Coeducation

(88)

4441 Champlain Avenue

1902 FEB 27

My dear Dr. Harper —

As women are co-heirs with our brothers in the kingdoms of nature and of God, and as shall not be deprived of our heritage.

I cannot believe that you realize your tremendous force for good or ill in the educational and ethical world or you would not set the hands of the clock of progress and justice back. — You cannot stop it, but you might advance

the progress of women — and therefore of the race, by standing boldly and fairly on the platform of the French revolutionists, liberty, equality, fraternity.

There are enough conservative men — narrow, cast in antique lines who are not equal to our new conditions, cannot adjust themselves to the demands of the coming hour. What a wonderful and unconquerable clientele you would have if you welcomed — not tolerated the women who are fit, — only

must speak true to my ideals and my hopes.

It is my hope to have a university in this city which will offer the highest ideal of education, — and that is not possible unless its unlimited opportunities are free to all, — without regard to race, religion or sex —

Sincerely,

Florence Holbrook.

February 27 — 1902.

owes & affords better continually.

You have great responsibility for you are a born leader. Under such leadership with such a cause, such enthusiasm owned be aroused as owned astonish even you with the record you have for success.

There are so many things I owed say for I feel so deeply that this is a crisis in the question of co-education. I feel also for the honor of my Alma Mater and as a true daughter, — Miss Cordelia, I

men and women to work together in any and all subjects.

Women everywhere, the best women, owed and both boys and girls to such a university as you owed offer. Money owed pour in and every night cause owed be advanced. Women, themselves, need to be educated to demand the best for themselves and for their children and they need such men as you to champion their cause and to help them, to educate them to demand and to get the best the world affords and to make the

other lines of study. Before such a radical move against the spirit of true education is made as a separation of the sexes in recitation I beg you to wait until you are sure such a course is the best for both women and men. In such work as both elect to do they should work together. The time has gone by when it was believed that women retard men in intellectual work. They are a help to each other. Open the doors wide +

those and the men who are fit to do the work a great university has a right to demand of her sons and daughters. Because such a course would be right and just it would carry conviction and bring joyful acceptance and success. Those of both sexes who could not answer the requirments would soon perceive the fact and vanish, but the free and honest justice of the atmosphere thus obtained would result in a better manhood and womanhood — both helpful to a university. It is no university

if half the students – are openly and covertly legislated and regulated against. Better shut the doors entirely than offer a grudging welcome.

Co-education means co-operation not company in the promenade or dance. If the classes are too large divide them, but not by sexes. If too few men are coming to the university, offer courses of study that will attract them. Women are now seeking the B. A. because it is what they have longed for, but men have had such work offered for centuries and the present time demands

Melusina Fay Peirce

(Sister of Mrs. Theodore Thomas)

to

President Harper. -

University of Chicago. -

Coeducation

Head

(6)

Honored & Dear Sir: -

At the age of sixty-six, and as a student of sociology from my girlhood - especially in all its aspects as relating to my sex - I venture to address you on the impending policy of "Segregation" for the magnificent Institution of which you are the enlightened & powerful head.

The reasons for this new depart-

(1)

we have not been made so clear that the reading public fully understands them. — If I apprehend aright, however, the chief reason alleged is that in the first two years of the college course the mental attention of the young men is too much distracted from their studies by the presence of the other sex in their classes.

Such knowledge as I have of college life alone, leads me to the belief that while the freshmen & sophomores may not think much about or pay much attention to the girls of their acquaintance who are in their respective social

sets – yet this sex-distraction is much more than made good by their interest in & association with the "fast" or the "lost" girls of the lower middle class with whom they seek companionship. – The thoughts & the imagination of unmarried youth of both sexes not only do, but owing to the Nature God gave them must – run – dwell – more or less on the opposite sex. The one & only question for the Educator is – Is it better to try to place and keep those thoughts & imaginations on the Plane of the Mind – of the Spirit – or shall be – by taking these away, compel them to that of the Senses & the related Emotions?

Co-education is an American institution. - To desert it, or even to modify it, implies a want of faith in an original and striking evolution of our national life. - The education of men by men is many, many centuries old. - So old, in fact, that we may presume it to have given to the world all it ever will give in the training & development of either manhood genius or manhood character.

Co-education is comparatively a very youthful educational method. - The first girls were placed in the Boston schools only in 1790 - & even then only in summer. - In 1825 or so - a High School in Boston

was opened to girls & was at once so eagerly thronged by them that in a panic it was soon closed by the then Mayor, - Mayor Quincy - afterward President of Harvard College - & was not re-opened to them again until 1837." - Women teachers were not allowed in the Boston schools before 1830. - It is the fashion now to decry women as public-school teachers: - but who shall say how much the humaner, gentler methods of the American Public School during the last seventy-five years as compared with the previous harshness before that period are due to the patience, tact & sympathy of the American

women Public = School teachers?. 6
The native American manners, too, as evolved under those feminine auspices were surely far preferable to the boorish insensibility in these respects so often noted in Germany - where School masters are the rule & school mistresses the exception. -

If Americans are not surpassed in vim, dash & manhood by any men of any nation - can we sincerely claim or fear that the school association of boys with girls, & the school teaching of boys by women, have in any degree "feminized" the stronger & braver sex? - and if we can not claim

this - if, on the contrary, we can boast both mentally & physically of the most <u>manly</u> manhood = minds & the most <u>stupendous</u> manhood = achievements on earth to-day - shall we now begin to go back upon our national Method & Education & thereby halt if we, ~~now~~ in future, separate & keep apart the boys from the girls - a more manly, & stronger type, of the former will then be produced? -

It is possible, however, that the strongest objection to co-education in the minds of the Authorities of the University of Chicago - is in its effect

upon the so-called "co-ed."
It is perhaps feared, or even
observed, that the college
girl in co-educational col-
leges loses the feminine &
the womanly charms and
standards while not at the
same time developing mental
power & originality equal to
those of men. -

I can easily believe this to be a
real danger, but if it exists,
I equally believe that the
reason for it is to be found in
the attitude of the co-education
University Authorities. -

They have committed the same
sin & omission against the

Sister Sex that men committed in the first place when they put girls into the public schools. -

From that day to this it would seem that men have never said to themselves. — "Here is a Sex which we have hitherto kept in almost total intellectual darkness. yet all the while it has been achieving for itself and for us stupendous things. — To provide the clothing & prepare the food for the entire race — from birth to the grave — has been their giant task from the beginning of time. and all the processes & utensils for accomplishing it, up to the age

in which men began to smelt
metals & to make metal utensils for cookery - were the inventions & the manufactures of women. -
Pottery, Basket-weaving, Leather-dressing - all textiles - all cleansing agents - all cleansing & dyeing processes were evolved from the busy brain & through the busy hands of Womanhood. - In Christian lands also, Womanhood, has created Society. - Grace & courtesy & modesty and Refinement - the standards of Propriety, the joy & charm of social festivity & hospitality - & hospitality - Home Decoration - Becoming Toilette - the Beautiful as we have it in our Homes & in our Daily Lives, founded as it is upon Cleanliness & upon Order - all this we owe

to Womanhood. — It is a vast Realm in itself. — Mothers train their Daughters from birth to succeed themselves in it. — Shall we then ignore all this in the School & College Education of Girls & Maidens? — Shall we ask no advice whatever from the Standard Matrons of this Land in taking this entirely new departure for our daughters — moved to it as we are by a sense of the injustice toward them of which Manhood has too long been guilty — that of depriving them of all knowledge save the knowledge which they themselves have wrested from nature in the performance of the daily & nightly ceaseless tasks we have expected them to

perform for our comfort & well-being?" —

Yet this is just what American Manhood did do when it opened its Schools & Colleges to the Sister Sex. —

Haughty & arrogant Boyhood, in 1790 no doubt made its grimace & "hated" to have this "inferior" element thrust into its Class-rooms & Companionship. And to this day ungrateful Boyhood & ungrateful Manhood ignore alike their debt of Ages to the Feebler Sex & begrudge to have them in their recitation rooms and as members in equal standing of the same

Schools and colleges. — 13

But would School-boys and Collegians continue to feel in this way if the Heads of Schools & Colleges were noble and magnanimous enough to explain the inestimable manhood indebtedness to Womanhood? — If, before the age of machinery, mothers & wives had not daily provided the comforts of life for sons & husbands — is it probable that the delicate inventive brain of those sons & husbands could have thought out the difficult & delicate mathematical & physical problems or have conducted the absorbing researches & experiments required to make our modern Civilisation

what it has now become?
Tennyson's flippant jeer —
"They hunt old trails", said Lyrie
"very well.
But when did woman ever yet
invent?" —
is contradicted by every counter
in Marshall Field's vast Im=
porium — & that man's millions
have rolled up upon processes
nearly every one of which were
originally invented by women. —

The invention of women seems
nothing beside that of men, mere=
ly because womanhood stopped
with unit labor. — Women have
not yet learned to work together
to accomplish their common
ends — and this — as I pointed
out 30 years ago in my

little work on co-operative (or department) & housekeeping — is why as a sex they have fallen so behind their Brothers this last 300 years. —

But let the Co-Education College take the position that this, now, this "co-working" — this mental discipline — this stern demand of inexorable hours for inexorable things instead of the laisser faire & laisser aller of the modern "home" girl or matron — is the thing above all others that the American girl can & should learn at the University — so that she may leave it prepared to attack this mighty

Problem of Home Industry V6
of Domestic Supply - on the Modern
Stock-Company, Specialized
Labor Basis - College-bred
men are now demanded in
Business Firms. College Bred
Women should be demanded
by the Housekeeping Agencies of the
period, because the factory system
daily drafts away from the
household the maidens who
would otherwise - as in the
days of our foremothers, be found
in it - & the Modern Matrons
& Maidens succeeded
must Organize Housekeeping
if they wish to solve either
their personal Housekeeping Prob-
lems or the general Poverty
Problem of their Sex. -

An Ideal Co-education Univer-

sity. It seems to me - would 17
be one wherein the Domain that
the daughters of Mother Eve in
the course of ages wrested from
Nature - would be represented
equally with the triumphs
achieved by the sons of Adam. -
Exquisite Dancing should be a
recognized College Art as much
as superb foot-ball or Rowing.
The viands on the College Tables
no matter how simple - should
be so perfect of their kind as
to give every youth & maiden
food-standards for their lives.
(- yet a recent american
writer about Oxford - a Mr.
Corbin, I be-heive - says in his
book that food-preparation
in American Colleges is
universally bad.) -

The dress standard should be equally exacting. - No matter how poor a girl may be. her hair should be arranged with absolute accuracy & in the fashion - her dress dainty & well put on, and with immaculate linen or lawn at her throat. - The tribute of accurate and spotless dress is one absolutely due to their instructors & class-mates of the "other" sex: it is equally indispensable in the case for the respect of that sex. - The women leaders of fashion in the town wherein is the Co: education University should be enlisted as the Reception Committee of a series of College Receptions & Dances each season - thus affording the girl-students

from the country, glimpses 19
of the one special thing that
Society Leaders do contribute
to human Life — namely
— its aesthetic standards and
ideals. That is what an
"aristocracy" is for, and if
it does not do that it
has no excuse for being. —
The fine arts & the arts of
Expression — Music — the
Drama & the Esthetic Dance
should be embraced in the
Schools & the University — and
Committees of the Girl Students,
under suitable oversight —
should be responsible for all
the housekeeping & the
Institution — for its Cleaning,
its Ordering — its Laundering,
its Mending — its Cooking

Table-setting, Table Serving & daily Flower Decoration.— If Co-education Universities thus practically demonstrated their respect for Womanhood & its Realm — & announced to each & every maiden seeking its advantages that she was not received there in order to forget the traditions & ideals of her own sex — but to accentuate them & develop them to their highest charm — along with the severer discipline of her purely intellectual gifts — I doubt very much whether the dislike & indeed hatred of collegians to "co-educational" colleges & universities would not entirely pass away. —

To my humble self it seems that

if when men first opened the Public Schools to girls they had placed some of their Mothers on the School Boards & kept them there ever since — the latter would not have allowed training & skill in the Domestic arts nor instruction in Moral & Patriotic Principles to have lapsed so completely from girlish education that the manager of the Chicago Pure Food Exposition, Mr. P.M. Hanney, declared only last week that the ignorance of the Chicago wives how properly to feed their husbands "is universal." — while Religion & Morals are tending to swift decay all about us from similar feminine ignorance of what in my youth girls were still taught as a matter of course ⊙ —

I think the pratical sense of American motherhood would have long ago utilised the big school buildings in summer time for sewing & cooking lessons to their daughters & for practise in the use of tools for their sons. — and if the Catholics will not let the Bible be read by nor one word about the Protestant Reformation be taught to the millions of the school children of the United States in school hours, I think those old time Mothers would have managed to have these taught the children out of school hours. — But no help or advice from the Nations Mothers was ever asked by the School Boards of the Nation — & so we have now a generation of girls unskilled in the household arts and morally

unfortified for the struggles & 23
temptations of our sensational amer-
ican life. —

And similarly — the Heads of Colleges
& Universities, in opening these
Institutions to another Sex, have
not seriously considered that Sex
& its achievements & standards per
se; they have not realized that
they were uniting the Creators
of the Home and of Society
into their College Halls, but-
on the contrary have extended
~~extended~~ a sort of intellectual
bounty to a set of intellectu-
al beggars who could contribute
nothing to the common stock.
With. This de haut en bas attitude
on the part of the Professors, if
is not surprising that the young

men students feel little or 24
no chivalry. reverence & respect towards their co-education class-mates, & that the latter, feeling their womanhood is understated, should strive, poor dears - rather to be manish and athletic - indifferent to softness, grace, charm & the traditional beauty & retiring modesty of the "old-time" woman. - instead of being more scrupulous in all these regards for the very reason that they are thrown daily into close contact with the contrasting sex. -

If young men of the better classes avoid Co-education Colleges it is my belief that it is because the girl-students therein have forgotten - or are not encouraged -

wherein to fulfil the great function
of their sex - the Expression of the
Beautiful. - Rather than this
"segregation" - which is & must be
felt a sort of Brand upon the
girl students - let the grand Uni-
versity of Chicago restrict the
proportion of girl students to
two: third the number of the
men students. — but let that
proportion be free. - not "circled,
cabined, nor confined:" & let the
Authorities of the University ask
of them only one thing other
than conformity with the regulations
for all students - & that is -
that they aim high, higher,
Highest the immemorial - the Sa-
cred - the Divine Feminine Ideal
in whose "Image" they were created.

