

Sandstone & Tile

FALL 2005 STANFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY VOLUME 29, NUMBER 2/3



Through the Dean's Open Door ■ *The Chinese Students Club*

From the Editor

As the new editor of *Sandstone & Tile*, I'm delighted to have the chance to explore Stanford's history with such thoughtful and knowledgeable readers and members of the Stanford Historical Society. In coming issues, we'll continue to aim high and delve deeply into Stanford's past, and I welcome your feedback and suggestions.

My own Stanford history goes back three decades. After graduating from Stanford in 1978 with a bachelor's in English and Communications/Journalism, I served as an editor of *The Stanford Magazine*. Since then, I've worked on a steady stream of Stanford projects that combine history, writing, and editing—including authoring the book *Stanford: Portrait of a University* for the Stanford Alumni Association. That project sparked my desire to go back to school to pursue a master's degree in history. *Sandstone & Tile*, for me, is a happy merging of many interests. I look forward to working with all of you to build on its excellent record as a vital and engaging forum about Stanford's past.

—SUSAN WELS, EDITOR

IN THIS ISSUE

Through the Dean's Open Door: 3 A Conversation with Former Student Affairs Deans James W. Lyons and Norman W. Robinson
Negotiating Multiple Identities: 17 The Chinese Students Club at Stanford University 1916–1942
Stanford Through the Century 32
SHS News 35
Member Roster 36
Upcoming Activities 40



Left: Branner Hall students staged a sand castle buildathon in the dorm's parking lot in March 1987.

Cover: In 1977, after a major campus demonstration and sit-in protesting apartheid and corporate investments in South Africa, Dean of Student Affairs James W. Lyons speaks with protesters in the lobby of the Old Union, listening to their concerns and making sure that they understand university policies on disruption.

PHOTOS: STANFORD NEWS SERVICE

Through the Dean's Open Door

A Conversation with Former Student Affairs Deans James W. Lyons and Norman W. Robinson

The role of deans in student life at Stanford has changed dramatically over the last fifty years. Traditionally, separate deans of men and women functioned, in a sense, as surrogate parents for the student body—acting “in loco parentis,” as the practice was known. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, however, with the revolution in academe that accompanied the “time of troubles,” Stanford fundamentally altered its relationship with students. No longer were there separate deans for men and women. Stanford deans also began, for better or worse, to give up their role as surrogate parents and expand their responsibilities to include health, career counseling, and other services.

Former Stanford Dean of Student Affairs James W. Lyons and former Associate Dean Norman W. Robinson oversaw much of this period of change. On January 26, 2005, in a conversation introduced by Stanford Historical Society Vice President Bill Stone, they recalled some of the principles that guided them and several of the countless incidents that gave them pause.



James W. Lyons, seen here circa 1978, served as Stanford's dean of student affairs from 1972 to 1990.

BILL STONE: I begin with Norm Robinson. Norm, as you may detect when he speaks, is a graduate of Bowdoin College, with a little bit of a Maine accent lingering in his expressions. He holds an M.B.A. from Columbia and a Ph.D. from this esteemed



Former Associate Dean Norman W. Robinson, pictured here in 1995, was on staff with Stanford's Student Affairs organization from 1970 to 1993.

institution, received in 1974. He's been a stunning volunteer up and down the Peninsula and was on staff at Student Affairs at Stanford from 1970 until 1993. Subsequent to that, he has presided over all manner of worthy good causes from San Francisco to San Jose, as both permanent and interim executive director for a number of community-related organizations. He's been a terrific Stanford citizen over the years. Among his credentials, he has staffed thirty Stanford travel-study programs, a selfless contribution to humanity like few others.

Now I turn to his former boss and good colleague, Jim Lyons. He was a student at Allegheny where he worked in the student affairs office. As a youngster he went on to Indiana University for a master's and a doctoral degree. He moved on to Haverford, where he served with distinction as dean for ten years. He came to Stanford in 1972 and presided over the student affairs organization until 1990. During that time, he also joined the faculty of the Stanford School of Education, where for a while he directed a graduate degree program in higher education. All this time he was also the university's unofficial beekeeper, which explains his ability to deal with fraternity row. Interestingly, Jim abandoned campus and dorm life just three years ago to move to Webster House, the first time since 1950 that he wasn't living on a college or university campus. Webster House now has RAs on every floor, but his

drive to eliminate coed bathrooms is not going very well. With great pride and affection, I give you your conversants, Norm Robinson and Jim Lyons.

JIM LYONS: Thank you, Bill, very much. Several of my housemates are here from Webster House. It is a hotbed of former students and faculty from earlier eras of Stanford, and I'm very happy that they're here.

I think we'd better begin with some truth in labeling. We made a habit in our office of employing students, and some years ago a student by the name of Francis Robert, who worked as a student assistant in the office, came in after the ten o'clock class break, limping. I could see him out of the corner of my office, and he was kind of holding his hip. I said, "Francis, what's going on?" I got up and went out there, and he says, "Oh, Jim, you know, they're digging up holes in White Plaza." And I say, "What's new? They're always digging up holes in White Plaza." He says, "Yeah, and they've got tapes around them and stuff. Have you ever been in White Plaza at class break?" "Yeah, of course I have." He says, "Well, I got behind the yellow tape, and I stood on a manhole cover that wasn't set, and one side went down and the other side went up, and my leg went down on the down side. Now, Jim, they're heavy, and when the cover settled back, I was stuck. Have you ever been out in White Plaza knee-high to the cyclists and everything passing by when you're stuck in a manhole? Bikes going this way and that way and one thing and another. I needed help getting out! Finally," he says, "this guy walks by, and he looks down at me and I look up at him, and I said to him, 'Would you help me?' And Jim," he says, "that guy looked down at me and said, 'Are you part of a psych experiment?'"

I tell that story because things are not always as they appear to be. Norm and I may accidentally reconstruct some history today—not intentionally—just because we're doing the best we can.

NORM ROBINSON: Well, Jim, thank you, and thanks to all of you for being here, and a special thanks to the Historical Society for putting this program together. It's also nice to see so many colleagues and friends here, although the down side of that is it's a little bit like having a truth squad following you around. As Jim said, we may be taking some liberties, and I'm afraid somebody who knows us well will stand up and say, "It never happened like that. You aren't even close to telling the truth." But we are going to persevere.

It's been a very interesting experience to look back after being out of this arena for some twelve years and to think about some of the events and issues with which Jim and I dealt—only this time when I thought about them, my heart wasn't racing, and my blood pressure wasn't soaring. I was just able to look back and think about what we had done. The real joy of preparing for today is that I've been able to work again with Jim, who is somebody for whom I have tremendous respect, admiration and affection. So we are going to have a conversation. I have a few questions that I'm going to pose to Jim to get him started, and we will see where this takes us.

So, Jim, it would be useful if you talked a little bit about what you did as dean of student affairs and what you were responsible for—not what a generic dean would do, but what you did.

LYONS: We did probably three things. I say "we" because Norm was my associate dean. He headed the centerpiece of the student affairs organization during my eighteen years here, and that was residential life and residential education. We built everything around that—working closely with academic advising; the dean of undergraduate studies and graduate studies later on; working not only with what was then known as Cowell, but also Counseling and Psychological Services, the Career Planning and Placement Center, campus

organizations—which was a huge thing—and very, very closely with certain service organizations such as the Haas Community Center. We had to put up with what was happening downstairs in the Admissions Office. We had no control over them. We just had to deal with all their mistakes...and successes. As a matter of fact, I don't know if there were very many mistakes.

ROBINSON: None that they'll admit to.

LYONS: So that was part of what we did. You can put those things in the category of administration, and we did them not as an end in and of themselves. We did them because it was a means to an end. I think mainly what we tried to do was teach certain things. We used a mode of teaching called the

"teachable moment."

*"Where there's
tension around
a university,
we tended to
be near it."*

Now I should explain that. Almost everything we did could be found in a tension zone between the group and the individual, the individual and the group, the parent and the son, the parent and the daughter, one roommate and another roommate, faculty and

nonfaculty, two faculty members, the healthy and the unwell—you name it. Where there's tension around a university, we tended to be near it.

If there was tension within a fraternity, it was probably Norm's problem. But when you're working in that kind of a zone where things go wrong—and we started with the assumption that things *would* go wrong—we never panicked because we couldn't understand what the hell was going wrong anyway. So when something would happen, we would try to teach from it, and—without getting into too much

of what we did—there were certain things that we tried to teach. One was the elimination of violence to deal with disagreement. Another was that you can disagree and be friends. Another was human dignity. Another was the power of trust. You trust students, which is a hard thing to do sometimes, because the only way to teach trust is to trust. And sometimes there were issues of human dignity. I think throughout our time, probably the biggest of all continuing issues was where one group with power and another group without power would play on each other. Human dignity would always be a price. That’s kind of what we did.

ROBINSON: Before I get to that, it was nice to hear Jim having in his mind a real sense of what he was responsible for and how he went about it. I say that because I want to call your attention to two headlines in the *Stanford Daily*. This one is dated Friday, March 3, and it says “Lyons Named New Dean to Head Student Affairs.” Then we have another one dated March 9, and it says, “New Dean’s Duties

Unclear.” So apparently Jim, over the course of the years, was able to bring some clarity to it. When he enumerated the list of areas for

which he was responsible, the one that I would add to it is this very building that we are in, Tresidder Union. It actually seems very surreal in a sense, for me to be up here. I mean, this was a room we spent an awful lot of time in, talking with students and talking with staff, and it’s very nice to be back here in a setting that’s familiar, talking about issues that are familiar.

“One thing we had no responsibility for was the Stanford Band. We didn’t want it.”

So you’ve heard a little bit about what Jim did and how he viewed it, but I think, Jim, it would be helpful if we talked a little bit about what the principles were that underlay your work and guided us in our everyday interactions. You talked about trust and believing students, and I think that’s absolutely true. I mean, it would have been impossible—or if not impossible, a really unpleasant task—if our view of students was that they were always trying to game us, rather than always believing them unless we had reason not to believe them, which we had occasionally but not all that often.

So that’s one of the principles, trust. But Jim, what were some of the other guiding principles that we had in our minds when we were doing our work and making decisions?

LYONS: Well, before we do that, I ought to mention that one thing we had no responsibility for was the Stanford Band. We didn’t want it. There were times when all kinds of people asked if we wouldn’t try to do something, and no, we wouldn’t. But there was one time when Norm got sucked into being kind of helpful to the band. Tell them that.

ROBINSON: Well, one day Jim called in early November, before Big Game—many, many years ago, at a time when the band would go up to the city the night before Big Game, and they would march around and sort of terrorize most of San Francisco. Hundreds and then I guess thousands of students would also go to the city and follow them around on this sort of unplanned route from one place to another. The police in San Francisco had finally had their fill of it and said that the only way they would allow this to happen that year was if they issued a permit to the band. So the band had to apply to the San Francisco Police Department, and the Police Department insisted that somebody from the university had to attend, somebody responsible,

The Leland Stanford Junior University Marching Band was banned from the UCLA game in 1986 for bad behavior. As a student organization, the band was outside the purview of the university's Student Affairs organization.

which is why I was puzzled that I was selected to go. But Jim called me and basically said that I had been chosen to do this. And at the time I felt a little bit like Lyndon Johnson approaching the campaign, when he said if nominated he would not run and if elected he would not serve. That's exactly what I felt like when I had this responsibility thrust upon me.

But I called the San Francisco Police Department and spoke with the captain who was in charge of all of this, and I said to him, "Look, really, there's not a reason for somebody from the university to go because the band is a student organization. This is their thing, and the university doesn't have anything to do with it." And he said, "Well, that may be," but he wasn't going to issue a permit unless somebody from the university went to this meeting. So I went, although as usual I was not wearing a tie. The students and I arrived, and we were ushered into a room. The patrol sergeant was there and started the meeting, and we did our introductions. And then the captain came in, and he looked around and said, "Hmm, well, I guess this isn't going to be a very long meeting because apparently Dean Robinson couldn't make it today." So I said, "Well, excuse me, but I'm here," and it went downhill from there. He then asked me for a copy of the plans, and I turned to the student who was in charge of the band and asked him to give the captain the plans. The captain asked if I had signed off on them, and I reiterated what I had told him earlier on the phone, and he basically liked the plans. As we were concluding the meeting, he asked me where I was going to be on the night of this rally, and I said most likely I was going to be at home. That wasn't good enough. He said he would not issue the parade permit unless I was at the rally, so I said, "Okay, fine, I'm happy to go to the rally, but why do you need me there?" And his answer was, in case there was trouble,



if things got out of hand, they needed to be able to call on me. I said to him, "Let me explain to you how things work on campus. When things get out of hand and there's trouble, we call the *police*."

