

# *Sandstone & Tile*

SPRING/SUMMER 2006   STANFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY   VOLUME 30, NUMBER 2



*A History of Roble Halls*   ■   *Stanford's Red Hot Profs*

---

---



**IN THIS ISSUE**

“If These Walls Could Talk”: A History of Roble Halls ..... 3

Stanford’s Red Hot Profs: Leading the Field .....15

Stanford through the Century ..... 24

SHS News ..... 26

From the President ..... 27

Upcoming Activities ..... 32

**Above:** Residents of Roble Hall assemble in one of the dorm’s reception parlors in 1898. With its plentiful socializing space, Roble housed most of Stanford’s student functions and get-togethers in the early years.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

**Cover:** The original Roble Hall, shown here in 1895, was completed in time for the university’s opening in 1891. Stanford’s first dorms—Encina, to the east of the Main Quad, and Roble, equidistant to the west—were built along Serra Mall, consciously enforcing a common, if casual, segregation of the sexes.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

# “If These Walls Could Talk”

## A History of Roble Halls

JANE LILLY

*Jane Lilly, '05, a Stanford urban studies major, won the society's 2004 undergraduate essay prize for this paper. The judges of the competition were Peter Stansky, Paul Turner, Roxanne Nilan, Karen Bartholomew, Margaret McKinnon, and Bob Hamrdla. Maggie Kimball, university archivist, presented the prize, which was supported by the Robert and Charlotte Beyers Fund.*

In their 1929 book *College Architecture in America*, Charles Z. Klauder and Herbert C. Wise observed that “a dormitory of the simplest type for women must have features peculiarly its own [including]... several important rooms for purposes other than lodgment, for it is more nearly a home than is a men's dormitory.”<sup>1</sup> The original Roble Hall, the first women's dorm on the Stanford campus, was constructed in 1891 in accordance with such gendered design notions.<sup>2</sup> Nearly three decades later, the designs for a second Roble Hall, which replaced the original in 1918, reflected similar but changing conceptions of female students and their housing needs.

In 1889, two years before the University's first class was to be admitted, Leland and Jane Stanford



Roble residents—members of Stanford University's first class—relax in the dorm's lobby during the 1891–92 school year.

commissioned the building of Roble Hall for women and Encina Hall for men. Shepley, Rutan & Coolidge were the architects. These two sandstone dormitories, located on Serra Mall, were designed to house nearly 500 students.<sup>3</sup> Construction on Encina Hall began immediately and progressed smoothly. Unfortunately—because of poor planning, overextended resources, and the fast approach of the university's scheduled opening in the fall of 1891—Roble was far from ready for arriving students. By winter 1890, only its foundation had been laid, and the architects deemed it impossible to complete the project by the fall deadline.

Many college officials from older schools had advised the Stanfords to postpone admitting female students until after the university had been established for a few years. A number of planners and architects working on the Stanford project had offered similar advice. Although many of Roble's sandstone blocks were ready for the masons, the dormitory, they maintained, could not be completed before the beginning of the university's second year.<sup>4</sup> Jane Stanford, however, rejected any delay in admitting women, desiring instead that males and females enter the university at the same time

and on equal ground. It was essential, she argued, that female students attend from the beginning; otherwise, she feared, "the young ladies might be considered as interlopers."<sup>5</sup> Many professionals working with the Stanfords had already learned that when Jane Stanford wanted something, she got it. And so, in April 1891, just six months before Stanford University opened its doors, the architects abandoned the original foundation of the women's dorm and immediately began building a smaller, somewhat modified design, about a third the size of the original plan.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES



Roble's dining staff were known as "biscuit shooters." Unlike Encina and later male dormitories at Stanford, the women's residence featured a dining hall. Male students relied, instead, on separate eating clubs away from the "domestic confines" of their residences.

