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August 1, 1902.

Dr. T. W. Goodspeed,
Secretary, University of Chicago,
City.

Dear Dr. Goodspeed:

In the matter which is now pending before the Board of Trustees, and which relates to the separation of the sexes during the two years of the junior college course, I beg you to express my approval of the measure. If I were present, I should vote for it, and I would be glad to be counted as among those who favor it. For myself, I believe the proposed step will be a positive advance in educational development, and that the results will justify the assertion that it is in no measure hostile to co-education, but an aid to its highest development.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Jesse A. Baldwin
August 5, 1905

Dr. T. W. Goodspeed

Secretary, University of Chicago

G. T. W.

Dear Dr. Goodspeed:

In the matter which I now bring before the Board of Trustees, and with reference to the expression of the same topic in the new source of the Junior college course, I ask you to express my sympathy with the messenger. I have long felt I should voice the opinion that the Junior College and the University have a combined responsibility in this branch of education, and part of the latter's responsibility is to make the Junior College part of the program of the University. I believe the Junior College and the University are in close agreement in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Y
My dear Dr. Harper,

I am sending you the rough drawing as you requested. I think that it makes fairly clear the main points which we discussed this afternoon. Of course the architect will know how to correct our crude ideas.

I have also read over the document on segregation. I regret to say that I am still of the opinion that the least said about the social and pedagogical aspects the better. Professor Small has done the thing as well as it could be done, but nevertheless the result is unconvincing. This material presents a marked contrast to the brief definite paragraphs of the earlier part of the paper. The reason is not far to seek. The later pages deal with opinion rather than with demonstrable facts. These assertions, however gently and qualifiedly made, are open to attack, and may provoke replies which will seem to make telling points. My attitude may be summed up in this aphorism: "When in doubt, don't do it".

Yours sincerely,

George E. Brinton.

President Harper.
of Las Vegas.

I would like to mention that you are located in a
convenient area of the city for easy access to the hotel and
restaurants. The city is also home to numerous casinos and
entertainment venues.

I have also reviewed the layout of the convention center
and have made several recommendations. I suggest
incorporating a larger ballroom to accommodate larger
sessions and provide more space for exhibit space.

I look forward to seeing you at the meeting.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Presidential Hotel
COPY.

June 24, 1902.

Dear Mrs. Rockefeller:

I have been greatly cheered during the past year by your assurance made to me at the Decennial that I need have no fear for the position of the women in the University. The action which I apprehended has been taken by the Junior College faculty which has voted to provide separate instruction for men and women. That this action was taken chiefly in the interests of men is shown not only by the fact that the protests of every woman connected with the administration and instruction and of nearly every woman graduate received no official recognition, but by the open statements of members of the faculty at the meeting and by the votes of men not in favor of the higher education of women. Some of the results which we fear are foreshadowed by our only experience in separation thus far. During the past season the University preacher has addressed the women's assembly five times and the men's assembly eight times.

I send you this message feeling assured of your continued sympathy for a work which has heretofore stood for the highest interests of women as well as of men, and I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

Marion Talbot.

Green Hall,
University of Chicago.
June 8th, 1923

Dear Mr. Rockefeller:

I have been extremely honored to have been offered the position of acting dean of women at the University of Chicago. The section which I have been requested to organize, the Junior College Faculty, has never had a voice to protest the discrimination against women in the University. The position is one of keen interest, not only for the fact that the percentage of women in the curriculum and the number of women in the front ranks of scholarship, research, and leadership is increasing, but also because of the growing realization that the University should be open to all students, regardless of sex.

I have accepted the position and look forward to working with the faculty and students to ensure that the University remains a place where women can contribute their talents and abilities.

Best regards,

[Signature]

University of Chicago
CO-EDUCATION IN AMERICA

My theme is not of my own choosing. New England ears are quick to catch any rustling in the western tree tops over co-education. There was more than now when the leaves were all out in August and you called me on a long wire in the glorious New York mountains to join my esteemed neighbor, the President of the University of Chicago, and present an address in your course upon the subject. My regret is deep that President Harper cannot come at the appointed time, and that you are not to have the benefit of his discussion, for we all know that it would be illuminating, and I am sure that it would clear up some misconceptions and give double weight here in New England, where it is most needed, to a widely though not universally accepted doctrine in American education.

Few educational people are free from bias upon our subject. Such as have had most to do with institutions exclusively for men, or exclusively for women, are likely to favor their policy, while others who have been associated with co-educational institutions think their policy the really wise one.

But no matter what leanings one may have he can hardly deny that the policy of educating boys and girls, young men and maidens, and grown men and women together is overwhelming in America.

In the elementary schools it is, in the words of the justly distinguished Commissioner of Education, "practically universal and excites no comment." It is true that there are rare exceptions to this in two or three eastern cities, due to accidental conditions such as the location or structure of schoolhouses, or possibly they may be survivals of the feeble beginnings in the public school system when
what an adequate plant for a large university could be constructed for; that upon being told from ten to fifteen millions of dollars could certainly be invested in one to good advantage and that less than that would prove inadequate, she turned to her husband and said, "Well, Mr. Stanford, it looks as if we could arrange to put five millions into the enterprise now and five millions more in five years we would be doing very well and need not fear to start." This certainly looks very natural and very creditable to the head and the heart of a woman who is preeminent in her giving to higher education.

But to come back to our subject. Northwestern University, hard by Chicago, has been forced to some meditations by reason of the number of women attracted by the special advantages offered to women. No one has thought of departing from the unalterable co-educational policy of the university. There is too much Methodism and too much democratic patriotism in the constitution of Northwestern to make such a thought permissible. The only question, and that a small one, concerns the preservation of the equilibrium of the sexes rather than the elimination of one of them.

But the University of Chicago has, in the last year, if we may judge from its just published statement, been giving itself over to much intellectual entertainment upon this subject, and has finally, by a preponderance of opinion 
\hspace{1cm} \underline{\text{favorable}}
\hspace{1cm} \underline{\text{conclusive}}
\hspace{1cm} \underline{\text{preponderance}}
\hspace{1cm} determined to separate recitations on the line of sex for perhaps two-thirds of its students in the first two years of the college course.

It is unfortunate that I cannot present the statement of the university in its own words, but its elaborateness precludes. This much
may doubtless be said without injustice from conversation. The university is co-educational, and has no thought of anything else. Its charter declares its object to be to furnish opportunities of higher education "to persons of both sexes on equal terms." It does not think that "equal terms" means the same classes, and that there are some reasons which make separate classes in the first two years desirable. Some of these reasons arise out of special circumstances at that university. It declares its unalterable purpose to provide exactly equal privileges for each sex. It distinctly says that one policy is not intended for women and another for men. The plan does not contemplate separate faculties, or a faculty with a preponderance of women for women students, or "instruction for women after the fashion of a so-called mania," or separation of men and women in public exercises, or the application of separate rules for men and women, or any "deprivation so far as either men or women are concerned of any educational privilege now enjoyed, unless co-instruction be so considered."

Happily the university does not intend to set up "artificial barriers to prevent men and women from every reasonable kind of association," or the "separation of the younger women from the older ones in residence halls." This declaration releases the intense feelings of the friends of the university. From all the loose talk of recent months we began to fear that the authorities of that university had gone stark mad and intending to separate its fair students into divers groups on the basis of age and intellectual attractiveness, and then going to keep out all students of the male persuasion and the better sort by fences of some kind without seeing that the height of the fences
would have to be graduated on the comeliness of the groups and without realizing the engineering impossibility of building fences high enough to meet the needs where caution was most imperative. Indeed, there was some reason to fear that the men and women who are managing that university had forgotten all they knew in their younger days and were going the lengths of trying to keep a young man and young women of intellectual pursuits altogether apart even after they had found something decidedly interesting in each other, without knowing that the fence which could make any pretense of doing that must have its underpinning in wet earth and its pickets in the blue arch of heaven, and that the faculty which set it up would have to call on the Chicago police and the posse comitatus of Cook County, and the Militia of Illinois, and the United States Regulars, the veterans of two wars, at Fort Sheridan to maintain it, with the chances ten to one that in the end the whole combine would go down in humiliation before a force that is over and above and independent of universities. But save the work, the very thought of it was all unjust.

But with so much gone out of this matter it will be difficult for most of us to see what is left to justify separate instruction and recitations for two years and no more. There is nothing very objectionable in the arrangement under all the explanations and assurances, but why make the explanations and assurances necessary? Why for slight reason take a course which must very naturally provoke endless and irritating question as to whether the sexes have equal privileges? Why have to defend the apparently illogical position that co-education is the natural method for conducting educational work up to the time of
going to college, then it is not so far two years, and then it is again
for the rest of the time? And if the association of the young men and
women is to be interrupted only so far as recitations are concerned,
why do away with it in the only place where each gets the benefit of
the serious work, measures the intellectual capacity, and sees the moral
attitude of the other?