Well, anyway, I promised him I would be there, and his final comment was, "How will we find you?" And this was before cell phones, before beepers, before any way of getting in touch with somebody, and I said to him, "Well, I'll tell you. I'll be wearing jeans and a leather jacket." His final words were to tell me that when USC was in San Francisco the Friday night before their game (either with us or with Cal), the university always had representatives from the dean's office who were being helpful. I looked at him and said, "Well, that's the difference between USC and Stanford."

He issued the parade permit, and I went, and it was relatively uneventful. But what that story illustrates, I hope, is one of our prevailing principles—that we really did entrust students with responsibility for their activities, and if there were problems, they had to deal with the consequences. This was a student activity, and I wasn't about to be the one who gave the plans to the police or even to okay the plans. This was something that they were responsible for.

LYONS: And when that captain walked in the room and said, "Where's the dean?" one of the band members said, before Norm could say anything, "He's over there. He's in plain clothes."

Created in 1982, the Dean's Award for Service was renamed the James W. Lyons Award for Service in 1990.



In terms of assumptions, let me say we tried to bring to the university something that we thought was a message of that time. Remember, we're

talking now about the late sixties, when students were saying "Don't trust anybody over thirty, we want to be responsible." That was music to our ears in a way, because by the time we got here, there had been a sea change in the theory of how our institutions worked with students. It used to be the notion of so-called *in loco parentis*—that is, deans and presidents and so forth stood as parents for the students. Students saw this as, of course, exerting control, because that's what their parents did—they put their thumbs down and controlled. Many of us saw it as much more than control. What we were trying to do in four years, if we had half a chance, was to get students to take responsibility for their own affairs and all things intellectual and social that they could. The only way to do that is to say, "Do it." And so we made the operating assumption that students were mature, in the face of overwhelming evidence that they were. One of the best ways to teach responsibility is to expect it, to assume it.

We avoided rules like the plague. When a student says, "What goes around here? I mean, can I play my stereo at four in the morning, or can I break windows if I wish?" some campuses will point to the rulebook. We would find all the different ways there were for staff and RAs and others to ask another question: "What's right?" There's a power about that question that is ennobling and very painful for students. At the

same time they were saying, "Don't trust anybody over thirty, leave us alone" and so forth, they'd say, "Can we drink?" And we would say, "Should you?" And they'd say, "Oh, Christ, Dean, come on!" There is a tendency for students this age to want rules and regulations until those rules apply to them. So the key to the culture of Stanford, then at least, was something known as the Fundamental Standard, this general idea that you should act in civil, respectful ways.

ROBINSON: We used to cite the Fundamental Standard in any of a number of situations. It really was the backbone of how we viewed the relationship between the student and the university, and how we viewed student conduct. I think I can still recite it. I'll give it a shot. It's "Students at Stanford are expected to show both within and without the university such respect for order, morality, personal honor and the rights of others as is demanded of good citizens. Failure to do this will be sufficient cause for removal from the university." Or something like that. And I think the part that we relied most heavily on was the "respect for the rights of others." For students living in the residences, we had a lengthy residence agreement that dealt in great detail with matters related to paying rent, being assigned to the dorms and things like that, sort of administrative issues. In terms of student behavior, it simply said students had to behave in ways that showed respect for other residents and the residence staff. It was taken almost directly from the Fundamental Standard. So it was a statement of principle, and that's what we would continually remind students of.

I remember one time a student came in from a fraternity that used to be in trouble every now and again. They were planning a party, and we had been driving home for years the notion that when there were parties on campus, if they were going

to serve alcohol, it was the students' responsibility to know what state law was and to decide whether they were going to follow state law and be prepared to run the risk or suffer the consequences if they didn't comply with state law. Jim was talking earlier about how, when we give students the responsibility for making decisions, there really does have to be genuine choice. So if there was going to be alcohol, there also had to be something called "ENABS"—equally available, equally attractive nonalcoholic beverage alternatives. If you want to say there was a rule, that was the rule. So the student came in because he wanted to avoid having any problems associated with

this party, and he

was somebody I knew and respected.

He was like most Stanford students, very bright and thoughtful. So he came in, had the plans for the party, and wanted me to approve them.

I wouldn't do

it, because really what he wanted was to be let off the hook, if they had not anticipated something going a certain way. So I did what Jim was talking about—I just kept posing questions to him. "Have you thought about X, have you thought about Y? What are you going to do if something happens that you hadn't anticipated? How are you going to deal with it?" And I know he left frustrated, but it was a good example of how we did things. Bright students who were learning to take responsibility needed to

have that notion reinforced for them frequently when they wanted to place responsibility elsewhere if there would be problems.

Sometimes it was difficult for us to do that, because you could almost see somebody heading for disaster. If it was going to be a real disaster, we would intervene, but other times we just had to let things unfold, because it was very likely that students would learn more from things that went wrong than from things that went right. We learn more from our failures than our successes.

LYONS: We had a lot of safety nets around—counseling, student leadership, resident assistants, and faculty living in the residences. But I think part of our philosophy was to keep them over the horizon, just out of sight, so there was this sense of a real growing-up experience. And one of the things to remember is that one of Stanford's great strengths has always been its ability to attract absolutely the brightest of students and very good and productive faculty members, and to keep them both.

Now there is not always a solid relationship between intellectual brightness and social brightness in students, and an eighteen-year-old genius still may need a little help tying his shoes, so we were dealing with a certain amount of immaturity. It's one of the distinctive characteristics of Stanford that most of our undergraduate students were roughly in the same age cohort along the way. We were blessed by having graduate students here who were older, so we had models, sometimes, of maturity. Not always, but sometimes.

ROBINSON: I used to think there was an inverse correlation between intelligence and common sense. The more our students had of intelligence, the less they seemed to behave in ways that would make sense to Jim or to me but maybe made sense to their friends.

“What we were trying to do in four years. . . was to get students to take responsibility for their own affairs and all things intellectual and social that they could.”

LYONS: This teaching agenda again is what we were talking about. One of the great social movements of our time, of my time, was the diversification of Stanford, of going from a student body that was not very diverse, by any number of measures, to one that's as ethnically and geographically diverse as we are right now. Well, these were painful times, because frankly—I can speak for myself—we didn't know exactly what we were doing along the way. We knew that we had to increase the numbers of diverse students here, and we were very mindful of that, thanks to the leadership of Dick Lyman and people after him. There was a powerful streak of egalitarianism at Stanford. Among other things, we were always able to say the ability to pay is not a part of admission. We admit you, you can come. We make sure you can come. I believe that exists today, and that started in some part because of the Stanford Charter. The initial thing was to teach the children of California, but no tuition was charged until the 1920s, if you can believe that. This group, of course, can believe that.

ROBINSON: I just want to go back to this very strong streak of egalitarianism that ran through the Stanford student body. One of the best manifestations of that was how we did freshman dormitory and roommate assignments. We wanted every new student to start out in as close to the same situation as possible, so we did not accept requests from freshmen for specific roommates. We did not put students from the same high school in the same house. We didn't tell students before they got here who their roommate was going to be. We did not write to them and say, here's the name and address of your roommate, because we didn't want them to come to any preconceived notions about who their roommate was in terms of race, religion, or socioeconomic background by looking at his or her ZIP code, looking at names, and things like that. Every freshman had to have at least one roommate, and it was a very strongly held view that all the freshmen

should get here and meet a roommate for the first time on the day they arrive, and that they then had to negotiate living together in a relatively small space with somebody they did not know beforehand. And I would say it was overwhelmingly successful, although there certainly were a lot of bumps along the road, and RAs in residences always had to get very involved in helping negotiate truces or treaties between roommates. But that strain of egalitarianism ran through everything that we did in terms of how we viewed students. We really did view them in ways that a lot of other universities did not. I have a colleague at Harvard who, when he heard about our freshman assignment policy, was in awe, and said, "How do you get away with that? We have alums who insist that their son or now their daughters live in Adams House or wherever or the five or ten kids from Andover who apply to live in the same house," and Harvard honors those because they are, I guess, bound by tradition. Our tradition was in the exact opposite direction. And so it's a good example of where, again, a principle of egalitarianism guided what we did in terms of our behavior.

LYONS: I didn't agree with that one, I might say. I always thought we should let them know who their roommates were so they could write a letter and be friends before they get here. That's just to show you, you don't win 'em all.

ROBINSON: Jim, now I'm going to mention a variety of constituencies. You had mentioned, early on when talking about what you did, different parts of the university with which you had to interact. This isn't going to be a Rorschach test, but I'm just going to throw out some constituencies, and I think it would be interesting to hear your thoughts on how we worked with them. We'll start with lawyers.

LYONS: A while ago I mentioned *in loco parentis*. That was a guiding principle for a long time, with students

as well as their parents. Of course it was meaningless, but we pretended that it meant something, and I for one was very thankful that it went by the bye in the late sixties. Unfortunately, some of the things that it threw out with the bathwater was the notion of caring. That needed retention, that needed protecting. It got replaced slowly with several efforts nationally and here with notions of how should students be responsible for their own affairs, what are our relationships to the students, so on and so forth. Unfortunately, at the same time, there was this massive rise in public higher education which had a different kind of constituency—the public, the electorate, the legislature. And it was at that point where I think law tried, never successfully, to replace caring. I think what we lived through was a

period in which we were more challenged not to ask the question of what's right, but to ask the question and answer it, "What's legal?" And there are very different answers to that sometimes.

For example, we all know that if you're under twenty-one you shouldn't drink. The law says that. Now, isn't that an effective law? It really works. Nobody under twenty-one drinks, anywhere. We pretend that it's effective. But as educators, should we be any less concerned about a thirty-year-old graduate student organizing his or her life around booze than

In March 1980, a malfunctioning extension cord started a midafternoon fire in Storey House. Student Affairs relocated all residents and helped them through the trauma and transition.

STANFORD NEWS SERVICE



After a 7.1-magnitude earthquake struck on October 17, 1989, many students evacuated their residences and camped out on lawns, in dorm lounges, and in the Old Pavilion.

STANFORD NEWS SERVICE



an eighteen-year-old? No. We have the flexibility not to be asked to enforce the law. We have a duty to be lawful, but that's a whole lot different than saying, "My job is to be a cop." That job belongs to Marv Herrington, and thank goodness, we have one of the best. So I hate to admit this, but there were times when I actually urged our staff not to consult the legal office without first checking with me.

ROBINSON: Or he would encourage us, if we felt we needed to consult with the legal office, to go in and pose the question not from the point of view of *can* we do something, but here is something that we *want* to do, and ask the lawyers if they could figure out a way, legally, that we could do what we thought made sense from an educational point of view.

LYONS: The other thing was that we had some of the brightest minds around. I mean, Jim Siena, Iris Brest, John Schwartz. We would try to pick their minds, because they could tease apart an issue and a problem, and they knew we weren't asking for permission legally to do something or not do something, and they were great in helping us think and challenging us. One of the things that I think characterized Dick Lyman's administration and Don Kennedy's administration was that we never tried to hide lumps under the carpet. If there was something going wrong, the operating thing was to take a look at it, try to understand it, do something about it.

ROBINSON: That explains why we didn't have carpeting anywhere. Jim, you talked about *in loco parentis*. What about our relationship with students' parents?

LYONS: We were the deans for students. We weren't deans for parents, and we went to great lengths at times to follow Stanford's culture. At Stanford then, the bills would be sent to students, not to their parents. The grades would be sent to students, not to their parents. We and the Registrar would often get calls—"I want to know what my Susie's grades were. How come you didn't send them home?" And we would say, "Ask Susie." That was a startling, radical thought for some parents at that time. Our relationship was to try to work directly with students, and we didn't really get that many calls from parents. We actually wrote a letter to the parents before they came. We worked a lot at that, and we suggested ways they could be helpful to students. We pointed out the fact that we send the bills to the student and said if they want to know what the grades are, to ask their son or daughter. I think most of them were relieved, don't you?

ROBINSON: I think most of them were, but there were issues that would come up.

LYONS: There was one time I remember, Norm. There was a little screw-up in the housing assignment, and you got a letter.

ROBINSON: I got a letter. It actually wasn't a screw-up in the housing assignment. It was, again, an interesting example of Stanford placing responsibility on students, and the university not necessarily taking responsibility for some of the administrative functions that students were quite capable of handling.