The hall, now a three-story building, would house 80 women, Stanford's anticipated female enrollment for the first year. It would have been impossible, just a few years earlier, to build a structure of that size in the time frame proposed by the Stanfords. Luckily, the firm of Percy and Hamilton—already at work building the Leland Stanford Junior Museum—was experimenting with Ernest Ransome's reinforced-concrete system, the newest engineering innovation. The museum's construction had been hailed as a great success, given that “the building contained over 1.1 million cubic feet of space, required about 260,000 cubic feet of concrete, was erected in seven months, and cost about eighteen cents per cubic foot of space...a very low figure for a thoroughly substantial and fireproof building.”<sup>6</sup> Reinforced-concrete construction, a quick method, offered a perfect solution to the Roble problem. With its low cost, it was also likely a comfort to the Stanfords, whose resources were growing increasingly overextended. Ransome himself adapted Roble's original designs by Shepley, Rutan & Coolidge to accommodate the concrete work, and Percy and Hamilton's firm executed the new plans. Amazingly enough, when pigment was added, the concrete—which was poured into molds around the clock—could take on the appearance of the Quad sandstone without the costly labor of quarrying, cutting, or setting sandstone blocks.<sup>7</sup> And so, in a flurry of events, builders completed the construction of Roble Hall in only 97 days, and it opened just in time to welcome the women of Stanford's first class to campus.<sup>8</sup>

Both Encina and Roble were operated by an outside entity, the Stanford Estate, which provided residents with “board, lodging, heating and lighting for twenty-three dollars a month.”<sup>9</sup> While such an economical arrangement might have seemed a bit steep for the period, the dorms were reported to be “fitted out with

---

### Surviving the Earthquake

The original Roble, hastily built of reinforced concrete, proved remarkably strong during the devastating earthquake of 1906. While Encina Hall, Memorial Church, and many of the sandstone buildings of the Main Quad sustained costly damages, Roble and the central section of the Leland Stanford Junior Museum—the only part of the museum built with Ernest Ransome's new reinforced-concrete system—survived with only minor damage. As an observer recorded in a 1907 report on the earthquake, “The chimneys on [Roble Hall] collapsed, but no other damage was done, the walls being left intact, without any cracks.”<sup>45</sup> This evidence inspired the claim that “when sandstone was crumbling, Ransome concrete would still be standing,” contributing to a surge in business for Ransome's young company.<sup>46</sup>

---

the most modern conveniences, including electricity, steam heat, a dining hall, and a lounge,” amenities for which students were willing to pay.<sup>10</sup>

Although Roble Hall was smaller than Encina, the two dorms were physically similar—reflecting, perhaps, the equal social footing of men and women on the Stanford campus.<sup>11</sup> One could also infer the opposite, however. Just as reinforced concrete was an imitation of sandstone—similar only from afar—male and female students shared only a surface-level equality; women at Stanford had a limited choice of

study, as well as restrictions on their personal and social freedoms.<sup>12</sup> Despite this discrepancy, Stanford still employed a number of progressive policies that granted freedoms to female students. As one freshman noted in a February 1892 letter home, “There are no rules over us yet, but there are a few things we are expected to do, like coming in at nine o’clock, be on time at meals and some other things that most of us would do anyway.”<sup>13</sup>

Likewise, the interiors of Roble and Encina differed significantly, despite their similar façades. This divergence was no doubt due in part to Roble’s reduced size. Letters from Leland Stanford to his wife, however, suggest that he had always intended the floor plans of the two buildings to be different: “The side and exterior of [Roble] will be like [Encina Hall] but the interior will be changed some—of course there will be more parlor and reception room [sic] needed and a little more accommodations for teachers.”<sup>14</sup>

The primary differences between the two halls, in fact, lay in the variety, quantity, and arrangement of their common spaces, with many more in Roble than Encina. Roble’s common rooms, according to Klauder and Wise, reflected “the perceived needs of the female residents” and reinforced the homelike character of the women’s dorm.<sup>15</sup>

Roble’s upper floors, like Encina’s, were aligned along both sides of one hall. Roble’s ground and upper floors, however, offered a range of social spaces—including a large central living area and a

dining room—that Encina lacked. With its plentiful reception and socializing space, Roble housed most of the university’s student functions and get-togethers. In a letter home dated November 15, 1891, one young man detailed his experience at a Roble party:

