jews connect the brutal murder of Frank with Emory's intentional failing of Jews illuminates the harm Emory perpetrated against the Jewish community.¹¹⁰ The intentional flunkings did not result in physical harm to the victims, but deprived them of their dreams of becoming dental professionals. As many of the former students Brickman interviewed confessed, they began to see themselves as

¹⁰⁶ Leonard Dinnerstein, *The Leo Frank Case* (Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 2008), 3-36, 114-142.

¹⁰⁷ Amy Louise Wood, *Lynching and Spectacle: Witnessing Racial Violence in America, 1890-1940* (United States: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 151-152.

¹⁰⁸ Dinnerstein, *The Leo Frank Case*, 149-150.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid*, 152.

¹¹⁰ Several publications and Atlanta locals, including articles written by the Anti-Defamation League, "The Ballad of Leo Frank" from *Us and Them* by Jim Carnes, *A Bulwark against Anarchy: Affirmative Action, Emory Law School, and Southern Self-Help* by William B. Turner and published in the *Hastings Race and Poverty Law Journal*, interviews given by Perry Brickman, and the testimonials of former Emory dental students give the impression that Atlantans, as well as Jewish Studies scholars, have drawn connections between the anti-Semitic climate stoked in Atlanta by the Leo Frank lynching and the quotas instituted at Emory in the recent past.

failures and disappointments. Their families expressed shame that their children failed out of dental school, which deeply wounded the victims and resulted in years of agony and depression. Brickman, himself, recalled his mother's anguish at his supposed failure. Many gave up their pursuit of dentistry and instead went on to study other subjects.¹¹¹

During the period in which Jews were being targeted and intentionally failed out of the Emory School of Dentistry, anti-Semitism ran rampant in Atlanta, riding on the coattails of the atmosphere borne out of the Frank lynching. In 1958, a group of white supremacists bombed the prominent Hebrew Benevolent Congregation Temple, Atlanta's oldest shul. No one was injured, but the bombing came as a result of both growing anti-Semitic sentiment in the city as well as the synagogue's vocal support of racial integration. Five suspects were arrested after the bombing, and one suspect's confession revealed connections to notorious white supremacist groups with strongholds in Atlanta - the National States Rights Party, the Knights of the White Camelia, the Christian Anti-Jewish Party, the American Nazi Party, the Ku Klux Klan, and what one suspect called "the Confederate Underground."¹¹²

The Leo Frank lynching and the bombing of the Hebrew Benevolent Congregation Temple was indicative of much of Atlanta's white population's attitude toward Atlanta's Jewish population in the late 1950s and early 1960s. This provided the perfect environment and smokescreen for Emory's continued failing of Jews. The majority of the faculty responsible for enforcing these policies and intentionally failing Jewish students in their courses were local to Atlanta, and had likely grown up steeped in the city's anti-Semitic fervor. The Jewish community in Atlanta watched on helplessly as Jewish students were failed out of the prestigious

¹¹¹ Brickman, *Extracted*, 12.

¹¹² Melissa Fay Greene, *The Temple Bombing* (New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1997) 186-234. ; There is no evidence of the Confederate Underground actually existing. One suspect called the shul to threaten a bombing and claimed he was from the group, possibly as a red-herring.

dental school, knowing that anti-Semitism was likely playing a role but being powerless to confront it. Much like the lynching of Leo Frank and the terroristic attack on the Hebrew Benevolent Congregation Temple, the flunking of Jewish dental students at Emory was meant to put Jews in their place and remind them of the supremacy of whites. Although Emory's scandal was carried out in silence and brushed under the rug for decades, it was sinister enough to be equated with an anti-Semitic, white supremacist lynching and the bombing of a synagogue.

Johns Hopkins University

Unlike the vast majority of universities that implemented quotas curbing Jewish attendance from the 1920s to the 1930s, Johns Hopkins had a reputation for fostering Jewish academic success. Johns Hopkins boasted, and still boasts, one of the most well-known and prestigious medical schools in the country. Many premier Jewish scholars studied at Johns Hopkins during a time when Jewish attendance at other schools was being restricted. However, when Isaiah Bowman took office as university president, admissions policies began to change. As other universities began to roll back their anti-Semitic quotas, Johns Hopkins began to implement them.

Prior to being named the fifth president of Johns Hopkins University, Bowman had become the director of the American Geographical Society (AGS) and participated in high level geography-centric government projects. He worked closely with President Woodrow Wilson during World War I, and afterward played a major role in the distribution of land and determination of borders in the Balkans as part of the Paris Peace Conference. After becoming the president of JHU, Bowman continued his work with the government, becoming a State Department advisor to President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1939, President Roosevelt appointed Bowman to lead a project that entailed searching for land suitable for the settlement of Jewish

refugees fleeing Europe. Bowman lead his team to search five continents, looking for spaces that were either sparsely populated or completely uninhabited and appropriate for the Jewish emigrants; however, Bowman refused to consider searching for land in the United States due to his anti-Semitic beliefs. He rejected the notion that Jewish refugees should find a home in the United States because he believed that Jews “were an alien threat to American culture.”¹¹³ This anti-Semitism found its way into Bowman’s work with JHU, ultimately becoming the justification for JHU’s anti-Semitic admissions policies. Bowman implemented policies discriminating against Jewish applicants starting in 1942 and solidified them in 1945, just as World War II was winding down and the horrors of the Holocaust were becoming too obvious to ignore. The publicity of the Holocaust was a turning point for many universities that had enacted admissions policies that barred Jewish attendance, and they largely began to reverse them after the war had ended.¹¹⁴ Bowman insisted upon Jewish admissions quotas at a time when other schools were ending theirs as a response to the Holocaust, citing fears that Jewish students would taint the culture of Johns Hopkins and the country at large. In Neil Smith’s *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization*, Bowman was quoted as saying, “Jews don't come to Hopkins to make the world better or anything like that. They come for two things: to make money and to marry a non- Jewish woman.”¹¹⁵ In this statement justifying his decision to bar Jews from admission to JHU, Bowman evoked several anti-Semitic canards, including the idea that Jews are greedy as well as a trope commonly used by white supremacists against both Jewish and Black men - that these non-white men sought to defile white women.¹¹⁶

¹¹³ Geoffrey J. Martin, *The Life and Thought of Isaiah Bowman* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1980), 128.

¹¹⁴ Karabel, *The Chosen*, 689.

¹¹⁵ Neil Smith, *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 247.

¹¹⁶ Sally Kitch, *The Specter of Sex: Gendered Foundations of Racial Formation in the United States* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009), 264.

Bowman's admissions quotas undoubtedly affected undergraduate admissions, as undergraduate admissions had indisputable documentation¹¹⁷ of a quota system being used to determine applicants' fate. However, there is little formal evidence that quotas or other anti-Semitic policies were imposed upon applicants to JHU's graduate and professional schools. The information surrounding the existence of anti-Semitic quotas, or lack thereof, at the medical school in particular is sparse and contradictory. Several alumni of the medical school insist upon there having been a quota restricting Jewish attendance, while researchers in the topic claim that there is no evidence to suggest that one actually existed. Several sources, including alumni, have claimed that the Johns Hopkins medical school employed a quota of only six Jews, but there is no documentation available to substantiate this claim.¹¹⁸ Most of the documentation that would verify if quotas were implemented in the JHU medical school are not currently accessible, as most documentation regarding student admissions are restricted from public access.