Very deeply and respectfully yours -
Melusina Fay Peirce - 16 Astor St
Oct. 19, 1902

March 13, 1904

30 High Street.
Charlestown — Mass.

My dear Sir,

Will you kindly send me, at your very earliest convenience, catalogues and whatever printed matter may be available, concerning the women's department at your college. I am preparing a book to be called "The College Girl of America," and it is my earnest desire to cover in the volume as fully and interestingly as may be possible, the real life of girl students in all the more important colleges of the country. In each case, also, I wish to sketch with what color and incident I may, the historical growth of the college. To this end I would ask you to indicate (if you cannot send me articles) where I may find such

sketches as I need.

My book (L. C. Page & Co., Boston, publishers) is to be carefully illustrated, and I would welcome particularly any suggestions in regard to pictures of the life, or a photograph of a typical college girl at your institution.

Trusting that all this will not tax you too greatly, and thanking you in advance for serving me in these matters, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

Mary E. Crawford.

(Member class of '98, Radcliffe College).

March 13, 1904.

Coeducation

To the President and Trustees of the
University of Chicago.

Gentlemen:--

I beg leave to submit the following report of my visit to certain Eastern colleges for women, together with such suggestions as my observations and experience indicate should be embodied in plans for future women's buildings of the University.

My trip extended from February 28 to March 14. The institutions I visited and the officials who gave me information freely and most courteously were as follows:

Wellesley College, President Hazard, Dean Pendleton, Registrar Kelsey, Miss Davis, Head of Wilder Hall and Instructor in Domestic Science, and Treasurer Hardy.

Radcliffe College, President Agassiz, Dean Irwin, Secretary Coes, and Miss Hoppin, Head of Bertram Hall.

Mount Holyoke College, President Woolley and various members of the Faculty, including nearly all of the eighteen who have been members of the University of Chicago.

Smith College, President Seelye, Miss Jordan and Miss Hanscom of the Faculty, and the Head of one of the Halls.

Swarthmore College, Dean Bond and Prof. Bronk.

Bryn Mawr College, President Thomas.

Barnard College, Professor Maltby.

Teachers College, Dean Russell, Principal Prettyman, Dr. Wood, and Mrs. Farnsworth, Head of Whittier Hall.

Vassar College, President Taylor, Lady Principal Kendrick and several members of the faculty and Heads of Houses.

I also had profitable interviews with Miss E.H. Richards and Miss F.M. Cushing for-mer trustees of Vassar College and with Mrs. Elizabeth L. Clarke, an active trustee of Smith College. It was a matter of regret that the plans for Simmons College were not further advanced as the college will undoubtedly have problems similar to our own to solve. Although the conditions in all the institutions were interesting and profitable to study, only those at Barnard College, Teachers College and Radcliffe College practically the same as our own. Their location in cities and their connection with men's colleges put them in quite a different class from the women's colleges and give them peculiar advantages and difficulties. The points which I particularly studied were:

1) Cost of living and tuition.
2) Size and apportionment of rooms.
3) Space devoted to general social purposes of household.
4) Opportunities for social training.
5) House government.
6) Domestic administration.
7) Amount of domestic service.
8) Accommodations for employees.
9) Student social organizations.
10) Equipment for physical culture.

The following table gives the expenses of at the institutions visited.

	Tuition	Board	Room				Total		
			min.	Max.	Av.		Min.	Max.	Av.
Radcliffe	$200.	$6 or $216.	$100.	325.	190		$516	741	606
Mt. Holyoke	125		$175 without laundry service required						303.
Smith	100.		300 with laundry a few special suites						400
Barnard	150								
Bryn Mawr	150	175	125 upward						500
Wellesley	175		225 without laundry						400.
Teachers	150	$4.50 or	162	70 400	127		382	712	439.
Vassar	100		300 with laundry						400.
Nancy Foster	120	$3.50 or	$126	42 135	117		288	381	363
Green Hall	120	$3.50 or	$126	54 126	112		300	372	358
Beecher & Kelly	120	$3.50 or	$126	90 162	122	40	336	408	368 40

A partial study of the ratio of servants to students gives the following results:

Radcliffe 1: 4 1/2 excluding janitor and housekeeper
Vassar 1 : 5 excluding janitors and laundresses
Chicago 1 : 6 excluding " " "
Wellesley 1 : 6 1/4 excluding janitors and laundresses

At Radcliffe there are 3 1/5 housemaids for 26 persons or 1 : 8.1
At Vassar 13 to 100 or 1 : 7.6
At Green Hall 8 to 72 or 1 : 9.

It was interesting and indeed gratifying to observe that the lines along which the domestic and social life of the older institutions are developing are almost precisely the same as those that have already been established at the University of Chicago. These are:

1) A member of the faculty as the social head of each hall.
2) Student government of each hall.
3) Range in choice of price of rooms.
4) Suites giving place to single rooms.
5) Increasing social liberty and privilege.
6) Centralization of domestic administration.
7) Larger sanitary facilities
8) Better housing and social opportunities for the employees.
9) Increasing facilities for physical training and exercise.

It is evident that many of the institutions are so hampered by architectural and other conditions, as well as by the force of tradition, that they cannot make much headway in the directions desired. The following were a few instances:

1) Domestic administration is centralized to the extent that there is a common buyer of supplies for all the halls, but the housekeepers use the supplies and hire and manage their service independently with the result that there is a wide variance in the degree of satisfaction, economy and taste secured, as well as some friction due to misunderstandings and critical remarks.

2) As the halls have no equipment or accommodations for entertaining, the desire of the students to extend hospitality has to be met by allowing them to give teas and luncheons and otherwise to entertain friends at inns or restaurants in the neighborhood.

3) The servants in most cases have rooms in the top story shut off from the students' rooms and approached by separate stairs. They eat in the kitchen and lead their social life to a considerable extent on the streets. This condition seems so objectionable that a separate building for the social life of employees is under consideration at several institutions.

I would respectfully make the following recommendations:

1) Single rooms only should be provided.
2) Corner rooms on each floor should not communicate with the adjoining rooms, the object being to secure greater quiet in certain rooms.
3) A few pairs of connecting rooms should be planned on each floor.
4) Each floor should have a suite of two or three rooms with bath-room.
5) No room should be less than 8 1/2 ft wide.
6) There should be a variation in rentals, the minimum approximating $25 a quarter and the maximum $60 with half control of a bath room.
7) If the plan is adopted of small lecture halls, involving much going up and down stairs in order to pass from one class room to another, elevators must be provided in each residence hall with uniform rates for corresponding rooms on different floors; otherwise residence halls of not over four stories need not be furnished with elevators provided rates for rooms decrease according to the height.
8) There should be separate toilet accommodations for each 6 or 7 students.
9) There should be no regular story below ground but a basement fitted with trunk room, rubbish room, coal closet, janitor's closet, servants' dressing room and water closet, connecting passge way and stairs leading up to first floor.
10) The first floor should be near the ground and should have diningroom (size multiples of 9 x 11- 4 plus some extra sq. ft. for serving tables, etc.) parlor (16 x 35) and reading room 16 x 15) (aggregating 16 sq. ft. per inhabitant, or 800 Sq. ft. per 50 students), kitchen (16 x 12) serving room 16 x 8),

Back (down) stairs, front stairs with recess for telephone, house maid, closet and letter box, suite of sitting room (to be used as occasion requires for private dining room, special social functions, general entertaining, men's cloak room or guest's parlor), bed room to be used as gentlemen's cloak room at social functions, and private toilet room. The parlor and dining room should be connected by folding doors.

11) The suite of the Head of the House(study, bed room, toilet room and ample closet space) should be on the second story and extend from side to side of the Hall.

12) Household employees should not live in the house. The space necessary for them in the upper story would be much more remunerative if fitted up for students. The space required for a back stair case would thus also become available for students.

13) The approach to fire escapes should not be through private rooms.

14) The best floors that are practicable should be provided.

15) The gymnasium building should be reserved for that purpose, but might be connected with the general social or club building.

These suggestions summarize the general points to be considered. I shall gladly hold myself in readiness to report on matters of detail.

Respectfully submitted.

(signed) Marion Talbot."

GEO. C. WALKER,
519 The Rook

Dr Goodspeed

Chicago, May 24 1897

Dear Dr Harper

This is a serious question and should have attention. I do not know what action of the Trustees is referred to but presume for some reason they decided to abandon all effort to furnish the girls with rooms.

Co-education will not continue there as an action force with only the local girls to cater for, and if that end is desired, should it not come squarely and not by slow degrees. It is simply a question, is it best to abandon coeducation among the younger people

Truly Yours
Geo C Walker

Pres File —
Trustees — Walker

~~[illegible]~~ what I mus
[illegible]s if I am g[illegible]
[illegible]t sincer[illegible]

1902
JAN
15
120

My dear President Harper,

Will you allow me to state to you my position on the proposed plan for the separation of men and women in the Junior Colleges: I believe in the desirability of a separate campus for women, but I do not consider such a campus sufficiently desirable to take precedence of other demands more immediately

connec[illegible] the prosperity
of the [illegible] as a whole.

Separate instruction for men and women would, to my mind, from the point of view of the women here and of women throughout the country, be a measure deeply to be regretted.

I hope this expression of opinion will not be regarded as an intrusion. It seemed only right that I should say frankly

to you what I must say
to them if I am questioned.

Most sincerely yours,

Myra Reynolds.

January 15, 1902.

Coeducation

Report of Com. on proposed institution of learning in Chicago.

The Special Com. appointed by the Ex. Com of the Bd of the Am. Bap. Ed. Soc. to consider questions relating to the establishment of an I. of L. in C. Seewith present the following report,

The City of Chicago is located near the permanent center of population on this Continent. It is & will always remain the inland Commercial metropolis of the Country. It will always be the center most easily & cheaply accessible from all parts of our land. the lines of travel radiating from it to every quarter. It is now a city of a million people & by the end of the century will have nearly 2000000. The city has as yet no Protestant College or University & an institution now founded within its limits will take & permanently retain the leading position. The Bap. Denomination has no College of a high order & good equipment in the entire North west, It has no College of any sort near Chicago. The city. as respects Education under Bap. Auspices is the center of a vast area of destitution & need. Our young people are, for the most part, remaining uneducated, while the greater part of those who are seeking a liberal training find their way into the Colleges of other denominations or into State Universities in which they too often become alienated from or lost to us. Believing that a thoroughly good institution of learning located in this city would have an attraction for students second to none in the land, & that it would then enable the denomination

to lay hold of & influence mightily the intellectual, social & religious life of the entire west & that the educational claims of Chicago upon the denomination, for these & other reasons are at present <u>preeminent</u>. we submit the following recommendations touching the points of inquiry raised in the letter of your instructions.

1. That the Am. Bap. Ed. Soc'y would do wisely to take steps <u>at once</u> toward the founding of a well equipped <u>College</u>, leaving any desirable further development to the natural growth of time.

2. That this institution be located within the city limits of Chicago, — this recommendation being urged as essentially important.

3. That the privileges of the institution be extended to persons of both sexes on equal terms.

4 That there be established a preparatory school of the highest excellence with an endowment of at least $100,000. — this school however not to be located on the site of the College, but in some locality to be approved by the Am. Bap. Ed. Soc'y: & that the warmest encouragement be given to all the Academies which would naturally become tributary to the College.

5 That for a suitable site for the proposed College there be purchased at least ten acres of land & as much additional as available funds will admit.

6. That the following Buildings be at once erected.

(1) the Main Bldg for chapel & lecture rooms to cost	$ 80.000.
(2) Two Bldgs for laboratories & apparatus to cost $20.000. each	50.000.
and as soon as possible thereafter	
(3) a library Bldg to cost	100.000.
(4) Four dormitories to cost $20.000. each	100.000.
(5) A gymnasium, to cost	40.000.
Total cost of buildings at present proposed	$370.000

7. That for founding the institution on an adequate basis, the following offices & chairs of instruction with salaries designated be provided. President $5.000.

Professor of Greek	3.000.
" Latin	3.000.
" Pure Mathematics	3.000.
" Applied Mathematics	3.000.
" Rhetoric & English Literature	3.000.
" Physics	3.000.
" Chemistry	3.000.
" History & Political Science	3.000.
" Philosophy & Logic	3.000.
" Modern Languages	3.000.
" Biology	3.000.
" Geology & Paleontology	3.000.
" Physiology	1.000.
" Education	1.000.

Librarian	3.000.
Secretary	3.000.
Treasurer	1.000.
Registrar	1.000.
Curators	1.000.
A total of	$52.000.

in annual salaries requiring an endowment at five per cent of $1.040.000

8. That the sum of $75.000. be provided to sustain the annual cost of accumulating & supplying the library & the illustrative apparatus. — $50.000. for the former & $25.000. for the latter.

9 That four years be taken for the development of the institution as proposed: & that the work of instruction begin in the autumn of 1890 in case suitable buildings shall then have been provided.

10 That the following schedule be adopted representing the sums required from the Society each year in the development of the institution. viz.

For the first year closing Sept. 1. 1890 $300.000

To be applied as follows.

For Endowment of Presidents Office	$100.000.
For purchase of land	100.000.
For Endowment of Secretarys Office	60.000.
For temporary loan applied to endowment of Academy	40.000

For first year $300.000
For Second year closing Sept. 1. 1891 $400.000
to be applied as follows. ——
For library & Apparatus fund —— $75.000,
" Endowment of librarians office 60.000.
" " of professorships & general purposes 265.000.
For third year closing Sept. 1. 1892 $260.000
And for the fourth year closing Sept. 1. 1893 215.000.
for endowment of professorships. a total of $1215.000
That various sums should be invested for investment by April 1st of the years named.