*My dear Mother:*

*Friday evening the young ladies of Roble Hall gave a reception to the students of Encina and the Faculty. I thought that if my set were going I would put on my best “bib and tucker” and go... Well, I had a very nice time but there was just standing room and there were four or five fellows to every girl, and if she was very attractive perhaps more. The boys received a paper on which was a part of a verse, and the girls had the other part, and each boy would try to find the other part of his verse.... I succeeded in getting an introduction to three girls which is better than most of the fellows did...*

*Your loving and devoted son,*

*H.M. Boutelle<sup>16</sup>*

As Boutelle’s letter and others attest, Roble was home to much early social activity on campus. Filled to capacity during Stanford’s opening year, however, Roble quickly became too small to satisfy the needs of Stanford’s burgeoning female population. Given male housing shortages as well, a number of fraternities and sororities and a string of residences on Alvarado Row and Mayfield emerged by the mid-1890s to provide additional housing for up to two-thirds of the students.<sup>17</sup> These houses were popular not only for their more intimate size, but also for the minimal rules and restrictions they placed on students, although there were reports of unsatisfactory living conditions in some of these residences.<sup>18</sup> Roble, moreover, began to fall into disrepair, recognizably inadequate for meeting the needs of female students. Finally, construction began on a new Roble, which



To meet the expanding needs of female students, a new Roble Hall was completed in 1918. Its innovative H-plan design permitted more intimacy and amenities than simpler block-style dormitories, such as Encina and the original Roble.

opened in 1918, and the women turned the old Roble, renamed Sequoia Hall, over to the men.<sup>19</sup>

### ROBLE PLANTS NEW ROOTS

The new Roble Hall, on Santa Teresa Street, was part of a greater architectural expansion of the campus. New academic buildings, as well as student and faculty housing, were constructed, including, in 1923, both Toyon and Branner Halls. The new Roble's interior and exterior design diverged completely from common women's dormitory construction at American colleges of previous decades and moved toward a more intimate organization that was increasingly popular. Its architect, George Kelham—designer of San Francisco's Public Library and the Palace Hotel—creatively blended Renaissance and Spanish styles in the hall's design.<sup>20</sup> He originally envisioned Roble as “two H-plans side by side,” a

configuration that maximized the window-to-room ratio and courtyard space.<sup>21</sup> In the end, however, the university built only one of the H-plans, with the dorm's dining room, main parlor, and lobby spaces connecting it to an additional wing. The plan also included a library and numerous seminar, study, and tutoring rooms. Students occupied one-room singles and three-room doubles; every floor was outfitted with a kitchenette, and many also had additional common rooms. When the new Roble opened, it housed 154 female students, each with her own bedroom.<sup>22</sup> Today, by contrast, more than 325 students live in Roble Hall, and, to accommodate them, the dormitory has lost much of its original common space, general roominess, and social intimacy.<sup>23</sup>

The new Roble provided its residents with all the necessary amenities listed by Klauder and Wise for “a dormitory of the simplest type for women.”<sup>24</sup> These features included:

- a vehicle approach to within a few feet of the entrance
- a suitable alcove or similar space for an attendant immediately inside the main entrance
- an attractive common room of generous dimensions for social functions or small dances
- one suite for the “house mother” or other appointed chaperone
- a small reception room or parlor near the main entrance
- a kitchenette near the center of the building, accessible to the greatest number of student occupants
- a small laundry in the basement for student use
- a trunk lift and outside basement entrance.

A study of plans for Toyon Hall, a men’s dormitory constructed five years later, offers a fine local comparison between male and female dormitory designs in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Toyon, whose main common room is a large assembly hall directly behind the entrance lobby, lacks many of the other common areas Roble provided. These living areas, seen as so necessary to women’s residences, were considered of such little import to men’s dormitories that

Klauder and Wise did not provide a percentage of floor space dedicated to shared living spaces in male residences as they did for Roble.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, Toyon was originally organized with two-room singles, comprising a study and bedroom—demonstrating the reduced focus on socialization among residents. In Roble, by contrast, residents shared study rooms, which became additional spaces for socializing among roommates and housemates and for hosting guests. Although Toyon does borrow Roble’s wing structure, breaking down the large hall into smaller, more intimate sections, its organization allows for more solitude than social interaction.