Duke University and Wake Forest College

Like Johns Hopkins, the Duke University Medical School in Durham, North Carolina and Bowman Gray School of Medicine at Wake Forest College¹¹⁹ in Wake Forest and later Winston-Salem, North Carolina are rumored to have discriminated against Jewish applicants, but no concrete evidence exists to confirm whether or not quotas were actually enacted. The only indications that quotas had been enacted at Duke and Wake Forest involve rumors and hearsay from alumni,¹²⁰ as well as documentation that subtly hints at discriminatory admissions policies. Unlike JHU, Wake Forest lacked distinctive figureheads that could be pinpointed as sources for

¹¹⁷ Smith, *American Empire*, 245-250.

¹¹⁸ Frank Kingdon, "Discrimination in Medical Colleges," *American Mercury*, vol. LXI (61), 394-395.

¹¹⁹ Prior to 1967, Wake Forest was known as Wake Forest College, rather than Wake Forest University.

¹²⁰ Relying on rumors carries the implication that these claims are inaccurate; however, as the most helpful evidence of the existence of quotas comes from the firsthand accounts of students, it is worth looking into.

possible anti-Semitic policies. The Bowman Gray School of Medicine at Wake Forest could have hidden its anti-Semitic policies behind a stated preference for applicants from North Carolina. As private universities that did not receive state funding, Wake Forest was not required to accept a predetermined number or percentage of in-state applicants; however, Wake Forest's medical school openly declared that they favored in-state students, particularly over northern students.¹²¹ A handbook detailing Wake Forest's admissions policies for its medical school notes that admissions priority was given to Wake Forest alumni, applicants living in North Carolina, and applicants located in areas surrounding the piedmont region of North Carolina, including western South Carolina, eastern Tennessee, and southwestern Virginia.¹²² While these preferences were by no means conclusive evidence of quotas, they are, when combined with the evaluations of northern students by medical school admissions officers, a bit more telling. Comments on admissions assessments for northern students, such as one student being rejected in part due to "speaking New Yorkese" and another being rejected for being a "big city boy" and "not well-rounded," are similar to the justification given to Norman Treiger by the dean of admissions at Emory - northerners were not welcome.¹²³ Although it is unclear if these rejected students were Jewish, it is possible that they, like Treiger, were rejected under the guise of being too northern when they were truly rejected for being Jewish. Another coincidence regarding Jewish enrollment at the Bowman Gray School of Medicine was that it was steadily maintained at two to six percent - a similar range to other medical schools employing quotas - until the late 1960s,

¹²¹ The number of northern applicants was likely relatively low; however, as evidenced by Brickman's analysis of Emory, many northern Jews were interested in studying medicine in the South.

¹²² Memorandum Concerning Admission and Other Educational Policies of The Bowman Gray School of Medicine, 1940, Memorandum Concerning Admission and Other Educational Policies of The Bowman Gray School of Medicine, Prepared in the office of Mr. Lloyd Aukerman, Wake Forest University Archives, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

¹²³ Notes from the Office of Admissions, 1932, Bowman Gray School of Medicine Medical Library Archives, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

when other medical schools were reversing or had reversed their policies.¹²⁴ While, again, not an absolute indication that Wake Forest had implemented quotas, the timeline of Jewish enrollment and its correspondence with the timelines of other schools with verifiable quotas could be a sign that admissions discrimination was at play.

Like Wake Forest's Bowman Gray School of Medicine, the Duke University Medical School had similar geographical preferences when it came to admitting students, giving students from North Carolina and neighboring states priority in admissions. However, unlike Wake Forest, the Dean of Duke University Medical School from 1927 to 1960, Wilburt Davison, is a key figure to note when investigating Duke's alleged quotas, as he wrote extensively about the quotas in other schools in his personal papers. In one note, he wrote, "Jews have a twenty-four fold greater urge [than whites] to study medicine,"¹²⁵ recognizing what officials at other universities had used as a justification for the quotas - too many Jews wanted to attend medical school, which threatened the opportunities of whites. His other notes discussed Jewish doctors' tendencies to live in big cities, and criticized their supposed avoidance of rural areas that were in desperate need of doctors.¹²⁶ Taken together, Davison's writings on the anti-Semitic quotas enacted at other medical schools and his writings on Jews in medicine indicate that he may have been justifying the implementation of the quotas on account of the abundance of Jews and their stereotypical tendencies to be city-dwellers. It is important to note that these papers were written after Davison had retired as Dean of the Medical School, and it is unclear whether these writings were an attempt to justify quotas that he had either enacted or maintained, or simply an outsider's observations. Another important note is that, under Dean Davison, Jewish enrollment

¹²⁴ Kingdon, "Discrimination in Medical Colleges," 345.

¹²⁵ Memorandum. Conrad Huffman, Jr., to William Preston Few, Dec. 4, 1933, Davison Papers, Box 110, Duke University Medical Library Archives, Durham, North Carolina.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

at the medical school ranged from eight to sixteen percent, a notably larger population when compared to universities with verifiable quotas.¹²⁷ Davison could have implemented a larger maximum percentage of admissible Jews in any possible quotas enacted by the medical school, or discrimination was carried out through different means, with policies similar to the intentional failings implemented at Emory in order to reduce the number of Jewish graduates in the program. The idea of Duke University Medical School implementing anti-Semitic quotas is feasible, but without conclusive evidence, it is unclear.

The lack of documentation verifying the existence of discriminatory admissions policies could tell a larger story. Hard evidence is sparse, indicating that these policies were enforced primarily through word of mouth, well hidden, or that they never existed to begin with. Taking into account the policies enacted by the aforementioned medical schools and the lengths to which those that implemented them went to keep them hidden, it is not unreasonable to assume that Johns Hopkins, Duke, and Wake Forest went to similar lengths to conceal their discriminatory policies. While known to the Jewish students attending the schools, as demonstrated by the many rumors and alumni claims, these universities could very well have buried the documentation to keep the greater public ignorant of the quotas. It is unclear why universities were so determined to hide the policies that many of their white countrymen would have championed, but these efforts were exhibited clearly by the aforementioned medical school programs to be an essential part of the process. Johns Hopkins, Duke, and Wake Forest may just have been more successful at keeping their quotas a secret.

¹²⁷ Robert F. Durden, *The Launching of Duke University*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 442.