The wiser course is upon lines parallel with the highways of
nature. She helps us on our way if we do not cross her tracks. The
Reply to a Memorial

Relating to the Plan for Separate Instruction for men and women in the Junior Colleges.
I.

Has the Plan been adequately considered?
Yes.

1. "The plan has only been before the Junior College Faculty at two meetings, and no consideration has been accorded to alternative constructive plans". It has been thoroughly debated at three meetings of the Junior College Faculty. The whole ground was traversed so exhaustively that the Faculty became impatient of further debate and unanimously ordered a vote.

Besides this a debate in private conversation has been going on ever since last Autumn. Every member of the Faculty has been fully informed as to the every phase of the discussion.

Such alternative constructive plans as were offered in the Senate were considered by that body, and negatived by a large majority as undesirable and impracticable. No tangible alternative plans were offered in the Junior College Faculty.

2. "It has been before the Congregation once, and was overwhelmingly disapproved".

The Congregation took the matter up at the end of a small meeting, (6:00 P.M.) after a large number had left. Those in the majority (the vote of disapproval was 24 to 7) refused to lay the matter over for until there could be a full meeting adequate discussion, and refused to discuss the matter on its merits. They insisted on using their majority to put a vote of disapproval on record. Under the rules, the Junior College Faculty thereupon met, reconsidered the question, and reaffirmed their former action by a decisive vote (25 to 18).

3. "It has never been before a meeting of the United Faculties."

The United Faculties have no jurisdiction in the case, any more than have the Faculties of Law, Medicine or Theology.

The plan of a mass faculty was decisively voted down a year ago. It is hardly reasonable to protest now because business is not done in the very way in which at that time it was decided that it should be done.

4. "Many members of the Senate have never heard the plan discussed from the Junior College point of view".

Every member of the Senate has had ample opportunity to hear the Junior College point of view- both in the very abundant private discussion and in the report of the Junior College committee recommending the action. Moreover, in fact several members of faculties other than
The principal and only feature of the Junior College Faculty is its comprehensive academic program, designed to provide a thorough education for students preparing for professional careers. The faculty is composed of experienced educators who bring a wealth of knowledge and expertise to the classroom. Each member of the faculty is selected for their ability to inspire and challenge students, fostering a dynamic learning environment.

In addition to their academic duties, faculty members are also involved in various extracurricular activities, including sports teams, student clubs, and community service projects. This commitment to student development goes beyond the classroom, ensuring that students receive a well-rounded education.

Faculty members are dedicated to maintaining high standards of academic excellence and continuously strive to improve their teaching methods. They are active participants in professional development opportunities, staying current with the latest advancements in their fields. This ongoing learning is essential to delivering the highest quality of education to our students.

The Junior College Faculty is committed to helping students achieve their personal and professional goals. Through a combination of rigorous coursework, hands-on experience, and supportive relationships, we provide a supportive environment where students can thrive and reach their full potential.
that of the Junior Colleges did attend the meetings of that body in order
to hear the debate—as any senator might have done had he so chosen.

5. "No committee of the Senate has ever considered the strictly
educational aspects of the plan."

The Senate is so small a body and opinions on the matter were
so clearly defined that debate in the full Senate easily covered the
whole ground. In fact several meetings of the Senate have been devoted
to debating this question alone; and there has been no subject before the
University which has been more thoroughly canvassed on all sides than
this question.

II.

Are the administrative features of the plan thoroughly worked out
and understood?

Yes.

1. "Are the departments to be accorded responsibility in adminis-
tering the measure? If so, there will be radical variance in the mode of
administration due to divergent opinion in many departments."

Departments will carry out the policy of the University, as in
other matters, irrespective of personal opinions.

2. "There must be undesirable coercion of departments."

It is customary to administer what has been decided as it has
been decided, and not as the personal judgment of individuals may dictate.
This is order in place of chaos. It is not coercion for the minority to
yield to the majority.

3. "Does the measure apply to elective work in the Junior Colleges,
or only to required work?"

The plan applies to all Junior work, both elective and required,
wherever the size of the class permits. This has been repeatedly stated
and is well understood.

4. "What is there to preclude the transfer to the Junior Colleges
of elective courses now offered in the Senior Colleges?"

This seems to imply that those who may be entrusted with adminis-
tration will by some underhanded means extend the working by the plan
farther than is implied in its adoption. An answer is hardly necessary.

5. "Are co-education sections to be provided in elective courses?"

This will be decided by experience. It is not necessary to
attempt forecasting every detail in advance.
8. "Will instructors be allowed any choice of the sections they are to teach?"

This will of course be decided, as all other matters are, by the head of the department in consultation with the President. There will be such conformity to the wishes of instructors as is usual in other cases.

7. "Is it judicious to enforce a measure with the disapproval of many instructors?"

This is merely asking whether the policy of the University shall be decided by majorities or minorities.

IX.

Have the general educational consequences of the plan been sufficiently considered?

Yes.

1. "Aggravated by the proposed change which leaves untouched the real danger point", etc.

It is not a question of a "danger point" at all. The plan is favored by its advocates from no apprehension of dangers in the present system, but because it is believed that better results can be secured by the new one—better results in scholarship, and in dignity and refinement of life.

The steadying influence of association in the class rooms doubtless is of value; but those who have had the opportunity of observing the reciprocal influence of men and women studying in adjacent schools, or in different divisions of the same school, but not in the same classes, as are strongly of the opinion that this influence is in every way healthful at a certain stage of education as that which is exerted where the plan of full co-instruction is followed.

In this connection much stress is laid on the assertion that men and women by meeting in the class-room, learn a just estimate of one another, free from the glamour which comes from partial knowledge.

There is truth in this proposition; but like many sweeping generalizations on educational subjects, it should be received with caution. It is true in many cases. In many other cases it is not true at all. In still other cases it would be impossible to tell whether it is true or not.

Further, even if assumed to be true in all cases, it by no means follows that it is desirable that men and women should in every instance
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be associated in the class room. Quite enough of the desired disillusion-
ment may be secured by association for a part of the time. Sooner or
later all students who receive the University degrees will have ample
opportunity for association in mixed classes. meantime being for a while
kept in separate classes they may receive the undoubted benefits which
come from separate instruction. Thus at least a measure of the good
results of both systems may be secured.

2. "The wisdom of seeking more rather than less of such competition
is a stimulus"

The opposite inference should be drawn. It is not a question,
however, of inability so much as of unwillingness. Men will compete
with one another, but not with women. This is especially true at the
age at which college is usually entered.

Further, it is a fact of common observation that at that age girls
are usually further developed socially than boys, and for that reason
are far from excelling such an influence on the latter as will draw them
rather out. The reverse is likely to happen. It is well known that girls
who enter the Junior Colleges commonly have their associates among men
who are older, and are apt to think and speak slightlyingly of young men of
their own age. There is little mental stimulus for either in such an
attitude.

IV.

"Where is the System to End?"

The arguments in favor of the plan must distinctly do not apply
"from kindergarten to graduate school." On the contrary it may easily
be pointed out that the considerations which lead the majority to favor
the plan apply with especial force in the Junior Colleges, very little
in elementary schools, very little in real University work (which begins
with the Senior Colleges). Moreover, the financial consideration would
render separation in real University work impracticable. There are no
sections in Senior College and Graduate Classes. To multiply sections
at this point would be expensive to such an extent as would not be warrant-
ed by any considerations now apparent.

V.

Will not the adoption of the proposed plan reflect inevitably and
unjustly on our students?

No more, for instance, than revision of our athletic rules, or
adoption of revised definition of professionalism, or improvements in the
administration of the house system, or any other changes which experience suggests. It is wholly gratuitous to imply that culpable conduct on the part of students is the ground urged for the change. The conditions which it is desired to modify are a handicap upon the most wholesome development of student life. Change of those conditions is no more a reflection upon the conduct of students under those conditions than giving to them better dormitories, or better dining room and club facilities would be. It is not true that the observations upon which these conclusions are based were made recently for the first time. They have been the subject of private comment among many members of the faculty from the opening of the University. They did not think it would be timely, until very recently, to attempt creation of better conditions.

VI.

Have the effects of the measure on the higher education of women at the University of Chicago and elsewhere been sufficiently recognized?

The dangers recited in this paragraph may seem very real to certain members of the faculty. To others they seem wholly groundless. How either of the consequences suggested can follow from the plan is surely not apparent. The plan is an attempt to diminish the ratio of distractions which interfere with serious attention to college work. The course of reasoning is surely not apparent by which it can be concluded that the attainment of such result, or even an honest effort after it, can either be stigmatized as "coercive," or can "set back the cause of woman's education," or can put a premium on the presence of an undesirable class of women. These conceivable consequences can hardly be considered sufficiently within the range of probability to rank as practical objections.