II That Lehicago & the West be expected to provide as follows:
(1) The buildings named, to cost as above indicated $370.000
(2) For initial expenditure in library & apparatus 30.000.
(3) For land, buildings & endowment for preparatory school 200.000.
A total of $600.000

It being understood that the $40.000. temporarily furnished by the Society toward the endowment of the preparatory school shall be returned within four years.
We recommend further that these provisions be fulfilled according to the following schedule.
For the first year $200.000. to be applied as follows
For chapel & lecture rooms $50.000,
For the preparatory school. land. buildings etc. 150.000.
For the second year $200.000. to be applied as follows.
For initial expenses in library & apparatus $30.000

For two laboratories $25.000 each. $50.000.
For two dormitories " " 50.000.
For preparatory school 70.000.
For third year: for library building + 100.000.
For fourth year $100.000. to be applied as follows.
For two dormitories. $25.000. each 50.000
" preparatory school 10.000.
" Gymnasium 40.000.

12. That in incorporating the institution, the President & two thirds of the Board of Trustees should be members of Bap. Churches. — the trustees to number twenty one & the first Board constituting the incorporators to be elected by the Board of the Ed. Soc'y. The Board of trustees should be divided into three classes with terms of service expiring respectively in one, two & three years.

13. That the funds contributed by the Ed. Soc'y. should be controlled by the Soc'y. the interest only being annually paid to the trustees until such time as Chicago & the West should fulfil the conditions named.

14 That the Ed. Soc'y should require from the Trustees of the institution a conditional mortgage on the property of the Corporation in consideration of the endowment & other aid rendered by the Society.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Coeducation

May 3rd, 1902.

Hon. W. T. Harris,

Commissioner of Education, Washington.

DearSir:

I am verymuch obliged to you for giving me anopportunity to contradict the statement quoted in your letter of April thirtieth. So far as I know, there is absolutely no basis for the statement that in the University of Chicago male undergraduates are manifesting dislike of co-education in annoying ways. This is a newspaper story.

Very truly yours,

May 3rd, 1902.

Hon. W. T. Harris,

Commissioner of Education, Washington.

Dear Sir:

I am very much obliged to you for giving me opportunity to contradict the statement quoted in your letter of April thirtieth. So far as I know, there is absolutely no basis for the statement that in the University of Chicago male undergraduates are manifesting dislike of co-education in annoying ways. This is a newspaper story.

Very truly yours,

A.T.S. B.Y.H.

Address all official communications to
"Commissioner of Education."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

April 30, 1902.

Dr. William R. Harper,

President of Chicago University,

Chicago, Ill.

Sir:

In view of the many inquiries received at this Office relative to the higher education of women as provided for in this country, I beg to inquire if there is any validity in fact as regards your university for the following statement quoted in the Literary Digest of April 19th and credited to the Philadelphia Press: "In the Northwestern University, Chicago University, Cornell University, Columbia University, and Brown University the male undergraduates are manifesting their dislike of coeducation in ways that are more annoying than chivalrous."

The favor of an early reply to this inquiry will be greatly appreciated.

Very respectfully,

W T Harris

Commissioner.

A.T.S. B.Y.M.

Address all official communications to
"Commissioner of Education."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

April 30, 1902.

Dr. William R. Harper,

President of Chicago University,

Chicago, Ill.

Sir:

In view of the many inquiries received at this Office relative to the higher education of women as provided for in this country I beg to inquire if there is any validity in fact as regards your university for the following statement quoted in the Literary Digest of April 19th and credited to the Philadelphia Press: "In the Northwestern University, Chicago University, Cornell University, Columbia University, and Brown University the male undergraduates are manifesting their dislike of coeducation in ways that are more annoying than obvious."

The favor of an early reply to this inquiry will be greatly appreciated.

Very respectfully,

Commissioner.

SUMTER BAPTIST CHURCH.
C. C. BROWN, PASTOR.

C C Brown

Sumter, S. C.

[Mimeograph Copy.]

Nov. 11, 1893.

28

Dear Bro.:

In the Baptist Year Book for 1893, your School is put down as having female instructors. I infer from this that it is a co-educational institution. We are discussing the wisdom of combining our male and female colleges at Greenville, and I shall be glad to have your opinion concerning the practical workings of the plan. Does your experience lead you to favor the admission of women to our male schools? Is it beneficial to the boys or hurtful to the girls? and what is the resultant harm? I shall be glad to have your opinion on these questions that I may lay it before our Carolina brethren at the approaching convention.

Very Fraternally,

C. C. Brown.

To
Wm R. Harper,
Chicago.

SUMTER BAPTIST CHURCH.
C. C. BROWN, PASTOR.

Sumter, S. C.

[Mimeograph Copy.]

Nov. 17, 1892.

Dear Bro.:

In the Baptist Year Book for 1892, your School is put down as having female instructors. I infer from this that it is a co-educational institution. We are discussing the wisdom of combining our male and female colleges at Greenville, and I shall be glad to have your opinion concerning the practical workings of the plan. Does your experience lead you to favor the admission of women to our male schools? Is it beneficial to the boys or hurtful to the girls? and what is the resultant harm? I shall be glad to have your opinion on these questions that I may lay it before our Carolina brethren at the approaching convention.

Very Fraternally,

C. C. Brown.

ANDERSON & PRICE, MANAGERS.
ALSO OF · THE ORMOND · FLORIDA.

White Mountains

Mount Pleasant House

PURE MOUNTAIN AIR, PURE MOUNTAIN SPRING WATER AND THE GRANDEST MOUNTAIN SCENERY IN AMERICA EAST OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

MOUNT PLEASANT HOTEL CO., Proprietors,
3 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK.

POST, TELEGRAPH, TICKET AND
LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE OFFICES IN HOTEL.

Coeducation

Mount Pleasant

Sunday Eve.

Mr Dean Chief

The Loesch-Herschl effort affected me as the most meaningless dumb show in the whole program. and the argument of "Educator" in yesterday's Evening Post was enough to prove beyond a doubt that it would be worse than useless to attempt to educate the public in any way except by doing the thing and letting people get used to it. The whole business looks to me more and more like a tempest in a teapot attempting to turn back the trade winds. The Registrar of Barnard is here — Mrs. Leggitt. She is a most astonishingly plain-spoken person. and she has given me her views on segregation and related subjects with a bluntness that I wasn't prepared for. "You have done the right thing. I would simply carry out the program and let the rabble howl." "If the Women's Clubs make an issue against you. they are pretty sure to prove you are right." "The sensible women have begun to find out that the

PURE MOUNTAIN AIR. PURE MOUNTAIN SPRING WATER AND THE GRANDEST MOUNTAIN SCENERY IN AMERICA EAST OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

MOUNT PLEASANT HOTEL Co. Proprietors
3 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK.

POST TELEGRAPH TICKET AND
LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE OFFICES IN HOTEL.

movement to make imitation men out of women has gone a long way too far, and there's got to come a reaction, but they haven't the courage yet to say so." &c. &c. She is down on women as College instructors, and says there is absolutely no future for them at Barnard, because they must have "interchangeable courses" with Columbia, and no courses by women would be accepted by Columbia, either students or faculty. She represents the interest in the East in our experiment as very largely a spirit of congratulation rather than of deprecation. — the feeling that has been artificially worked up corresponds with that of our obstructionists, but the people who see no reason for making a fetich of coeducation believe that our plan will be an eye-opener, and will help restore the same balance between men and women. The more the opposition to this thing shows its hand, the more I am convinced of the superficiality of its position.

Now about affiliation. I supposed that Prof. Miller had prepared the exhibit of facts, as I spoke to him about it some six weeks ago, at Prof Shepardson's prompting, and he said the material was easily available in the office. If you want to speak about the future, I should be at a loss to outline anything that it would seem to me

ANDERSON & PRICE, MANAGERS.
ALSO OF · THE ORMOND · FLORIDA.

White Mountains

Mount Pleasant House

PURE MOUNTAIN AIR, PURE MOUNTAIN SPRING WATER AND THE GRANDEST MOUNTAIN SCENERY IN AMERICA EAST OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

MOUNT PLEASANT HOTEL CO., Proprietors,
3 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK.

POST, TELEGRAPH, TICKET AND
LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE OFFICES IN HOTEL.

wise to print, except about secondary affiliations. We can't publish to the world what we know about our experience with College affiliation, so far. The Colleges whose association with us would help us, don't want affiliation, and we can't afford to carry the burden of any more Colleges that are a dead-weight.

My program would be to adopt with Colleges a modification of our system in the case of coöperating schools; i.e. a recognition of individual members of faculties, and acceptance of their courses as alternatives — for the sake of the sensitiveness of our own people I would not use the term "equivalent" — alternatives, major for major, with our undergraduate courses as credits toward degrees. That is, a College like Oberlin might, we will suppose, offer 27 majors which we would credit against our requirements. In case a student had taken those courses we might countersign his diploma, according to the Bucknell suggestion. There would be no conferring of our Bachelor's degree in such a case, but, on the one hand, I think we could create a desire on the part of B.O.'s to get this recognition of their courses, and, on the other hand, I believe the desire of Colleges to be known as offering courses

ANDERSON & PRICE, MANAGERS.
ALSO OF · THE ORMOND · FLORIDA.

White Mountains

Mount Pleasant House

PURE MOUNTAIN AIR, PURE MOUNTAIN SPRING WATER AND THE GRANDEST MOUNTAIN SCENERY IN AMERICA EAST OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

MOUNT PLEASANT HOTEL CO., Proprietors,
3 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK.

POST, TELEGRAPH, TICKET AND
LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE OFFICES IN HOTEL.

that could be substituted for ours would put a bigger premium on our D's for faculty positions than the present device of consultation about appointments. Furthermore, the plan would presently create a demand for the work of our appointed but not commissioned Departmental Delegates. They would be called upon to pass upon the courses proposed for alternative rank, and would not be in the position which many of them fear, of seeming to be obtrusive.

If there is any tj in this, or along other lines, that you would like to have me work out before the middle of Sep. I will be glad to make a try at it, but if you are to be in town the last half of Sep. I could probably make up for lost time by putting in my work after we had talked the thing through.

Yrs. you gave Hayes his hood last June.

Sincerely

Small.

ANDERSON & PRICE, MANAGERS.
ALSO OF · THE ORMOND · FLORIDA.

White Mountains

Mount Pleasant House

PURE MOUNTAIN AIR, PURE MOUNTAIN SPRING WATER AND THE GRANDEST MOUNTAIN SCENERY IN AMERICA EAST OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

MOUNT PLEASANT HOTEL CO., Proprietors,
3 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK.

POST, TELEGRAPH, TICKET AND
LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE OFFICES IN HOTEL.

H. W. HAWKINS, Pres. MRS. A. R. DOW, Sec. JNO. F. NELSON, Sup't.

Board of Education.

December 14th, 1901.

Geneva, Ill., Dec. 10 1901

President Harper,

Mrs. Belle A. Dow, Chicago University

Geneva, Illinois. Dear Sir:-

My dear Madam: Will you kindly write me,

I can take time only to give my own your opinion of the

opinion, after seeing co-educational workfor ten desirability of co-education in Colleges.

years in the University of Chicago. There is no I am told you were opposed to it

question whatever that it is the natural and the before the opening of the institution,

satisfactory form for college education. I have but are now an ardent advocate.

never been opposed to it, but I now regard it as the I would like your opinion in

regular order of things. I am sure that there will favor of co-education for a debate in

be changes in the methods now employed and that great our woman's club.

progress will be made, but the principle of co-educa- Please pardon the presumption, I shall

tion is, in my opinion, thoroughly established. feel highly honored if you have time to

Very truly yours, grant my request. I have the degree A. M.

from the State University of Iowa and

am a warm freind of Dr. J. L. Pickard

and Prof. A. N. Currier of that Institute

(in the past and present.)

Very Respectfully Yours,

(Mrs.) Belle A. Dow

December 14th, 1901.

Mrs. Belle A. Dow,

Geneva, Illinois.

My dear Madam:

I can take time only to give my own opinion, after seeing co-educational work for ten years in the University of Chicago. There is no question whatever that it is the natural and the satisfactory form for college education. I have never been opposed to it, but I now regard it as the regular order of things. I am sure that there will be changes in the methods now employed and that great progress will be made, but the principle of co-education is, in my opinion, thoroughly established.

Very truly yours,

MRS. A. R. DOW, Sec. JNO. E. NELSON, Sup't.

Board of Education.

Geneva, Ill., Dec. 10 th 1901

President Harper,
Chicago University.

Dear Sir:-

Will you kindly write me, however briefly, your opinion of the desirability of coeducation in Colleges. I am told you were opposed to it before the opening of the institution, but are now an ardent advocate. I wish the weight of your opinion in favor of coeducation in a debate - in our woman's club. December 17th - Please pardon the presumption, I shall feel highly honored if you have time to grant my request. I have the degree A.M. from the State University of Iowa and am a warm freind of Dr. J. L. Pickard and Prof. A. N. Currier of that institution (in the past and present.)

Very Respectfully Yours,
(Mrs) Belle A. Dow

Geneva, Ill., Dec. 30th 1901

President Harper,
Chicago University

Dear Sir:-

Will you kindly write me, however briefly, your opinion of the desirability of coeducation in Colleges. I am told you were opposed to it before the opening of the institution, but are now an ardent advocate. I wish the weight of your opinion in favor of coeducation in a debate - in our woman's club. December 17th - Please pardon the presumption, I shall feel highly honored if you have time to grant my request - I have the degree A.M. from the State University of Iowa and am a warm friend of Dr. J. L. Pickard and Prof. A. N. Currier of that institution (in the past and present.)

Very respectfully yours,
(Mrs.) Belle A. Dow

Coeducation

May 13th, 1902.

Miss Mary B. Harris,
2252 Calumet avenue, Chicago.

My dear Miss Harris:

I am very glad indeed to make a statement in reference to the point suggested in your letter.

Neither the University in general, nor any member of the University so far as I am aware, has it in mind to take any step which would be understood to be a backward step in co-education. The charterof the University provides that the work of the University shall be open to men and women on equal terms. If any change is introduced, it will be a change intended to improve the situation in the University so far as it relates to women, and the change will be made with this particular thought in mind. The University of Chicago has never feared that the number of women would be too great. It has never taken any step to discourage the attendance of women. It may fairly be criticised, on ther other hand, for having done much more for women

May 13th, 1902.

Miss Mary R. Harris,

5252 Calumet avenue, Chicago.

My dear Miss Harris:

I am very glad indeed to make a statement in reference to the point suggested in your letter.