Klauder and Wise cite the new Roble as one of the most innovative women’s dormitories, comparing its H-plan design to the simpler block designs of most dormitories of the time, including both the old Roble and Encina. A comparison of the plans for the new Roble Hall and Cornelia Connolly Hall at Rosemont College, Pennsylvania, highlights the peculiarities of Roble’s design. Both residences devoted almost the same percentage of square-footage to common spaces. While Connolly Hall offered only one large living room for its 70 inhabitants, however, Roble contained music, reception, and living rooms, a parlor, and libraries for 154 residents. The variety

1920 STANFORD QUAD



The new Roble’s reception room, shown here in the 1919–20 school year, was one of many spaces designed for social events. Special-interest rooms included a sewing room, a music room, and kitchenettes.

of common spaces in Roble allowed students to host multiple social functions at once and provided exceptional versatility in activities and physical organization compared to most other women’s dormitories of the time. Although this variety was due, in part, to the great number of students the dorm could accommodate (significantly more than most dormitories, according to Klauder and Wise), the clever arrangement of the wings afforded intimacy—with floors of only 16 to 20 residents—along with extra amenities only available in larger halls.<sup>26</sup> In the new Roble, architects provided social spaces along the central axis of the H-shaped building, as well as an immense living room adjacent to the main entrance.<sup>27</sup> Special-interest rooms in Roble included a sewing room, a music room, and several kitchenettes. With such a spectrum of social spaces contained within one dorm, Roble equipped residents for any potential social event, from tea parties to formal dances, and offered common space within which its residents could share regular and more intimate interactions.

---

*Roble contained music, reception, and living rooms, a parlor, and libraries for 154 residents*

---

Unlike Encina and later male residence halls, the new Roble, like the old one, also contained a dining hall.<sup>28</sup> Male students, instead, relied on separate eating clubs, where they would collect their meals free from the “domestic confines” of their residence.<sup>29</sup> Female residents had different needs, according to Klauder and Wise, who wrote that:

*Girls especially like to carry on all the activities of home life under their own roof, and hence the eating of meals on the first floor of the house in which*

*they live is a practice that they will not willingly abandon. It is, in a word, more homelike. Moreover the inconvenience, loss of time and exposure of making an outdoor journey for her meals is more keenly felt by the girl student. Dining-rooms and kitchens are invariably found within or immediately adjoining dormitories for women.<sup>30</sup>*

This conscious differentiation between male and female residences reflected popular gender notions of the period and highlighted inequalities that persisted between males and females, even on Stanford’s progressive campus.

While the new Roble adopted many of the features of its predecessor, particularly lounges and common areas, it marked the beginning of a shift in Stanford’s residential architecture from large dormitories to more intimate, house-like settings. The new Roble can be seen, in many ways, as a transitional dorm between two extremes, exemplified by the old Roble Hall (1891) and the houses of Lagunita Court (1934). Students and faculty perceived the new Roble—organized into smaller units such as separate wings or floors, each with an accompanying study and library or recreational room—as a clear improvement. According to University Registrar and Chemistry Professor J. Pearce Mitchell, “these smaller units are more desirable in every way, and all the modern dormitory construction on the campus follows this general plan with suitable variation.”<sup>31</sup>

The new Roble’s design was also an architectural innovation for Stanford residences. Unlike any other dorm before or after, the building’s façade was ornamented with *sgraffito*—intricate, scratched-on designs—by Paul E. Denivelle.<sup>32</sup> Structurally, Roble also differed significantly from its residential generation. Campus planner Eldridge T. Spencer, in his 1949 architectural and historical survey of Stanford’s buildings, classed Roble’s style as “transitional” and grouped it with a number of