The attitude of the women of the University toward the plan may be explained by their fears of possible results, and by the persistent contention on the part of certain members of the faculty that the whole plan is an attempt to drive women out of the University; perhaps by the apprehension that in case the change women will presently be allowed to teach only women.

VII.

Has the influence of recent changes affecting the men in the University been thoroughly considered?

The establishment of new divisions in the University which will increase the number of men, and the erection of new buildings intended especially for the use of the men, do not favor the recommendation to delay, for no one of these buildings or new schools will be sufficiently
far advanced within a year to furnish data. Besides it has never been suggested that the plan was intended to do away with the danger of femininizing men. It is intended rather to reinforce the effects of the new gymnasium, the club house, the commons, and like agencies.

VIII.

Has public opinion been sufficiently regarded?

It is Utopian to expect the general public to succeed even in correctly presenting to itself the problem of an academic situation until it is first before them in the concrete. The agitation thus far conducted has thrown so much dust in the air, and has stirred up so much irrelevant feeling, that trial of the question in the court of public opinion can result in nothing but more confusion, until the public can be confronted with the plain facts in working form. When the real character of the plan is on exhibition in its operation, it can be judged intelligently by the public, whereas further speculative argument would simply result in greater confusion and increased incapacity to maintain a judicial attitude. Everybody familiar with the educational history of Chicago, knows that the public was led to fight Colonel Parker relentlessly when he was making some of his most important experiments. The analogy throws direct light upon the question of permitting the general public to dictate the policy of the University. That policy should be determined by those to whom the institution has been entrusted.

Furthermore, the epithet "irrevocable" is entirely inappropriate. On the contrary, the plan is not irrevocable. The majority believe that with full trial the disposition to reverse it will diminish. Should experience prove the plan a mistake, return to co-instruction in the Junior Colleges will be entirely practicable.

IX.

Have the financial consequences of the plan been adequately considered in their bearing on the University's educational procedure?

The financial consequences have been carefully studied; and it is evident that large sums of money are not necessarily involved. For example:

a) Greek, Latin, French, German and English, Mathematics and History, are subjects which require no laboratory equipment. The ordinary books used by Junior College students must in any case be duplicated many times.
It makes no difference in cost whether there are 12 copies of a book in one place, or 6 copies in each of two places.

b) It costs no more to arrange laboratory accommodations for 600 or more students in two places than in one.

c) It is necessary, in any case, to provide other space for laboratories, or crowd out the higher students. The present laboratories are about full. In a year or two there must be further provision for laboratory work. The most economical plan of extension would involve a building or buildings for elementary work. It can make little difference in cost whether there be one large building for such purposes, or two smaller ones. This is a very different problem from that involved in constructing highly specialized laboratories for advanced work.

d) In only one department is there possible increase of cost, that of physiology, the entire equipment of which for an elementary course does not exceed $8,000 to $10,000.

e) Additional dormitories would be erected only as needed, and these would, as heretofore, furnish an income on the investment. The separation question is therefore entirely distinct from the architectural question.

f) If, for any reason, the expense of separate sections for instruction proves to be serious, the plan provides that in such cases the separation shall not be made. But in few cases would it be necessary to provide more sections than now.

It should be kept in mind that the plan of buildings for a women's quadrangle is one thing, and the plan of providing separate instruction for men and women in the Junior Colleges is quite another thing. It is the second of these only which is now under discussion.

X.

It it certain that the proposed plan meets more efficiently than any other the asserted difficulties of the present situation?

If the reasons for the proposed change were to any great extent architectural, it would be wise to postpone action until all reasonable schemes for the amelioration of the architectural situation had been considered. If, however, there are good and sufficient reasons for the change independent of the matter of buildings, and if the question has already been so fully discussed that further delay could only bring fruitless and harmful agitation, then delay is unwise.

The Junior College Faculty voted unanimously (May 17) for
the adoption of a report recommending a residence quadrangle for women on the east and for men on the west of the central grounds. There is no confusion of architectural and educational questions. It is clear that the buildings can be so constructed as to call for the slightest possible change in case later it shall be desired to revert to the co-instruction plan.

Finally:

To throw the matter back for further discussion by the faculties could answer no good purpose. It has been fully considered by each faculty body which has jurisdiction, and further discussion would be quite unlikely to give any new light or to change any opinions.

Further agitation by the public, who are not charged with the administration of the University, and who are not in a position either to understand all the facts at issue or to judge without bias the questions involved, can do no good. The matter can be decided quite as well now as a year hence, and its early determination will be a benefit to all concerned. It is true that the memorial asking for delay is signed by members of the faculty who are entitled to all respect. But the signers comprise only about a fifth of the entire faculty, and several of these are in favor of the plan. Under these circumstances it is respectfully urged that the plan repeatedly and deliberately recommended by the faculty and by the senate be put into effect.

In behalf of the majority who favor the plan.

H.P. Judson
June 30th, 1902.

The University Recorder:

On the motion pending before the Senate, to approve the action of the Faculty of the Junior Colleges looking towards separate provision for men and women, I vote aye.

The change in question I regard, under all the circumstances, as a distinct advance in educational method. It must be taken in connection with the system of the University as a whole, and in that sense is a proposition new, original, and eminently suggestive. There are institutions in abundance in which separate education is practiced throughout. There are institutions on all sides in which co-education is practiced throughout. There is no institution in which the varying needs resulting from difference of age and circumstance are taken into account in such way as to secure for students in large part the best results of both systems, without loss of anything vital in either.

Co-education should not be held as a fetish— as something so perfect and so mysterious in its efficacy that it is dangerous to look into it and impossible to modify it without destroying it. Between co-education at all points and co-education at no point there is room surely for much diversity of practice. Co-instruction in gymnasium classes and in college sports is not usual. Reasonable decorum requires separate homes for men and for women students. In many cases elective classes are taken only by men— others only by women— thus losing the inestimable benefit of co-instruction if that benefit is to be held as omnipresent and equally vital at all points. Social life is a good thing, but every individual needs the opportunity for solitude. The life of men and women together is a good thing. But the best development of both demands that
each should have the opportunity for some life by themselves. Young men should have some regular, concerted and definite activities in which women are not concerned. The same is true, mutatis mutandis, of women. This is very far from saying that all student life should be of this character. It does recognize an actual need of human nature, and it seeks to provide for it.

Education, is may be assumed, is a preparation for life beyong school or college. But there is a large part of such life in which men act together, quite aside from their ordinary social relations. This is true to a great extent of business, of politics, of clubs. Perhaps there ought to be no point at which a man ought to be able to escape from womankind, and live and commune with his own sort for a while. Perhaps that is the tendency of present social progress, so that in time this freedom of what may be called sex solitude will be lost. Perhaps— but meanwhile one may be permitted to believe that in these present conditions there is material benefit to the energy and the interest in life of those concerned— that in fact these separate activities by relief and contrast rather strengthen than weaken the general social instincts. They are not in themselves non-social forms of social organization. And is not all this quite as true of women as of men?

But uncompromising coeducation provides little opportunity and little training for these forms of separate sex activity. Athletics do something— but the athletes are few. Fraternities do something— but the majority of students are not in fraternities. Adapted coeducation recognizes the special needs of the case and affords a reasonable opportunity for separate life and action for all beside the mere ephemeral accidents through which students stumble in the ordinary college course.

In the old-fashioned men's colleges there is a sense of unity, a feeling of social solidarity, which is notably lacking in coeducational
background to their educational opportunities for educational advancement. Administrative and curricular reforms are essential to address these issues. The need to frame policies to accommodate the needs of students is crucial. If these reforms are not implemented, the existing educational landscape will face challenges.

In the context of contemporary higher education, there is a need to ensure a balance between academic excellence and social responsibility. This requires a comprehensive review of the existing system to identify and address gaps.

In conclusion, the challenge lies in the intersection of academic and social dimensions, necessitating a holistic approach to education.
institutions, and which in itself is a powerful educational agency. The flavor of it and the force of it might not be lost to any system of college education. This is not necessarily an argument against coëducation. It may perhaps be worth while to lose this particular benefit of separate education in order to attain the undoubted benefits of education together. But is it necessary to lose it? May it not in great part be attained, without losing the good results of coëducation, if adapted coëducation is adopted in judicious form? It is my belief that this is exactly what can be done, and in large measure, provided that the new system be adopted in the right time, in the right place, and to the right degree.

The Junior college as it exists in the University of Chicago, affords a peculiarly favorable opportunity for this new departure in method. The students come from many states, from many communities, from many homes. They are to a large degree strange to one another. They come in a great number of cases from small places, and are at once brought into a large city— the second largest in America, and one of the largest in the world. This, then, is the time, as they enter their new life and are introduced to the college, for giving them that careful attention, for enabling them at the outset to form a definite notion of mass solidarity, and for keeping them interested in such college activities and aloof from such adventitious distractions as may tend to dissipate their energies and to make them effeminate. Let the men have for a while a man's life—let the woman for a while have a woman's life. The influences which at this particular time they need most can best be given them apart.