Jim's referring to an instance right at the start of winter quarter when a female student came into my office. She'd just come back from studying overseas, and she said, "Did you get a letter from my father?" And I said, "Not yet," and she said, "Well, you will. Ignore it." The next day the letter arrived, and I wish I had a copy of it, but I think I can recite it almost from scratch. It was "Dear Dean Robinson, as the father of a current undergraduate, I realize or am aware, perhaps

more than most, of the difficult situation that you're in dealing with so many adolescents, and I want to commend you on the success with which you do it."

Of course I got that far and thought, oh, my God, I can just imagine what's coming next. And he said, "Our daughter just returned from studying overseas and was reassigned to her house"—which was an all-upper-class house, one of the self-operated residences on campus—and "she was thrilled to be assigned back there, so we were very happy for her. However"—there's always a however—"we were wondering if you could provide something slightly more substantial than the bed sheet that she is using to separate her half of the room from that of her roommate, Fred." It turns out that Fred and this woman were very good friends. They were not romantically involved. This was not an error that had happened. They had wanted to be roommates, and so they figured out this arrangement to do it. And before I had a chance even to phone the father back, in response to his letter, he phoned the next day and asked the same question his daughter had asked me, "Did you get a letter from me yet?" And I said, "Yes, I did. In fact, I was just preparing to respond," and he said, "Well, my wife and daughter just have been all over me ever since I wrote it, so do me a favor—just forget the fact that I ever wrote it."

It's very similar to a phone call I received from a mother who had just dropped her son off at Kennedy Airport to come back for the start of his sophomore year. As he kissed her good-bye and was running into the terminal, he turned around and said, "Hey, Mom, I can't remember. Did I tell you who my roommate is this year?" She looked up and said to him, "No, I don't think you did." And he said, "Susie," and then he just took off.

Well, she called me and said she was a parent and was just curious what the roommate assignment policy was. So I explained to her that in upper-class houses, we assign students to the house. They figure out who roommates are. We did make clear that

we expected men to be roommates with men and women with women, but we didn't check on sleeping arrangements. That's what I told the mother, and then I said to her, "But I have a feeling there's something more than just intellectual curiosity behind this question." So she told me that story, and I said to her that I would be happy to call her son in and pass along the parental concerns. She said, "I'd appreciate it if you would call him in, but you cannot mention that I called you." I said to her, "How is it, then, that I would come to have this knowledge?" She said, "Well, I guess that's true. So on second thought, don't say anything to him. But all I can tell you is that when his father finds out about this, he's going to be so angry, he's likely to withhold the money for his tuition, room, and board." I said to her, "Well, I tell you what. That's more clout than I could muster."

So, again, it's an example of where students had a lot of responsibility placed on them—in this case, figuring out room situations in the upper-class houses. Usually it went okay, but occasionally things went awry or they somehow told their parents, and their parents weren't happy with it. But I always thought it was not our job to get involved in a situation between a student and a parent. I mean, to me, that was just a loser from the get-go. If there were problems between parents and their kids, we weren't going to solve that. And so we just, as Jim said, kept saying to parents, "You want the grades? Ask your son or daughter. And if they're not going to give them to you, don't send them the tuition money." That kind of thing. It was something that came up more than once. I used to go around talking to parent clubs, and one of the most frequently asked questions was, "Why don't you send the grades home?" And so that was a teachable moment where we could talk about how our relationship is really with the students, and if we're really teaching students to be responsible for their own lives, that meant they got the bill, they got

the grade. If there was an issue with the parents, the students had to take that up with their parents.

QUESTION: When would you take the initiative to call parents?

ROBINSON: Generally, we wanted the students to contact the parents. So if a student became ill, we would ask the student if he or she had called the parents. Depending on the answer, we would suggest that that would be a wise thing to do. We would offer to do it if they would like us to do that. So it was a pretty rare instance when we would have called the parents. We would have called the parent if the law mandated that we had to, but we tried to make those kinds of decisions based on some kind of sound principle rather than on what the law was. In terms of a student who was suicidal—seriously suicidal or had engaged in a suicide threat or attempt—we would work with the staff at Counseling and Psychological Services and try and make the best judgment about whether it would be helpful or a hindrance to that student's well-being to contact the parents. There was no hard and fast answer. We really would try and evaluate each situation. One of the things that Stanford really can pride itself on is dealing with each student as an individual and trying to figure out what is best for that student.

LYONS: The principle is still the relationship between the student and the parent. When the Loma Prieta quake came, one of the very first things we did was set up a phone bank out here so students could call home, on us. The whole notion was that there's a relationship between the student and the parent that we don't want to get in the middle of unnecessarily.

QUESTION: What is the status of the honor code?

ROBINSON: I think I'll just turn that question slightly since neither one of us has been here for at



An avid beekeeper at his campus home for 18 years, Lyons examines a hive that dropped from a tree inside the Quad. In the early 1980s, Lyons gave annual lectures to Stanford students on “the joy of bees.”

least twelve years. What was the status of the honor code when we were here?

LYONS: The long tradition of the honor code here was accepted by the faculty and the students. The students would assume responsibility for their own scholarship and not misrepresent the scholarship of others. Now I think it was worded slightly different from that, but there was a condition of trust, and exams were not proctored, so on and so forth. It was a very powerful part of Stanford’s educational fabric. In the late sixties, early seventies, some study suggested that the honor codes had failed. We repeated parts of that national study right here, because we had some data sets in it. We did it twice—every five years, or twice over a five-year period—and what we found was despite the fact that people thought the honor code was going to hell in a hand basket, it wasn’t. The facts were different. The sense here was that you neither cheated nor did you tolerate cheating. Faculty members might occasionally get students to turn themselves in, or a student might go to a faculty member or something like that. If the student didn’t take responsibility for it, then we would often field a complaint from a faculty member. I think as honor codes go, we had quite a healthy one when we left, but I don’t know now.

QUESTION: Did you ever have any humorous moments?

LYONS: No, never. We were very serious.

ROBINSON: I just remember almost every day it was just a joy to come into work, partly because I got to work with Jim. We were working with bright, interesting people, and generally, but not always, people with highly developed senses of humor, and so work was fun.

LYONS: I remember one embarrassing moment. When I got here in 1972, I came from Haverford College. When I left, it was seven hundred fifty men, and it had just dropped football because they couldn’t get enough people out to play it. I had spent some years, as you heard, at Indiana, which was Big Ten football, and I got here two years or a year after Stanford went to the Rose Bowl. I thought, this is going to be fun, so one of the early things I did was to ask when fall practice started and noted it on my calendar. On that day, I went out to the practice field, which then was next to Maples. I actually took part of the afternoon off, and I got out there, and I was so impressed. I’d never seen such discipline, in the first place. First day of practice, and there they were, the red jerseys. One of the quarterbacks was throwing a ball, and it was just like it was on a wire. Somebody was kicking field goals fifty-five, sixty yards. And then, with no words or anything, there was somebody in a pith helmet at the center of the field area, out there blowing a whistle, and everybody would go do something else.

Ambling up next to me was one of those guys with his neck as big as his thighs. I looked up at him and saw he had “Stanford Football” on his sweats, and I was so impressed, and I said, “Well, I’m Jim Lyons, I’m your new dean of students.” “Oh? Um hmm.” “Boy, I’m really impressed with the football,” I said and started extolling all the stuff that was going on out there—neat players just so disciplined—and he finally says, “Dean, those are the Denver Broncos—our practice starts tomorrow.” ❀



Negotiating Multiple Identities

The Chinese Students Club at Stanford University 1916-1942

TAMARA VENIT

In 2004, Tamara Venit, a Stanford graduate student in history, won the society's graduate-level essay prize for this paper. University Archivist Maggie Kimball presented the prize, which was supported by the Robert and Charlotte Beyers Fund. The judges were Peter Stansky, Paul Turner, Roxanne Nilan, Karen Bartholomew, Margaret McKinnon, and Bob Hamrdla.

For the first three decades of its existence, the Chinese Students Club at Stanford University made decisions big and small, ranging from the mundane allocation of household chores to the fundamental determinations of identity, politics, and purpose. The students bickered over who would clean the kitchen or tend the yard, and they registered noise complaints over late-night gambling in the clubhouse. They planned dances, played basketball games, and held end-of-quarter “jolly-ups” with young alumni. Amid the frivolity of college life, they also navigated alliances within and without the campus, with other clubs, with other universities, with other Chinese. The club secretary, a position

In 1942, Chinese Students Club members were “well-liked boys,” according to the *Quad*—“they study hard and have a sprinkling of activity men.”

that rotated among members each quarter, faithfully recorded these discussions and decisions in meeting minutes that reflect a gradual establishment of a group identity. These notes offer a window onto a community of young Chinese men and women as they negotiated multiple identities—as Chinese, as Americans, and as Stanford students. Yet the social and political agendas of the Chinese Students Club were the products not only of these negotiations but also of a distinct environment—a university campus in pre-World War II suburban California. The club existed and was transformed within this confluence of social, political, and environmental factors that would yield unexpected effects over the years.

THE FIRST YEARS

The Chinese Students Club made its first appearance in the Stanford yearbook in the academic year 1916 to 1917. There were twelve members listed in total, including five recent graduates from the classes of 1914, 1915, and 1916.¹ Before 1916, Chinese students at Stanford appeared most frequently in the yearbook pages as members of the Cosmopolitan Club, an organization for international students. In the academic year 1915 to 1916, this club listed seven Chinese men as members, including Y.S. Chuck as treasurer.² In the following year, when the Chinese Students Club first appeared in the yearbook, Chinese membership in the Cosmopolitan Club dropped precipitously from seven to two.³

The earliest meeting notes indicate that the Chinese Students Club existed in some capacity before 1916. In these notes, members refer to fundraising campaigns in previous years, but few records of this early activity exist, and meeting minutes date only as far back as fall quarter 1916.⁴ The club's first appearance in the Stanford yearbook and the drop in Cosmopolitan Club membership also suggest that the Chinese Students Club may have achieved enough critical mass in 1916 to pay for a yearbook photograph, as was the custom.⁵ Critical mass among club members, however, does not imply a large Chinese student population; even at this time, there were just eight Chinese students enrolled at Stanford, among whom only one was native-born [table 1].

TABLE 1 Chinese Students at Stanford, 1916 ⁶	
NAME	HOMETOWN
James Hinguong Hall	Canton, China
Kwak Chan Kwong	Canton, China
Sik Kei Lau	Canton, China
Thomas Tswoking Lee	Canton, China
Joe Woon Lum	Canton, China
Hymn Moy	San Francisco, California
Hu Wei Pai	Amoy, China
Shui Kei Wong	Canton, China

Source: *Stanford University Directory of Officers and Students*, Winter Quarter 1916-1917⁷

Foreign-born students would continue to comprise the majority of Stanford's Chinese student population [table 2], but by the 1940s the population of native-born students would gradually increase and surpass the numbers of their foreign-born counterparts.⁸

The club membership reflected this mix of foreign and native-born students. Members interacted with one another on a daily basis in the Chinese Students Clubhouse. It was first rented and then purchased from Stanford in 1920 for the purpose of housing club members and some alumni. The clubhouse always had a mix of foreign- and native-born students, and, overall, foreign-born students seem to have been just as likely to live in the clubhouse [table 3].

The changing composition of foreign and native-born Chinese would become significant to the evolution of the club's identity in several ways. In the 1910s and 1920s, on the most basic level, the members disagreed about which language to use: English, Mandarin, or Cantonese. Club leadership included both English- and Chinese-speaking secretaries, and the meeting minutes—while recorded in English—often include Chinese characters and translations. In 1929, one club member, C.Y. Shen, moved to adopt Chinese as the club's official language. Another student seconded the motion, but it was defeated,⁹ and English would remain the club's official language. Even among the

TABLE 2 Number of Chinese Stanford Students, Graduate and Undergraduate, Foreign-born vs. Native-born, Winter Quarter of the Academic Year						
	1917-1918	1922-1923	1927-1928	1932-33	1937-1938	1942-1943
Foreign-Born	8	18	30	14	15	7
Native-Born	2	5	5	12	7	18

Source: *Stanford University Directory of Officers and Students*

TABLE 3

Campus Residence: Number of Chinese Students by Nativity and Residence

	1917-18	1922-23	1927-28	1932-33	1937-38	1942-43
Foreign-Born Living in the Clubhouse	NA	16	13	7	7	1
Foreign-Born Not Living in the Clubhouse	NA	2	17	7	8	6
Native-Born Living in the Clubhouse	NA	5	1	4	4	2
Native-Born Not Living in the Clubhouse	NA	0	4	8	3	17

Source: *Stanford University Directory of Officers and Students*

students born in China, divides between northern and southern Chinese became apparent as the composition of the club's foreign-born members became more diverse [table 4].