Neither the University in general, nor any member of the University so far as I am aware, has it in mind to take any step which would be understood to be a backward step in co-education. The character of the University provides that the work of the University shall be open to men and women on equal terms. If any change is introduced, it will be a change intended to improve the situation in the University so far as it relates to women, and the change will be made with this particular thought in mind. The University of Chicago has never feared that the number of women would be too great. It other hand, for having done much more for women nce of women. It may fairly be criticised, on has never taken any step to discourage the attend-

than for men. The friends of co-education and of the education of women need have no anxiety with respect to the attitude of the University towards women. The last step taken in this matter may be presented as evidence of this statement; namely, the opening of the doors of Rush Medical College to women.

Very truly yours,

than for men. The friends of co-education and of the education of women need have no anxiety with respect to the attitude of the University towards women. The last step taken in this matter may be presented as evidence of this statement; namely, the opening of the doors of Rush Medical College to women.

Very truly yours,

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE
1902
MAY
12
19

Dr. Harper

falls upon

the a report before the

L. C. A. next Saturday of

Chicago's progress during

the past year. The changes

in policy are especially

emphasized in these reports,

and I should be greatly

obliged if you would

grant me your public

Sincerely yours,

Mary B. Harris

2252 Calumet Avenue

May 12/1902

utterances regarding the anticipated or rumored change in the Kinsey's attitudes toward women. It is a question that will surely come up, even if omitted from the report; and I have nothing more than newspaper stories for a reply.

Any other suggestions you may make will be very welcome.

CORA SMITH EATON, M. D.,
717 MASONIC TEMPLE,
COR. HENNEPIN AVENUE AND SIXTH STREET.

HOURS:
10 TO 12 A. M. AND 2 TO 5 P. M.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

July 2nd, 1902.

President Harper,

Chicago University,

Chicago, Ill.

July 7th, 1902.

Dear Sir:

Dr. Cora Smith Eaton,

717 Masonic Temple, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

My dear Madam:

I am very much obliged to you for your letter of July second and the expression of opinion which it contains. I think I can assure you that there is no desire or intention on the part ofanybody in the University of Chicago to do away with co-education. Such a step has never been contemplated, even for a moment. I agree entirely with what you have said. At the same tkme, I believe that there are possible improvements in connection with the co-educational scheme and that it is our duty to undertake to improve it to the highest possible extent.

Very truly yours,

Cora Smith Eaton

July 7th, 1902.

Dr. Cora Smith Eaton,

717 Masonic Temple, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

My dear Madam:

I am very much obliged to you for your letter of July second and the expression of opinion which it contains. I think I can assure you that there is no desire or intention on the part of anybody in the University of Chicago to do away with co-education. Such a step has never been contemplated, even for a moment. I agree entirely with what you have said. At the same time, I believe that there are possible improvements in connection with the co-educational scheme and that it is our duty to undertake to improve it to the highest possible extent.

Very truly yours,

President Harper,
Chicago Univ

, M. D.,
MPLE,
O SIXTH STREET.

HOURS:
10 TO 12 A. M. AND 3 TO 5 P. M.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

July 2nd, 1902.

President Harper,

Chicago University,

Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

It is a matter of regret to many men and women through out the country to note through the newspapers that there is an effort to change the co-educational standard in Chicago University back to the old one of segregation of the sexes. I trust that co-education will not be done away with in the great Western University at whose head you stand. It is the sincere conviction of thousands of people who are interested in the progress of the University that its best interests and the best interests of the students will be conserved through co-education. Boys and girls are born into the same family, with interests allied from first to last and the more closely they are associated the better for their relations in adult life.

Trusting that you will not consider this expression of opinion an intrusion, I am, with much respect,

Yours truly,

Constant Eaton

(H)

A.T.S. E.Y.H.

Address all official communications to
"Commissioner of Education."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTEROR,
BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

September 22, 1902.

October 2nd, 1902.

Dr. W. R. Harper,

President of the University of Chicago,

Chicago, Illinois.

Commissioner W. T. Harris,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

My dear Sir:-

You will doubtless recall a request made by letter of August 21st for a copy of your report on coeducation which you had in contemplation at that time. In replying to this previous letter you expressed the hope that your report might be completed by the first of September. As I am very desirous of making use of it in my own report now rapidly drawing to completion I take the liberty of enquiring of you as to the possibility of my securing a copy from you before the expiration of the present month.

I regret very much to say that I am not in a position to prepare the article on co-education. Our affairs have not yet been settled, and it will be November first before I can be in a position to present anything on the subject. I regret this very much.

With pleasant recollections of our meeting last summer, I remain

Yours very truly,

Very respectfully yours,

W. T. Harris

Commissioner.

With kind regards

October 2nd, 1902.

Commissioner W. T. Harris,

Washington, D. C.

My dear Sir:-

I regret very much to say that I am not in a position to prepare the article on co-education. Our affairs have not yet been settled, and it will be November first before I can be in a position to present anything on the subject. I regret this very much.

With pleasant recollections of our meeting last summer, I remain

Yours very truly,

A.T.S. B.Y.H.

...icial communications to ...sioner of Education."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTEROR,
BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

September 22, 1902.

Dr. W. R. Harper,

President of the University of Chicago,

Chicago, Illinois.

30

Dear Sir:

You will doubtless recall a request made by letter of August 21st for a copy of your report on coeducation which you had in contemplation at that time. In reply to this previous letter you expressed the hope that your report might be completed by the first of September. As I am very desirous of making use of it in my own report now rapidly drawing to completion I take the liberty of enquiring at this time as to the possibility of my securing a copy from you before the expiration of the present month.

Very respectfully yours,

W. T. Harris

Commissioner.

With kind regards

A.T.&S. S.Y.M.

Address all official communications to
"Commissioner of Education."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

September 22, 1902.

Dr. W. R. Harper,

President of the University of Chicago,

Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Sir:

You will doubtless recall my request made by letter of August 21st for a copy of your report on coeducation which you had in contemplation at that time. In reply to this previous letter you expressed the hope that your report might be completed by the first of September. As I am very desirous of making use of it in my own report now rapidly drawing to completion I take the liberty of enquiring at this time as to the possibility of my securing a copy from you before the expiration of the present month.

Very respectfully yours,

Commissioner.

Hawthorne Inn
and its cottages

Manse Old Home Seven Gables Province House
Baldwin Cottage Peabody Hall
Wayside Grove Cottage Casino Felton Hall
Orchard Cottage Endicott Hall
Cherryfield Blythedale Meadowbrook
The Willows
East Gloucester, = Massachusetts

Coeducation

5

East Gloucester, Mass., Aug. 27, 1913.

Pres. Harry Pratt Judson,

University of Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

We are pushing in Virginia the movement for the establishment, of a Co-ordinate College for women, by the State, in connection with our State University at Charlottesville. We have to meet the objections, first, the unfortunate social relations resulting from the proximity of a Woman's Institution to one for men. Secondly, it is said that the placing of this college near the University would injure the intellectual status and reputation of the University.

We want to answer these objections, as well as to show, on the constructive side, the advantages from an intellectual stand-point, and the economies of a co-ordinate type of college, when established in communities and in connection with old institutions, where traditional ideas prevail, which render co-education impracticable and unsuitable. We are collecting letters from distinguished men and women, who have had experience with co-ordinate and co-educational colleges, with the view of printing them in a little bulletin for the information and guidance of our people in the discussion of this important matter.

wthorne Inn
and its cottages
Home Seven Gables Province House
aldwin Cottage Peabody Hall
Grove Cottage Casino Felton Hall
Orchard Cottage Endicott Hall
gfield Blythedale Meadowbrook
The Willows
ast Gloucester, = Massachusetts

East Gloucester, Mass.,

You would do us a real service if you would write us your views along the above lines and along any others, which may suggest themselves to you, with reference to this matter.

Dr. Kendrick Babcock of the University of Illinois has suggested that your experience at the University of Chicago in experimenting, along the lines of segregation of courses and organizations for women students, would make such a letter from you especially helpful and suggestive.

Any service you will render us in this connection we shall appreciate and it will be of great value to us.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Caper Branch Bamford

(Mrs Beverley B.)

Chicago, September 5, 1913

Dear Mrs. Munford:-

Your letter of August 27th addressed to President Judson is received in his absence in England. Upon his return late this month it will be brought to his attention.

Yours very truly,

J. G.

Private Secretary

H. P. Judson

Mrs. B. B. Munford,
East Gloucester, Mass.

Chicago, September 5, 1913

Dear Mrs. Mumford:-

Your letter of August 27th addressed to President Judson is received in his absence in England. Upon his return late this month it will be brought to his attention.

Yours very truly,

Private Secretary

H. P. Judson

M.J.B.

Mrs. B. B. Mumford,
West Gloucester, Mass.

Chicago, September 23, 1913

Dear Mrs. Munford:-

Your favor of the 27th of August I find on my return from an absence of some weeks. The objections to the plan of a co-ordinate college for women at Charlottesville do not seem to me to have much weight. So far as the social relations resulting from the proximity of a women's institution to one for men may be concerned, the fact that such colleges have existed for some years in

Chicago, September 23, 1913

Dear Mrs. Munford:-

Your favor of the 27th of August I find on my return from an absence of some weeks. The objections to the plan of a coordinate college for women at Charlottesville do not seem to me to have much weight. So far as the social relations resulting from the proximity of a women's institution to one for men may be concerned, the fact that such colleges have existed for some years in

England, both at Oxford and Cambridge, without any serious trouble would seem to be conclusive. The same thing may be said with regard to Barnard College of New York and Radcliffe College in Cambridge.

The second objection I understand is that the placing of this college near the University would injure the intellectual status and reputation of the University. I cannot learn that such result has followed in the case of any one of the four institutions above mentioned. On the other hand the experience of those institutions has shown the wisdom of using existing institutions so far as

England, both at Oxford and

Cambridge, without any serious

trouble would seem to be conclusive.

The same thing may be said with

regard to Barnard College of New

York and Radcliffe College in

Cambridge.

The second objection I under-

stand is that the placing of this

college near the Universities would

injure the intellectual relations and

reputation of the Universities. I

cannot learn that such result has

followed in the case of any one of

the four institutions above men-

tioned. On the other hand the

experience of those institutions

has shown the wisdom of having

existing institutions so far as

eptember 5, 1913

egret 27th addressed

ile absence in

month it will

truly,

ivate Secretary

H. P. Judson

practicable for development of the training of women as being economically and intellectually advantageous as compared with the formation of new and remote institutions.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mrs. B. B. Munford,
East Gloucester, Massachusetts.

-2-

practicable for development of the training of women as being economically and intellectually advantageous as compared with the formation of new and remote institutions.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

136 I Street Salt Lake City
Sept 29th 1902

The accompanying resolutions are respectfully referred to the attention of the faculty of the University of Chicago by the Utah State Council of Women.

October 28th, 1902.

Mrs. J. Fewson Smith,
136 I Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

My dear Madam:-

I am in receipt of the communication from the Utah State Council of Women to the faculty of the University of Chicago in reference to co-education, and desire to acknowledge the same.

With many thanks for your interest in the matter, I remain

Yours very truly,

Mrs Martin A. Pierson
Geneva Lake Wisconsin.

October 28th, 1902.

Mrs. J. Fewson Smith,

136 I Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

My dear Madam:-

I am in receipt of the communication from the Utah State Council of Women to the faculty of the University of Chicago in reference to co-education, and desire to acknowledge the same.

With many thanks for your interest in the matter, I remain

Yours very truly,

136 J Street Salt Lake City
Sept 29th 1902

accompanying resolutions are respectfully referred to the attention of the faculty of the University of Chicago. by the Utah State Council of Women.

Mrs J. Henson Smith
Secretary

per Jenson
Mrs Martin A. Pierson
Geneva Lake Wisconsin.

Salt Lake City, Utah. September 19th. 1902

Resolution.

Having, as far as possible, carefully investigated public sentiment and the opinion of leading educators, on the subject of co-education, and finding the preponderance in favor of it, therefore

The Utah State Council of Women

Resolve: That it should be sustained and hereby make earnest protest against segregation as advocated by President Harper of the Chicago University.

Signed Emily S. Richards ..... President.

Mrs. J. Stevson Smith ..... Secretary.

Utah State Council of Women.

Salt Lake City, Utah. September 18th. 1903

Resolution.

Having as far as possible, carefully investigated public sentiment and the opinion of leading educators, on the subject of co-education, and finding the preponderance in favor of it, therefore

The Utah State Council of Women

Resolve: That it should be sustained and hereby make earnest protest against segregation as advocated by President Harper of the Chicago University.

Signed .....President.

.....Secretary.

Utah State Council of Women.

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH.

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH. Sept. 24, 1902.

Mrs. J. Fewson Smith,

City.

Dear Madame:-

At a meeting of the Faculty of the University of Utah held on Sept. 6th the following resolution was adopted:-

Resolved: That the Faculty of this institution favors co-education.

Respectfully,

Brig. R. Maxwell

Secretary of Faculty.

Office of
The President.

Latter-day Saints' University.

J. H. Paul.

Salt Lake City, Sept. 27, 1902.

Mrs. J. Fewson Smith,
Sec'y Utah State Council of Women,

Corner 3rd. & I Str.

I am decidedly in favor of co-education which is the practice, guided by principle, of this institution.

J. H. Paul.

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH.

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, Sept. 24, 1902.

Mrs. J. Pewson Smith,

City.

Dear Madame:-

At a meeting of the Faculty of the University of Utah held on Sept. 6th the following resolution was adopted:-

Resolved: That the Faculty of this Institution favors co-education.

Respectfully,

Secretary of Faculty.

Co-education

November 12th, 1906.

Mr. Hamilton Holt,

The Independent, 130 Fulton St., New York.

My dear Sir:-

Your favor of the 2nd inst. is received. While I appreciate your suggestion of an article on the subject of co-education in the University of Chicago, it does not seem to me at present necessary that one should be written. The action taken by the University some years since is fully embodied in the President's Report, to be found in the Decennial Publications, First Series, Volume I, published in 1903. A reprint from this report is herewith sent to you. Since that time there has been no change whatever. The plan as adopted in 1903 is the plan which is now being carried out.

May I call attention in particular to certain portions of the statement of President Harper in report above cited.