Whether the same things are possible to the same extent in all coëducational colleges need hardly be asked. Institutions in small towns and an institution in a large city are under very different conditions, and cannot be compared safely as on the same basis. We are concerned at present with no doctrinaire theories, but with the application of general principles to actual conditions as we find them. In such cases theories often need
material modification. The theory of coeducation is no exception. It should be applied in the first place so as not to deprive men of the essentially masculine training, or women of the essentially feminine training which they need. It should be applied in the second place so as to be adapted to local circumstances and needs. In a great city there are many things which can best be attained in education by having men and women for a time apart.

The same considerations do not apply to the Senior Colleges or to the Graduate or professional schools. With the Senior Colleges real university work begins. Students are older and more thoughtful. The period of preparation is ended with the Junior College. From the first it has been the policy of the University of Chicago to make sharp this distinction between the lower and higher college work, between preparation for the University and the University to which the preparatory work leads. In this preparatory work, especially in so far as students are away from their homes, and while the transition period in life is passing, students can to advantage receive the special benefit of training in separate groups. Later they become more individual with more advanced development and may well at that time broaden the social conditions in which their intellectual work is done.

Between the separate work thus arranged for the Junior Colleges and the coeducation of the Senior Colleges it is quite as well that the transition should be gradual. It is not essential to the plan that all Junior College work should be separate—only that that should be its general character. As the students approach the higher college they will gradually pass into Senior College methods—there will thus be no abrupt transition.

The proposed plan will sacrifice no material benefit of coeducation, and will secure some of the essential advantages of separate education. It will provide in the quadrangle for women a means of insuring a dignified and wholesome life, and of establishing traditions impossible under
other conditions. In the quadrangle for men there will be room for a distinctly masculine development. In the central quadrangles all doing higher work will meet on the common ground of advanced scholarship. If the plan succeeds, as its advocates sincerely believe that it will, it will be a contribution to education by solving some of its most perplexing problems. No other institution is at present so favorably situated for attempting the solution of these questions as is the University of Chicago. The solution should certainly be attempted, and I have entire faith in the issue.

(Signed) Harry Pratt Judson.
The question referred to the company to send letters to the various
national corporations and companies granting
higher wages as the companies in question were
partly to be in the near future.

The letter referred to the companies' difficulties in
obtaining or retaining their employees.

Agee: United States.

(Signed) United States.
April 10th, 1906.

Mr. John M. Downen,

Principal of the High School,
Pueblo, Colorado.

My dear Sir:

The plan of segregation at Chicago was largely a measure of expediency. Cobb Hall, our main recitation hall was badly crowded. It seemed necessary to provide additional accommodations and therefore a temporary hall for women was built and a hall already in existence was utilized for men. There are obvious advantages where classes are very large in keeping men and women separate, but although the large classes of the first two years are divided, not difference was made in the quality of instruction. The same teachers alternately instruct men and women. That is, a teacher who had a class of women one quarter would be given men the next and vise versa. Furthermore segregation has never been carried beyond the prescribed courses of the Junior Colleges, coeducation still existing in about three
Mr. John M. Downey

Principal of the High School

Pueblo, Colorado

My dear Sir:

The plan of segregation at Colorado State Normal School, Pueblo, Colorado, was intended a measure of expedience. Gould Hall, our main lecture hall was badly overcrowded. It seemed necessary to provide additional accommodation and therefore a temporary hall for women was built and a hall whereby an existence was maintained for men. There are analogous arrangements made elsewhere in the State. I urge to keeping men and women separate, but let the female classes of the first two years be given the proper instruction. The same teachers should preferably instruct men and women. That is a teacher who has a class of women one quarter may be given men the next and vice versa. Furthermore segregation has never been carried to the extreme. Colorado will exist until existing in our three

lgcd
The capacity of the dormitories is two hundred and twenty-two. The conditions of application are stated in the diagram to which I have referred. If I can make the situation clearer by another letter or in any other way help the lady to whom you refer in planning for her daughter's further education I shall be very glad to do so.

Yours very truly,

Secretary to the President.
The capacity of the corporations to two hundred and twenty-five. The condition of application one stage in the history to which I have referred. If I can make the attention offered in another letter or in any other way help the idea to whom you refer in planning for your guarantees' further execution I shall be very glad to do so.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
Memorial to President W. R. Harper and the Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago

Gentlemen: The undersigned officers of instruction of the rank of associate and above, in the University of Chicago, respectfully request your consideration of the reasons herewith briefly indicated for submitting the proposition of segregation of the sexes in the Junior Colleges to at least one year's further deliberation by the various divisions of the faculty. This need not involve postponement of any plans for providing new residence halls for women, nor delay the erection of certain buildings to relieve the present congestion in Colonnade, which condition in the minds of many members of the faculty, has apparently been a weighty consideration in support of the proposed measure.

I. Has the plan been adequately considered?

Although the proposed measure is much the most important in its educational bearing of any hitherto considered by the faculty of the University, it has only been before the Junior College Faculty at two meetings, and its consideration has been accorded to alternative constructive plans. It has been before the Congregation once, and was overwhelmingly disapproved. It has never been before any meeting of the newly formed United Faculties, although their work will be profoundly affected for good or evil by it; and many members of the faculty have never had an opportunity to express their opinion upon the subject in an official way. Since there is no provision for a joint meeting of Junior College Faculty and Senate, many members of the Senate have never heard the plan discussed from the Junior College point of view. While the building aspect of the matter has been before a Senate committee, no committee of that body has ever considered the strictly educational aspects of the plan. Those facts suggest the need of more mature consideration of the subject.

II. Are the administrative features of the plan thoroughly worked out and understood?

On the administrative side of the question there has been as yet but little elaboration of the scheme. Opinion is radically diverse and vague as to the exact plan contemplated. Are the departments to be accorded responsibility in administering the measure? If so, there will be radical variance in the mode of administration due to divergent opinion in many departments; if not, there must be an understandable criticism of departments reluctant to conform to the various consequences of the measure. Many other administrative features have not been discussed or determined. Does the measure apply to elective work in the Junior Colleges, or only to required work? What is there to preclude the transfer to the Junior Colleges of elective courses now offered in the Senior Colleges, and thus the virtual separation of the sexes throughout the undergraduate course? Are co-educational sections to be provided in elective courses in addition to those for men and women separately? Will they be favored? Will instructors be allowed any choice of the sections they are to teach? All these questions are pregnant with serious practical difficulties. It is judicious to enforce a measure, the exact bearing and final purport of which is unknown to a large part of the faculty, and which meets as now understood with the strong moral disapproval of many instructors who will be called upon to execute it? If the plan is really wise, it can only gain strength by a mature consideration which shall define the salient features of the program and the reasons for it.

III. Have the general educational consequences of the plan been sufficiently considered?

Despite all assertions of intention (and this expression is far from uniform among those favoring the plan, many of whom frankly advocate it as a first step in the overthrow of co-education) it is evidently problematic how far the measure will affect co-education as a permanent university policy. This question has never been submitted to the consideration of all those concerned. There seems reason to believe that such dangers as co-education supposedly involves will be aggravated by the proposed change which leaves untouched the real danger point, i.e., social relations, and destroys which is one of the most unpalatable advantages of the system, i.e., the steadying influence of intellectual association in the class room. Moreover, so far as true, the asserted inability of men to compete successfully with women in junior college work would seem to indicate the wisdom of seeking more rather than less of such competition as a stimulus to the men.
IV. Where is the system to end?

Positive assurances are given that nowhere else save in the Junior Colleges is separation of the sexes desired, yet every argument thus far advanced, which is based on educational considerations, is equally applicable in justification of such separation from kindergarten to graduate school.

V. Will not the adoption of the proposed plan reflect inertia and unfitness on our students?

The execution of this measure, if adopted on the basis of the reasons advanced, will inevitably be interpreted at home and abroad as a reflection on our student body. These reflections which have been openly expressed in the faculty meetings of the Junior Colleges, concerns the conduct of both sexes, and are such as were never made before. It is submitted, that the present proposition came up. Believing sincerely that we have an unusually fine body of undergraduate students, both men and women, we deplore this unjust but unavoidable inference.

VI. Have the effects of the measure on the higher education of women at the University of Chicago and elsewhere been sufficiently recognized?

The measure is strongly advocated as one of the greatest boons offered by modern education to women. Yet every woman under university appointment is Nazarene to the plan, and many of them are graduates of women's colleges, and therefore not predisposed to the latent extent. Thrice the measure will be coercive so far as concerns University women, that it will set back the cause of women's education wherever the University's influence is felt; that it will be a constant menace to the self-respect of women students, and will repel from the University some most admirable women, while attracting, with a probable increase of the total number of women, a less earnest class more interested in social diversions, and not assuming a corresponding increase in strong men; are consequences to be feared.