Donald Cheu, a second-generation club member from the class of 1955, related the memories of Won Loy Chan who had lived in the clubhouse in the 1930s: "There was a Chinese cook, who had to

In 1936, a nonresident female student posed with club members in front of their living quarters in the Chinese Students Clubhouse.

COURTESY OF EDMUND D. JUNG



TABLE 4

Hometown of Foreign-born Chinese Students, Winter Quarter of the Academic Year

	1916-17	1917-18	1922-23	1927-28	1932-33	1937-38	1942-43
Canton	86%	38%	28%	13%	43%	40%	-
Beijing	-	-	11%	-	7%	-	29%
Shanghai	-	25%	6%	-	-	13%	-
Anwhei	-	-	17%	3%	-	7%	-
Hong Kong	-	-	-	7%	-	13%	14%
Elsewhere*	14%	37%	38%	77%	50%	27%	57%

*No more than one student from each town in a given year. Source: *Stanford University Directory of Officers and Students*

serve noodles to the students from the Northern provinces of China. They occupied the northern eating area while the students from Southern China had rice and utilized the room on the south side of the building.”¹⁰ The meeting minutes also contain occasional references to language classes conducted within the club, including a Mandarin-Cantonese exchange initiated in 1920.¹¹ In 1930, the Secretary reported that “Mr. Ma wants us all to learn Mandarin,” but there is no indication, and it seems unlikely, that the club complied with his wishes.¹² After 1930, the question of language never surfaced again in the meeting notes. This may have reflected the demographic shift occurring within the club as native-born club membership began to approach and achieve parity with foreign-born membership in the 1930s and ‘40s. The question of language and its related implications for national or regional identity was only one way in which the club members’ multiple allegiances manifested themselves.

POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT

The presence and predominance of foreign-born members may have also explained the club’s involvement with political events in China in the 1910s and 1920s. The club sponsored speakers like

W. Reginald Wheeler, a Yale graduate who taught at Hangchow College in China and visited the campus in the fall of 1916. “Among other things he said, ‘I want to make a strong plea to you men especially to return to China and engage in teaching. After all, you men trained in American colleges are still better fitted to do the educational work in China than us [sic] Americans.’”¹³ Many of the foreign-born Chinese students would return after graduating from Stanford, and in some cases, native-born students would also take up residence overseas in China as well [table 5].

The earliest meeting notes indicate that the club was entrenched in supporting the causes of the Chinese Republic, especially the Nationalist Party or, as it was later known, the Guomintang. On October 10, 1911, the Wuchang uprising overthrew the Qing dynasty and replaced the monarchy with a parliament of elected officials.¹⁶ The club celebrated the Chinese Republic’s Independence Day on October 10 each year. In 1919, the club’s English secretary described the festivities: “A very elaborate program made the evening well spent and brought us right back to the very heart of China.”¹⁷

A year after independence, in 1912, the first Nationalist Party was formed in China, based on a

TABLE 5

Mobility of Chinese Alumni: Number of Alumni as a Percentage of Total and Residence after Graduation, Foreign Born vs. Native Born, 1917-1942¹⁴

	Peninsula: San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	Bay Area (Excluding Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties)	California (Excluding Bay Area)	Outside California: U.S., Hawaii or Canada	Asia	Unknown
Foreign Born	6%	11%	4%	7%	33%	38%
Native-Born	16%	20%	14%	20%	4%	24%

Source: *Stanford University Alumni Directories, 1891-1931 and 1891-1955*¹⁵



In 1911, David Starr Jordan posed with members of the Stanford Cosmopolitan Club, founded in 1908. Its mission was to promote international fellowship, and its charter members represented 12 different nationalities.

Then, rather than turn over the recaptured port to the Chinese, the Japanese stationed their troops around the port and railways and wrested control of the customs services. These actions provoked vociferous protest among the Chinese of Shantung.²¹

In support of the anti-Japanese movement in

platform of support for local self-government and provincial autonomy. This platform was considered a direct affront to the centralized authority espoused by China's president, Yuan Shikai.¹⁸ The Nationalist Party, having incurred the wrath of the president, fled to the southern provinces in 1913.¹⁹ In the years that followed, the Chinese Students Club at Stanford became actively engaged in disseminating information about the Nationalist Party and other events in China to Chinese communities in the Bay Area and elsewhere. The meeting minutes from 1916 reference a publicity campaign conducted by club members during the "Chinese-Japanese Crisis of 1915."²⁰ The Japanese, having declared war on Germany, seized an opportunity to expand their interests in China by demanding that the Germans turn over control of the port of Shantung, which had been under German control since 1897. For their part, the Chinese had expressed a desire to remain neutral, but this did not prevent the Japanese from attacking and expelling the Germans in Shantung.

Shantung, the Stanford club joined with the University of California at Berkeley Chinese Students Club to publicize the events overseas and the plight of the occupied Chinese. However, it is not clear how committed the club members were to the cause. The chair of the publicity committee at UC Berkeley, Miss Shew, reported that the Stanford club's members in 1915 had "agreed to subscribe towards the fund but did not make any actual payment in cash with the exception of N.C. Chu who expended about \$5.00 for the purpose of going on a short

STANFORD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES



Adelbert "Dell" Buttrey served as Cosmopolitan Club president for fall semester 1923.

W.S. Lee, a senior, was second-semester president of the Chinese Students Club in 1917.

lecturing tour around the Bay Regions in respect to the Chinese-Japanese crisis.”²²

Three years later, in 1918, the club once again embarked upon a publicity campaign to raise awareness about the plight of Chinese Nationalists:

*Three plans were proclaimed—The first one was suggested by Mr. Chi that a paper should be published with the purpose of propagating the Chinese political news and knowledge to all the Chinese students in all the parts of the U.S.; the second one by Mr. Wong that a simple Chinese paper should be published with the purpose of propagating the knowledge of the present situation in China to our country people in San Francisco; and the third one by Mr. Chang that some one of our club may be sent out to San Francisco to speak with people there.*²³

This involvement in Chinese affairs signaled the club’s identification with China, the homeland of the vast majority of members in the 1910s. However, its political activism was also significant inasmuch as it drew the club members away from the bucolic, secluded campus and encouraged engagement with other Bay Area Chinese. Through political activism, the Chinese Students Club began to forge networks with communities in San Francisco, Berkeley, and beyond.

During and after World War I, the conflict between Chinese and Japanese interests deepened. Barely concealing their guiding purpose of expanding their control over China, the Japanese issued twenty-one demands after their occupation of Shantung. The relatively weak Chinese government was forced to capitulate to all but the most egregious of the demands in what became known as “national humiliation day.”²⁴ The club took a stance on Japanese imperialism and engaged in lengthy discussion over Japanese-Chinese relations both in regular meetings and in dedicated sessions:



1914 STANFORD QUAD

The remainder of the evening was devoted to the discussion of the Japanese demands question.

Chairman Mei appointed a committee composed of Mr. S.K. Wong, Mr. G.L.

Pun, and Mr. W.J. Chang under

*the name of the National Welfare Committee whose duties are to survey the Japanese question carefully and devise methods to do our bit toward China. It was unanimously decided that the club would meet informally every Friday night at 8 to 9 pm for the duration of the quarter to hear whatever report this committee has to offer and also to discuss national problems as well as to exchange knowledge.*²⁵

By the end of the war in 1918, the Japanese held the northern-based Chinese parliament in their pocket, and the U.S. and other world powers recognized their “special neighborly interests,” diplomatic policy that did nothing to assist the colonial oppression of the Chinese.²⁶ Removed by thousands of miles at Stanford, the club could do little but discuss the plight of the Chinese revolutionaries.

Ten years later, the state of Japanese-Chinese relations still loomed large in club discussions. By 1928, the Nationalist Party in China had assembled an army and embarked on a military campaign to retake the northern provinces. In Shantung, the Nationalist army clashed with Japanese troops. The battle resulted in a humiliating defeat for the Chinese.²⁷ Sometime thereafter, the club received a telegram from a youth group in China describing “the butchery done by the Japanese army on the Chinese in Shantung.” After reading this message at the May 18 meeting, the club decided on two position statements: one, that “we are anti-Japanese

Chinese Students Club members pose for the 1917 *Quad*.

Imperialism” and two, that “We strongly support the Chinese masses both here and in China in their anti-Japanese imperialist movement.”²⁸

Perhaps not surprisingly, the Japanese occupation in the 1920s and ‘30s seems to have affected the Chinese Students Club’s interaction with Stanford’s Japanese Students Association during that period. When the club received an invitation to hold a banquet with the Japanese Students Association in 1924, the response was less than enthusiastic. Mr. Huang reportedly cautioned that the Japanese club, while friendly on the surface, “may not be warm within.” This shorthand suggests the Chinese Club’s lack of trust in the Japanese Students Association. The members decided to “refuse the Japanese offer cordially” and instead voted thirteen to four to invite the more neutral Cosmopolitan Club to another social gathering.²⁹

While they eschewed contact with the Japanese Students Association, the Chinese Students Club maintained ties to the Cosmopolitan Club. It seems that while the lofty issues of nationalism and imperialism may have inspired Chinese Students Club members, they also had to contend with their daily existence as Stanford students and their immediate environment in suburban California. The Chinese students shared their culture in “a program characteristic of the Chinese” in social gatherings and banquets sponsored by the international club,³⁰



and the gesture was reciprocated by inviting the Cosmopolitan Club to the clubhouse.³¹ However, there were limits to the clubs’ interactions with one another. For example, despite some members’ opinion that “it was a moral obligation for [the Chinese Students Club] to help the Cosmopolitan Club,” the Chinese students balked at the Cosmopolitan Club’s request for financial assistance with a float competition in 1924.³² Regardless of their reluctance to share in the cost of float construction, the Chinese Students Club’s relationship with the Cosmopolitan Club suggests one way in which the Chinese used their unique heritage to participate in the broader student community.

BAY AREA TIES

Beyond the confines of campus life, club members also existed within and engaged with a larger suburban community of Chinese and Chinese-Americans living and working in Santa Clara County. While the majority of Bay Area Chinese lived in San Francisco,

TABLE 6
Chinese Population by County

	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940
San Francisco	13,954	10,582	7,744	16,303	17,782
San Mateo	306	309	342	510	713
Santa Clara	1,738	1,064	839	761	555

Source: *U.S. Census*

a significant population had long inhabited the peninsula as well [table 6]. These numbers fluctuated with changing political conditions in China, U.S. immigration policies, and the level of labor demand of California agriculture.³³

Although primarily employed as agricultural workers, many Chinese also found employment as launderers, restaurant workers, and housecleaners.³⁴ Some Chinese residents, like Palo Alto restaurant owner Leung Kee, initially moved to the area to cook for Stanford students in fraternities and eating clubs.³⁵ In the first decades of the twentieth century, Chinese living in Palo Alto clustered around Emerson and Ramona Streets with Japanese families who were engaged in similar lines of work. Occasionally, Chinese Stanford students would also rent apartments in this “Oriental” neighborhood.³⁶

In the 1920s, the Stanford club made several attempts to reach out to local Chinese. Nga (“Nelson”) Yau Yue was particularly dedicated to such efforts. In 1921, Yue “moved to invite the Chinese laborers near the campus sometime next week to have a social meeting.” The motion was passed.³⁷ A year later, Yue once again “made a motion to invite all of the Chinese working people on the campus in view of launching a financial drive among them on behalf of our Club House.”³⁸ Yue, as a foreign-born Chinese student, would not necessarily have felt a natural connection with the nonstudent Chinese, who were more than likely born in the United States and separated from the club members by a significant class divide. Nonetheless, Yue sought out the involvement of the wider Chinese community in the social and financial affairs of the club. Perhaps

Club members in 1924 included (back row) John Hock How, Yu Fang Tsi, Henry Doo Foo Cheu, Hua-Pias Huang, Tsong-Hsun Tsui, Chin-Chuan Wu, Hung-Chau Wong; (third row) Pen-Tung Sah, Li Hwei Bain, Song-Ping Tsao, Shulin Lincoln T’an, Yao-Tung Hao, Tung Ho Cheng, Kwan-Chun Shen, Shu Kai Wang; (second row) Wu T’aam, Eugene Shen, Roland Chung Fang, Nelson Y. Yee, Kuo-Liang Chi, Ko-Chuen Yang, Chun-Kao Teng, Liang-Kung Yang; and (first row) Faw-Yap Chuck, Er-Chang Ping, Young D. Hahn, David Kiong Chang, and Tseng Ku Chuan.

