

# EXHIBIT 240

Jews

1086

May 19, 1922

Dear Mr Hocking:

You are quite right that the Hebrew question is a knotty one, and a source of much anxiety. The main problem caused by the increase in the number of Jews comes, I take it, not from the fact that they are individually undesirable, but from the fact that they form a distinct body, and cling, or are driven together, apart from the great mass of the undergraduates. If other men of the same <sup>moral</sup> character flowed undistinguished in the stream of college youth, there would be no difficulty. The summer hotel that is ruined by admitting Jews meets its fate, not because the Jews it admits are of bad character, but because they drive away the Gentiles, and then, after the Gentiles have left, they leave also. This happened to a friend of mine with a school in New York, who thought, on principle, that he ought to admit Jews, but who discovered in a few years that he had no school at all. A similar thing has happened in the case of Columbia College; and in all these cases it is not because Jews of bad character have come; but the result follows from the coming in large numbers of Jews of any kind, save those few who mingle readily with the rest of the undergraduate body. Therefore any tests of character in the ordinary sense of the word afford no remedy. The number of men who could be rejected by any such process is very small, and would not, I think, touch the real problem. The summer hotel guards itself by refusing to admit any Jews. That, I believe, is very unfortunate; and in the case of a college would be wholly wrong. We must take as many as we can benefit, but if we take more, we shall not benefit them and shall ruin the college.

There may be different ways of limiting the number of Jews; either by directly excluding all beyond a certain percentage, a rule that could on the same ground be applied to any group of men who did not mingle indistinguishably with the general stream, - let us say Orientals, colored men, and perhaps I can imagine French Canadians, if they did not speak English and kept themselves apart; or we might limit them by making the fact that men do not so mingle one of the causes for rejection above a certain percentage. This would apply to almost all, but not all, Jews; possibly, but not probably, to other people. Applied in that way to all candidates for admission who do not clearly pass our entrance examinations, or who seek to transfer from other colleges, it would probably be effective for the moment; and meanwhile a committee could be studying the matter and report next year.

Personally, I think I should prefer to state frankly that we thought we could do the most good by not admitting more than a certain proportion of men in a group that did not intermingle with the rest, and give our reasons for it to the public. This would cause at once some protest, but would be recognized by reasonable people as the wise and generous thing. I suspect, however, that the Faculty, and probably the Governing Boards, would prefer to make a rule whose motive was less obvious on its face, by giving to the Committee on Admission authority to refuse admittance to persons who possess qualities described with more or less distinctness and believed to be characteristic of the Jews. This is what Professor Holcombe's motion was intended to do. Its object was to diminish the number of Jews in the college. He merely did not want it to be supposed that the Jews were excluded simply because they were Jews, but because they possessed the qualities common to Jews, although not absolutely universal.

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

Very truly yours,

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL

Professor William E. Hoisington

16 Quincy Street

Cambridge, Mass.