VII. Has the influence of recent changes affecting the men in the University been thoroughly considered?

The establishment of the School of Medicine, of the College of Commerce and Administration, and the School of Law, the prospect of the development of technological work, the building of the men's club house, of Hitchcock Hall, of the Commons, and the Barrett Gymnasium, all promise a radical change in the University atmosphere, which will put a stop to all danger of the effeminizing of the institution, and suggest strongly that the consequences of these changes on university student life should be allowed to develop before adopting measures subjective to the already established conditions.

VIII. Has public opinion been sufficiently regarded?

The natural and legitimate interests of the public in the University render it at once judicious and appropriate to show some regard to public opinion; as yet there has been no opportunity for a general expression of the public mind in this matter. It seems at least desirable before adopting so irreversible a policy, to know whether the great mass of thinking people in this section of the country, especially the parents of our own students, would regard such a measure as a genuine educational reform, or a retrograde abandonment of hard earned ideals.

IX. Have the financial consequences of the plan been adequately considered in their bearing on the University's educational procedure?

Evidently separate instruction for the two sexes must involve separate laboratories, libraries, and all the mechanical features of instruction. This means enormous increase of expenditure which could otherwise be used in much needed development of departments already established; or, if immense sums are not forthcoming, a serious deterioration in the grade of junior college work. This, for example, under the proposed plan be three laboratories of physics, three laboratories of chemistry, etc. Is it yet certain that greater efficiency in the work of the institution can be gained by the new and untried plan, or that it will not be as effective as the old method? Further, what are the financial consequences of the plan?

X. Is it certain that the proposed plan meets more efficiently than any other the asserted difficulties of the present situation?

The necessity for delay in the present matter springs entirely from the unfortunate holding up of an educational problem, i.e. the determination of methods of instruction, with an architectural program, i.e. the construction of separate quadrangles for men and women. If it were simply a question of expansion under our present coeducational system, there need be no delay, and it would be easy to work out a plan of buildings to meet the pressing needs. But no proper opportunity has ever been afforded for the discussion of alternative constructive schemes which might meet the asserted difficulties of the present situation. Such discussion could not fail to locate the main source of these difficulties, as far as they may prove real, and would, as we believe, permit the elaboration of plans which should secure all the advantages and avoid the dangers and difficulties of the proposed measure. Moreover, such mature consideration of the problems at issue would certainly tend to the securing of a harmony of opinion and belief among the members of the faculty which is at present unfortunately and markedly lacking.

We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

(Signed)
SEGREGATION OF SEXES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

The question of separate instruction for men and women during the first two years' work at the University of Chicago came up before the Trustees some time ago. At that time a gift was offered to them for the purpose of building separate quadrangles for the men and women of the Junior Colleges. It was noticed by them that in the terms of the offer "quadrangles" was meant to include not only separate dormitories, but separate classrooms and laboratories as well. As this made the matter a question of educational policy, the Board of Trustees referred for advice to the Senate. This is the highest ruling body of the Faculty, composed of the Heads of Departments only, and ordinarily all educational questions are brought to it before being submitted to the Board of Trustees. The Senate, after discussion, voted to ask for the opinion of the Junior College Faculty, before giving its own decision.

At its meeting held on June 14 the Junior College Faculty, over which President Harper presided, considered two reports from its committee; the majority recommending "that in the development of Junior College instruction, provision be made as far as possible for separate sections for men and women;" and the minority recommending "that the system of co-education be continued as heretofore." The committee's majority report was disapproved by a vote of 19 to 14. After the adjournment of the meeting, President Harper spoke to two members of the Faculty and their votes were then changed from negative to affirmative, making the vote 17 to 16 still against separation. President Harper himself then voted, and threw out the opposing votes of six other persons. This was done on the ground that they were disqualified because they were on one year appointments only, a rule of the University, so far as can be ascertained, never before enforced. The President then, several hours after adjournment, announced the final vote as 17 to 11 in favor of separation of sexes.

Two days later the Congregation, a body which is composed of delegates from the Faculties and Alumni, and which has certain advisory powers, voted 24 to 7, disapproving the action of the Junior College Faculty as reported to them, i.e., 17 to 11 for separation. The Junior College Faculty was obliged to reconsider. Its vote this time was informally announced 26 to 18 in favor of segregation. Among the members of the Faculty themselves, it is not positively known whose votes were this time allowed and whose not. The Senate next met and after hours of discussion decided to take its vote by mail in order to include its members who were away on vacation. This vote was to be counted on July 25, and the result announced to the Board of Trustees at its next meeting.

ARGUMENTS FOR SEGREGATION OF SEXES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

These, as advanced in Faculty meetings, have been noted and listed as follows:

1. Boys will not endure rivalry with girls, who always beat them, consequently many do not work at all.
2. Impossible to use sufficient severity with girls in class to produce best results.
3. Impossible to treat boys and girls in same way, regardless of mere question of severity, therefore great advantage to both in separation.
4. Tendency toward more crowding and physical contact in halls of Cobb. Asserted same result in any building for both sexes, corroding social effect of present coeducational regime.
5. Monopolizing of corridors, stairs and grounds by girls.
6. Asserted preference of many boys and girls for separation.
7. Development of more intimate comradeship among men and women, respectively. Better type of social life.
8. Development thus of better college spirit.
9. Combination under proposed plan of all advantages of both men's and women's colleges.
11. Increase of number of men under this stimulus.
12. Decrease in number of women under influence of this restraining action.
13. Increase in number of women for same reason, e.g., women who would otherwise go to women's colleges.
14. Practically a blow at coeducation. Influence slowly but surely in favor of return to old system of separate instruction.
15. Step in advance toward firm establishment of enlightened form of education. All the blessings and none of the vices.
16. No further development in junior college until proposed step is taken.
17. Large gifts available if measure is adopted.
18. Opportunity to do "comprehensive" thing in education.
19. Appeal to approval (financial and otherwise) of many persons hostile to unvarnished coeducation, especially persons of wealth, who want their girls treated from "society" point of view, and their boys from the fashionable Yale-Harvard standpoint, as they conceive this.
To the Alumni of the University:

Our attention is called to a circular headed "Segregation of Sexes at the University of Chicago," and signed by the Recording Secretary of the Chicago Branch of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae and by the Secretary of the Chicago Alumni Association of the University of Chicago. The circular contains what purports to be a statement of facts with regard to action of University authorities, a statement of arguments alleged to have been advanced in faculty meetings favoring segregation, and a summary of arguments against segregation.

To the customary newspaper misinformation with which the public is supplied as to University affairs, and to anonymous communications on this particular subject, it is not worth while to pay any attention. But as the above mentioned circular is in a way official in character, and as it contains a great number of misstatements on matters of fact, we owe it to our alumni to furnish a correction. As the main question is now pending before the Board of Trustees it would obviously be improper at this time for us to go into any argument on that subject. Our comments on the circular, therefore, relate solely to questions of fact.

In the statements of the circular the following inaccuracies should be pointed out:

1. "At that time a gift was offered them for the purpose of building separate quadrangles for the men and women of the Junior Colleges."

No gift was ever offered for such special purpose, and no such gift was ever suggested by any prospective donor. The question raised in the first discussion of the Senate was whether, in case money could be had for a women's quadrangle, it would be advisable to provide class-rooms and laboratories as well as dormitories. However, it was thought advisable to settle the educational question independently of all financial considerations, and accordingly when the subject was taken up the second time the whole question of money was put aside. The President thereafter repeatedly announced that the money question must not be confused with the issue under discussion, and that whatever policy of future development might be thought best, means would be found for carrying it out.

2. "It was noticed by them that in the terms of the offer 'quadrangles' was meant to include not only separate dormitories, but separate class-rooms and laboratories as well."

No such offer was made—therefore the offer had no "terms."

3. "As this made the matter a question of educational policy, the Board of Trustees referred for advice to the Senate."

The matter was not referred by the Board of Trustees to the Senate. The President laid the matter before the Senate as a question of general policy, as he is accustomed to do with all important questions.

4. "The Senate, after discussion, voted to ask for the opinion of the Junior College Faculty before giving its own decision."

The Senate took no such action. The matter was brought before the Junior College Faculty by the President without reference to the action of the Senate, because it related to Junior College work.

5. "The committee's majority report was disapproved by a vote of 10 to 14. After the adjournment of the meeting, President Harper spoke to two, and their votes were then changed from negative to affirmative, making the vote 17 to 16 still against separation. President Harper himself then voted, and threw out the opposing votes of six other persons. This was done on the ground that they were disqualified because they were on one-year appointments only, a rule of the University, so far as can be ascertained, never before enforced."