1924 STANFORD QUAD





for him, the club served a larger purpose than enhancing student life. Yue would not return to China, remaining in the Bay Area after graduating with a degree in botany in 1922. He married, moved to Oakland, and worked as a cashier and manager at the Chinatown branch of Bank of America.³⁹ Adam Pen-Tung Sah, also born in China, similarly attempted to involve the club with the local Chinese. In 1924, he suggested the club start a night school for Chinese cooks. The proposal was denied as the club decided it would not “take up the teaching job for lack of time on the part of the members.”⁴⁰ Graduating in 1924, Sah returned to China where he became a teacher of physics at a college in Beijing.⁴¹ There is also a reference to another outreach attempt in 1938: “The President appointed Mr. T.H. Liu to talk over the matter of helping the Chinese down at Palo Alto.”⁴² However, no further information as to the nature of “help” follows in subsequent meetings. Despite their good intentions, the Chinese Students Club seems to have had only limited contact with the local Chinese community.

The club interacted more readily and more frequently with the Chinese community at UC Berkeley, with whom they shared the bonds of college travails and other youthful adventures. In addition to cooperating in political activism, the two groups engaged in athletic events (when they found enough players to field a team), dances, and other social gatherings. These occasions could become quite elaborate, such as an evening in the

The Chinese Students Clubhouse was first rented and then purchased in 1920 from Stanford as a residence. A preliminary club constitution, drafted in 1951, stated that its purpose was “to remain as ‘a house for all Chinese’ but with all races invited to mix and integrate in fostering international fellowship.”

East Oakland home of Mr. and Mrs. Lan Hing in 1916 “where there were fifty or sixty present, that is counting the students of the University of California and other schools. Besides dancing and parlor games, we had on our program trombone solo, mandolin, and vocal solo, Chinese flute solo, and a fifteen minute vaudeville sketch.”⁴³ The purpose of these gatherings was clear to the participants: “to afford ample opportunity for fostering closer contact and more comradeship among the students of the two universities and other institutions.”⁴⁴ As with political activism, these social gatherings drew the students off campus and into relationships with other suburban campuses and communities around the Bay.

The Chinese students of Stanford and Berkeley would encounter one another regularly at intercollegiate conferences and Big Game Day dances (which were alternately held on the Berkeley and Stanford campuses).⁴⁵ However, this social network extended beyond the common experience of college life. The Stanford Club also had ties with the Chinese community of San Francisco. In the 1910s and 1920s, gatherings would often serve dual social and political purposes. For example, in 1922, the club staged a play in San Francisco “with the proceeds of the first two days to go towards keeping the southern [i.e. Nationalist] government and the returns of the third day to be put to the use of our club house.”⁴⁶ (This show was not an isolated incident; the meeting notes make at least one other passing reference to travel to San Francisco for the purpose of staging plays and general debate about whether or not train fare should come from the club treasury.⁴⁷)

The Stanford Chinese Students Club also interacted with established organizations in San Francisco’s Chinatown, such as the Chinese Six

Club members relax over a board game in 1939. According to the *Quad* that year, the club represented “aptitude, achievement, a minority—but not a lost one.”

Companies and the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA). During its 1918 campaign against Japanese imperialism, the club followed the lead of the Chinese Six Companies, a well known and powerful association of San Francisco Chinatown businessmen: “Mr. S.K. Wong announced [at the meeting] that since the Chinese Six Companies are taking the publicity work toward the Japanese questions, we should cooperate with them.”⁴⁸ On a more casual level, the Stanford club interacted with the Chinatown YMCA, holding joint meetings and inviting its members to campus for football games.⁴⁹ Beyond social and political ties, the club became financially connected to San Francisco when the Canton Bank, located there, lent the Chinese students money to purchase the clubhouse from Stanford.⁵⁰ In this sense, the Chinese Students Club existed within a suburban community that socially, politically and financially revolved around the city of San Francisco and, more particularly, its ethnic enclave of Chinatown.

The Stanford club’s social, political, and financial network reached up the peninsula to San Francisco and out to the East Bay. The existence of this network and the ease with which the Stanford club connected with Chinese communities in Berkeley, Stockton, Oakland, and elsewhere suggests a geographic relationship unexplored by scholarship that focuses largely on urban ethnic neighborhoods like San Francisco’s Chinatown. The peripheral communities in the suburbs were smaller and perhaps therefore less conspicuous. However, their frequent and regular interactions with one another and with the central urban community suggest some of the ways in which the Chinese perceived their community as centered on but not limited to the space occupied by Chinatown and its institutions. Even in the first half of the twentieth



century, Bay Area Chinese were not simply urban or non-urban, living in Chinatown or in the strawberry fields of Santa Clara County. Rather, they developed and maintained extensive social networks that implicated the communities of the Peninsula in the affairs, politics, and society of those of the East Bay and San Francisco.

However, the Chinese students at Stanford who so adeptly navigated the social environment of the Bay Area were atypical inasmuch as they were of a privileged, highly educated class. As such, they likely had more to gain by cultivating relationships outside the immediate area than would the average working-class Chinese gardener or cook. Several factors may explain the students’ motivation. They had the means to make regular trips to San Francisco, a place where they could immerse themselves in Chinese culture, entertainment, and politics. After all, the largest Chinese community in the area and, for that matter, in the country was in San Francisco. The city’s Chinatown had the area’s

highest number and concentration of Chinese banks, stores, businesses, and associations. Moreover, a significant number of native-born Chinese students at Stanford had grown up there and had family living there. Given these personal ties as well as the cultural and social significance of San Francisco's Chinatown to the state's Chinese population, it is not surprising that the Stanford club would naturally orbit around that city rather than the smaller but more proximate Chinatown of San Jose.

Another factor working in favor of these suburban networks may have been the inherent transience of the Stanford Chinese student population. Very few students would remain in Santa Clara or San Mateo counties; therefore, there was relatively little incentive to nurture relationships with the Chinese community of Palo Alto and neighboring towns such as San Jose, Menlo Park, or Burlingame. Many Chinese students, however, would take up residence in the greater Bay Area, including San Francisco and Alameda counties [table 7].

After graduation, students looking for jobs or spouses might have capitalized on their existing relationships with Chinese communities in San Francisco and its suburbs. As time went on, the Chinese students at Stanford were increasingly likely to remain in the Bay Area (including San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties) or move to other cities in California, while the percentage taking up residence in Asia declined.

The passage of time also eroded the political fervor of the club's early years. In the 1930s and 1940s, the meeting minutes reflect a marked change in tone and content. The political agenda of the club disappeared almost entirely, subsumed within a flurry of social activity and clubhouse management. The club's social agenda had always figured largely in meeting discussions. Dances, picnics, and athletic events engaged the same Bay Area networks that the club used to disseminate information on the plight of the Chinese Nationalist Party. Yet throughout the Great Depression and World War II, discussion of politics was conspicuously absent. The austerity of

TABLE 7

Mobility of Chinese Alumni: Number of Alumni as a Percentage of Total Chinese Alumni, with Their Residence after Graduation, by Year

	San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties	San Francisco and Alameda Counties	California (Excluding Bay Area)	Outside California: U.S., Hawaii or Canada	Asia	Unknown
1917	–	20%	10%	–	30%	40%
1922	4%	22%	4%	13%	43%	13%
1927	6%	17%	3%	3%	29%	43%
1932	15%	–	15%	8%	19%	42%
1937	5%	9%	5%	18%	18%	45%
1942	24%	20%	4%	28%	4%	20%

Source: *Stanford University Alumni Directories, 1891-1931 and 1891-1955*

the Depression years is faintly evident in the types of social activities organized by the club. Whereas during the flush years of the 1910s and 1920s, the club might hold a banquet for members and alumni, members seemed more likely to organize a picnic during the 1930s. An end-of-year report in 1934 laments that “the only social accomplishment for [fall] quarter was the giving of a buffet luncheon to the U.C. Chinese students on Big Game Day.”⁵¹

During World War II, the meeting notes contain some oblique references to a lecture series, but it seems to have had little if anything to do explicitly with the topic of war. These lectures included a visit, shortly after Pearl Harbor, by Dr. Shen who “spoke to the students informally on the life of students in England and other aspects of college life.”⁵² Three years later, while war still waged, Dr. Chiang spoke to the Stanford community at large about “the Communist problem” and “Russia’s future in the Far East.” However, when he met exclusively with the Chinese Students Club, the meeting notes report that he “spoke to the students on the need for the development of scientific thinking along with artistic thinking.”⁵³ Given the state of events in East Asia, one

might consider that the abstract merits of scientific versus artistic thinking would be of relatively less importance to a community of young Chinese people. Yet throughout the war years, the meetings’ discussions were dominated by mundane matters. For example, the theft of Mabel Lee’s fur coat during the Big Game Dance of 1937 became an ongoing concern, as it was brought up at multiple meetings several years after the fact. The coat seems to have remained an issue due to Lee’s determination to be reimbursed for her loss and the club members’ reluctance to raise a fund for this purpose.⁵⁴

It is difficult to state definitively why the club meetings seem to have lost the fervor of early political involvement. Perhaps it was the changing demographics of the club; as the number of native-born Chinese-American members increased, the dedication to Chinese nationalism and its causes diminished. One might also interpret the focus on social activities as a form of escapism. Picnics, gambling, and dances may have served as a welcome diversion from the daily deprivations of the Great Depression and of World War II. Alternatively, the Chinese students may have joined other organizations involved in the war effort, in which case the club would no longer have needed to serve a political purpose. The meeting notes offer little indication, but further research and interviews with former club members might explain why this drop off in activism occurred.

The most surprising omission in the record is any mention of the forcible evacuation of thirty-four Japanese students and one faculty member in 1942, an event that infiltrated even the most isolated corners of campus life.⁵⁵ The tenuous position of the Japanese at Stanford had been a matter of public discussion among the general student body since

1941 STANFORD QUAD



A clubhouse meal, shown here in 1941, might feature noodles for students from China’s northern provinces and rice for students from the south, as well as separate eating areas for students from the two different regions.



the bombing of Pearl Harbor. On December 10, 1941, only days after the attack, President Ray Lyman Wilbur spoke at Memorial Auditorium on “The Stanford Student in the War Crisis.” In this speech, he made a particular “plea for tolerance toward Japanese students. Dr. Wilbur said, “They are just as good Stanford people as we are.”⁵⁶

Campus discussion continued after Franklin Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, authorizing the evacuation and internment of Japanese and Japanese-Americans living along the West Coast. An editorial in the student newspaper, *The Stanford Daily*, criticized this measure, arguing that the U.S. should follow Russia’s example and shoot “all possible suspects.” The leniency of the American policy, the editorial contended, would not further the Allies’ cause: “Here in the United States, we round up possible fifth-columnists, build new homes for them, feed them better than most of them ate before, clothe them, and actually pay them a salary! That’s humane; it is not efficient, and efficiency, not humaneness wins the war.”⁵⁷

Club members, the 1943 *Quad* asserted, were popular as well as famous for their “D.A.R.’s,” or “Damned Average Raisers.”

A flurry of responses to the article flooded the offices of the student newspaper. In reaction, the *Daily* printed a second editorial professing to reflect the “opposite side of the case.” The American policy toward the Japanese, this second editorial claimed, tongue-in-cheek, was perhaps “inefficient” relative to a dictatorship. However, “there is no paradox in the statement that efficiency and humanitarianism can be completely compatible. Further, in the case of the Japanese what looks like lovely light pink idealism is cold-blooded, long-range practicality.”⁵⁸ The editorial went on to argue that the internment of the Japanese was not humane and that:

There is many a loyal American, who has been removed from the danger area for no other reason than that his grandfather wore a kimono instead of a pair of pants. He doesn't know where

*his family or his friends are. He sold his entire household and business goods at panic prices and took only what he could carry with him.*⁵⁹

The editorialist cautioned the reader to remember that such wronged individuals might “become a solid bloc of American-haters if the country to which they had given their allegiance and their trust failed them in this, the worst hour of their lives. The advocates of ‘efficiency’ had better weigh well the trifling difference between several thousand Japanese fifth-columnists and several hundred thousand before they put their program into effect.”⁶⁰

Wilbur’s speech and these newspaper editorials suggest some of the ways in which the Japanese-American experience during World War II was considered and discussed openly by Stanford students. One might expect the matter to be of interest to the Chinese Students Club, particularly given their involvement in issues of Japanese imperialism and their hot-and-cold relationship with the university’s Japanese Students Association. However, it seems to have generated no discussion in the official meeting records. One can only guess what disquiet and hushed conversation the evacuation might have provoked within the clubhouse. Among the non-student Chinese population of Palo Alto, resident Wallace Leung recalled: “Early one morning in the spring of 1942, I awoke to find a convoy of U.S. Army trucks rolling up along Channing and Ramona streets. The evacuation of our Japanese American neighbors was taking place, and they were being transported to their embarkation point....The Chinese American men wore Chinese flag lapel buttons to distinguish their nationality from the questioning populace.”⁶¹ Perhaps the Chinese Students were similarly anxious to distance themselves from their Japanese counterparts and therefore remained silent on the issue of evacuation.