The dental school at Emory University, Johns Hopkins Medical School, the Bowman Gray School of Medicine at Wake Forest College, and Duke University Medical School serve as evidence that the anti-Semitic quotas instituted at many Southern medical schools were, as Kingdon notes, “denied in words but applied in fact.”¹²⁸ Admissions discrimination against Jews was likely decided upon behind closed doors and rarely physically documented. Quotas barring Jewish students from entering medical school were a shadowy extension of white supremacy at the academic level. The quotas and intentional failings policies at the Emory University School of Dentistry were suspected by the students in attendance, but were not publicly known until the Anti-Defamation League published damning statistics. Even then, Emory was able to maintain a level of silence that left many still unaware of the quotas until decades later, when Perry Brickman exposed Dean John Buhler as an anti-Semite and collected testimony from dozens of Jewish students impacted by intentional failures and admissions discrimination. Alleged quotas at Johns Hopkins, Duke, and Wake Forest have not yet been fully uncovered, but evidence suggests there could be truth to the rumors. Johns Hopkins and Duke both had high level officials that were connected to anti-Semitism that could have had the power to enact quotas, but no one administrative entity or individual has been cited as the source of the alleged quotas at Wake Forest College. While Isaiah Bowman had a long and well-known history of anti-Semitic behavior and Wilbur Davison wrote about the nationwide quotas after his tenure as dean, no one figure at Wake Forest can be pinpointed as being a possible suspect with the power to implement sweeping admissions policies. Whether these particular medical schools were exceptionally good

¹²⁸ Kingdon, “Discrimination in Medical Colleges,” 398.

at concealing the existence of their quotas or whether they had not implemented such measures in the first place has yet to be proven, and will remain a mystery, perhaps until conclusive documentation becomes accessible. Perhaps, like Emory, the rumored quotas at JHU, Duke, and Wake Forest will be brought to light decades after their implementation.

CHAPTER FOUR: CHANGES IN AMERICAN JEWISH LIFE, RECKONING, AND CONTEMPORARY CONSEQUENCES

The effects of anti-Semitic admissions quotas extended beyond the walls of the universities that implemented them. The American Jewish community saw these quotas as another attack on their identities, resulting in a variety of responses. Some chose to relinquish their Jewishness and melt into white America, while others fought the systems of oppression holding them back and attempted to change society, becoming active in the Civil Rights Movement, establishing organizations like the Anti-Defamation League that fought anti-Semitism that launched investigations into schools suspected of having quota systems, supporting movements like Zionism that called for the formation of a Jewish state, and establishing secular, non-discriminatory institutions of higher education like Brandeis University. Some of the most important and helpful responses came from outside of the Jewish community, with Historically Black Colleges and Universities offering the most assistance and even saving lives. Remnants of the quotas still live on today, particularly in the Common Application millions of students use to apply to college each year. Discriminatory quotas barring Jewish admittance to medical schools had a lasting effect on both the American Jewish community as well as on the landscape of higher education.

Assimilation

One of the ways in which Jews coped with anti-Semitic admissions quotas, as well as America's generally anti-Semitic atmosphere, was to assimilate into WASP society. Jews that felt threatened by the anti-Semitic sentiment in the United States often turned to social and cultural conformity. This entailed abandoning traditional Jewish customs in favor of American traditions, as well as embracing interfaith marriages. Jews wishing to assimilate also felt

pressured to become less politically active in the hopes of quashing anti-Semitic stereotypes related to the political involvement of Jews.¹²⁹ Some Jews changed their Jewish sounding names to more Anglo-Saxon sounding names in an attempt to assimilate. For example, Jewish songwriter Israel Baline changed his name to Irving Berlin, and Jewish actress Betty Persky changed her name to Lauren Bacall.¹³⁰ Jews came up with a variety of strategies to mask their Jewishness and “earn” their whiteness in order to escape anti-Semitism. Today, most non-Black American Jews consider themselves to be white, and are largely considered to be white by non-Jews.¹³¹

The Civil Rights Movement

Conversely, Jews that did not attempt to assimilate with gentiles found themselves becoming even more politically active. For many Jews, the advent of anti-Semitic quotas opened their eyes to the systemic nature of oppression in the United States. Rather than blending in like their assimilating peers, these Jews used their position as marginalized people to fight against injustice. One of the most well-known examples of this occurring was during the Civil Rights Movement, when many Jewish individuals and organizations marched alongside Black Americans in support of desegregation, voting rights, economic freedom, and overall equality for Black people in the United States. Jews found themselves in a unique position, as they could relate to the struggles of Black people having faced similar discrimination. However, Jews sat in the middle of the racial binary, not quite being considered white but not considered Black. At the

¹²⁹ Neil M. Cowan and Ruth Schwartz Cowan, *Our Parents' Lives: Jewish Assimilation and Everyday Life* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1996), 153-160.

¹³⁰ Benjamin Balint, *Running Commentary: The Contentious Magazine That Transformed the Jewish Left into the Neoconservative Right* (New York: Public Affairs, 2010), 23.

¹³¹ During the Black Lives Matter movement in 2020, many Black and non-Black Jewish activists called for non-Black Jews to recognize and acknowledge their white privilege as white and white-passing people.

time, they were not liked by whites, but were liked more than Black people, so Jews were able to use this unique position to do extensive advocacy work.¹³²

Jews helped found and provide funding for some of the most prominent and significant civil rights organizations, including the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), and the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.¹³³

A disproportionate number of the white supporters active in the Civil Rights movement were Jewish, and many Rabbis used their platforms to urge their congregations to support the movement. One Rabbi, Abraham Joshua Heschel, marched arm-in-arm with Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in his 1965 Selma to Montgomery March.¹³⁴ Jews also played a central role in the drafting of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, both of which occurred in the conference room of the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism under the backing of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.¹³⁵ Jews saw similarities in the way Black Americans were treated and the way they, themselves, had been treated by white America. Just as quotas had barred Jews from admission to universities, Black people rarely had the opportunity to attend colleges outside of schools designated for students of their race. The role Jews played during the Civil Rights Movement set a precedent for the American Jewish community to be unafraid of political activism, with many participants going on to become prominent political figures. In addition to assisting with the movement due to a personal understanding of what it meant to be oppressed, Jews also recognized the work Black Americans

¹³² Clive Webb, *Fight Against Fear: Southern Jews and Black Civil Rights* (Athens, GA: Univ. of Georgia Press, 2011), 8-16.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 69.

¹³⁴ Or N. Rose, *Abraham Joshua Heschel: Man of Spirit, Man of Action* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2003), 72.