Scarcely one of the above statements is correct. The facts are as follows:

Before the ballot was taken the President called attention in the Faculty meeting to the statute of the University with regard to voting: "Instructors appointed for one year attend the meetings of the faculty with which their work is connected,
and take part in the deliberations, but do not vote" (Register of 1901-2, p. 10). This statute was enacted by the Board of Trustees at the beginning of the University, has been printed in every Annual Register, and has been in force and has been applied from the first on fundamental questions. Of course, on ordinary questions there is no roll-call.

The tellers reported 19 negative votes and 14 affirmative, neglecting to take the President's ballot. The list was then scrutinized by the Recorder, with the aid of the Dean of the Faculties and the Secretary of the Board of Trustees, in order that no error might be made. It was found that six negative votes were cast by persons disqualified under the statute to which attention had been called in advance. Others present who were in like manner disqualified, but who, had they voted, would have voted in the affirmative, did not vote. Before the vote was recorded two who had voted in the negative under misapprehension of the purport of the resolution asked to change their votes. One of those asked the President for information as to the meaning of the resolution— with the other the President had no words on the subject at all.

The motion, therefore, was carried without the President's vote, and even counting in the negative the two votes which were changed at request of the persons concerned.

The President did not announce the final vote. It was reported to the Senate by the Recorder in regular course.

6. After the action of the Congregation, a meeting of the Junior College Faculty was called to reconsider the question.

"Its vote this time was informally announced 25 to 18 in favor of segregation. Among the members of the Faculty themselves it is not known positively whose votes were this time allowed and whose not." The tellers, Messrs. Judson and Salisbury, one representing each side, formally announced the vote as 25 in the affirmative and 17 in the negative, with six negative votes believed to be disqualified. On verification one of the questioned votes was found to be valid, and was counted accordingly. Each person whose vote was not counted was personally notified to that effect.

It is difficult to comprehend how so many mis-statements could be compressed into so few lines as is the case with the preamble of the letter to the alumni.

Nineteen arguments for segregation, purporting to have been noted at Faculty meetings, then follow. No comment is necessary on them, except on the last four.

"16. No further development in Junior College until proposed step is taken." No such assertion has been made by any responsible authority.

"17. Large gifts available if measure is adopted." No such assertion has been made by any responsible authority. The truth appears in what has been said above.

"18. Opportunity to do 'conspicuous' thing in education." This is a perversion of what has been said.

"19. Appeal to approval (financial and otherwise) of many persons hostile to unvarnished co-education, especially persons of wealth, who want their girls treated from 'society' point of view, and their boys from the fashionable Yale-Harvard standpoint, as they conceive this." This also is an utter perversion of anything which has been said.

The women whose names are signed to the statement on which the above comment is made, are incapable of intentionally misrepresenting facts. It is to be regretted that the sources of their information should have been so unreliable.

Harry Pratt Judson,
Dean of the Faculties of Arts, Literature, and Science.

Alonzo K. Parker,
University Recorder.

The University of Chicago,
September 25, 1902.
The Question of the Co-educational Policy of the University was discussed at great length in the University Senate during the Autumn and Winter.

In February 1902 the Senate by a vote of 13 to 8 approved of a proposition looking toward the erection of a Women's Quadrangle with recitations and laboratories for the use of women in the Junior Colleges.

In the Faculty of the Junior Colleges also the matter was under consideration and in April 12, 1902, a committee on the Teaching of the Sexes in Separate Classes made the following report:

"The Committee with attempting to answer the educational question involved expresses its judgment that from an administrative point of view the separate instruction of the sexes is feasible provided such instruction be of exactly the same grade and quality for both men and women. This report was accepted and referred for further consideration to the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction."
The question of the co-educational policy at the University was discussed at great length in the University Senate during the Autumn and Winter.

In February 1905, the Senate of a vote of 15 to 8 approved of a proposition favoring the erection of a Women's Gymnasium with recreation and apparatus for the use of women in the Junior College.

In the Faculty of the Junior College, before the matter was under consideration and in April 1905, a committee on the subject was instructed to examine the following report of the Senate in reference to the following:

"The Committee with appropriate to answer the following question involving expression the judgment that there is an administrative point of view the physical education of the sexes is essential to provide an equal opportunity of the same range and diversity for both men and women. The report was received and referred for further consideration to the Committee on Curriculum and In-

Certificate"
At a meeting of the Junior College Faculty held May 17, 1902 the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction presented a Plan for the Future Development of the Junior Colleges making the following recommendations:

1. The new buildings be erected for the use of the Junior Colleges
2. That the work of the Junior Colleges be separated from that of the Senior Colleges and the Graduate Schools.
3. That a residence quadrangle for women be established east of the central grounds and one for men to the west.
4. That both residence quadrangles be sub-divided into Houses each with its own commons and a resident Head.
5. That Houses or Clubs with common lunches be provided for students who live outside the University.
6. That smaller units for recitation halls be provided rather than one large building.

Action on this report was made a special order of business for the next regular meeting.

At a meeting of the Junior College Faculty held May 31st this report was discussed and adopted unanimously by a separate vote on each of the six propositions.

The majority and minority reports were then presented on a seventh proposition.

Proposition seven reads as follows:

Majority report: The Committee recommends that in the development of Junior College instruction provision be made as far as possible for separate sections for men and for women.

Minority report: It is recommended that the system of co-instruction be continued as heretofore.

Copies of these reports upon proposition seven were sent to each member of the Faculty and the vote upon them was postponed.
At a meeting of the Junior College Faculty held May 18, 1928, the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction presented a plan for the future development of the Junior College making the following recommendations:

1. That the new buildings be erected on the west of the Junior College.

2. That the work of the Junior College be emphasized from that of the Senior College and the Graduate School.

3. That a residence be constructed on the west side.

The central location may be lost to the west.

4. That the new residence be made possible by turning to the west.

5. That all new farms be made possible by turning to the west.

6. That all new farms be made possible by turning to the west.

7. That the new farms be made possible by turning to the west.

Action on this report was made a special order of business.

At a meeting of the Junior College Faculty held May 18, 1928, the report was discussed and adopted unanimously by a majority vote in favor of the six recommendations.

The majority view of the minority report was then presented on a seventh proposition:

Proposition Seventh reads as follows:

To report to the Committee the recommendation that the development of Junior College Instruction be made as an essential for separate sections or separate sections for men and for women.

Minority report: It is recommended that the system of coeducation be continued as per statute.
and it was ordered that copies of the same reports be sent for two weeks to each member of the faculty.

At a meeting of the Faculty held June 14, 1902 the consideration of proposition seven of the report of the Committee on the Future Development of the Junior Colleges was made the special order of business and after discussion a vote upon the adoption of the majority report was taken by ballot with the following result: 17 aye and 11 nay.

At the thirty-first meeting of the University Congregation held Monday, June 16, 1902 the Congregation, by a vote of 24 aye and 17 nay, disapproved of the action of the Junior College Faculty in the adoption of proposition seven.

At a meeting of the Faculty of the Junior Colleges held June 23, 1902 the Recorder reported that the Congregation had disapproved of the action of the Junior College Faculty in the adoption of proposition seven of the report on the development of Junior College instruction. The action disapproved of was reconsidered and after discussion reaffirmed by a vote taken by ballot with the following result: 25 aye and 18 nay.

At a meeting of the University Senate held Wednesday, June 25, 1902 it was voted that the Senate approve of the action of the Junior College Faculty on proposition Seven and that the vote upon this motion be taken by individual statements made in writing by the members of the Senate. The result of this ballot was 16 aye, 12 nay.

At a meeting of the University Congregation held Thursday, August 28, 1902 the Recorder presented the action of the Junior College Faculty taken at its meeting June 23 in reaffirmation of proposition seven of the report on the development of Junior College instruction which was disapproved by the Congregation at its thirty-first meeting and also the vote of the Senate in ratification of this action of the Junior Colleges.
At a meeting of the University Senate, June 28, 1940, the Recorder reported the following:

The Recorder reported a vote of the section of the Junior College Faculty on the report of the Development of Propagation and Other Associated Areas, at the meeting of the University Senate, June 28, 1940, in which the development of Junior College instruction with an emphasis on junior college faculty, was taken up by vote of the members of the Senate.

At a meeting of the University Senate, June 28, 1940, the Recorder reported the following:

The Recorder reported a vote of the section of the Junior College Faculty on the report of the Development of Propagation and Other Associated Areas, at the meeting of the University Senate, June 28, 1940, in which the development of Junior College instruction with an emphasis on junior college faculty, was taken up by vote of the members of the Senate.
It was moved that the Congregation approve of this action of the Junior College Faculty and this motion was carried by a vote of 21 aye and 23 nay.

[Signature]

[Recording]
If we may refer the Congregational students of this section
of the Junior College Faculty and this section was created by a
vote of 25 to 25. See also...
Social Vivisection.