Male and female Roble residents gather in 1977 for a group photo, nine years after the dormitory went coed and women become the minority population in the hall.

contemporary campus buildings, including the School of Education, the University (Green) Library, and Toyon Hall.<sup>33</sup> Spencer also incorrectly identified the new Roble's building material as reinforced concrete when its walls were actually composed of hollow, unreinforced ceramic tiles.<sup>34</sup> Because George W. Kelham's style was similar to that of Bakewell and Brown (B&B)—correlations have been made between his San Francisco Public Library and B&B's University Library—Spencer might have mistaken Roble's ceramic wall structure for the reinforced concrete that B&B often used in its Stanford designs. Forty years after the survey, however, this oversight nearly caused Roble's downfall.<sup>35</sup>

### RESIDENTIAL REVOLUTIONS

Most Stanford women resided at Roble, the only campus women's residence, for at least a year.<sup>36</sup> The dormitory served as a networking hub for its residents, who hosted events enabling them to

meet influential figures. Similarly, at a time when women had few career options beyond nursing and teaching, Stanford offered ambitious women like housing director Anastasia Doyle the opportunity to achieve more. As *Stanford University News* reported on October 18, 1954, "Miss Anastasia Doyle came to Stanford in 1930 as director of Roble Hall, at that time the only University-operated residence for women on campus. She soon acquired an interest in solving student housing problems...[and] since 1950 has held her present post as director of all University campus residences for both men and women students."<sup>37</sup> During her 25-year tenure, Doyle transformed Roble, altering and updating the organization and orientation of the dorm without disturbing the original floor plans. Doyle also saw the number of women housed on campus increase from 200 to more than 1,450 once the enrollment cap of 500 female students—instituted in 1899 by Jane Stanford—was lifted in 1933.

Doyle's vision of female residential education profoundly influenced student life. While a lecturer in the School of Education, she developed the residential assistant (RA) system still in place today. This program, which first began with graduate students serving as RAs and later included upperclass undergraduates, was first introduced in Roble and later in all campus dorms.<sup>38</sup> It established a new system of governance that empowered residents and enabled them to serve in leadership capacities within their dormitories, becoming an integral element of residential life at Stanford and giving rise to a stronger student voice in residential organizing.

In the 1960s, a new residential revolution reached Roble in the form of coeducational housing. While Roble was not one of the dorms involved in the first phase of integrated male and female housing in the mid-1960s, it finally opened its doors to male residents in the fall of 1968. According to the Stanford University Steering Committee, the administration during this time came to believe that

*coeducational residences and the inclusion of members of various classes, including freshmen, in the same residence are highly desirable policies, and that a component of academic programs in the residences helps to create an environment in which living, learning, and social activity form a unity of experience.*<sup>39</sup>

When this policy was applied to Roble, the administration distributed the genders by floors, with males on the first and third floors and females on the second. The number of freshmen at Roble dropped to about 95—roughly a third of the dorm's population—with only 30 females, and women became the minority population in the hall for the first time in its history.

A second, cultural, revolution also touched Roble. In a call for institutional recognition in the

late 1960s and early 1970s, minority ethnic groups across campus demanded a greater level of support from the university. The administration responded by providing residential space where African American, Latino, and Native American students could be housed together in greater numbers.

---

*While Roble was not one of the dorms involved in the first phase of integrated male and female housing in the mid-1960s, it finally opened its doors to male residents in the fall of 1968*

---

Commonly known as ethnic theme dorms, these houses were controversial when first established, but they became important features of Stanford's residential landscape. In the 1970–71 academic year, administrators designated Roble as one of two homes for the Latino community

on campus, with Chicano students comprising half of all residents of the hall's A-wing.<sup>40</sup>

This era at Stanford was characterized, moreover, by a significant housing crunch on campus. As a result, Roble soon had twice its previous population, and its spacious three-room doubles quickly became triples and quads. While the administration preserved many of the dormitory's common spaces, they were soon inadequate for the fast-growing number of residents.<sup>41</sup>