The members of the Chinese Students Club came and went, graduated, moved back to China, up to San Francisco, to the East Coast, to Canada. They became doctors and teachers, businessmen and politicians. While the agenda of the club may have shifted over time for reasons not explained by the written record, the members continued to contribute to and grow the presence of Chinese culture at Stanford and in the Bay Area at large. Doing so, these students constructed bridges between rural, suburban, and urban Chinese populations, organizations, and institutions. They were go-betweens, charting the liminal spaces of the Bay Area and compressing the distances—both physical and social—that separated them from other Chinese communities. Forging such networks lent a spatial coherence to a large, diffuse metropolitan area before the post-World War II boom of suburban development, when the construction of freeways and commuter rails facilitated and accelerated suburban-urban interactions. The San Francisco Bay Area, with its uniquely large Chinese population, makes a particularly intriguing case study for the suburbanization of Chinese and Chinese Americans who, even at a significant distance from the densely populated enclave of Chinatown, reconstituted their ethnic community within a distinctly non-urban environment. In the case of the Chinese Students Club, this environment was the campus of Stanford University, a place that anchored and united these suburban pioneers as it gave them the freedom to reach beyond their geographic and social circumstances. ❁

Tamara Venit is a fourth-year Ph.D. student in the Department of History at Stanford. She is currently at work on her dissertation, which studies discourses of race and rootlessness in nineteenth-century California land reform movements. Originally from Pasadena, California, Tamara graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Amherst College in 2000. She lives in San Francisco.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ *The Stanford Quad*, 1917, p. 313.
- ² *The Stanford Quad*, 1916, p. 254.
- ³ *The Stanford Quad*, 1917, p. 295.
- ⁴ Chinese Students Club (CSC) meeting minutes, 29 September 1916, Haas Center for Public Service, SC541, Stanford University Archives, Dept. of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, California, ACCN 2001-237, Box 12; CSC meeting minutes, 3 November 1916.
- ⁵ In subsequent years, the cost and member contribution to the yearbook picture would remain a subject of much debate within the club. See CSC meeting notes from 9 November 1934 and 6 November 1936, for example.
- ⁶ This data was compiled by counting students with Chinese surnames listed in the *Directory of Officers and Students*. Ambiguous surnames were checked against first names, hometowns, and after 1920, residence (for example, the Chinese Clubhouse). The same counting system was applied to subsequent years and to Japanese students.
- ⁷ Data compiled as described above.
- ⁸ The sample is composed of data from the winter quarter of each academic year, every five years up to 1943.
- ⁹ CSC meeting minutes, 1 April 1929.
- ¹⁰ Donald H. Cheu, "The Chinese Club House," Asian Activities Center, N.D.
- ¹¹ CSC meeting minutes, 10 October 1919.
- ¹² CSC meeting minutes, 1 October 1930.
- ¹³ CSC meeting minutes, 3 November 1916.
- ¹⁴ Mobility data was compiled by cross-referencing Chinese student names culled from the student directories with the alumni directories.
- ¹⁵ Mobility data compiled as described above.
- ¹⁶ Richard T. Phillips, *China since 1911* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996) 11.
- ¹⁷ CSC meeting minutes, 10 October 1919.
- ¹⁸ Phillips, *China since 1911*, 16.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 19-20.
- ²⁰ CSC meeting notes, 29 September 1916.
- ²¹ Phillips, *China since 1911*, 22-23.
- ²² CSC meeting notes, 3 November 1916.
- ²³ CSC meeting notes, 25 October 1918.
- ²⁴ Phillips, *China since 1911*, 23-24.
- ²⁵ CSC meeting notes, 3 May 1918.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 30.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 81.
- ²⁸ CSC meeting notes, 18 May 1928.
- ²⁹ CSC meeting notes, 11 April 1924.
- ³⁰ CSC meeting notes, 5 November 1920; CSC meeting notes 26 February 1921.
- ³¹ CSC meeting notes, 17 March 1923.
- ³² CSC meeting notes, 27 April 1924.
- ³³ Kenneth Chow, "The History of Chinese in Santa Clara County," *Chinese Argonauts: An Anthology of the Chinese Contributions to the Historical Development of Santa Clara County*, Gloria Sun Hom, ed. (Los Altos: Foothill Community College, 1971) 6.
- ³⁴ *Polk's Palo Alto Directory Embracing East Palo Alto, Ravenswood, Stanford, and Menlo Park*. (San Francisco: R.L. Polk and Co. of California, Publishers, 1917-1918, 1922, 1927).
- ³⁵ *Palo Alto Times*, 7 July 1930.
- ³⁶ *Polk's Palo Alto Directory*, 1917-1918, 1922, 1927.
- ³⁷ CSC meeting notes, 24 January 1921.
- ³⁸ CSC meeting notes, 3 February 1922.
- ³⁹ Stanford University Alumni Directory, 1891 to 1931.
- ⁴⁰ Stanford University Alumni Directory, 1891 to 1931; CSC meeting notes, 11 April 1924.
- ⁴¹ Stanford University Alumni Directory, 1891 to 1931.
- ⁴² CSC meeting notes, 13 January 1938.
- ⁴³ CSC meeting notes, 6 November 1916.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁵ CSC End of Year Report, 1933-34; CSC meeting notes 8 January 1940, 6 October 1941, 12 January 1945.
- ⁴⁶ CSC meeting notes, 24 February 1922.
- ⁴⁷ CSC meeting notes, 8 March 1920.
- ⁴⁸ CSC meeting notes, 7 June 1918.
- ⁴⁹ CSC meeting notes, 24 January 1921.
- ⁵⁰ CSC meeting notes, 16 June 1921.
- ⁵¹ CSC End of Year Report, 1933-1934.
- ⁵² CSC meeting notes, 13 February 1942.
- ⁵³ CSC meeting notes, 18 April 1945.
- ⁵⁴ CSC meeting notes, 8 January 1940.
- ⁵⁵ *The Source 2004: An Asian American Guide to Stanford University*, Asian Activities Center, Stanford University, p. 5.
- ⁵⁶ "We Face Guns,' Wilbur Warns Student Body," *Stanford Daily*, 11 December 1941, p. 1.
- ⁵⁷ "For Efficiency's Sake," *Stanford Daily*, 9 April 1942, p. 4.
- ⁵⁸ "Friend or Alien?" *Stanford Daily*, 14 April 1942, p. 4.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁶¹ Speech by Wallace Leung, "Changing Lives—Chinese Americans in Palo Alto," Sunday March 5, 2000 at Lucie Stern Community Center.

Stanford Through the Century

1905-2005

100 YEARS AGO (1905)

The first **Big Game** to be played at Stanford took place in the new “stadium”—a field with grandstand seating for 4,500 located near the current Maples Pavilion. Stanford defeated California 12–5. Most previous football matches had been played in San Francisco.

Addressing the issue of **inadequate pensions** for college professors, including those at Stanford, Andrew Carnegie donated \$10 million to establish a noncontributory pension fund, which was chartered as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Studies in the 1910s determined that the foundation was spending itself out of existence; in 1918 it developed the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association (TIAA) to carry on pension and insurance work. In his autobiography, President David Starr Jordan, an original trustee of the foundation, wrote, “Carnegie himself said to

me that he thought the foundation the best and most far-reaching of all his public gifts.”

75 YEARS AGO (1930)

In a feat of daring on April 3, 21 Sequoia Hall men **recovered the Stanford Axe**, which had been grabbed 31 years before by University of California students after a hotly contested baseball game. For three decades, Cal students had stored the blade in a Berkeley bank vault, removing it only for their annual spring Axe Rally to taunt Stanford. This time, as the custodian stepped from an armored car with the Axe, he was pounced by one of Stanford’s “Immortal 21” diving off the car roof; another set off a large charge of magnesium flash powder, temporarily blinding Cal students posing for a photograph. As one Stanford man recovered the blade and headed for a getaway car, another set off a tear gas canister and others diverted Cal students to the Campanile to organize

a pursuit posse. The Axe was rushed back to The Farm at speeds in excess of 60 miles an hour. Classes were canceled the next morning as students celebrated on the steps of the Main Library. The Axe remained in a Palo Alto bank vault until Cal and Stanford officials agreed in 1933 to make it the trophy of Big Game.

Students officially adopted the **Indian** as a symbol for Stanford, and used it for more than 40 years interchangeably with the color cardinal, which had symbolized Stanford since 1892. Former varsity football player Dr. Tom Williams, '97, proposed the Indian in 1923. Excavation of Indian archeological sites on campus, combined with the image of the Indian as the conqueror of bears and other animal mascots, led to its popularity with alumni and newspapers, but students had been largely apathetic until the late 1920s. By 1937, the heroic Indian brave had been joined by the shirtless, wide-eyed, boyish “Li'l Injun,” a caricature that eventually



Frederick E. Terman, Stanford's dean of engineering and the "father" of Silicon Valley, was named provost in 1955.

became the dominant image. Reacting to concern about racial stereotypes, the student senate in 1972 ratified a recommendation by President Richard W. Lyman to discontinue the mascot.

50 YEARS AGO (1955)

Engineering dean **Frederick E. Terman** was named provost, the second-ranking officer of the university. With support from President J.E. Wallace Sterling, he assumed a major role in strengthening the faculty. Terman also became known as the "father" of Silicon Valley for his role fostering closer ties between Stanford and high-technology industries.

Fulton Lewis Jr., a conservative syndicated radio commentator, used his nationwide broadcast to **attack Stanford**. His object was

In 1974, trustees formally placed the foothills in "academic reserve," forgoing residential and commercial development.

the impending appointment to the Law School faculty of Herbert Packer, recruited by law dean Carl Spaeth to conduct a study of the testimony in judicial and legislative inquiries into communist activities in the United States. President J.E. Wallace Sterling defended Packer's integrity with university trustees and Packer was appointed, effective Jan. 1, 1956. He then spent six years assembling and analyzing more than 200,000 pages of testimony from the inquiries. The chapter of his resulting book dealing with Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers was separately published as *A Tale of Two Typewriters*.

Trustees adopted the principle of keeping the hilltops and ridges of the **foothills behind campus** free from the erection of any new structures, reversing a 1953 plan that included development of housing for 40,000 people. In 1974, trustees formally placed the foothills in "academic reserve," forgoing residential and commercial development.

On Sept. 30, Roos Brothers became the first of many stores to open at the new \$15 million **Stanford Shopping Center**, located on 55 acres of former grain field and vineyard on Leland Stanford's farm.

Faculty member Willis E. Lamb Jr. was named co-winner of the **Nobel Prize** in physics for work done at Columbia on a phenomenon now called the "Lamb shift," which established a deviation from the previously accepted formula for the structure of the hydrogen atom. His work became one of the foundations of quantum electrodynamics. He left Stanford for Oxford in 1956.

25 YEARS AGO (1980)

Paul Berg was named co-winner of the **Nobel Prize** in chemistry for his fundamental studies of the biochemistry of nucleic acids, particularly recombinant DNA, which set the stage for subsequent development of genetic engineering techniques.

In 1980, Donald Kennedy (center)—accompanied by President Emeritus Richard W. Lyman (left) and Chancellor J.E. Wallace Sterling (right)—was inaugurated as Stanford’s eighth president.

Kennedy urged the faculty to overcome the alienation of the late 1960s.



Berg joined the faculty in 1959; in 1985 he launched the Beckman Center for Molecular and Genetic Medicine to bridge the gap between basic science and clinical medicine.

The \$14.7-million **Cecil H. Green Library**, built on the back of the old Main Library, was dedicated in April.

Trustees appointed **Donald Kennedy as Stanford’s eighth president**, effective Aug. 1, replacing Richard W. Lyman, who had been appointed president of the Rockefeller Foundation. Kennedy joined the faculty in 1960, served as chairman of Biological Sciences from 1965 to 1972 and of Human Biology from 1974 to 1977. That year, he was recruited to join the Carter

administration as head of the Food and Drug Administration; he returned to campus in July 1979 as provost. At his Oct. 12, 1980, inauguration, Kennedy urged the faculty to overcome the alienation of the late 1960s, and announced establishment of the Stanford Humanities Center.