The idea of society as of vital organism with a common life and co-ordinate organs, an injury to any one of which is an injury to the whole, a violation to one part is a violation to every part, is one of the great generalizations of Herbert Spencer. It is a truth which only enters feebly into the thinking, and still more feebly into the acting of even intelligent men. Even those who assume to be public spirited, to be guardians of public interest, and promoters of public good are found on the slightest provocation retreating behind the defense of the barbarian, viz., the defense of his own interests; or, as he puts it, "The right of doing as he pleases with his own."

Not only in the industrial world are great combinations and vast aggregations of capital slow to recognize the rights of the public in these aggregations, but even in educational and religious institutions there still remains a large degree of that medieval assumption that such institutions exist for but not by society; that the management has supreme control, and that in the direction of such, the people, the public, have no right nor wisdom. All such assumptions rest on the greater assumption that the community is not vascular; that you can cut it and it will not bleed; you can stop the currents of its life and there will be no wound; or, if such violence be done, there will be no scar left.

The contrary is quite true. Society is not only full of blood vessels, but it is full of nerves, and to interfere with its growth, change or alter its normal development, is not dissection, the cutting up of dead matter, but vivisection, the violation of living tissue, which is always accompanied with pain and when visited upon normal tissue under normal conditions, is always cruel and detrimental.

Chicago has been visited during the last years by a series of painful social vivisections in its intellectual life. Hopeful saplings springing from seeds planted with care, watered with hopes and self-sacrifices, have been ruthlessly pulled up, transplanted or transformed in such a way as to leave permanent scars and many
“Chicago Tribune,” said: “We must recognize the importance of the newspapers. Even a job of enlightenment is a service to your town and country.”

Carnegie says that if he had Carnegie's A million men would have given away a good day's work, but a good day's work. A daily-papers make the place of all ages and ages that if Carnegie had done that he would have had a job to distribute.

The Daily Mirror is the title of a new daily that is to be issued by the faculties of the University of Chicago. It is the first of a series of newspapers that are to be issued, and the Association is said to be backed by the Association of Colored Educators.

We wonder if this policy board is a matter of co-ordination or co-operation education.

Memorial stones in the case of the Daily News building at Washington. Memorial stones are to be put up in the memory of the great and good from time to time, and various contributions to these living monuments have already been made.

A Pensions, N. Y., formerly, white business it is in the interest of white men to speak in words of the employees. These demands, in another time or century, because they had to be, but because of the increased cost of living to which one's employees have been subjected. Let others get paid the same as now as long as possible.

not published, even a president in the best sense of the word. He was a new professor, Professor of Social and Political Science in Columbia University. We wonder more universities do not have more use for the products of science. There is not much work to be done in the field of the social sciences. The problem is to find
disappointments. Even the humblest educational institution is something vastly more and other than walls of brick and mortar, books and machinery and endowments and professors. A school is a living thing with ancestry, traditions, hopes, and character quite its own. And sometimes the indirect ministry of this individual is worth even more than its direct ministrations.

Among some of these vivisections in the educational life of Chicago may be mentioned, first, the transformation which, so far as its individuality is concerned, obliterated the Manual Training School on Twelfth street, founded by the Commercial Club, planted near the heart of the city, endowed to a degree by the generosity of the dead, with a proud alumni and several hundred young men who were winning for themselves an honorable place in the world. But it was absorbed. The property was transferred to a board of trustees that will ever be "identical with the board of trustees of the University of Chicago." This year closes the life of this institution that was planted in a needy spot to do a definite work through indefinite time. There will be a Manual Training School hereafter on the Midway, five miles distant, under the management of the Chicago University. It will doubtless do good work, but there is one center of vitality lost to the educational life of Chicago.

Then came the disappointing death by transmigration of the School of Education, founded upon the gift of a million dollars or more from Mrs. Emmons Blaine, with the prophetic Colonel Parker at its head. Grounds were secured, plans were being matured, the North Side was feeling the inspiration of the new movement, when it was absorbed and transferred to the Midway, where again good work will be done. But some of the best things about that institution could not be carted away. Chicago lost another radiating center of culture.

This process of vivisection next showed itself in the elimination of the domestic sciences from the Armour Institute, to the disappointment of many progressive men and women. Then came the expulsion of girls altogether from that institution, with more disappointments of the same kind; and latterly, as we understand, the practical surrender of the individuality of the Armour Institute with all its hopeful traditions, and it becomes an educational annex to the University of Chicago; three or four miles away.
In all these annexations and affiliations there are undoubtedly certain economic advantages. But education is not primarily a thing of dollars and cents, and wherever individual energy, spiritual potency, the loves and the ambitions of the human heart, the radiating power of manhood, are sacrificed to an aggregation of money and a concentration of business, there is a spiritual loss. It is not true that one board of trustees can exert the vital energy and contribute the creative wisdom which four boards, wisely chosen and socially environed with traditions and hopes and generosities of their own could do.

Lastly in this list of social vivisections is the threatened radical change in the management of the University of Chicago, alluded to in our editorial of last week.

It has been a hot week on the campus. The public, just awaking to the far-reaching significance of the proposed “reform,” discussions of which and preparations to realize which have been going on inside the organization for several years, has shared in the anxiety and the discussion. The local press tardily has lent itself to the agitation, and although in its headlines and editorial comment it has largely reflected the assumption of the complacent members of the community, that the change is already assured and that whatever is desired by the president and the chief founder, John D. Rockefeller, will go through, and that “outsiders” have no right to meddle, already there is a reaction taking place, at least so far as to recognize the fact that there are no “outsiders” to such a vast question as this. Even a ten-years’ history such as the University of Chicago has written is public property; it has passed into the wealth of the world; it is a chapter of the intellectual history of humanity. And back of this lies the quarter of a century or more of history of the earlier university, whose alumni and alumnae, their purposes and spiritual investments the new university has inherited.

It is difficult at this writing to know where the question stands. The junior college faculty in executive session last Saturday voted nineteen to fourteen against the proposed change, the segregation of the young men and women during the first two years of their college life. Five members of the faculty thus voting were counted out by the president on a time test, which made the vote a tie, fourteen to fourteen, and the president cast the deciding vote in favor of the innovation. The university congregation voted 24 to 7 against segregation and the “senate,” a body representing the entire faculty, adjourned without voting.
...
However the action of these voting bodies and the utterances of the president may be interpreted, it is evident that the main question is still unclosed and that there is a large discussion, a far-reaching agitation still awaiting the ultimate settlement of co-education at the University of Chicago.

At this stage of the debate, we understand that the alleged million and a half which some unknown party had offered to build the new girls' quadrangle, is mythical. We have the president's assurance that no such sum has been promised. Again we have the assurance of the president that co-education will be guarded, and that young women electing it will be permitted the privileges of co-education as now interpreted; also the assurance that what might be called the accessories of co-education, which in certain stages of this discussion seem to have been mistaken for the essentials, viz., the social functions, the dances, the freedom of the campus, etc., etc., are not to be interfered with.

Underneath this confusion of details it is well to hold hard on to the fundamental question. Is the sex line to be drawn in the educational privileges of the Chicago University? It is overcrowded; new buildings are necessary; better and more dormitories for girls and boys are required; more class rooms and laboratories must be had, and we are told there is sufficient money forthcoming to provide for all these. The division of classes and multiplication of class rooms and professors are inevitable. The open question is whether the sex consideration is to enter into such division, and this is the question that has agitated the leading educators of America during the last half of the nineteenth century. It is a question which involves the future educational methods of Europe and America; it touches the educational institutions of Europe as well as of America, and educators are to be heard from.

Fitting, then, was the request for delay on the part of the protestants indicated in the letter given below. In future discussions it will be well to avoid the confusions of technicalities and the distractions of side issues. We repeat, the main question before the Chicago University today is whether it will introduce the sex line into its class room and chapel privileges. The following letter was placed in the hands of the president of the University of Chicago early Saturday morning: We do not know whether it was in time to enter into the deliberations of the junior faculty; but certainly it was in time for the "senate" on Monday, al-luded to above:
It has been a hot topic on the campus. The public, just awakening to the far-reaching significance of the proposed reform, discussions of which and preparations in advance, which have been going on inside the organization for several years, has shared in the anxiety and the discussion. The local press, doubtless, has lent itself to the agitation, and although it has, indeed, and editorial comment too, largely reflected the assumption of the compassionate members of the community, that the change is already assured and that whatever is desired by the president and the chief founder, John D. Rockefeller, will no doubt, and that "outsiders" have no right to meddle, already there is a reaction taking place, at least so far as to recognize the fact that there are no "outsiders" to such a vast question as this. Even a ten-years' history such as the University of Chicago has written is public property; it has passed into the wealth of the world; it is a chapter of the intellectual history of humanity. And back of this has the quarter of a century or more of history of the earlier universities.
Chicago, June 14, 1902.