¹³⁵ "Jews and the Civil Rights Movement," Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, November 20, 2018, <https://rac.org/jews-and-civil-rights-movement>.

in HBCUs had done to assist Jewish students and faculty fleeing the Holocaust, and wished to repay the favor.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Claus-Dieter Krohn, in his book *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research*, discussed the impacts of anti-Semitism and Jewish quotas in American universities on Jewish refugees fleeing Nazi-held regions of Europe and the Holocaust in the 1930s. Refugee scholars found that American colleges were reluctant to hire them, both as Jews and as refugees. Krohn told the story of John Herz, a Jew born in Germany who had earned a doctoral degree in political theory and international law at Cologne University. After fleeing to the US during Hitler's reign, Herz could only find work as a substitute teacher for the summer at a Connecticut university. In an interview with Krohn, Herz said that the college "wouldn't employ me full time after that. One of them told me later - rather shamefully - that being a Jew in addition to being a refugee was a reason."¹³⁶ The majority of other refugee scholars faced the same predicament - anti-Semitic quotas for both students and faculty stood in their way of finding success in their new country. Before being allowed entry, refugees were required to demonstrate that they would not be an economic burden on the country. If refugees could not find jobs, they would not be issued work visas and thus would be stuck in Nazi Europe. Just as Herz began to think he would have to leave academia - and possibly face deportation - he was presented with a teaching opportunity at Howard University - a historically black college - in 1941.¹³⁷

¹³⁶ Claus-Dieter Krohn, Rita Kimber, and Robert Kimber, *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), 176.

¹³⁷ Ibid, 177.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) were institutions of higher education that were established to allow Black American students to pursue a college education when all other universities barred their admission on account of their race. Many HBCUs were established nearly a century before the passing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which provided for the integration of schools and prohibited segregation, and were a mix of private and public colleges. Most HBCUs were founded in the South, and the majority were established during the Reconstruction Era.¹³⁸ In the 1930s, when Jewish refugees were entering the US and anti-Semitic quotas were at their peak, HBCUs were thriving epicenters of Black scholarship. As more and more Jewish refugee scholars began to run into roadblocks securing jobs at white universities, leaders at HBCU began to offer Jewish refugees faculty positions. One of these leaders was James Shepard, president and founder of North Carolina Central University (NCCU) in Durham, North Carolina. Shepard reached out to four Jewish refugee scholars and offered them teaching positions, with all accepting the opportunities. Shepard understood the dire situation Jewish refugees were in, and also recognized that Jews had faced discrimination that was similar to the discrimination suffered by Black people. He took advantage of the situation to not only take part in an act of humanitarianism, but also add world-class professors to the faculty NCCU.¹³⁹

Students that were taught by the Jewish refugees hired by HBCUs were inspired by their stories and enthusiasm for teaching. Eugene Eaves, a student of one of the refugees Shepard hired at NCCU, recounted his experience in an interview with the *Washington Post*, saying, “These teachers cared for us, they demonstrated a recognition of the barriers we had to confront

¹³⁸ Bobby L. Lovett, *America's Historically Black Colleges & Universities a Narrative History from the Nineteenth Century into the Twenty-First Century* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2015), 84-109.

¹³⁹ Mark K. Bauman and Berkley Kalin, *The Quiet Voices: Southern Rabbis and Black Civil Rights, 1880s to 1990s* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 209-210.

and committed themselves to arming us with what we needed to survive it all.”¹⁴⁰ Students mentored by Jewish refugees at HBCUs include many prominent names, such as Joyce Ladner, a sociologist and civil rights leader; John T. Biggers, an artist; and Joycelyn Elders, a surgeon general. In total, HBCUs hired fifty-three Jewish refugee scholars when white universities and their anti-Semitic faculty and student quotas refused to give them employment.¹⁴¹ With many non-secular universities being founded after World War II had ended, it is likely that, had the leaders of these HBCUs not taken these scholars in, the fifty-three Jewish refugee scholars hired by HBCUs would have been denied entry into the US and left to suffer a miserable fate in Nazi Europe.

Brandeis University

As a direct response to the quotas plaguing American universities and preventing Jews from pursuing higher education, members of the American Jewish community founded Brandeis University. Named after Louis Dembitz Brandeis, the first Jewish justice of the US Supreme Court from 1916 to 1939, Brandeis University was established as a secular, non-sectarian institution at the former site of Middlesex University in Waltham, Massachusetts.¹⁴² Middlesex University had been a medical school that was one of the few medical schools that did not impose a quota restricting Jewish attendance. The founder of Middlesex, John Hall Smith, died in 1944 and willed the grounds of the school to any group that wished to establish a non-sectarian college should Middlesex face financial trouble. In 1946, Middlesex failed to secure accreditation by the American Medical Association and was shut down by the state of

¹⁴⁰ Heather Gilligan, “Perspective | How Historically Black Colleges Helped Rescue Jewish Refugees,” *The Washington Post* (WP Company, December 11, 2019), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2019/12/11/how-historically-black-colleges-helped-rescue-jewish-refugees/>.

¹⁴¹ Ibid

¹⁴² Arthur H. Reis, “The Founding,” *Brandeis Review, 50th Anniversary Edition*, January 26, 1998, PDF, 43.

Massachusetts. John Hall Smith's son, C. Ruggles Smith, was determined to fulfill his father's wishes and save the grounds of Middlesex University. Israel Goldstein, a New York rabbi, headed a committee of members of the Jewish community that sought to establish a Jewish-sponsored non-sectarian university to remedy the harm and inaccessibility caused by anti-Semitic quotas. Upon learning of this committee, Smith reached out to Goldstein and proposed that he bestow the Middlesex campus and charter to the committee, hoping that the committee would be able to establish a secular university and save the preexisting medical school. Goldstein and the committee accepted Smith's offer and began to recruit prominent Jews to assist with establishing a university.¹⁴³ Among the recruits were distinguished lawyer George Alpert, historian and National Hillel Commission chairman Abram Leon Sachar, and German theoretical physicist Albert Einstein.¹⁴⁴ The founders of Brandeis did not believe they were in a position to fund the upkeep of the preexisting Middlesex medical school or convince the American Medical Association to restore its accreditation, and thus closed the medical school in 1947, establishing a robust pre-med program in its stead.¹⁴⁵

In 1948, Sachar was chosen as Brandeis' first president. As president, Sachar vowed to never implement quotas of any kind because quotas "are based on the assumption that there are standard population strains, on the belief that the American must look and act like an eighteenth-century Puritan, that the melting pot of America must mold all who live here into such a pattern."¹⁴⁶ Unlike most universities at the time, applications to Brandeis did not ask applicants to declare their ancestral, religious, gender, or racial identities. The university's first freshman

¹⁴³ Ibid, 44.

¹⁴⁴ Arthur H. Reis, "Einstein," *Brandeis Review, 50th Anniversary Edition*, January 26, 1998, PDF, 64.

¹⁴⁵ Gary Phillip Zola and Marc Dollinger, *American Jewish History: A Primary Source Reader* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2014), 288-289.