## AVERTING DISASTER

December 1987 brought the first real threat to the new Roble since its opening almost 70 years earlier. When an outside architectural firm studied floor

plans and early records of the campus dorms to determine which, if any, were at great earthquake risk, it discovered notations indicating that Roble's walls were not composed of reinforced concrete, as previously thought and as Eldridge T. Spencer had mistakenly asserted.<sup>42</sup> Instead, its walls were made of hollow, brittle ceramic tile, a material that would surely crumble if a significant earthquake hit the area. When the firm presented its findings at a regular meeting of the University Administrative Council on December 16, the evidence was compelling enough to mandate the immediate relocation of students upon their return to the campus in January.

Some students, stunned and frustrated by their hurried displacement, scrawled messages as they left the house, such as "Roble=Rubble" and "2B or not 2B," while others took bits of the dorm to keep as memorabilia.<sup>43</sup> Many residents were defiant and fought for Roble to remain open for the remainder of the school year. Ultimately, however, 300 "Roble Refugees" squeezed into temporary quarters in Branner Hall, Manzanita Park, and various other residences while the retrofitting work commenced. The university, fortunately, did not demolish Roble and replace it with "FloMo II," as some had feared. The seismic strengthening, moreover, saved the dorm from sure destruction when the Loma Prieta earthquake, registering 7.1 on the Richter scale, struck the Bay Area on October 17, 1989, less than two years after Roble's emergency evacuation and just weeks after the dorm finally reopened on September 21.

Since then, Roble has continued to serve as a residence for freshmen and upperclassmen, housing students from around the world with a full spectrum of backgrounds and interests. The oldest continuous dormitory on campus, Roble has been home to a significant number of Stanford students, past and present, and remains one of the university's largest dorms, with more than double the residents of any other individual campus house. Famous for

its annual resident-written, produced, directed, and acted musicals and infamous for its freshman quads—three-room suites shared by four cramped, first-year students—Roble is still a hotbed of student activity.<sup>44</sup> Its H-shaped wing and innovative design has enabled the dorm to adapt to changing residential needs and remain one of the most successful residences on the Stanford campus.

---

*Jane Lilly, '05, majored in urban studies with a focus on architecture and urban design. She is currently living in Oxford, England, where she is finishing up a master's degree in evidence-based social work. She plans to spend the next few years working with youth organizations and traveling around the world.*

#### ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Charles Z. Klauder and Herbert C. Wise, *College Architecture in America* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1929), 137.
- <sup>2</sup> Paul V. Turner, *Campus: An American Planning Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 1984), 133.
- <sup>3</sup> Richard Joncas, David J. Neuman, and Paul V. Turner, *Stanford University* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999), 42. The authors do not provide source citations, but I have assumed that they collected their information from primary sources in the Stanford University Archives and elsewhere.
- <sup>4</sup> Orrin Leslie Elliott, *Stanford University: The First Twenty-Five Years* (Stanford University Press, 1937), 441.
- <sup>5</sup> Paul Yee, *On the Origin of Spaces: The Evolution of Stanford Dormitories, 1891–1992* (Stanford University Archives, 1994), 9.
- <sup>6</sup> Paul V. Turner, "The Architectural Significance of the Stanford Museum," *Museum Builders in the West: The Stanfords as Collectors and Patrons of Art, 1870–1906* (Stanford University, Stanford Museum of Art, 1986), 103.
- <sup>7</sup> Ransome patented various techniques of handling concrete surfaces in 1889, specifying "ways in which the form-boards could be constructed so that the resulting concrete wall would have the appearance of masonry blocks, which workmen could then chisel or 'bush-hammer' in order to create various textures, similar to those of dressed or rusticated stone...a pigment [was also] added in order to match the sandstone used in the other university buildings." (Turner, "Stanford Museum," 104).
- <sup>8</sup> Joncas, et al., 44–45.
- <sup>9</sup> Architectural Resources Group, Information brief.
- <sup>10</sup> Joncas, et al., 44.
- <sup>11</sup> Yee, 8.