"The Proposition briefly stated, is as follows: To

November 12th, 1906.

Mr. Hamilton Holt,

The Independent, 130 Nassau St., New York.

My dear Sir:-

Your favor of the 2nd inst. is received. While I appreciate your suggestion of an article on the subject of co-education in the University of Chicago, it does not seem to me at present necessary that one should be written. The action taken by the University some years since is fully embodied in the President's Report, to be found in the Decennial Publications, First Series, Volume I, published in 1903. A reprint from this report is herewith sent to you. Since that time there has been no change whatever. The plan as adopted in 1903 is the plan which is now being carried out.

May I call attention in particular to certain portions of the statement of President Harper in report above cited.

"The Proposition briefly stated is as follows: To

make provision in the development of Junior College work as far as possible for separate instruction for men and women, upon the basis of extending equal privileges to both sexes. The above wording, with the exception of the last clause, is the form of the statement upon which action was taken by the Junior College faculty and the form which was approved by the University Senate. The last clause, viz., "upon the basis of equal privileges to both sexes," has always been assumed as a part of the proposition, for it should evidently be undesirable to give to either one of the sexes larger or higher privileges than to the other.

What the proposition does not involve. It does not mean that one policy is contemplated for women and another for men. It does not mean that those who advocate the proposition desire to see the policy extended to any work outside of Junior College work.

The proposition does not contemplate the organization of instruction for women after the fashion of the so-called annex.

The plan does not involve two separate Faculties, or special rules and regulations for women as distinct from men."

In the editorial to which I referred not merely was the University criticised a
the University criticised on the basis of an unverified press despatch, which despatch in fact had no sufficient foundation, but also the integrity both of the living and of the dead was called in question. It seems to me under these circumstances that if the Independent wishes to be just, a statement should be made to the effect that the editorial strictures was based on misinformation. I have no doubt that the Independent desires to be entirely fair and that a suitable correction will be made.

Very truly yours,

H. P. Judson

make provision in the development of Junior College
work as far as possible for separate instruction
for men and women, upon the basis of extending
equal privileges to both sexes. The above wording,
with the exception of the last clause, is the form
of the statement upon which action was taken by
the Junior College faculty and the form which was
approved by the University Senate. The last
clause, viz., "upon the basis of equal privileges
to both sexes," has always been assumed as a part
of the proposition, for it would evidently be
undesirable to give to either one of the sexes
larger or higher privileges than to the other.

What the proposition does not involve. It does
not mean that one policy is contemplated for women
and another for men. It does not mean that those
who advocate the proposition desire to see the
policy extended to any work outside of Junior College
work.

The proposition does not contemplate the organization
of instruction for women after the fashion of the
so-called annex.

The plan does not involve two separate Faculties,
or special rules and regulations for women as
distinct from men."

In the editorial to which I referred not merely was
the University criticised a
the University criticised on the basis of an unverified
press despatch, which despatch in fact had no sufficient
foundation, but also the integrity both of the living
and of the dead was called in question. It seems to
me under these circumstances that if the Independent
wishes to be just, a statement should be made to the
effect that the editorial strictures was based on mis-
information. I have no doubt that the Independent
desires to be entirely fair and that a suitable correction
will be made.

Very truly yours,

H. P. Judson

Co-education

Vassar College,
Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

October 24th, 1902.

October 20, 1902.

My dear Dr. Harper,

President J. M. Taylor,

Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

My dear President Taylor:-

I have your letter of October 20th. I think, after all, that you and Mr. Gates agree. I should like to talk with you about it. I am wondering if I may not see you at Princeton.

Yours very sincerely,

October 24th, 1902.

President J. M. Taylor,

Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

My dear President Taylor:-

I have your letter of October 20th. I think, after all, that you and Mr. Gates agree. I should like to talk with you about it. I am wondering if I may not see you at Princeton.

Yours very sincerely,

Vassar College,
Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
President's Office.

October 20, 1902.

My dear Dr. Harper,

Dr. Goodspeed has written me a letter enclosing a type-written copy of a letter from Mr. Gates recounting the history in brief of our meeting in New York where the co-education plank of the Chicago Charter was discussed. He asks me to answer you directly if my remembrance agrees with Dr. Gates'. I assume that you wish to know in any case what my memory is, although of course I understand that I am writing you privately and not with the purpose of entering into the present discussion in any degree.

My recollection is that when the discussion came up over the question whether the institution should be co-educative or not, I was the sole objector to co-education. The arguments that were urged at that meeting have escaped my mind, but I assume they were the general ones, but one in particular I recall distinctly, and that is, that no institution could be started in the West and appeal for the favor of the West that was not co-educational. That was made so strongly against my own position that it deeply impressed me. Of course I had nothing further to say and have said

nothing si

questions

nothing since, knowing perfectly well that matters of that sort are questions of expediency amd not of principle. I have watched the course of your history, however, with immense interest, not only because of our associations in the beginning and because of the mighty progress of the institution, but because of my great friendship for you, and no one has rejoiced more than I have and do in all that marks your great prosperity.

I do not propose to enter into the discussion which is just now troubling you, on one side or the other, but of course it interests me in the light of history. I think that Dr. Gates' interpretation is of course perfectly possible so far as the phraseology of the act goes, but it is not my remembrance of the discussion in which we engaged. I remember urging, myself, that if the institution were started for one sex, it could be more easily developed for two than a return could be taken from co-education to separate education.

You will understand, my dear friend, that I write this simply because of Dr. Goodspeed's letter and Dr. Gates' statement, and just to make clear to you my own slightly different recollection of the occurrences at that meeting.

With best wishes always, I am

Faithfully yours,

(Dictated)

Form 2289 B.

NIGHT LETTER

THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY

INCORPORATED

25,000 OFFICES IN AMERICA CABLE SERVICE TO ALL THE WORLD

This Company TRANSMITS and DELIVERS messages only on conditions limiting its liability, which have been assented to by the sender of the following Night Letter. Errors can be guarded against only by repeating a message back to the sending station for comparison, and the Company will not hold itself liable for errors or delays in transmission or delivery of Unrepeated Night Letters, sent at reduced rates, beyond a sum equal to ten times the amount paid for transmission; nor in any case beyond the sum of Fifty Dollars, at which, unless otherwise stated below, this message has been valued by the sender thereof, nor in any case where the claim is not presented in writing within sixty days after the message is filed with the Company for transmission.

This is an UNREPEATED NIGHT LETTER, and is delivered by request of the sender, under the conditions named above.

ROBERT C. CLOWRY, PRESIDENT — BELVIDERE BROOKS, GENERAL MANAGER

RECEIVED AT Cor. Jackson Boulevard and La Salle St., Chicago ALWAYS OPEN

4659

--241 EA C3-- 49 N.L.

Seattle, WN. Oct 27th-10.

President Judson,

University of Chicago--Chicago, Ills.

Please have your Secretary enumerate for me in a letter the advantages of segration of sexes from your experience in the University of Chicago are there any serious disadvantages of the plan that in part offset the advantages information for a paper before university president needed by November second

Thos.P. Kane.

248a Oct 28

SEE OTHER SIDE FOR TELEGRAM

Domestic and Foreign Money Orders by Telegraph and Cable

THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY

INCORPORATED

THE LARGEST TELEGRAPHIC SYSTEM IN THE WORLD.

OVER ONE MILLION MILES OF WIRE IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

It has over 25,000 Telegraph Offices, including Branch Offices.

It has also Direct Connection by Telegraph or Telephone with many more romote and smaller stations, making a total list of 60,000 in the United States, Canada and Mexico, and this number is rapidly increasing.

SEVEN ATLANTIC CABLES

Connecting North America with all points in Europe and beyond, including Two Cables of the American Telegraph and Cable Company, Four Cables of the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, and One Cable of the Direct United States Cable Co.

Direct Wires to Galveston, Texas, connecting at that place with the Cables of the Mexican, the Central and South American Telegraph Companies for all points in Mexico and Central and South America.

Direct Wires and Cables to Havana, Cuba, connecting at that place with the Cuba Submarine and West India and Panama Telegraph Companies for all points in the West Indies.

Connects at San Francisco with Pacific Cables to the Sandwich Islands, Honolulu, Guam, the Philippines, China, Japan, etc., and at Victoria, B. C., with Pacific Cable to Australia and New Zealand.

Connects at Seattle, Wash., with U. S. Government Lines and Cables to and in Alaska.

Exclusive connection with the Great North-Western Telegraph Co. of Canada.

THE TWO TELEGRAPH POLES REPRESENT THE RELATIVE SIZE IN NUMBER OF OFFICES OF THE WESTERN UNION AS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER COMPETING COMPANIES COMBINED

WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY

ALL COMPETING COMPANIES

Domestic and Foreign Money Orders by Telegraph and Cable

SEE OTHER SIDE FOR TELEGRAM

Coeducation

Chicago, June 2, 1915

My dear Mr. Noyes:-

Your secretary has sent me Dr. Welch's discussion of "The Education of Women" in his inaugural, which I suppose was delivered in 1869. In the light of the experience of these later days the whole address gives us a sense of humor. It quite reminds me of the time in the late seventies when I was present at Williamstown at an alumni meeting of Williams College. The question before the alumni at that time was whether it would recommend to the Board of Trustees that the various classes in the College might be opened to young women whose parents were residents of Williamstown. A rising vote was taken, and I was one of three who voted in the affirmative. I may say that the rest of the alumni looked on us three with profound amazement.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

H. P. Judson

Mr. La Verne W. Noyes,
1450 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago.

Chicago, June 2, 1913

My dear Mr. Noyes:-

Your secretary has sent me Dr. Welch's discussion of "The Education of Women" in his inaugural, which I suppose was delivered in 1889. In the light of the experience of these later days the whole address gives me a sense of humor. It quite reminds me of the time in the late seventies when I was present at Williamstown at an alumni meeting of Williams College. The question before the alumni at that time was whether it would recommend to the Board of Trustees that the various classes in the College might be opened to young women whose parents were residents of Williamstown. A rising vote was taken, and I was one of three who voted in the affirmative. I may say that the rest of the alumni looked on me three with profound amazement.

Very truly yours,

H. P. Judson

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. Le Verne W. Noyes,
1450 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago.

140

#22 Hamilton Terrace, New York City, N. Y.
March 12th, 1909.

Pres. H. P. Judson,-

Dear Sir:-

I am connected with Columbia University, and am making an investigation of co-education in Colleges, the results of which are to be reported on March 22nd, 1909. I am getting the opinions of men prominent in the collegiate world, and desire yours among them. May I ask you to answer the enclosed questions, and mail same to me at your earliest convenience?

Thanking you for your kind interest and attention, I am,

Very truly,

L. M. Duika.

1. Does co-education affect the standard of scholarship of the institution?
2. Is it beneficial to the scholarship, manners and morals of the young men?
3. Is it beneficial to the scholarship, health, manners and morals of the young women?

422 Hamilton Terrace, New York City, N. Y.
March 12th, 1909.

Dear Sir:-

I am connected with Columbia University, and am making an investigation of co-education in Colleges, the results of which are to be reported on March 22nd, 1909. I am getting the opinions of men prominent in the collegiate world, and desire yours among them. May I ask you to answer the enclosed questions, and mail same to me at your earliest convenience?

Thanking you for your kind interest and attention, I am,

Very truly,

1. Does co-education affect the standard of scholarship of the institution?

2. Is it beneficial to the scholarship, manners and morals of the young men?

3. Is it beneficial to the scholarship, health, manners and morals of the young women?

51

Primos Pa May 22, 1915.

President and Trustees Chicago University-

Chicago Ill.

Gentlemen- Coeducation

In connection with a plan to put women in a separate college after twenty years of co-educatio at University of Pennsylvania- the Vice Provost made the statment that University of Chicago pronounced co-education a failure at least that was the idea of the faculty. As members of our Alumnae Associatin have studied with you and pronounce the system a success we wish for a brief statement from the University upon the subject for which we will be sincerely obliged even if negative to our desires-

Respectfully-

(Mrs) Josephine L. R. Hopwood.

B. S. in Biology U, of P, '05

≠

Chicago, June 4, 1918

Dear Mrs. Hopwood:-

Your favor of the 22d of May is received. I have never heard anyone here pronounce coeducation a failure. Of course I do not know what all individuals may think, but I am sure the faculty as a whole have no such idea. Personally the suggestion has never occurred to me. In fact, the question isn't a question with us: we never think about it.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mrs. Josephine L. H. Hopwood,
Primos, Pennsylvania.

Chicago, June 4, 1915

Dear Mrs. Hopwood:-

Your favor of the 22d of May is received. I have never heard anyone here pronounce coeducation a failure. Of course I do not know what all individuals may think, but I am sure the faculty as a whole have no such idea. Personally the suggestion has never occurred to me. In fact, the question isn't a question with us; we never think about it.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mrs. Josephine L. H. Hopwood,
Primos, Pennsylvania.

Chicago, June 4, 1918

Dear Mrs. Hopwood:-

Your favor of the 22d of May is received. I have never heard anyone here pronounce coeducation a failure. Of course I do not know what all individuals may think, but I am sure the faculty as a whole have no such idea. Personally the suggestion has never occurred to me. In fact, the question isn't a question with us: we never think about it.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mrs. Josephine L. H. Hopwood,
Primos, Pennsylvania.

Box 24, Folder 3

(Copy) January 9, 1902.

President W. R. Harper,

My dear Sir:

In voting "No" upon the proposition submitted to the Senate, involving separate recitation rooms and laboratories for Junior College women, I respectfully submit the following reasons:

1. At the outset it was a matter of choice to adopt or not to adopt co-education. Having adopted it, the University assumed certain responsibilities. These extend to the cause of woman's education here and elsewhere. Therefore the effect of the proposed move upon the cause of co-education must be taken into account Action in accordance with it would be generally regarded by the public as evidence that co-education as hitherto conducted had been a failure. To put this stigma upon co-education is to deal the most severe blow at the cause of the collegiate education of women that it has met in the present generation. The action would be everywhere quoted as proof that co-educational institutions regretted co-education and were beginning to move backward. To disguise this blow under the name of an advance in the administration of co-education would, in the long run, deceive no one. Moreover the action would satisfy no one. While antagonizing the friends of co-education, so strong in the middle west, it would none the less be regarded by the opponents of co-education as an unworthy evasion of the main issue.