¹⁴⁶ John H. Fenton, "Sachar Installed As Brandeis Head," *The New York Times*, October 8, 1948, 22.

class consisted of 107 students from twenty-eight states and six foreign countries. Under Sachar's leadership, Brandeis grew in size and reputation, becoming known as an influential and respected research institution after just a few years of operation. Brandeis University accomplished its mission to combat nationwide anti-Semitic quotas and became a safe haven for Jews, as well as Black students, women, and other marginalized scholars.¹⁴⁷

The Anti-Defamation League

Anti-Semitic quotas in southern medical schools directly contributed to the strengthening of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) as an organization. The Anti-Defamation League, formerly known as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, was founded in 1913 in Chicago, Illinois by the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, a Jewish service organization. The primary goal of the ADL was to combat anti-Semitism and secure justice for persecuted Jews. Its creation was sparked, in part, by the aforementioned arrest and lynching of Leo Frank in Atlanta.¹⁴⁸ As the ADL grew, it began to investigate anti-Semitic quotas and discriminatory policies in higher education. As discussed in Chapter 3, the ADL released incriminating statistics about the disproportionate rate of failures of Jewish students in Emory's School of Dentistry. Shortly after releasing this report, John Buhler, Dean of the School of Dentistry, resigned, though Emory claimed his resignation was not due to the report.¹⁴⁹ The ADL was also active in investigating other universities, creating a "crack the quota" campaign in 1949. The League collaborated with the American Council on Education to hold a conference with over one-

¹⁴⁷ Leeza Barstein, Megan Geller, and Jocelyn Gould, "50 Years of AAAS: Remembering a Resistance," *The Justice*, February 5, 2019, <https://www.thejustice.org/article/2019/02/brandeis-aaas-anniversary>.

¹⁴⁸ "Our History," Anti-Defamation League, accessed June 21, 2020, <https://www.adl.org/who-we-are/history>.

¹⁴⁹ Brickman, *Extracted*, 5.

hundred delegates from universities around the country in order to determine what schools may have been implementing discriminatory policies, including Emory University.¹⁵⁰

According to a 1963 Congressional Record, the ADL's efforts were incredibly effective and drastically decreased the number of colleges that employed quota systems. In addition, the document reported that the ADL had identified over 1,000 schools that had revised their application forms to remove questions regarding the race or religious identity of applicants.¹⁵¹ These results further legitimized the work of the ADL, and solidified its position as a staunch advocate for American Jews. It also created a precedent for the ADL to oppose quota systems and defend universities whose admissions policies were compared to quotas but ultimately not reflective of quotas. In 2013, and later in 2015, the ADL defended the University of Texas's admissions policies after a legal challenge that alleged that the university's race-conscious admissions policies were discriminatory against Asian-American students by filing an amicus brief. The ADL argued against claims that the policies were similar to anti-Semitic quotas, citing a lack of evidence that the policies were meant to discriminate based on race and a lack of quotas restricting attendance.¹⁵² Seven years after the initial University of Texas filing, the ADL announced similar support for Harvard's race-conscious admissions policies in 2020 and denounced attempts to compare the policies to anti-Semitic quotas in an amicus brief.¹⁵³ In both of these shows of support, the ADL directly disputed any similarities opponents were drawing between these policies and the anti-Semitic quotas of the past, defending these policies as vital to

¹⁵⁰ *The Fight Against Prejudice*, 88th Cong., 1st sess., Congressional Record 109, pt. 7: 9302.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid*, 9303.

¹⁵² Brief for The Anti-Defamation League, et al. as Amici Curiae Supporting Respondents, *Abigail Noel Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*, et al., 570 U.S. 297 (2013) (no. 11-345). ; Brief for The Anti-Defamation League, et al. as Amici Curiae Supporting Respondents, *Abigail Noel Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*, et al., 136 S. Ct. 2198 (2016) (no. 14-981).

¹⁵³ Brief for The Anti-Defamation League, et al. as Amici Curiae Supporting Respondents, *Students For Fair Admission, Inc v. President and Fellows of Harvard College*, 1:14-cv-14176-DJC (2020) (no. 19-2005).

establish a diverse student populace rather than an attempt to discriminate against applicants.

Today, the ADL is known as a Zionist organization dedicated to fighting anything it deems anti-Semitic hate speech.¹⁵⁴

Zionism

Anti-Semitic quotas led to the adoption and strengthening of the Zionist ideology in many American Jews. Zionism is an ideology and movement that calls for the re-establishment of and protection for a Jewish state in Palestine, which was considered by Jews to be the biblical Land of Israel.¹⁵⁵ Prior to 1948, when the State of Israel was established, the primary goals of Zionism were to re-establish a sovereign Jewish state in the Land of Israel and protect Jews against anti-Semitism. Until 1914, many American Jews were opposed to Zionism, particularly the idea of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine. Influential American Jews, such as Jacob Schiff, declared that Jews that embraced Zionism would be accused of divided loyalty, a common anti-Semitic canard, or disloyalty to the United States. Critics of Zionism argued that the United States was the promised land for Jews, and began to popularize the saying “America is our Zion.”¹⁵⁶ However, after the start of World War I in Europe in 1914, recent Jewish immigrants to the United States who had lived under anti-Semitic pogroms began to support Zionism. Louis Brandeis, a prominent Jewish leader and future justice of the US Supreme Court, embraced Zionism and legitimized and popularized the movement among Jewry in the States. As more American Jews began to adopt the Zionist ideology, anti-Semitic quotas at American universities strengthened their desire for the creation of a Jewish state.¹⁵⁷ It became clear that

¹⁵⁴ It is important to note that the ADL has faced criticism in recent years for using anti-Palestinian, Islamophobic, anti-Black, and homophobic language.

¹⁵⁵ Aaron Berman, *Nazism, the Jews, and American Zionism, 1933-1948* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990), 13-18.

¹⁵⁶ “Zion” is what the Land of Israel and Jerusalem were called in the Hebrew Bible.

¹⁵⁷ Berman, *Nazism, the Jews, and American Zionism*, 34-35.

Jews would face educational roadblocks in both the United States and in Europe, thus leading Zionists to more urgently call for the creation of Israel in order for Jews to thrive.

The Common Application

According to Jerome Karabel, author of *The Chosen*, which describes the anti-Semitic quotas implemented at Harvard, the application questions created in order to identify Jewish applicants became the basis for modern college applications. Prior to the quotas, elite private colleges used entrance examinations to determine admission, and public state schools admitted most students who had graduated from certified high schools. Applications were rarely used. In the early 1900s, as the Ivy Leagues began to establish quotas restricting Jewish attendance as an answer to “the Jewish problem,” admissions applications were created to weed out the Jewish applicants. The application questions included questions about the religious affiliation of the applicant, the religion and nationality of an applicant’s parents, the applicant’s mother’s maiden name, and the character traits of the applicant. Some applications also required photographs of the applicant, as well as letters of recommendation from church leaders. Personal interviews also became established. These applications became known as “character-based applications,” with their primary purpose being to use common Jewish stereotypes about personality and appearance to identify whether or not an applicant was Jewish if the application did not ask for the applicant’s religion up front.¹⁵⁸

Character-based applications began to become popular outside of the Ivy Leagues, and their use spread across the country. In 1975, the Common Application, a single evolved form of character-based applications, was created and, as of 2019, is used by over 900 colleges.¹⁵⁹ The

¹⁵⁸ Karabel, *The Chosen*, 555-557.