- <sup>12</sup> Female students at Stanford were limited primarily to studies in the humanities and social sciences. Given this, an early planner suggested that the Main Quad should be organized with the women's departments on the west side of the Quad nearest the women's dormitories (letter from Francis A. Walker of Olmsted's office to Leland Stanford, dated November 30, 1886, Stanford University Archives, SC125, Box 1, Folder 1). Ironically, the opposite organization has developed over time, with most of the humanities buildings on the Quad's east side.
- <sup>13</sup> Elliott, 177–178.
- <sup>14</sup> Leland Stanford: Letter to Jane Stanford, 1 Sept. 1890 (Stanford Archives, SC022a, Box 2, Folder 10). Experts have debated whether or not Leland Stanford originally planned the university to be coeducational. After his death, Mrs. Stanford claimed that she had persuaded him to accept women, but this letter and others suggest that he had planned to accept female students from the beginning.
- <sup>15</sup> Yee, 8.
- <sup>16</sup> Linda Winthrop Peterson, *The Stanford Century* (Stanford Alumni Association, 1991), 24.
- <sup>17</sup> Joncas, et al., 42.
- <sup>18</sup> Elliott, 441.
- <sup>19</sup> J. Pearce Mitchell, *Stanford University, 1916–1941* (Stanford University Press, 1958) 3. In 1918, the original Roble Hall was renamed Sequoia Hall and converted into a men's dormitory. Members of the U.S. Navy used the dorm during training on the Stanford campus during World War II. After that period, the hall was deemed unsafe, and the second and third floors were demolished. Following those changes, the one-story building was home to the Applied Mathematics Department until it was demolished in 1996 for the construction of the Science and Engineering Quad.
- <sup>20</sup> Alejandro Huerta, *The Architecture of George W. Kelham* (The University of Virginia, December 2004), 8.
- <sup>21</sup> Joncas et al., 71.
- <sup>22</sup> Klauder and Wise, 160.
- <sup>23</sup> Current Stanford President John Hennessy has proposed to relocate all freshmen students into dorms on the east side of the Stanford campus. As part of this proposal, he has recommended that the quads in Roble be restored to their original state as three-room doubles when it becomes an upperclass house so it will remain a popular residence among upperclassmen.
- <sup>24</sup> Klauder and Wise, 137.
- <sup>25</sup> Common rooms comprised 8.32 percent of the area in Roble. These included music, reception, living rooms, libraries, and a parlor (Klauder and Wise, 158).
- <sup>26</sup> Klauder and Wise, 160.
- <sup>27</sup> Yee, 10.
- <sup>28</sup> Toyon Hall, the first men's dormitory built after Encina Hall, also had eating clubs. These still furnish all meals today for Toyon residents.
- <sup>29</sup> Yee, 11.
- <sup>30</sup> Klauder and Wise, 148.
- <sup>31</sup> Mitchell, 13.
- <sup>32</sup> Huerta, 8.
- <sup>33</sup> Eldridge T. Spencer, *An Architectural and Historical Survey of Stanford University Buildings*, February 1949, Stanford University Archives.
- <sup>34</sup> In their 1929 book, written only 12 years after the new Roble was constructed, Klauder and Wise also recorded that “the building is of strongly reinforced concrete” (158). This also could also have contributed to the mistake and certainly demonstrates the early and widespread confusion over the dorm's construction, although the architect's plans clearly denote the use of tile and not a concrete system.
- <sup>35</sup> Joncas et al., 71.
- <sup>36</sup> Yee, 12.
- <sup>37</sup> *Stanford University News* (18 October 1954); Anastasia Doyle, Correspondence, 1935–1961, Stanford University Archives, SCM 084.
- <sup>38</sup> *Stanford University News* (18 October 1954).
- <sup>39</sup> Stanford University, Steering Committee of the Study of Education at Stanford, University Residences and Campus Life. Stanford University Archives, 1968, 7.
- <sup>40</sup> Robert E. Freelen, Director of Student Affairs, letter to Larry Horton, Director of Summer Housing, 29 June 1970, Student Affairs Archives; William Leland, Associate Dean of Students: letter to all residents participating in the draw, 11 May 1970, Student Affairs Archives. Muir House in Stern Hall, now known as Casa Zapata, was the second Latino residence and later became the sole Chicano theme dorm.
- <sup>41</sup> Many residences forfeited common space to accommodate the growing student population. Toyon, for example, converted a number of its study rooms, located at the end of each wing, into triples, quads, and even quints. It also converted all of its original two-room singles into triples to make room for the ever-growing student body.
- <sup>42</sup> Nick Anderson, “University closes Roble Hall.” *The Stanford Daily* (8 January 1988).
- <sup>43</sup> Nick Anderson, “Roble's Last Moments.” *The Stanford Daily* (8 January 1988). 2B is the second floor of Roble Hall's central wing.
- <sup>44</sup> To address the housing shortage, the rooms, originally designed as three-room doubles (two bedrooms joined by a central common room), were converted into three-room quads, with two residents sharing each bedroom. Since upperclassmen were generally reluctant to reside in such cramped quarters, incoming freshmen inevitably inherited the honor of calling a Roble quad home.
- <sup>45</sup> *The San Francisco Earthquake and Fire of April 18, 1906* (1907), 23.
- <sup>46</sup> Stanford University Planning Office, “Sequoia Hall Historic Values Information Brief (August 1996),” Architectural Resources Group. “Roble Hall (Sequoia Hall) Stanford University,” Stanford University Archives, 1996, SCM 167.