A faculty team announced plans to test **Einstein’s general theory of relativity** using super-chilled gyroscopes in a satellite 400 miles above Earth to provide an almost perfect space-time reference system. If Einstein’s explanation of how gravity works is right, the gyroscopes should tilt slightly as they spin; the gyroscopes would measure the tilt. After years of development, NASA launched the experiment

in April 2004. The science phase of the experiment ended in August 2005; data analysis will take another year. The idea grew out of a 1959 discussion at the Encina men’s pool by three naked scientists—Professors William Fairbank, Robert Cannon, and Leonard Schiff. ❀

—KAREN BARTHOLOMEW

Stanford Associates Honor Three SHS Board Members

On April 9, 2005, Stanford Associates—an organization of top alumni volunteer leaders—honored three Stanford Historical Society board members for their exceptional volunteer service to Stanford University.

At its annual STARS Assembly, the organization presented G. Robert Hamrdla, '60, MA '64, with a 2004-2005 Award of Merit. The citation commended him for:

- “his dedication to the Stanford community;
- “his three years, through 2004, of strong leadership as president of the Stanford Historical Society;
- “enabling the Society to enlarge its vision and aspirations—expanding its board, recruiting

dynamic new members from among faculty, staff, and community, spearheading the development of a strategic plan, and helping to revitalize its publications, its work on historic campus houses, and its oral history program.”

The award, Hamrdla said, was “a real, and of course very pleasant, surprise. As is often the case,” he added, “there were many whose efforts contributed to the recognition, and I thank and recognize them in turn.”

Stanford Associates also honored two other SHS board members for their extraordinary volunteer efforts. Anne Dauer, '60, received a Governors' Award for her long-time volunteer



SHS President Susan Schofield presents a 2004-2005 Stanford Associates Award of Merit to SHS board member G. Robert Hamrdla, '60, MA '64.

service to the Cantor Arts Center. In addition, SHS Vice President Bill Stone received an Award of Merit as part of a group that raised funds to endow the James T. Watkins IV Professorship. Watkins, who died in 1982, was an emeritus professor of political science and the Stanford Historical Society's first president. ❀

Society Elects Board Members

At its meeting on June 14, 2005, the Historical Society board elected Margaret Ann Fidler to its board of directors as treasurer and ex-officio board member with vote. From 1971 to 2001, she served in Stanford's Office of Student Affairs as Assistant to the Dean, Assistant Dean, Associate Dean, Director of Administration, and Associate Vice Provost for Administration. A graduate of Duke University, she has been honored with the Kenneth M. Cuthbertson Award for Exceptional Contributions to Stanford University and was the first recipient of the Margaret Ann Fidler

Award for Distinguished Service in Student Affairs.

The SHS board also reelected Dave Daly to fill an interim vacancy on the SHS board. Daly, '05, was originally elected as the first student member in 2004. A former chairman of the Axe Committee, Daly was also co-chair of the senior class gift campaign and a member of the Panel on Outdoor Art. He now works in Stanford's Office of Government and Community Relations and is researching the history of the Red Hot Prof, a tradition he revived while chairing the Axe Committee. ❀

THANKS FOR YOUR FEEDBACK!

A big thank you to the many members who completed and returned the first-ever SHS membership survey. A remarkable 82 percent of you had responded by late November. Your opinions about the society's publications, programs, and other topics are important to us, and we will share the survey results with you in the next issue of *Sandstone & Tile*.

Stanford Historical Society

ACTIVE MEMBERS AS OF AUGUST 31, 2005

The Stanford Historical Society is deeply grateful for the support and encouragement of our many members during the past year, September 1, 2004 through August 31, 2005. (Please notify cmiller@stanford.edu if you find any errors or omissions in this list—we apologize and pledge to correct them.)

LIFE

Young Boozer Family
Foundation
Paul L. Davies, Jr.
James F. Gibbons

PATRON (\$1000 AND ABOVE)

Peter S. Bing
Blume Foundation, Jene F.
Blume
Melvin and Joan Lane
Robert McIntyre
J. Boyce and Peggy F. Nute

DISTINGUISHED HERITAGE (\$500 - \$999)

Robert and Jean Ann
Augsburger
David Elliott
Don and Margaret Ann Fidler
Mr. and Mrs. William F.
Kartozian
Prof. George H. Knoles
Dr. and Mrs. Maurice M.
Osborne, Jr.
Kent and Dale Peterson
Edward and Nadine Pflueger
Doris C. Santana
Susan Ward Schofield
Steve Seay
Isaac and Madeline Stein

HERITAGE (\$100 - \$499)

Andreas and Juana Acrivos
Jim and Marian Adams
Roland H. Alden
Spyros and Christiane
Andreopoulos
Frank A. Bauman
Dorothy Black
Kenneth J. Bolich
Pam Brandin
Claude Brinegar and Karen
Bartholomew
Dr. and Mrs. E. Howard
Brooks
David O. Brownwood
John and Gale Bunnell
Bill and Barbara Busse
Karen Carlson
Dr. and Mrs. Robert Chase
Pat and Ginger Connolly
Anne Dauer
Gill Davis and Audrey Rust
Mr. and Mrs. John B. De Nault
Carl and Therese Degler
Frank and Ann Dowling
Joseph Ehrlich
Kellie Elliott
Jon Erickson
Dafri Estes
John and Nancy Etchemendy
Craig and Sally Falkenhagen
Frank and Lois Fariello
Robert B. Ferguson
Alexander Fetter
Robert and Sally Freelen
David and Betsy Fryberger

Prof. Frederick Fuhrman
Mr. and Mrs. Malcolm H.
Furbush
Robin Gates
Jonathan B. Gifford
George and Alison Gildred
Curtis V. Givan
Elizabeth C. Gonda
Dick and Anne Gould
Hank Greely and Laura
Butcher
John and Yvette Gurley
Prof. Stig B. Hagstrom
Mr. and Mrs. Robert M.
Halperin
J. Scott Hamilton
G. Robert Hamrdla
Mr. and Mrs. James C. Haugh
Robert A. Helliwell
Daniel S. Hill
Laurance R. Hoagland, Jr.
Mr. and Mrs. Albert J. Horn
Gerald and Virginia Hornung
Dr. and Mrs. Richard A. Hranac
Leslie Hume
Tom Isaak
Robert L. Joss
Thomas Kailath
William Kaufmann
David and Judy Kennedy
Al Kirkland
Helen Kmetovic
Donald and Jill Knuth
Shari Young Kuchenbecker
Philip M. Lally
Ambassador and Mrs. L.
William Lane, Jr.

David O. Larson
Mary Brown Lawrence
Ted Leland
Phyllis Leveen
Mr. and Mrs. John Loftis, Jr.
Carolyn Lougee Chappell
Eroeda Luck
Frank W. Lynch
Mandy MacCalla
Sam MacIsaac
David and Helen MacKenzie
James and Mary Madison
Rick and Amy Magnuson
Dr. and Mrs. Francesco
Marincola
Rosemary McAndrews
John McClelland, Jr.
Art and Robin McClish
Christine McCutcheon
Dorcas H. McFarlane
Tony and Linda Meier
William and Patty Miller
Donald and Pamela Mitchell
Mr. and Mrs. Bruce T. Mitchell
David W. Mitchell
Dr. and Mrs. Paul F. Mueller
Nancy B. Munger
Heidi Munzinger
David Neuman
Jonathan Olmsted
Franklin and Susan Orr
Charles and Miriam Palm
Lou and Mary Ann Peoples
Claire Perry
Mary E. Pike
Stephen and Nancy Player

HERITAGE (continued)

Mr. and Mrs. Gordon L. Poole
Dennis C. Poulsen
Elizabeth V. G. Reynolds
Carroll and Jane Rikert
Debbie Robbins
Mr. and Mrs. Frank Roberts
Mr. and Mrs. Joseph L. Rodgers
Robert and Adelle Rosenzweig
William Ross
Michael Roster
Allen and Cynthia Ruby
Elmer and Norma Sandy
Elizabeth A. Scroggs
Edward Shaw
George P. Shultz
Robert D. Simoni
John F. Sandy Smith
Rixford Snyder
Sheila Spaeth
Peter Stansky
William Stone and Deborah Duncan
Jeffrey Stone
Janella Swanson
Susan Sweeney
Prof. and Mrs. James C. Van Horne
Peter and Suzanne Voll
Drs. Alexander von Hafften and Kerstin Miller
Elizabeth J. Wade
Lois Deimel Whealey
Edward and Patricia White
Bruce and Elizabeth Wiggins
D. Myles Winbigler
Howard E. Wolf
Tom and Ellen Wyman
Richard and Susan Zare

FULL (\$40 - \$99)

David B. Abernethy
Kate Adams
Raymond M. Alden
William and Barbara Alhouse

Mr. and Mrs. William P. Allan
William Allen
Hersche V. Allen
Lawrence C. Ames, Jr.
Maxine O. Anderson
Edward V. Anderson
Mike Armstrong
Rick L. Arnesen
Prof. and Mrs. Kenneth Arrow
Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd W. Aubry
Ray and Carol Bacchetti
Bill and Susan Baribault
Mr. and Mrs. Dennis Bark
Dr. and Mrs. Arthur Barnes
Mary C. Baron
Gwen Barry
J. Peter Baumgartner
Nancy Dean Baxter
Charles T. Bell
Richard Bennett and Ann Kay
Paul Berg
John W. Bernet
James Bjorken
Tom and Sheri Blaisdell
Traci Bliss
Mr. and Mrs. Richard Blois
Marsden and Elizabeth Blois
Mr. and Mrs. A. William Bloom
Thomas R. Boag
Greg Boardman
Mario and Ginny Bonicelli
Barry and Joan Boothe
Dr. and Mrs. James V. Bordoni
Christopher and Jane Botsford
Laurence and Grace Boxer
Stephen Boyd and Anna Ranieri
Prof. and Mrs. Ronald Bracewell
Mary Sarah Bradley
Holly W. Brady
John and Sharon Brauman
Marjorie P. Bridges
Ross and JoAnn Bright
Howard Bromberg
Pauline Brown

Jean Gould Bryant
Mark and Kathy Bube
Dr. and Mrs. Robert Buechel
Alexandria Bunten
Helen N. Burgess
Clara N. Bush
Bernard Butcher
Mariann Byerwalter
Carolyn Caddes
Mark Cairns and Amanda Martin
Peg Cann
Wil Cardon
Prof. and Mrs. W. B. Carnochan
Lyn Carr
Roy W. Cauwet
Jane M. Chai
Cheng-Wu and Tzu-Tsing Chen
Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Christiansen
Chris and Judy Christofferson
Mr. and Mrs. Thomas S. Clark
Dr. and Mrs. William H. Clark
Malcolm Clark
Jo Clayton
James and Linda Clever
Jean Coblentz
James Cook and Caroline Willis
Lauren Cook
Sharon M. Cooper
Prof. Richard W. Cottle
Dudley Cramer
Lina F. Crane
Dr. and Mrs. William P. Creger
Mary P. Crosten
Robyn Crumly
Alan and Judy Cummings
Joe and Kathy Cusick
Dave Daly
Elena Danielson
Paul L. Davies, III
Robert and Ann De Busk
Ingrid M. Deiwiks
Joanna Despres
Daniel DeYoung

Sandy and Barbara Dornbusch
Stan Doten
Andrew and Eleanor Doty
Peter and Frances Duignan
George W. Egan
Jane Cutler Ellis
Prof. Robert Eustis
Robert I. Farrar
Virginia Fehrenbacher
John Felstiner
Bob and Gwenn Fess
Phil and Sue Fialer
Paul Fink and Anita Sande
Thomas Maxwell Flood
Audrey Foley
Herb Fong
Jorge Fontana
Dr. and Mrs. Allan Forbes
Mark Franich
Gene and Gertrude Franklin
Lisa Fremont
Robert and Elizabeth French
Prof. Gerald W. Friedland
Jeanne Frost
Prof. and Mrs. Nathaniel L. Gage
Howard and Anita Gaines
Crystal D. Gamage
Jerold and Elizabeth Gard
Edward S. Garlock
Al Genevro
Mr. and Mrs. Donald Germain
James Lowell Gibbs, Jr.
Helen M. Gibson
Kirk R. Gibson
Don R. Goffinet, M.D.
Avram and Dora Goldstein
Susan Goodhue
Margi Mix Gould
Bob and Gretchen Gould
Rick and Nicole Gould
Anupam Goyal
Kathy R. Graham
Christopher Greene
Rev. and Mrs. Robert C. Gregg
Alan and Michele Grundmann