¹⁵⁹ Jessica Gross, “Who Made That College Application?,” *The New York Times* (*The New York Times*, November 8, 2013), <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/10/magazine/who-made-that-college-application.html>.

application includes in-depth demographic questions, questions about volunteering and extracurricular activities, and essay questions. Unlike the exclusionary goals of the past character-based applications of the Ivy Leagues, the aim of the Common Application today is to diversify schools by providing admissions officers with a well-rounded view of an applicant. It also serves to simplify the college application process by allowing students to apply to multiple colleges at once.¹⁶⁰ However, the Common Application has come under fire for giving colleges more ways to give preference to certain types of applicants, such as legacy students whose family members had previously attended the college or athletes that may not necessarily qualify academically. These incidents have shown that an application based on one that was meant to exclude Jews may be inherently flawed.

Reckoning

Perry Brickman's research and subsequent documentary and book on the anti-Semitic quotas and intentional failings policies implemented by the Dean of the Emory School of Dentistry, John Buhler, from 1948 to 1961 prompted a response from the university. In 2012, Emory University commissioned a screening of Brickman's documentary, *From Silence to Recognition: Confronting Discrimination in Emory's Dental School History*, and held a ceremony in order to confront the dental school's anti-Semitic past and apologize for the pain inflicted upon Jewish dental students. Emory President James W. Wagner issued a formal apology on behalf of the university at the ceremony, saying,

Institutions—universities—are as fallible as the human beings who populate them, and like individuals, universities need to remind themselves frequently of the principles they want to live by. The discrimination against Jewish students undermined the academic integrity of the dental school and ultimately of Emory. I am sorry. We are sorry.¹⁶¹

¹⁶⁰ "About," Common App, accessed June 28, 2020, <https://www.commonapp.org/about>.

¹⁶¹ Mary Loftus, "Film Screening Acknowledges Dental School Bias," Emory News Center (Emory University, October 15, 2012), http://news.emory.edu/stories/2012/10/er_dental_school_apology/campus.html.

Brickman, who was awarded a medal as an Emory University History Maker at the ceremony, accepted the apology as sincere. He acknowledged that the administration in 2012 was not directly responsible for the anti-Semitic policies and was grateful that they took the time to apologize for the university's past discrimination. In an interview with *ADA News* about the ceremony and apology, Brickman said, "It was a sincere apology. They (the current university administration) weren't the ones who did this to students but they took responsibility for it and that's all we could ask of them."¹⁶² At the ceremony, fifty-two former dental students from around the country were in attendance, as well as the families of former students who had passed. Ted Levitas, who graduated from the Emory University School of Dentistry in 1950, was appreciative of Emory's efforts to make things right. He said, "I believe this will serve as a statement to any university that this is not the way you do things, that this is America."¹⁶³ Perry Brickman's work exposing the anti-Semitism at play in Emory's now closed School of Dentistry¹⁶⁴ helped former students and families come to terms with the prejudice they or their loved ones were forced to endure and allowed Emory to atone for its distressing past.

Unfortunately, Emory is one of the only universities that has formally apologized for establishing quotas restricting Jewish attendance in the past. Some universities, such as the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, have indirectly acknowledged its past quotas through course material and online projects (often put together by professors in Jewish Studies departments), but have made no formal efforts to recognize or apologize for anti-Semitic

¹⁶² Karen Fox, "Emory Apologizes for History of Anti-Semitism at Dental School," *ADA News* (American Dental Association, November 19, 2012), <https://www.ada.org/sitecore/content/home-ada/publications/ada-news/2012-archive/november/emory-apologizes-for-history-of-anti-semitism-at-dental-school>.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ The Emory School of Dentistry closed its doors in 1988.

policies.¹⁶⁵ Other universities have made no attempts to acknowledge their anti-Semitic pasts at all.

Despite the lack of recognition of the anti-Semitic, white supremacist policies implemented at these universities, there is hope that one day, the universities that enacted such policies will finally reckon with their pasts. As of late, with the Black Lives Matter movement gaining prominence and student activists calling for universities to acknowledge their past injustices and formally denounce white supremacy, the landscape of higher education is changing. As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, one of the most obvious markers of bigotry at UNC was the statue of Silent Sam, a Confederate monument that was dedicated to the cause of white supremacy. After years of student activism demanding that the statue be removed from campus, students took matters into their own hands and tore the statue from its base on August 20, 2018. What followed was a period rife with white supremacist threats of violence against students, politicians denouncing the students as a “mob” of “criminals,” and frenzied discussions about what the university should do with the monument.¹⁶⁶ However, the moment also sparked discussions about white supremacy on the institutional level not only at UNC, but at universities around the country. In 2020, the Black Lives Matter movement, sparked by the murder of George Floyd at the hands of police, has evoked similar conversations and has led universities to rename buildings that had been previously named after white supremacists, remove monuments dedicated to the Confederacy and slaveholders, and hold meaningful discussions about racism and white supremacy on campus.¹⁶⁷ The atmospheres created by antiracist student and national

¹⁶⁵ “Jewish Life at Carolina,” Carolina Story: Virtual Museum of University History, accessed June 28, 2020, <https://museum.unc.edu/exhibits/show/jewishlife>.

¹⁶⁶ Jesse James Deonto and Alan Blinder, “‘Silent Sam’ Confederate Statue Is Toppled at University of North Carolina,” *The New York Times* (The New York Times, August 21, 2018), <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/21/us/unc-silent-sam-monument-toppled.html>.

¹⁶⁷ Lindsay McKenzie, “Searching for a Meaningful Response from College Leaders to the Killing of George Floyd,” Searching for a meaningful response from college leaders to the killing of George Floyd, June 8, 2020,

movements are ripe for discussions to begin about past anti-Semitic quotas. If schools will voluntarily go through the processes of renaming buildings and removing statues, it is possible that they will reexamine their pasts further and confront the anti-Semitic policies that have largely been ignored.

Conclusion

Anti-Semitic admissions quotas in southern United States medical schools were a tool of white supremacy to keep pure the racial and religious makeup of institutions of higher education. These policies were created by high level university officials and enforced by faculty members, many of whom participated in the harassment of the few Jewish students that were granted admission. Southern universities made an effort to keep these policies out of the public eye, and often vehemently denied they existed when confronted. It is unknown why southern medical schools went to such great lengths to keep quota systems under wraps. Perhaps it was an issue of religious freedom, perhaps it was a fear of retribution by the Jewish community, perhaps it was to protect the legitimacy of admissions, perhaps it was to make it harder for people to investigate, or perhaps it was an effort to keep up the “southern hospitality” façade. Regardless of the reason, universities strangely went out of their way to hide their white supremacist, anti-Semitic policies, despite the majority of white Americans subscribing to the same dogma.

The most common way Jewish applicants were identified was through the use of application questions that asked Jews demographic questions that would identify them as Jewish. Some applications asked if the applicant was Jewish outright, while others used the demographic information, such as the birthplace of an applicant’s parents, to determine whether the applicant was Jewish. These questions changed the way universities admit students, creating the basis for

the controversial modern college application. The architects of the quotas were willing and open participants in institutional white supremacy, and believed they were protecting the culture and integrity of their respective colleges by barring Jews from admittance simply due to their ethnic and religious identities. This, in turn, arguably led to different forms of academic gatekeeping in the future.