2. As matter of fact the move would be an attack upon co-education within the University itself. I have taught mixed classes for the past sixteen years including sophomore as well as advanced work. Beginning with a prejudice against co-education, I observed the matter scientifically, as a psychologist, as well as personally. My mature and firm conviction is that co-instruction is intellectually beneficial as well as morally helpful. In view of this it is not surprising that the specific argument of senators in favor of separate instruction were accompanied by expressions of distrust against co-education as such. Moreover, co-instruction is indispensable as a safe guard. To set up physical contiguity and social contact between young men and women without the checks and compensation of meeting in class room and laboratory, is wantonly to invoke difficulty and to invite danger. If the proposed move be taken I hope that the friction, undesirable and disagreeable complications arising, approaching scandal, will be seen to be due to the abandonment of the very essence of co-education; I am afraid, however, that they will be charged to the cause of co-education and urged as a reason for going still further.

3. The natural policy would be to meet whatever defects exist in the present situation by additional provision of a positive sort for both men and women, and especially for men. A relaxing of close supervision of the men's social life, sports, etc.; the introduction of more initiative and responsibility into their lives, would do much to attract and hold strong men. To make good the existing weak places in instruction and research would do the rest. Given the sort of life and work that young men want, and the kind of man that will be kept away from the University simply because he will have to associate upon equal terms with his equals, is not the kind that the University wants or needs. To divert energy and money away from the needed strengthening of certain obvious weak points in the present situation simply to create and foster a "corporate consciousness" (better described as a consciousness of sex distinctions) is superfluous as it is harmful.

The same holds as regards work for women. While it is certainly illogical to argue that the presence of women keeps away men, and at the same time plead for additional facilities for women which will induce more to come, yet discussion (which has not yet been had upon this topic) might show that certain great improvements are possible as regards courses more particularly adapted to the presumed needs of women. If this should appear, after mature consideration,

(Copy) January 5, 1902.

President W. R. Harper,
Mydear Sir:

In voting "No" upon the proposition submitted to the Senate, involving separate recitation rooms and laboratories for Junior College women, I respectfully submit the following reasons:

1. At the outset it was a matter of choice to adopt or not to adopt co-education. Having adopted it, the University assumed certain responsibilities. These extend to the cause of woman's education here and elsewhere. Therefore the effect of the proposed move upon the cause of co-education must be taken into account. Action in accordance with it would be generally regarded by the public as evidence that co-education as hitherto conducted had been a failure. To put this stigma upon co-education is to deal the most severe blow at the cause of the collegiate education of women that it has met in the present generation. The action would be everywhere quoted as proof that co-educational institutions regretted co-education and were beginning to move backward. To disguise this blow under the name of an advance in the administration of co-education would, in the long run, deceive no one. Moreover the action would satisfy no one. While antagonizing the friends of co-education, so strong in the middle west, it would none the less be regarded by the opponents of co-education as an unworthy evasion of the main issue.

2. As matter of fact the move would be an attack upon co-education within the University itself. I have taught mixed classes for the past sixteen years including sophomore as well as advance work. Beginning with a prejudice against co-education, I observe the matter scientifically, as a psychologist, as well as personally. My mature and firm conviction is that co-instruction is intellectually beneficial as well as morally helpful. In view of this it is not surprising that the specific argument of senators in favor of separate instruction were accompanied by expressions of distrust against co-education as such. Moreover, co-education is indispensable as a safe guard. To set up physical continuity and social contact between young men and women without the checks and compensation of meeting in class room and laboratory, is wantonly to invoke difficulty and to invite danger. If the proposed move be taken I hope that the friction, undesirable and disagreeable complications arising, approaching scandal, will be seen to be due to the abandonment of the very essence of co-education; I am afraid, however, that they will be charged to the cause of co-education and urged as a reason for going still further.

3. The natural policy would be to meet whatever defects exist in the present situation by additional provision of a positive sort for both men and women, and especially for men. A relaxing of close supervision of the men's social life, sports, etc.; the introduction of more initiative and responsibility into their lives, would do much to attract and hold strong men. To make good the existing weak places in instruction and research would do the rest. Given the sort of life and work that young men want, and the kind of men that will be kept away from the University simply because he will have to associate upon equal terms with his equals, is not the kind that the University wants or needs. To divert energy and money away from the needed strengthening of certain obvious weak points in the present situation simply to create and foster a "corporate consciousness" (better described as a consciousness of sex distinctions) is superfluous as it is harmful.

The same holds as regards work for women. While it is certain illogical to argue that the presence of women keeps away men, and at the same time plead for additional facilities for women which will induce more to come, yet discussion (which has not yet been had upon this topic) might show that certain great improvements are possible as regards courses more particularly adapted to the presumed needs of women. If this should appear, after mature consideration,

then the needed provision should be made in a positive and constructive way, not by introduction restriction and arousing ill feeling, sex divisions and continued attention to sex matters. It is clear that this would be also much more economical.

4. Any plan calling for removal of Junior College work (whether of men or of women) from the control and influence of the more advanced instruction and research, is a step backward.

5. Experience justifies the belief that separate instruction would lead gradually but surely to lowering the standard of scholarship in teaching women.

6. The proposition is highly objectionable in form. a/ It is ambiguous; it does not state whether separate instruction for women is to be compulsory or elective; b. It is loosely drawn without saying whether or no the same policy is to be extended to the women of the Senior Colleges it creates conditions which would inevitably tend to bring that about. We should soon find ourselves in a dilemma. The feelings, prejudices and customs engendered in in the two years of separation would either require continued separation, or else surround co-education in the Senior Colleges with continual and embarrassing friction--facts which would be quoted against co-educationas such. c. It is coupled in an obnoxious way with a financial condition. Discussion and legislation regarding a fundamental and radical educational change should be on a basis, and conducted on a plane where there cannot be the slightest suspicion of consideration about gifts of money influencing judgment. ...

For such reasons I record my vote in the negative,

Respectfylly yours,

(Signed) John Dewey

Head of the Depts. of Philosolhy and Education. "

then the needed provision should be made in a positive and constructive way, not by introduction restriction and arousing ill feeling, sex divisions and continued attention to sex matters. It is clear that this would be also much more economical.

4. Any plan calling for removal of Junior College work (whether of men or of women) from the control and influence of the more advanced instruction and research, is a step backward.

5. Experience justifies the belief that separate instruction would lead gradually but surely to lowering the standard of scholarship in teaching women.

6. The proposition is highly objectionable in form.

a/ It is ambiguous; it does not state whether separate instruction for women is to be compulsory or elective; b. It is loosely drawn without saying whether or no the same policy is to be extended to the women of the Senior Colleges it creates conditions which would inevitably tend to bring that about. We should soon find ourselves in a dilemma. The feelings, prejudices and customs engendered in in the two years of separation would either require continued separation, or else surround co-education in the Senior Colleges with continual and embarrassing friction--facts which would be quoted against co-educational such. c. It is coupled in an obnoxious way with a ~~[illegible]~~ condition. Discussion and legislation regarding a fundamental and radical educational change should be on a basis, and conducted on a plane where there cannot be the slightest suspicion of consideration about gifts of money influencing judgment.

For such reasons I record my vote in the negative.

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) John Dewey

Head of the Depts. of Philosophy and Education. *

(C O P Y)

"December 18, 1901.

My dear President Harper:

With reference to the inclosed proposition, I may very briefly express my opinion:

1. It seems very clear to me that a gift of a million and a half dollars should not be refused except on extremely good grounds.

2. It seems to me highly desirable that dormitories, gymnasium, club-house, and assembly halls, to be used exclusively by women, should be located on a separate block of land. It will permit the development of their own life in a way which would never be possible on the general campus. I, for one, would be extremely glad to see a gift for this purpose accepted.

3. I do not feel so sure as to the advisability of having recitation halls and laboratories exclusively for women on the same block of ground. Indeed I cannot help but fear some danger in such a proposition. The objections which come up in my mind may not be so applicable to the teaching of all subjects as they are to the teaching of the scientific branches, but in scientific subjects it would appear to me to be desirable to have all the laboratories and lectures in connection with the individual parent department. It is of great importance that the elementary teaching be done not simply by the same instructors as are engaged in the more advanced teaching, but also so far as possible in rooms of the same building, so that the general equipment may be employed and especially that the research work of the graduate schools may exert an influence upon the students of the elementary classes, and, in turn, that the influence of beginners may be felt by the more advanced work of the department. It seems to me that the setting up of laboratories for elementary classes would be a retrograde step, and it would bring high-school methods up into the college, whereas all our efforts are directed toward carrying university methods down through the college into the high-school.

There may be practical difficulties in the way of enlarging the parent department so as to provide additional rooms for an increasing number of students, but if laboratories were developed on the unit system and were capable of definite expansion, I, for one, should much prefer to see the additional class-rooms and laboratories which are to be built constructed in direct connection with and as integral parts of the parent laboratories; nor would I object to having certain laboratories and class-rooms set apart exclusively for women of the Junior Colleges, under these circumstances. If it were practicable, I should like to see full elective possibilities developed, so that women or men could do class work exclusively with others of the same sex, if desired, or in mixed classes.

Very faithfully yours,

(Signed) LEWELLYS F. BARKER"

(COPY)

"December 18, 1901.

My dear President Harper:

With reference to the inclosed proposition, I may very briefly express my opinion:

1. It seems very clear to me that a gift of a million and a half dollars should not be refused except on extremely good grounds.

2. It seems to me highly desirable that dormitories, gymnasium, club-houses, and assembly halls, to be used exclusively by women, should be located on a separate block of land. It will permit the development of their own life in a way which would never be possible on the general campus. I, for one, would be extremely glad to see a gift for this purpose accepted.

3. I do not feel so sure as to the advisability of having recitation halls and laboratories exclusively for women on the same block of ground. Indeed I cannot help but fear some danger in such a proposition. The objections which come up in my mind may not be so applicable to the teaching of all subjects as they are to the teaching of the scientific branches, but in scientific subjects it would appear to me to be desirable to have all the laboratories and lectures in connection with the individual parent department. It is of great importance that the elementary teaching be done not simply by the same instructors as are engaged in the more advanced teaching, but also so far as possible in rooms of the same building, so that the general equipment may be employed and especially that the re-

students of the elementary classes, and, in turn, that the influence of beginners may be felt by the more advanced work of the department. It seems to me that the setting up of laboratories for elementary classes would be a retrograde step, and it would bring high-school methods up into the college, whereas all our efforts are directed toward carrying university methods down through the college into the high-school.

There may be practical difficulties in the way of enlarging the parent department so as to provide additional rooms for an increasing number of students; but if laboratories were developed on the unit system and were capable of definite expansion, I, for one, should much prefer to see the additional class-rooms and laboratories which are to be built constructed in direct connection with and as integral parts of the parent laboratories; nor would I object to having certain laboratories and class-rooms set apart exclusively for women of the Junior Colleges, under these circumstances. If it were practicable, I should like to see full elective possibilities developed, so that women or men could do class work exclusively with others of the same sex, if desired, or in mixed classes.

Very faithfully yours,

(Signed) EDWARD P. BARKER"

(C O P Y)

"December 21, 1901.

The Recorder:

In answer to your question addressed to members of the Senate, I beg to say that by all means I should advise the acceptance of the gift suggested.

The plan of a separate quadrangle for the younger women does not interfere with coeducation in any true sense of the term.

It seems to a desirable extent a separate life for both young men and young women, without at the same time breaking off their natural relations in the University.

It opens the way to a solidarity of interest and a distinct corporate consciousness among the students in the colleges, a thing quite marked in the life of such colleges as Princeton or Williams and hardly perceptible in the State universities.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) HARRY PRATT JUDSON."

(C O P Y)

"January 9, 1902.

Dear President Harper:

In respect to the offer to provide separate house for Junior College women: I favor it, although I cannot at this hurried moment give all my reasons.

The experience at Morgan Park is instructive; for Junior College women are still adolescents, and mingle with adolescents somewhat less developed.

The present accommodations are already too small.

This change will further classification, and be a distinct addition to our resources.

These young women can be provided with better rest places and rest opportunities and their health guarded.

I assume that the change would increase rather than diminish their facilities for instruction.

Yours truly,
(Signed) CHARLES R. HENDERSON."

(C O P Y)

December 21, 1901.

The Recorder:

In answer to your question addressed to members of the Senate, I beg to say that by all means I should advise the acceptance of the gift suggested.

The plan of a separate quadrangle for the younger women does not interfere with coeducation in any true sense of the term.

It seems to a desirable extent a separate life for both young men and young women, without at the same time breaking off their natural relations in the University.

It opens the way to a solidarity of interest and a distinct corporate consciousness among the students in the colleges, a thing quite marked in the life of such colleges as Princeton or Williams and hardly perceptible in the State universities.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) HARRY PRATT JUDSON."

(C O P Y)

January 9, 1902.

Dear President Harper:

In respect to the offer to provide separate house for Junior College women: I favor it, although I cannot at this hurried moment give all my reasons.

The experience at Morgan Park is instructive; for Junior College women are still adolescents, and mingle with adolescents somewhat less developed.

The present accommodations are already too small.

This change will further classification, and be a distinct addition to our resources.

These young women can be provided with better rest places and rest opportunities and their health guarded.

I assume that the change would increase rather than diminish their facilities for instruction.

Yours truly,

(Signed) CHARLES R. HENDERSON."

(C O P Y)

"31 December 1901.

Dear President Harper:

I have some diffidence as to expressing my opinion on the question submitted to the Senators, as I was not present at the meeting of the Senate when (as I understand) the matter was discussed. I can, however, commit myself to these two propositions.

1. I am personally entirely in favor of coeducation, and should be sorry to see any weakening in this respect on the part of our university.

2. The present proposal appears to me to be directed, not against coeducation, but against certain objections actually entertained in some quarters against the principle of co-education. If the proposed scheme prove successful, it will, by removing such objections, strengthen co-education as a whole.

While there are supporters and opponents of coeducation as a whole, it is well known that there are many who consider it prejudicial to the earlier, but not to the later stages of a student's career. Such a feeling is exactly met by this proposal.