# Sandstone & Tile

SPRING/SUMMER 2006  
VOLUME 30, NUMBER 2

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

## STANFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

William Stone, *President*  
Susan Schofield, *Vice President*  
Therese L. Baker-Degler, *Vice President*  
Miriam Palm, *Secretary*  
Margaret Ann Fidler, *Treasurer*

Marian Leib Adams  
Dave Daly  
Anne Dauer  
Therese L. Baker-Degler  
Sanford M. Dornbusch  
Kellie Elliott  
Margaret Ann Fidler  
Bernard Fraga  
Bob Freelen  
Laurence Hoagland Jr.  
Charlie Junkerman  
David Kennedy  
Margaret Kimball  
Anne Marie Krogh  
Robert McIntyre  
David Mitchell  
J. Boyce Nute  
Miriam Palm  
Stephen Peeps  
Susan Ward Schofield

Anthony Siegman  
William Stone  
David Voss

### STAFF

Charlotte Kwok Glasser,  
*Office Administrator*  
P.O. Box 20028  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94309  
650 725-3332

Email: [Stanfordhist@stanford.edu](mailto:Stanfordhist@stanford.edu)  
Office: 3rd floor, Green Library

### WEB SITE

<http://histsoc.stanford.edu>

## STANFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY MEMBERSHIP

Membership is open to all who are interested in Stanford history and includes the following benefits:

- annual subscription to the society's journal, *Sandstone & Tile*, mailed to members three times a year
- invitations to free on-campus programs on aspects of Stanford history
- member discounts on society (and some other) publications

### Membership Categories

- Current Stanford Student \$10
- Society Member \$50
- Contributing Member \$150
- Supporting Member \$250
- Sustaining Member \$500
- Benefactor Circle \$1,000
- Historian Circle \$5,000

Membership is for one year and is tax deductible to the extent permitted by law. Membership dues are payable by credit card or by check.

To join or renew by credit card, visit our web site at <http://histsoc.stanford.edu>. Click on the Membership link at the left and then click on the "Make a gift now" link to the Development Office web site. You may also make out a check to the Stanford Historical Society and mail it to the society office (*see lower left on this page for address*).

## UPCOMING SOCIETY ACTIVITIES

PARTIAL LIST FOR 2006-07

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

**September 29, 2006** The Knoll: History, Renovation and Tour

**November 6** Stanford Stadium: Lecture and Tour

**October 4** Henry Lowood on how Stanford spawned Silicon Valley

**April 2007** Historic Campus Houses Tour

**May 9** Annual Meeting and talk by Gerhard Casper



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

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