The Jewish students affected by the quotas suffered tremendously, and often gave up trying to study medicine after being rejected by medical schools. Some students, such as Marvin Lillian of Georgetown and Morris Krasny of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, were able to successfully confront those who had implemented the quotas. Lillian was able to attend Georgetown after challenging medical school dean Father Paul McCauley¹⁶⁸, and Krasny dismantled the entire quota system at UNC after he resisted his rejections and faced medical school dean Isaac Hall Manning. However, Lillian and Krasny's stories of opposition and defiance in the face of anti-Semitic quotas were two of very few that were successful. Jewish students that had been rejected from Emory's dental school attempted to confront officials about the quotas, but were lied to and discouraged from further confrontation. In the medical schools of other universities, like Johns Hopkins, Duke, and Wake Forest, students seemed aware enough of discrimination to insist upon quota systems existing there, but were helpless to do anything about them. The future brought more secular, nonsectarian universities such as Brandeis, but the mark on the American Jewish community was permanent. The trauma inflicted upon Jews that were denied admittance to southern medical schools due to anti-Semitic quota systems is immense and immeasurable, with many Jews being forced to give up their dreams of becoming doctors and

¹⁶⁸ "MIRIAM FEINSON ENGAGED," *The New York Times*, 17.

settling for other career paths, and many not knowing that their rejection was due to their identity.

REFERENCES

Archival Material

Carr, Julian S. "Unveiling of Confederate Monument at University. June 2, 1913." Julian Shakespeare Carr Papers. #141. Southern Historical Collection. The Wilson Library. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Correspondence from Marvin Lillian to his mother and father, 12 September 1941. TN: 6294. Booth Family Center for Special Collections. Georgetown University Archives. Georgetown. Washington, D.C.

Diary 1923-1929. R. O. (Reuben Oscar) Everett Papers. David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Duke University

Diary 1930-1936. R. O. (Reuben Oscar) Everett Papers. David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Duke University.

E.J. Evans to Frank Porter Graham, October 6, 1933. Frank Porter Graham Papers #1819. Southern Historical Collection. The Wilson Library. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Letter from Father Phillips to Martin O’Nolan. August 1932. TN: 6268. Box 83. Addenda to Archives of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus 1914-1945. Booth Family Center for Special Collections. Georgetown University Archives. Georgetown. Washington, D.C.

Letter from Martin O’Nolan to Father John Gipprick S.J. 12 May 1932. TN: 6268. Box 83. Addenda to Archives of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus 1914-1945. Booth Family Center for Special Collections. Georgetown University Archives. Georgetown. Washington, D.C.

Letter from Martin O’Nolan to Father Phillips. July 1932. TN: 6268. Box 83. Addenda to Archives of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus 1914-1945. Booth Family Center for Special Collections. Georgetown University Archives. Georgetown. Washington, D.C.

Manning, Isaac H. Volume 1, Isaac Hall Manning's History of the U.N.C. School of Medicine, 1879-1937. #4369. Southern Historical Collection. The Wilson Library. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Memorandum Concerning Admission and Other Educational Policies of The Bowman Gray School of Medicine. Prepared in the office of Mr. Lloyd Aukerman. Wake Forest University Archives. Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Memorandum. Conrad Huffman, Jr., to William Preston Few, Dec. 4, 1933. Davison Papers. Box 110. Duke University Medical Library Archives. Durham, North Carolina.

Notes from the Office of Admissions, 1932. Bowman Gray School of Medicine Medical Library Archives. Wake Forest University. Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Bibliography

“Dental School Discrimination.” History and Traditions | Emory University. Accessed June 11, 2020, <http://emoryhistory.emory.edu/issues/discrimination/dental-school.html>.

“Dr. Isaac H. Manning Resigns.” *The Daily Tar Heel*. September 30, 1933.

“Good for Frank Graham.” *Statesville Record and Landmark*. October 3, 1933.

“Jewish Life at Carolina.” Carolina Story: Virtual Museum of University History. Accessed June 28, 2020. <https://museum.unc.edu/exhibits/show/jewishlife>.

“Jews and the Civil Rights Movement.” Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism. November 20, 2018. <https://rac.org/jews-and-civil-rights-movement>.

“Law Limits Jews in Public Schools.” United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Accessed July 29, 2020.

<https://www.ushmm.org/learn/timeline-of-events/1933-1938/law-limits-jews-in-public-schools>.

“Our History.” Anti-Defamation League. Accessed June 21, 2020. <https://www.adl.org/who-we-are/history>.

“Regarding Manning’s Resignation,” *The Daily Tar Heel*, September 30, 1933.

Balint, Benjamin. *Running Commentary: The Contentious Magazine That Transformed the Jewish Left into the Neoconservative Right*. New York: Public Affairs (2010).

Barstein, Leeza, Megan Geller, and Jocelyn Gould. “50 Years of AAAS: Remembering a Resistance.” *The Justice*. February 5, 2019.

<https://www.thejustice.org/article/2019/02/brandeis-aaas-anniversary>.

Bauman, Mark K. and Berkley Kalin. *The Quiet Voices: Southern Rabbis and Black Civil Rights, 1880s to 1990s*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press (1998).

Berman, Aaron. *Nazism, the Jews, and American Zionism, 1933-1948*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press (1990).

Brickman, Perry. *Extracted: Unmasking Rampant Antisemitism in America's Higher Education*. New York: Morgan James Publishing (2019).

Brief for The Anti-Defamation League, et al. as Amici Curiae Supporting Respondents. *Abigail Noel Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin, et al.*, 570 U.S. 297 (2013) (no. 11-345).

Brief for The Anti-Defamation League, et al. as Amici Curiae Supporting Respondents. *Abigail Noel Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin, et al.*, 136 S. Ct. 2198 (2016) (no. 14-981).

Brief for The Anti-Defamation League, et al. as Amici Curiae Supporting Respondents. *Students*

- For Fair Admission, Inc v. President and Fellows of Harvard College, 1:14-cv-14176-DJC (2020) (no. 19-2005).
- Cowan, Neil M. and Ruth Schwartz Cowan. *Our Parents' Lives: Jewish Assimilation and Everyday Life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press (1996).
- Curran, Robert Emmett. *A History of Georgetown University, Vol. 2: The Quest for Excellence, 1889-1964*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press (2010).
- Deconto, Jesse James and Alan Blinder. "Silent Sam' Confederate Statue Is Toppled at University of North Carolina." *The New York Times*. August 21, 2018.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/21/us/unc-silent-sam-monument-toppled.html>.
- Dinnerstein, Leonard. *Antisemitism in America*. New York: Oxford University Press (1971).
- Dinnerstein, Leonard. *The Leo Frank Case*. Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press (2008).
- Durden, Robert F. *The Launching of Duke University*. Durham: Duke University Press (1993).
- Fenton, John H. "Sachar Installed As Brandeis Head." *The New York Times*. October 8, 1948.
- Fox, Karen. "Emory Apologizes for History of Anti-Semitism at Dental School." *ADA News*. November 19, 2012. <https://www.ada.org/sitecore/content/home-ada/publications/ada-news/2012-archive/november/emory-apologizes-for-history-of-anti-semitism-at-dental-school>.
- Gilligan, Heather. "Perspective | How Historically Black Colleges Helped Rescue Jewish Refugees." *The Washington Post*.
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2019/12/11/how-historically-black-colleges-helped-rescue-jewish-refugees/>.
- Greene, Melissa Fay. *The Temple Bombing*. New York: Fawcett Columbine (1997).
- Griffin, Frances. *Less Time for Meddling: a History of Salem Academy and College, 1772-1866*.