It further gives opportunity to the women of the university to work out in practical experience the question, how far the advantages of the two rival systems can be combined. No one can exactly forecast the results; but in my judgment the experiment can be made without danger to the general principle of coeducation in the University of Chicago.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) R. G. MOULTON."

(C O P Y)

"January 9, 1902.

To
The President, The University of Chicago.
Chicago, Illinois.

My dear President Harper:

I wish to make the following statement of opinion concerning the question which you submitted to the Senate a month ago:

I should advise the Trustees to accept the gift of a million or a million and a half dollars, to be used in the way specified, but I should not advise the Trustees to endeavor to direct pro spective gifts into this channel, because I believe that the university has other things considerably more imperative than the things which would be met by this proposed gift, to do. I think that the development of the university in the manner proposed, would be in accord with the principle of development which has led to the establishment of such a large body of elective courses in Senior College. Those young women who might desire to pass their Junior College years in such an institution, somewhat separated from the larger body of the university, may properly have their desires gratified, and it is to me apparent that so far as the social relations are concerned, the proposition is one highly desirable.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) E. H. MOORE."

(C O P Y)

"31 December 1901.

Dear President Harper:

I have some diffidence as to expressing my opinion on the question submitted to the Senators, as I was not present at the meeting of the Senate when (as I understand) the matter was discussed. I can, however, commit myself to these two propositions.

1. I am personally entirely in favor of coeducation, and should be sorry to see any weakening in this respect on the part of our university.

2. The present proposal appears to me to be directed, not against coeducation, but against certain objections actually entertained in some quarters against the principle of co-education. If the proposed scheme prove successful, it will, by removing such objections, strengthen co-education as a whole.

While there are supporters and opponents of coeducation as a whole, it is well known that there are many who consider it prejudicial to the earlier, but not to the later stages of a student's career. Such a feeling is exactly met by this proposal.

It further gives opportunity to the women of the university to work out in practical experience the question, how far the advantages of the two rival systems can be combined. No one can exactly foresee the results; but in my judgment the experiment can be made without danger to the general principle of coeducation in the University of Chicago.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) R. G. MOULTON."

(C O P Y)

"January 9, 1902.

To

The President, The University of Chicago.

Chicago, Illinois.

My dear President Harper:

I wish to make the following statement of opinion concerning the question which you submitted to the Senate a month ago:

I should advise the Trustees to accept the gift of a million or a million and a half dollars, to be used in the way specified, but I should not advise the Trustees to endeavor to direct pro spective gifts into this channel, because I believe that the university has other things considerably more imperative than the things which would be met by this proposed gift, to do. I think that the development of the university in the manner proposed, would be in accord with the principle of development which has led to the establishment of such a large body of elective courses in Senior College. Those young women who might desire to pass their Junior College years in such an institution, somewhat separated from the larger body of the university, may properly have their desires gratified, and it is to me apparent that so far as the social relations are concerned, the proposition is one highly desirable.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) R. H. MOORE."

(COPY)

"Chicago, January 16,1902.

President W.R. Harper:--

Dear Sir:-- The request of the Senate for an expression of my opinion before January 10th concerning the acceptance of a gift for the erection of separate buildings for women in the Junior Colleges, did not reach me until late on January 15th. My vote is in the negative if the proposition means separate instruction. My reasons in brief are these:--

1. No gift of money, no matter how large would compensate for the injury done to the cause of woman's education in this community and this country if separate instruction were to be substituted for co-instruction in the University of Chicago after ten years of experience.

a. In spite of the undisputed evidence on our records that the scholarship of our women students as estimated by our faculty has been at least equal to that of our men, it would be impossible to make this fact known in such a way as to convince the general public that the step was not necessitated by weaker scholarship on the part of women. More time must elapse before the traditions of the past are quite eradicated.

b. No method can be followed and no pledges given which can insure the same grade of instruction to both sexes under the separate system, and there is no administrative device which will satisfy the public mind.

2. The University of Chicago has done more than any other institution (with possibly one exception), to give women an opportunity for the best intellectual training without the hampering restrictions which inevitably follow upon discriminations according to sex. The atmostphere of intellectual freedom enjoyed by our students, through which they have exercised their mental powers as human beings without reference to the fact that they are either men or women, has been appreciated by them and admired by the world. Separate instruction would introduce an element which would effect this condition unfavorably. If the trustees could know how eager girls and women are to study as thinking beings and not as females, they would hesitate in justice to women to adopt this measure.

I regret that the question of separation in instruction is brought forward in connection with a proposed money gift. Any step which would indicate that the educational policy of the University of Chicago is directed by money considerations would throw discredit upon it as the educational leader of the Middle West, which it surely should be.

If a gift of a million and a half dollars is available for educational purposes, I believe that the education of women would be much less seriously affected if the sum were expended exclusively for the benefit of men students than in an effort to attract them through a system which will seem to many to be in violation of the principles for which the University has thus far stood.

I will not at this time attempt to present my views as to the desirability of a separate campus for the social and domestic life of the women, although I believe that there are weighty reasons against it.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Marion Talbot."

(C O P Y)

"January 10, 1902.

To

The President of the University of Chicago.

Sir:--In answer to your request to give you my opinion as a member of the Senate upon the question whether it is desirable for the university to accept a gift of a million or a million and a half of dollars for the erection of dormitories for women and a set of laboratories, etc., to be exclusively for women, I beg to submit the following:

I think it would be undesirable to accept any gift which would lead the university to adopt an educational policy in regard to any fundamental or important question which would not otherwise commend itself to the best judgment of the university authorities. An institution like the University of Chicago cannot afford to bind its hands for a long time to come on any important question, even for two or three millions of money.

As to this particular question, I think it would be undesirable at present, and unless our experience should prove to be very different in the future from what it has been in the past, it would also be undesirable in the future to adopt any such policy as here suggested.

Even if some men are kept away from the institution at present on account of the presence of women, which I doubt, I am sure many others would be attracted to the university if the sum of money indicated were used in extending our library and laboratory facilities, instead of its being applied to removing the women.

Speaking from experience, there is not a single department of the university with which I have been connected which is even approximately equipped for the work assigned to it. Money applied in the improvement of facilities would be far more likely to bring the best class of students to the university than would the mere removal of the female element from the library and laboratories.

From a pedagogical point of view I do not think that our experience would justify the university in the adoption of any such policy, and I do not think that we ought to be persuaded to adopt any line of action by the possibility of obtaining money which, under the circumstances, would prove a burden rather than a benefit.

As a college student I attended for a time a co-educational institution, and subsequently institutions for men alone. As a college instructor I taught thirteen years in an institution for men alone, and have been for the past six years in the University of Chicago. I have given considerable attention to this question and studied it with care, and I have not as yet seen any evidence which would justify such a fundamental departure from the policy adopted by the University of Chicago at the beginning of its work.

Faithfully yours,

(Signed) EDMUND J. JAMES."

(C O P Y)

"January 10, 1902.

To

The President of the University of Chicago.

Sir:--In answer to your request to give you my opinion as a member of the Senate upon the question whether it is desirable for the university to accept a gift of a million or a million and a half of dollars for the erection of dormitories for women and a set of laboratories, etc., to be exclusively for women, I beg to submit the following:

I think it would be undesirable to accept any gift which would lead the university to adopt an educational policy in regard to any fundamental or important question which would not otherwise commend itself to the best judgment of the university authorities. An institution like the University of Chicago cannot afford to bind its hands for a long time to come on any important question, even for two or three millions of money.

As to this particular question, I think it would be undesirable at present, and unless our experience should prove to be very different in the future from what it has been in the past, it would also be undesirable in the future to adopt any such policy as here suggested.

Even if some men are kept away from the institution at present on account of the presence of women, which I doubt, I am sure many others would be attracted to the university if the funds thus dedicated were used in extending our library and laboratory facilities, instead of its being applied to removing the women.

Speaking from experience, there is not a single department of the university with which I have been connected which is even approximately equipped for the work assigned to it. Money applied in the improvement of facilities would be far more likely to bring the best class of students to the university than would the mere removal of the female element from the library and laboratories.

From a pedagogical point of view I do not think that our experience would justify the university in the adoption of any such policy, and I do not think that we ought to be persuaded to adopt any line of action by the possibility of obtaining money which, under the circumstances, would prove a burden rather than a benefit.

As a college student I attended for a time a co-educational institution, and subsequently institutions for men alone. As a college instructor I taught thirteen years in an institution for men alone, and have been for the past six years in the University of Chicago. I have given considerable attention to this question and studied it with care, and I have not as yet seen any evidence which would justify such a fundamental departure from the policy adopted by the University of Chicago at the beginning of its work.

Faithfully yours,

(Signed) EDMUND J. JAMES."

(C O P Y)

"January 9, 1902.

President W. R. Harper.

Dear Sir:--I write in response to the action of the Senate December 14, 1901, which calls for my opinion in writing upon the following proposition:

'Will the Senate advise the Trustees of the University to accept a gift of a million or a million and a half dollars to be used in erecting on a separate block of land dormitories, gymnasium, club house, assembly hall, recitation halls and laboratories, to be used exclusively for women, and as concerns recitation halls and laboratories by women of the Junior Colleges?"

In my judgment the proposition should be divided, for desirable and very undesirable propositions are coupled together. To provide an attractive home life for the women of the University, that will include proper provision for their social and physical culture, is a proposition that meets my entire approval. But to provide separate recitation halls and laboratories for the women is a proposition that meets my unqualified disapproval. It is to this phase of the general proposition that I would speak.

1. The essential feature of coeducation is coinstruction. That a social contact with university life meets the definition of coeducation cannot be claimed seriously, since its logical outcome would lead to an evident absurdity. To disguise this attack upon coeducation under the plea that it is merely progress in its administration can come only from an unconscious attempt to harmonize an unalterable opposition to coeducation with a pledge to continue it. It is a noteworthy fact that all the arguments presented by Senators to support the proposition were arguments against coeducation rather than in favor of its further development.

2. Coinstruction is a great safeguard. For immature men and women, who are in social contact, to have also intellectual contact is to my mind the strongest argument for coeducation. In the majority of cases it removes the unhealthy sexual glamour that is the curse of separate education. It is a matter of record that the follies arising from social contact in coeducational institutions are not to be compared with those in institutions for separate education.

3. The provision of separate recitation halls and laboratories for Junior College women is a needless expense. The present laboratories can accommodate much larger classes in separate sections, provided the number of laboratory assistants is increased; and even if that were not the case, the great loss from losing the direct touch of the university laboratory should suggest some other method of enlarging the space for work. Moreover, this unnecessary duplication of equipment would put another blockade in the way of university departments that are waiting with remarkable patience the opportunity to develop along university lines.

4. Men will be attracted if the life and work are attractive. This is mentioned, since it has been put forward that this provision, in keeping women out of recitation rooms, will result in attracting a more desirable class of men. I beg to suggest that desirable men are attracted by a chance to do strong work; and they will be attracted when the departments can give them as good or better opportunities than they can get elsewhere. If this be a prominent thought in connection with this proposition, I would suggest that the experiment of developing the university departments be tried, an experiment that could probably get unanimous consent, before one that involves so much money and encounters such strenuous opposition be attempted.

5. The form of the proposition is very objectionable. Such a subject should be discussed entirely apart from financial pressure. To suppose that the opportunity to secure a large sum of money for the university could influence the judgment of any Senator is not a pleasant suggestion. It seems to me that it would have been better to have kept the money consideration out of sight.

Yours respectfully,

(Signed) JOHN M. COULTER"

(C O P Y)

"January 9, 1902.

President W. R. Harper.

Dear Sir:--I write in response to the action of the Senate December 14, 1901, which calls for my opinion in writing upon the following proposition:

'Will the Senate advise the Trustees of the University to accept a gift of a million or a million and a half dollars to be used in erecting on a separate block of land dormitories, gymnasium, club house, assembly hall, recitation halls and laboratories, to be used exclusively for women, and as concerns recitation halls and laboratories by women of the Junior Colleges?"

In my judgment the proposition should be divided, for desirable and very undesirable propositions are coupled together. To provide an attractive home life for the women of the University, that will include proper provision for their social and physical culture, is a proposition that meets my entire approval. But to provide separate recitation halls and laboratories for the women is a proposition that meets my unqualified disapproval. It is to this phase of the general proposition that I would speak.

1. The essential feature of coeducation is coinstruction. That a social contact with university life meets the definition of coeducation cannot be claimed seriously, since its logical outcome would lead to an evident absurdity. To disguise this attack upon coeducation under the plea that it is merely progress in its administration can come only from an unconscious attempt to harmonize an unalterable opposition to coeducation with a pledge to continue it. It is a noteworthy fact that all the arguments presented by Senators to support the proposition were arguments against coeducation rather than in favor of its further development.

2. Coinstruction is a great safeguard. For immature men and women, who are in social contact, to have also intellectual contact is to [illegible] In the majority of cases it removes the unhealthy sexual glamour that is the curse of separate education. It is a matter of record that the follies arising from social contact in coeducational institutions are not to be compared with those in institutions for separate education.

3. The provision of separate recitation halls and laboratories for Junior College women is a needless expense. The present laboratories can accommodate much larger classes in separate sections, provided the number of laboratory assistants is increased; and even if that were not the case, the great loss from losing the direct touch of the university laboratory should suggest some other method of enlarging the space for work. Moreover, this unnecessary duplication of equipment would put another blockade in the way of university departments that are waiting with remarkable patience the opportunity to develop along university lines.

4. Men will be attracted if the life and work are attractive. This is mentioned, since it has been put forward that this provision, in keeping women out of recitation rooms, will result in attracting a more desirable class of men. I beg to suggest that desirable men are attracted by a chance to do strong work; and they will be attracted when the departments can give them as good or better opportunities than they can get elsewhere. If this be a prominent thought in connection with this proposition, I would suggest that the experiment of developing the university departments be tried, an experiment that could probably get unanimous consent, before one that involves so much money and encounters such strenuous opposition be attempted.

5. The form of the proposition is very objectionable. Such a subject should be discussed entirely apart from financial pressure. To suppose that the opportunity to secure a large sum of money for the university could influence the judgment of any Senator is not a pleasant suggestion. It seems to me that it would have been better to have kept the money consideration out of sight.