FULL (continued)

Samuel Gubins	Theresa M. Johnston	Joan W. Lomax	Kurt and Patricia Mueller-Vollmer
Rose Guntly	James and Joan Johnston	Bruce E. Lonbaken	Thomas and Gloria Mullen
Robert and Emily Haffner	Bruce and Harriet Johnston	Mr. and Mrs. William A. Loveland	Robert W. Murphy, Jr.
Bruce and Angela Haight	Dr. and Mrs. Henry Jones	Barbara Luce	John and Kate Mustain
Dr. and Mrs. E. William Hancock	Anonymous	David G. Luenberger	Norman Naimark
Marlene Handy	Charles L. Junkerman	Nancy Lund	Irene Simpson Neasham
Stanley and Jane Hanna	James Kashian	James Lyons	Corrine Nelson
John W. Harbaugh	Fritz and Anne Kasten	Dan and Julie Lythcott-Haims	Warren and Ann Nelson
Fred Hargadon	John R. Kates	Miriam R. MacKenzie	Elsbeth Newfield
Ted Harris	William Kays	Gene P. Mackey	Harriet C. Newman
Mr. and Mrs. L. W. Harris, Jr.	Ralph and Jane Keller	Ross and Mary MacMichael	William and Rosemary Nichols
Walter and Lucille Harrison	Michael Keller and Carol Lawrence	Richard and Jean Madigan	Roxanne Nilan
Julia Hartung	Mary B. Kennedy	Mary Magill	David C. Nolan
Mr. and Mrs. Douglas Hastings	Robert C. Kennedy	Susan A. Maher	William B. Noland
Prof. and Mrs. Albert Hastorf	Jeanne D. Kennedy	Prof. and Mrs. J. Keith Mann	Alan and Gretchen Nonnenberg
Lenis A. Hazlett	Mr. and Mrs. Dudley Kenworthy	Dallas D. Manning	Marshall and Jeanne O'Neill
Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Heckler	E. Gene Kershner	Tag and Joan Mansour	Robert and Janet Oakford
Mr. and Mrs. John M. Heidt	Kyung Ho Kim	Carol Hodge March	Harry and Betty Oberhelman
Eugene Helfrich	Margaret Kimball	Michele Marincovich	Cherylene C. Oliver
Ed B. Hendricks	Judith W. Kincaid	Michael F. Marmor, M.D.	Dr. Jane S. Ord
Andrew C. Hernandez	Cassius I. Kirk, Jr.	Prof. Sullivan S. Marsden, Jr.	Don and Shari Ornstein
Marvin Herrington	Noel W. Kirshenbaum	Patrick and Darle Maveety	Gretchen Ostenberg
Mr. and Mrs. David B. Heyler	Philip M. Klauber	Bruce and Karen McCaul	Ralph S. Paffenbarger, Jr., M.D.
Frederick S. Hillier	Carol Kleyensteuber	Jeanne F. McDonnell	Wolfgang and Adele Panofsky
Stephen and Grace Hinton	J. Burke Knapp	Dick McElyea	Mr. and Mrs. Henry W. Parker
Jack A. Hoagland	Anne Marie Krogh	Leona M. McGann	Dee Patberg
Frank W. Hodgdon, III	Donna Krupp	Margaret McKee	Daryl H. Pearson
Marion N. Hoffman	Peyton Lake	James H. McKibben	Scott and Sandra Pearson
Portia Smith Holmes	Bill Landreth	Ronald and Margaret McKinnon	Howard and Lisa Pearson
Leo and Florence Holub	Debra A. Lawless	Mr. and Mrs. Bud McLellan	Caroline Pease
Dr. Stephen Horn	David L. Leal	Scotty McLennan	Emma Pease
Tom Hornbeak	Herbert and Gloria Leiderman	Donnalie McPherson	Mrs. Templeton Peck
Rosemary C. Hornby	Chris and Kirsten Leonard	Carolyn M. Miles	Agnes F. Peterson
Michael Hudnall	Delight K. Leonard	Jackie Miller	Mr. and Mrs. Robert H. Philibosian
Elizabeth Lathrop Hunter	Mark and Jeanne Lepper	Brenda S. Miller	Meredith Phillips
Michael and Diana Irvin	John E. Leveen	Howard Miller	Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Pickering
Robert and Laurie Jackler	Patricia M. Levin	Barbara W. Milligan	Elwood Pierce
Daniel C. Jacobson	Mr. and Mrs. Robert M. Levison, Jr.	Jean B. Mitchell	Richard C. Pollard
Jacqueline A. James	Edmond and Diane Leys	Charles Mitchell	Elizabeth R. Pomeroy
Lu French Jenkins	Mr. and Mrs. George R. Liddle	Mr. and Mrs. Roy H. Mize, Jr.	Chris and Lisa Ponce
John R. Johnson	Jacques and Sandy Littlefield	Hilbert Morales	L. Timothy Portwood
Patricia Johnson	Leslie Liu	Lee Morgan	Constance B. Pratt
Carolyn Johnson	Dan Livingston	Tom and Joyce Moser	Harry N. Press
	Gary A. Logan	Lincoln E. Moses	Linden Press
		Bob and Helen Moulton, Jr.	

FULL (continued)

Don and Dee Price
Lowell and Carole Price
Ray M. Purpur
Carlene D. Putler
Russell L. Quacchia
Ginger Radlo
Dr. and Mrs. Sidney Raffel
William R. Rambo
Sal Ramirez
John and Harriette Ratchye
John Rawlings and Sara Timby
James Reed and Jean Deken
Jonathan P. Reider
Niels and Janet Reimers
Bruce and Nan Reitz
Carolyn Reller
Richard W. Renner
John L. Richardson
Burton and Laurose Richter
Eugene B. Rickansrud
Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Riddle
Joseph and Sawalak Riddle
David and Edda Ritson
Paul Robinson
Norman W. Robinson
Geoffrey and Rhesa Rubin
Ron and Carol Ruth
Dr. George W. Rutherford
Dr. and Mrs. Richard R. Rutter
Lawrence and Patricia Ryan
Gail L. Salem
Drs. Stanley and Lesley
Samuels
Jon and Jennifer Sandelin
Barbara Sawka
Mr. and Mrs. Earl F. Schmidt
Ruth S. Schneider
Stanley Schrier and Barbara
Klein
Mildred N. Schubert
Susan Schumann
Ray Schuster and Judy Staton
W. Richard and Joy Whitney
Scott
Thomas Seligman
Patrick A. Shea

Mr. and Mrs. Sheldon Sicotte
Anthony and Virginia Siegman
David and Sandra Siegmund
Charles Sieloff
Charles F. Sill, Jr.
Mr. and Mrs. Douglas A.
Skoog
Anonymous
Kendric and Marion Smith
Shirley Smith
Christine Hoover Sorensen
Robert and Verna Spinrad
George and Susan Springer
Angelo L. Stagnaro
Elizabeth D. Stahr
Walter B. Stahr
Nancy Steege
Margaret Stehle
Hal and Diane Steuber
Zach Stewart
Prof. Wilfred H. Stone
Margaret H. Stone
Jeanne W. Strong
Robert E. Summers
Lynda Swanson
Paul and Gail Switzer
Peter Sylvester
Suzanne Tamiesie
Marion G. Tammany
Margaret M. Taylor
Paul and Joan Taylor
Rev. Marylou McClure Taylor
Robert and Janet Temple
Terence and Marilyn Terman
Lorraine Murray Thackery
Olivia B. Thebus
Barbara P. Thomas
Calvin E. Thomas
Susan D. Thomas
Victor and Marianne
Thompson
Prof. Barton Thompson, Jr.
James and Emily Thurber
Mr. and Mrs. Thomas R.
Thurmond
Louise F. Thursby
Ruth Todd

Jim and Carol Toney
David and Deborah Trotter
Prof. Paul V. Turner
Norman and Evelyn Tutorow
Ellen E. Uhrbrock
Marta Ullman
Sylvia and Milton Van Dyke
Russell and Marilyn van Loben
Sels
Rex Vaughan
Walter Vincenti
David M. Voss
Robert V. Wagoner
Douglas R. Walker
Scott and Barbara Wallace
Ann Katherine Walton
Robert and Constance Ward
Mr. and Mrs. Philip L. Ward
Robert Ward
Brian Washington
Prof. and Mrs. Thomas Wasow
James and Cheryl Weaver
Mr. and Mrs. David C. Weber
Mr. and Mrs. Donald B.
Webster
Julia Hirsch Wedekind
Herbert A. Weidner
Charles B. Weigle
Len and Hilda Weisberg
Lewis Wexler, M.D.
Bill Whiting
George and Phyllis Whiting
Brian D. Wiggins
Phil and Ellen Williams
Allan R. Wilson
Joan E. Wilson
Christy Wise
Miriam E. Wolff
Mr. and Mrs. William F. Wood,
III
Hollis Wood
Betsy Woolpert
Roy and Patty Woolsey
John and Lysbeth Working
Gavin Wright
Willard G. Wyman, Jr.
Richard and Gwen Yeo

Max C. Yost
Marcia McNitt Young
Marlene Wine

STUDENT (\$10)

Amy Brown
Francisco Cendejas
Will Clayton
Reed Criddle
Amy Daley
Johnny Falla
Byron A. Feig
Bernard Fraga
Kirsten Hornbeak
Justin Hulse
Marisa Juarez
Marketa Trimble Landova
Marcela Muniz
Annie Peterson
Nick Robinson
Irene Smith
Alexis Smith

ORGANIZATIONS

California History Center
Los Altos Historical Museum
Menlo Park Historical
Association
Palo Alto Historical
Association
Palo Alto Stanford Heritage
California State Library,
Periodicals
San Mateo County Historical
Association

HONORARY

Mrs. Donald T. Carlson
Gerhard Casper
Ralph W. Hansen
John Hennessy
Don and Robin Kennedy
Lorry Lokey
Richard and Jing Lyman
Mrs. James T. Watkins, IV

Sandstone & Tile

FALL 2005
VOLUME 29, NUMBER 2/3

Susan Wels, *Editor*
Annabelle Ison, *Designer*

STANFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Susan Schofield, *President*
William Stone, *Vice President*
Miriam Palm, *Secretary*
Margaret Ann Fidler, *Treasurer*

Marian Leib Adams
David Daly
Anne Dauer
Therese Baker-Degler
Kellie Elliott

Margaret Ann Fidler
Bernard Fraga
G. Robert Hamrda

Laurence Hoagland Jr.
David Kennedy
Margaret Kimball
Anne Marie Krogh

Carolyn Lougee Chappell
Robert McIntyre
David Mitchell
J. Boyce Nute
Miriam Palm
Kent Peterson

Susan Ward Schofield
Anthony Siegman
William Stone
David Voss

STAFF

Carol Miller, *Office Administrator*
P.O. Box 20028
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94309
650 725-3332

Email: Stanfordhist@stanford.edu
Office: 3rd floor, Green Library

WEBSITE

<http://histsoc.stanford.edu>

MEMBERSHIP

Membership is open to all who are interested in Stanford history.
Annual dues are:

- Students (*currently registered*), \$10
- Full, \$40
- Heritage, \$100
- Distinguished heritage, \$500
- Patron, \$1,000
- Life, \$5,000

Make checks payable to Stanford
Historical Society and mail to:

P. O. Box 20028
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94309

To join or renew by credit card visit our Web site: <http://histsoc.stanford.edu>.
Click on "Membership" link at left and then click on the credit-card link to the
Development Office Web site. For further information, contact the society office
(see lower left on this page).

UPCOMING SOCIETY ACTIVITIES

*Confirmation of date and notification of time and location will be sent to members shortly
before each event.*

January 17, 2006 Chris D. Poland on
three seismic projects at Stanford

February 8 Panel discussion on technolo-
gy transfer with John Chowning, Leonard
Herzenberg, Cal Quate, Kathy Ku, and
Niels Reimers

March 11 Tour of Stanford Mansion,
Capitol, and Old Sacramento

April 9 Founders' Day.
Commemoration of 1906 earthquake
centennial

April 30 Historic Campus Houses Tour

May 10 Annual Meeting. David
Kennedy on the Bill Lane Center for
the Study of the North American West



Stanford Historical Society

P.O. Box 20028 Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94309

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Palo Alto, CA
Permit No. 28