- Winston-Salem, North Carolina: J.F. Blair, 1979.
- Gross, Jessica. "Who Made That College Application?" *The New York Times*. November 8, 2013. <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/10/magazine/who-made-that-college-application.html>.
- Halperin, Edward C. "Frank Porter Graham, Isaac Hall Manning, and the Jewish Quota at the University of North Carolina Medical School." *The North Carolina Historical Review* 67, no. 4. 1990.
- Hart, W.R. *Report of the Special Investigating Committee of the Council of the City of New York*. December 23, 1946.
- Hieke, Anton. *Jewish Identity in the Reconstruction South: Ambivalence and Adaptation*. Berlin: De Gruyter (2013).
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (2003).
- Jaher, Frederic Cople. *Jews and the Nation: Revolution, Emancipation, State Formation, and the Liberal Paradigm in America and France*. Princeton University Press (2003).
- Jones-Wilson, Faustine Childress, Charles A Asbury, Kamili Anderson, Sylvia M Jacobs, and Margo Ozakawa-Rey. *Encyclopedia of African-American Education*. Wesport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1996.
- Karabel, Jerome. *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Boston: A Mariner Book Houghton Mifflin Company (2014).
- Kingdon, Frank. "Discrimination in Medical Colleges." *American Mercury*, vol. LXI (61).
- Kitch, Sally. *The Specter of Sex: Gendered Foundations of Racial Formation in the United States*. Albany: State University of New York Press (2009).

Krohn, Claus-Dieter, Rita Kimber, and Robert Kimber. *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, (1994).

Lebos, Jessica Leigh. "Dr. Harold Black Talks about the Rotten Tooth in Emory's History." Connect Savannah. March 5, 2020. <https://www.connectsavannah.com/savannah/the-rotten-tooth-in-emorys-history/Content?oid=2329335>.

Loftus, Mary. "Film Screening Acknowledges Dental School Bias." Emory News Center. Emory University. October 15, 2012. http://news.emory.edu/stories/2012/10/er_dental_school_apology/campus.html.

Loevy, Robert D. *The Civil Rights Act of 1964: The Passage of the Law That Ended Racial Segregation*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.

Lovett, Bobby L. *America's Historically Black Colleges & Universities a Narrative History from the Nineteenth Century into the Twenty-First Century*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press (2015).

Marinari, Maddalena, Madeline Hsu, and Maria Cristina Garcia, eds. *Nation of Immigrants Reconsidered: US Society in an Age of Restriction*. University of Illinois Press (2018).

Martin, Geoffrey J. *The Life and Thought of Isaiah Bowman*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books (1980).

Massa, Mark Stephen. *Anti-Catholicism in America: The Last Acceptable Prejudice*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company (2005).

McKenzie, Lindsay. "Searching for a Meaningful Response from College Leaders to the Killing

of George Floyd.” June 8, 2020.

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/06/08/searching-meaningful-response-college-leaders-killing-george-floyd>.

Michael, Robert. *A Concise History of American Antisemitism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield (2005).

Morgan, Iwan, and Philip Davies, eds. *From Sit-Ins to SNCC: The Student Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2013.

Muller, Jerry Z. *Capitalism and the Jews*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Ngai, Mae. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (2014).

Oren, Dan A. *Joining the Club: A History of Jews and Yale*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

Reis, Arthur H. “Einstein.” *Brandeis Review, 50th Anniversary Edition*. January 26, 1998. PDF.

Reis, Arthur H. “The Founding.” *Brandeis Review, 50th Anniversary Edition*. January 26, 1998. PDF.

Rogoff, Leonard. *Homelands: Southern Jewish Identity in Durham and Chapel Hill, North Carolina*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press (2001).

Rose, Or N. *Abraham Joshua Heschel: Man of Spirit, Man of Action*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society (2003).

Rosen, Robert N. *The Jewish Confederates*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press (2001).

Smith, Neil. *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization*. Berkeley: University of California Press (2004).

Sokoloff, Leon. "The Rise and Decline of the Jewish Quota in Medical School Admissions."

Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine 68, no.4. 1992.

The Fight Against Prejudice, 88th Cong. 1st sess. Congressional Record 109, pt. 7: 9302.

Walvin, James. *Passage to Britain: Immigration in British History and Politics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984.

Webb, Clive. *Fight Against Fear: Southern Jews and Black Civil Rights*. Athens, GA: Univ. of Georgia Press (2011).

Williamson-Lott, Joy Ann. *Jim Crow Campus: Higher Education and the Struggle for a New Southern Social Order*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2018. "About." Common App. Accessed June 28, 2020. <https://www.commonapp.org/about>.

Wood, Amy Louise. *Lynching and Spectacle: Witnessing Racial Violence in America, 1890-1940*. United States: The University of North Carolina Press (2011).

Zola, Gary Phillip and Marc Dollinger. *American Jewish History: A Primary Source Reader*. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press (2014).

APPENDIX: TIMELINE OF EVENTS

| Year | University | Event |
|-------------|---|---|
| Early 1930s | University of North Carolina School of Medicine | Jewish quotas implemented |
| 1932 | Georgetown University School of Medicine | O’Nolan sends anti-Semitic letter |
| 1933 | University of North Carolina School of Medicine | Morris Krasny confronts Dean Isaac Manning |
| 1933 | University of North Carolina School of Medicine | Manning resigns, quotas cease |
| 1934 | Georgetown University School of Medicine | Jewish quotas implemented |
| 1939-1945 | N/A | World War II |
| 1940s | N/A | Holocaust becomes unignorable to Americans |
| 1941 | Georgetown University School of Medicine | Marvin Lillian confronts Dean McCauley |
| 1945 | Johns Hopkins University (undergraduate) | Jewish quotas implemented |
| 1948 | Emory University School of Dentistry | Jewish quotas implemented, intentional failings established |
| 1950s | Georgetown University School of Medicine | Quotas ended |
| 1960s | Johns Hopkins University (undergraduate) | Quotas ended |
| 1961 | Emory University School of Dentistry | Quotas/failings ended |
| 2012 | Emory University School of Dentistry | Perry Brickman releases documentary |
| 2012 | Emory University School of Dentistry | Emory formally apologizes |
| 2019 | Emory University School of Dentistry | Perry Brickman releases book |