Yours respectfully,

(Signed) JOHN M. COULTER"

(COPY)

"Chicago, January 9,1902

Reverend A.K.Parker,D.D.,
Dear Sir:--
In reply to your letter of January 9, I hope I may excuse myself from attempting to answer the question propounded in the senate. I do not feel sufficiently acquainted with the operations of the university to have an opinion on the question referred to.
Very truly yours,
(signed) J.F. Jameson,
B."

(COPY)

"Chicago, Jan. 19,1902.

President W.R. Harper,
Dear Sir:--
In reply to the request for a written statement regarding the Senate action of Dec. 14th. I would state that I am heartily in favor of the proposition.
Very truly yours,
(signed) A.A. Michelson."

(Copy)

"Chicago, Jany. 9,1902.

Dr. W.R.Harper,
President University of Chicago,
Chicago.

Dear Sir:--
I wish to say that I would favor the establishment of a Woman's quadrangle especially adapted to the peculiar needs of the women in the Junior Colleges. The suggestion that duplication of existing laboratories may be avoided by the enlargement of the present buildings, coupled if possible with the introduction of the unit system of connection, seems to me worthy of consideration. I remain,
Yours very respectfully,
(signed) L. Hektoen."

(COPY)

"The University, Jany. 9,1902.

President W.R.Harper,
Dear Sir:--
I wish to cast my vote in favor of the acceptance of the gift of one million and a half dollars for a woman's quadrangle.
I hope that this gift will be a step towards a separation of the Junior College from the University. This, however, is only possible if the acceptance of the gift does not burden the University with new additional expense which exceeds the income to be derived from the new gift to such an extent as to curtail the graduate work of the University.
I remain, Yours respectfully,
(signed) Jacques Loeb."

(COPY.)

"Chicago-

I should strongly recommend the proposed Womans Quadrangle; additional Halls for women must in any case be built to meet the demands of the future. Nor can I see that the provision of lecture rooms be for women only contradicts or is inconsistent with the University's fundamental policy of co-education.
(signed) A.K.Parker."

(COPY)

"Chicago, Jan. 1,1902.

The Recorder,
University of Chicago.
Dear Sir:--
I wish to record my vote in favor of the proposition submitted to the members of the Senate some weeks ago relative to the proposed removal of the women of the Junior Colleges from the present campus for the major part of their instruction, as well as for their life in general. As a teacher I have always felt that a large proportion of the men students are influenced for the worse by the presence of women in the classroom with them, and the same effect is noticable to a less extent in the case of women. This is especially, if not almost wholly, true of the

early part of the course, in my experience. In the second place I do not believe in the same kind of higher education for the women as for the men; the proposed change will open the way for the fullest development of the best type of education for both sexes.

Yours respectfully,
(signed) Edward Capps."

" Chicago, Dec. 16,1901.

Dear Sir:--

At a meeting of the Senate held Saturday, Dec. 14, 1901, it was voted that the Senators send before the 10th of January next their opinions in writing to the President upon the following proposition to be submitted by the President to the Board of Trustees:

"Will the Senate advise the Trustees of the University to accept a gift of a million and a half dollars to be used in erecting on a separate block of land dormitories, gymnasium, club house, assembly hall, recitation halls and laboratories to be used exclusively for women, and as concerns recitation halls and laboratories by women of the Junior Colleges?"

Yours truly,
(singed) A.K. Parker,
Recorder. K."

(COPY)
I vote yes on the above proposition.
(signed E.D.Burton."

(COPY)

"Morgan Park, Dec. 26th,1901.

President Wm. R. Harper,
Dear Sir:-
I am heartily in favor of advising the Trustees to accept the million and a half for the purpose mentioned above.

Yours most truly,
(signed) Galusha Anderson."

(COPY)

"December 20,1901.

My dear President Harper:--

Replying to the Recorder's communication of the 16th inst., I will say that I am quite in accord with the views expressed by the President in his last quarterly report, on the subject of coeducation. I believe that the plan to erect separate buildings for women and to carry on separate work is quite within the letter and spirit of the University charter. I would therefore advise the trustees of the University to accept a gift of a million or a million and a half dollars to be used in erecting on a separate block of land dormitories gymnasium, clubhouse, assembly hall, recitation halls, and laboratories to be used exclusively for women, and as concerns recitation halls and laboratories, by women of the Junior Colleges."

Yours very truly,
(signed) Eri B. Hulbert."

(Copy)

"President Wm. R. Harper.
Dear Sir:

On the question of the acceptance of a gift of a Quadrangle for women, with the condition that it shall include recitation halls and laboratories to be used exclusively by women of the Junior College, I vote no.

I should heartily welcome the building of a Quadrangle for young women, with dormitories, gymnasium, and grounds for exercise, upon the proposed site, just as I should heartily welcome the building of a quadrangle for young men upon some other site, preferably to the west of the present grounds.

I am strongly opposed to the establishment of separate instruction for women in the University of Chicago in any year or years of study, from the Kindergarten to the end of the work of the Graduate School. My reasons in the present case are as follows:

1. The proposed line of distinction in the education of the sexes is a purely artificial one.

It was at first argued in the Senate that there is a period in the life of every girl when she is in a temporary state of physical sensibility and unrest, and that during this time she should be educated apart from the young men. The physical fact is as stated. But I believe it to be the experience of parents that, in the life of a normal girl, this temporary state of sensibility and unrest has, to the girl's own consciousness, nothing to do with her relations to the actual persons of the other sex whom she meets in her daily life. Moreover, if the conclusion were drawn that there should be temporary separation, the time at which the alleged reason exists is not between the ages of seventeen to nineteen, or eighteen to twenty (as in the Junior College) but three or four years earlier. If there be a separation on this ground, then, it ought not to be in University education, but in the High School. The argument under this head, though strongly urged at first, has been abandoned in the Senate, and I hope will not be revived.

It should be noted also that the proposition before us, though it ostensibly separates the young women of the Junior College from the young men, would actually do this completely for a single year only. One third of the work of the second year of the Junior College is by our system elective, and is actually taken in the Senior College. It has not yet been proposed to separate the sexes in the Senior College,--though every argument advanced, except the baseless one stated above, is really an argument against co-education at any point.

2. Co-instruction is the best corrective of the dangers of co-education.

The sole danger in co-education lies in the undue interest of the one sex for the other, which in individual cases is generally founded on illusion. Sympathies which would not bear the strain of actual life easily spring up in the years of inexperience. The more open the intercourse is, and the more largely it has to do with intellectual pursuits, the saner its results will be. The best corrective of youthful romanticism is the daily work of the class-room, pursued by the two sexes in common. By giving up co-instruction, we should give up the greatest safe-guard which we now possess, and plunge ourselves into an utterly false and factitious life which we should some day regret.

(Copy)

"President Wm. R. Harper.

Dear Sir:

On the question of the acceptance of a gift of a Quadrangle for women, with the condition that it shall include recitation halls and laboratories to be used exclusively by women of the Junior College, I vote no.

I should heartily welcome the building of a Quadrangle for young women, with dormitories, gymnasium, and grounds for exercise, upon the proposed site, just as I should heartily welcome the building of a quadrangle for young men upon some other site, preferably to the west of the present grounds.

I am strongly opposed to the establishment of separate instruction for women in the University of Chicago in any year or years of study, from the Kindergarten to the end of the work of the Graduate School. My reasons in the present case are as follows:

1. The proposed line of distinction in the education of the sexes is a purely artificial one.

It was at first argued in the Senate that there is a period in the life of every girl when she is in a temporary state of physical sensibility and unrest, and that during this time she should be educated apart from the young men. The physical fact is as stated. But I believe it to be the experience of parents that, in the life of a normal girl, this temporary state of sensibility and unrest has, to the girl's own consciousness, nothing to do with her relations to the actual persons of the other sex whom she meets in her daily life. Moreover, if the conclusion were drawn that there should be temporary separation, the time at which the alleged reason exists is not between the ages of seventeen to nineteen, or eighteen to twenty (as in the Junior College) but three or four years earlier. If there be a separation on this ground, then, it ought not to be in University education, but in the High School. The argument under this head, though strongly urged at first, has been abandoned in the Senate, and I hope will not be revived.

It should be noted also that the proposition before us, though it ostensibly separates the young women of the Junior College from the young men, would actually do this completely for a single year only. One third of the work of the second year of the Junior College is by our system elective, and is actually taken in the Senior College. It has not yet been proposed to separate the sexes in the Senior College,--though every argument advanced, except the baseless one stated above, is really an argument against co-education at any point.

2. Co-instruction is the best corrective of the dangers of co-education.

The sole danger in co-education lies in the undue interest of the one sex for the other, which in individual cases is generally founded on illusion. Sympathies which would not bear the strain of actual life easily spring up in the years of inexperience. The more open the intercourse is, and the more largely it has to do with intellectual pursuits, the sanerits results will be. The best corrective of youthful romanticism is the daily work of the class-room, pursued by the two sexes in common. By giving up co-instruction, we should give up the greatest safe-guard which we now possess, and plunge ourselves into an utterly false and factitious life which we should some day regret.

two bodies of students, living near each other, could not possibly be kept apart; and the mere attempt to establish a partial separation would make intercourse more attractive, while robbing it of its natural safe-guard.

(3) The proposed separation would entail a waste of money and of energy.

The proposition (suggested in the recent convocation address of the President) to give each young man or young woman the choice between instruction in common and instruction apart would make it necessary, in many subjects, to have four separate places for laboratory work and instruction: one for young men and young women of the Senior College or Graduate School; a second for the young men of the Junior College who wanted to have instruction by themselves; and a third for young women of the Junior College who wanted instruction by themselves; and a fourth for young men and young women of the Junior College who wanted instruction together. The great waste of money involved in such a scheme should be obvious to every one. On our excellent system of keeping the classes down to a maximum of 30, we now divide the sum total of the students in a given subject by 30, and but one fraction need be left over. On the proposed system, we should have to divide each of four numbers by 30, with four fractions left over. And this would be the case with every subject in the Junior College. Moreover, the difficulty of superintending the work of a given department in four different places would be very heavy. It would in general not be well done; but if it were well done in any case, it would be at the sacrifice of energy which would be more valuable to the University if spent in ways less mechanical.

The teaching and laboratory work of the departments of Arts, Literature, and Science should all be conducted in the central mass included in the original four blocks of the University; and as it becomes necessary to duplicate buildings for a given department, the new ones should, in each case, be as close as possible to the old. A glance at the map of the University will show that this is still entirely feasible. For example, buildings for Physics and for Geology could be placed on Lexington Ave., in reasonable proximity to the Ryerson Physical Laboratory and the Walker Museum; and a building for Chemistry could be placed on Ellis Ave., in reasonable proximity to the Kent Chemical Laboratory.

4. No division of studies can be made according to sex.

It has been implied, in some of our discussions, that there are certain studies which belong peculiarly to women, and for which special buildings should therefore be provided. If by this is meant the study of art, in any of its phases,--for example music and painting,--these studies certainly could not be forbidden to our young men. It would be equally rational to forbid our young women to study political sciences or Sanskrit. There is then no reason for separate buildings reserved for subjects taken by women only.

(5) Partial non-coeducation would not meet the difficulties that are supposed to exist.

As the movement to establish separate education has come up before us, it seems to be prompted by the fear that the number of women in the University of Chicago will come to exceed that of the men. There are special reasons why women should come here in large numbers. It is obvious that there is no other place where the opportunities for them are so great. On the other hand, it is not obvious that there is no other place where the opportunities

for men are so great. Indeed, it may be questioned whether the statement would be true. The way to increase the number of our men is by making it true, and obviously true. This can be effected by giving them better places to live in, better opportunities for social life, and, above all, better opportunities for scholarship. It is unhappily the fact that the attention of the country at large is more attracted by our interest in the supposed expansion of our lower work by "university extension", "affiliation", and correspondence", than by our scholarly achievements, as evinced for example, by publication. And indeed, the conditions of life in the University of Chicago make productive scholarship extremely difficult. A great advance in this respect could be accomplished by the expenditure of a moderate amount of thought and money. And it is only an advance of this kind that will give the better people of the country the confidence in us which they do not now possess, and so set in motion the influence that will bring us large numbers of able men as students. If such steps were taken, I believe that the end of another decade would see us clearly the strongest University in America.

In expressing the above opinions, I have not been speaking from a one-sided experience. I have taught in an institution for men alone (Harvard), an institution for women alone (Radcliff), and two co-educational institutions (Cornell and Chicago). In the last two named, I have taught mixed classes ranging from the Freshman year to the end of the Graduate School. I have never seen any embarrassment or difficulty caused by the presence of the two sexes together in the class-room. The difficulties that exist belong to the life outside of the class-room; and for these there is no natural and healthy corrective except the common intellectual life that centres in the the class-room.

Very respectfully,

(Signed) W. G. Hale.

Jan. 10, 1902.

Jan. 10, 1902.

(C O P Y)

"January 8, 1902.

Dr. W. R. Harper.

My dear Sir:--I am opposed to the plan of accepting money for the establishment of a separate Junior College for women, for the following, as it seems to me vital, reason:

It is ethically inconsistent for the University to take such a step in view of its charter and its history during the past ten years

Yours very truly,

(Signed) J.U.NEF."

(C O P Y)

"January 9, 1902.

President W.R.Harper.

Dear Sir:--Referring to the accompanying question, I should consider the undertaking proposed to be undesirable from the standpoint of educational policy. Regarded as a final arrangement it would commit us to two policies. Regarded as a step merely in the segregation of the women, it would miss the point since such segregation · is not practically obtainable when the institutions for men and women are in the same neighborhood.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Henry H. Donaldson."

(C O P Y)

"January 8, 1902.

Dr. W. R. Harper.

My dear Sir:--I am opposed to the plan of accepting money for the establishment of a separate Junior College for women, for the following, as it seems to me vital, reason:

It is ethically inconsistent for the University to take such a step in view of its charter and its history during the past ten years.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) J.U.MEF."

(C O P Y)

"January 9, 1902.

President W.R.Harper.

Dear Sir:--Referring to the accompanying question, I should consider the undertaking proposed to be undesirable from the standpoint of educational policy. Regarded as a final arrangement it would commit us to two policies. Regarded as a step merely in the segregation of the women, it would miss the point since such segregation is not practically obtainable when the institutions for men and women are in the same neighborhood.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Henry H. Donaldson."