W. R. Harper, Esq., President Chicago University, Chicago:

Dear Sir: I beg leave to call to your attention the following protest:

Chicago, June 12, 1902.

To the President and Trustees of the University of Chicago:

We, the undersigned, parents, friends and neighbors of the University of Chicago, would respectfully protest against the proposed segregation of the young men and women of the Junior College in separate quadrangles, class-rooms and chapels, as being a re-actionary movement in education, abandoning the essential elements in co-education at the age when co-education is most significant and important. We believe such a change would be in the nature of social vivisection, interrupting the natural development of the university, necessitating the rearranging of the plans of many parents, encroaching upon the rights of past graduates and benefactors of the University of Chicago and working serious disadvantage to its spiritual growth.

This protest has already been signed by over four hundred and fifty individuals, widely distributed. This list of names, representing as it does, representative men and women in many walks of life, gathered without any organized effort whatever by a few individuals in less than twelve hours, is, we believe, representative of a public sentiment both within and without college circles that deserves at your hands at least so much consideration as to avoid precipitate action. However much this matter may have been under discussion within official circles, it is very obvious to your petitioners that the public at large, many of the donors to the institution, as well as its alumni and alumnae, have not been aware of the agitation and are just now beginning to realize the far-reaching significance of the proposed change. "Co-ordinate education," whatever it may mean, is not the co-education for which progressive educators have struggled and suffered, and which has been the pride and hope of many of the friends of the University of Chicago, as well as the motive which has inspired, as we believe, many of the patrons and contributors.

In view of this fact, may we ask you to delay taking so important a step until further expression of the public mind may be reached, during which time this petition will be completed and submitted to your deliberate consideration.

Hoping for such delay as will give this matter the full discussion it deserves at the hands of educators at large and the public so much interested, I am

Very respectfully yours,

[Signed.] Bessie Bradwell Helmer.
It is difficult at this writing to know where the question stands. The junior college faculty in executive session last Sunday voted unanimously in support of a proposed change in the segregation of the senior men and women during the first two years of their college life. Five members of the faculty favoring were opposed out by the president on a roll vote, which made the vote a tie, so matters are in abeyance, and the president is in favor of the operation. The University congregation voted 21 to 7 against segregation and 21 for, a vote representing the younger generation.

However, the action of these young bodies and the attitude of the president may be interpreted, it is evident that the main question is still undecided and that there is a large discrimination, a vast exclusion, and a great injustice in not giving the women the same facilities as the men in the University of Chicago.

At this stage of the debate, we understand that the alleged million dollar subsidy has been restored, and that young men entering it will be permitted to receive the benefits of co-education. As such, the president, in his statement, has assumed that the University is the only institution to which it is necessary to have been admitted for the essentials, viz., the social functions, the training in the humanities, etc., and that the university, which is the only one that can be carried on in a practical way.

Unquestionably, the constitution of details it is well to hold firm on the fundamental question. Is the sex line to be drawn in the educational privileges of the Chicago University? If it is overcrowded, new buildings and other facilities must be better and more permanent for
CO-EDUCATION AT THE CHICAGO UNIVERSITY NOT SETTLED YET.

Notwithstanding the fact that the sensational headlines of the Chicago papers have assumed that the Harper plan of segregation was inevitable, and that even the Women's Journal, of Boston, has announced in its heading, "Co-education half abolished at the Chicago University," and notwithstanding the fact that since our last issue the question has been before the junior college faculty, and that after a long debate of two hours and a half, in which the President himself took active part, and that the vote in favor of the segregation plan was twenty-five to twenty-two, the question is yet very far from being a closed one. From the junior college it must go to the senate of the university, where it may carry, but not until after a determined vote and a clearing of the ground in many ways; then it may be thrown back into the "Congregation" of the university, the largest and most democratic advisory body, where it was defeated last week, twenty-four to seven. After that it must come before the board of trustees and they take action. Then the million and a half dollars must be found, and the ground must be bought, as we understand it. On President Harper's own estimate it will take two years of time to build the quadrangle, and then, if the President's declaration can be relied upon, it will be an elective matter and there will be some girls of sufficient serious purpose and heroic mold to take their stand and ask for co-education; which does not mean the privilege of dancing with young men members of the university, but the privileges of co-instruction at the hands of professors who do not teach feminine science and female mathematics, but rather Science and Mathematics.

But if all these should seem to fail the Chicago University, if it takes this backward step, has the twentieth century to reckon with.

Said one of the professors: "This is clearly a movement of aristocracy as opposed to democracy; it is wealth trying to establish its distinction." This is at bottom a question of democracy, and democracy is to win out.

Indeed, there is not much comfort in the votes already taken to those who consciously or unconsciously would deal a fell, though not a fatal blow, to co-education, the painful though precious fruit of cen-
turries of evolution. The majority is not an imposing one when we remember that conservatism is a stolid element to deal with, and that there are always certain elements that ally themselves with the administration, whatever that may be, and that the personal power of President Harper has, up to this point, been considered almost imperial on the campus.

And still, any one knowing the personality of the faculty realizes how preponderating is the weight of character on the side of co-education. On this side in the junior faculty alone, five deans, representing the administrative power of the university, are opposed to change. And among those who are waging a determined war against this reactionary movement are men, most of whom have not only national, but international fame in their respective departments. Co-education has everything to hope for when it is so valiantly championed by such men as Professors Chamberlain, Coulter, Hale, Laughlin, Dewey, Taitts, Cutting, Shorey, Salisbury, Tarbell, Galusha Anderson, Henderson, Owen, Angel, Hatfield, Thompson, Triggs, all the women members of the faculty and the administration, and many others. There are many prominent and influential men and women on the campus who have decided convictions on this question who have no vote in any of these advisory bodies, but who, together with the spirited alumni and the young women in the undergraduate departments, as well as the intelligent and progressive educators and friends of education in America and Europe, are to be reckoned with before this question is closed. The following communication was promptly signed and forwarded to the proper authorities immediately after a vote of the junior faculty:

“To the president and to the members of the junior college faculty:

“We, the undersigned women, officers of instruction and administration in the University of Chicago, but without a vote in the junior college faculty, desire hereby to express our opinion that the proposed separation of men and women in the classes of the junior college is not called for by any existing conditions, and would be detrimental to the best interests of both the men and the women in the university, as well as to the general interests of education throughout the country.”
This protest was signed by the following:
Sophonisba Breckinridge, Anna S. Packer,
Clara Comstock, Cora B. Perrine,
Zella Allen Dixson, Maude L. Radford,
Frances Knox, Amy E. Tanner,
Florence Lyon, Ella F. Young.

As we said in our last issue, this is not a local question over which the trustees of the Chicago University have moral, though they may have legal, jurisdiction. It is a time for all friends of progressive education to express themselves. Those wishing to lend a hand will do well to communicate with those who are trying to discover "public opinion on the matter. Let their protests be sent directly to the President, and let the public know the nature and character of these protests.

The shocking death of Dean J. B. Johnson.
Co-Education Threatened at the University of Chicago.

So quietly and skillfully has the agitation been conducted inside of the University management that the general public has scarcely heard of, much less realized, the far-reaching significance of a movement which, if successful, will practically be an abandonment of the principle of co-education in the Junior College departments of the Chicago University.

Co-education in academy, college and university is a dearly bought triumph, as many think, in the educational world. So far as state universities and most of the modern established colleges in America are concerned, it is a closed question. The triumphs of Horace Mann at Antioch, of Finney at Oberlin, the forethought of the founders of Cornell University, the Leland Stanford, and we think all of the State Universities in America, would seem to be conclusive in this matter.

Yet it is but fair to say that the traditions of the older universities in Europe and America and the convictions of many men and women in the educational world still look upon the principle with distrust and perhaps regard the practice as still experimental. There are no “closed questions” to the philosopher and to the believer in progress. If the management of the Chicago University proposes to open anew this question it is its right and privilege so to do. But let it be opened upon its merits, and let the public, who have so much interest in this University and still more boundless interest in the right education of both men and women, fully realize the far-reaching significance of the movement. However the University was founded, and wherever the management is placed, the public has vested rights in such an institution. The management holds in trust not only the bequests of many individuals, some of whom are already dead, but the tender associations of a long line of alumni and alumnæ. And all these have a right to object to the surrender of a vantage gained, without at least a thorough publication of the facts that lead to it; and, if need be, a thorough sifting of the rights of the dead and the living in this matter before the highest tribunals of justice provided by law.
In the course of evolution there is no more philosophical difficulty in man's acquiring immortal life than his acquiring the erect posture and articulate speech.

—John Fishr.
The plan, as we understand it, is to construct separate quadrangles on remote sections of the University grounds or on new grounds to be acquired, where the young men and young women of the Junior College will be segregated, in separate class rooms, recitation rooms, and general assemblies. During these two years the co-education will then consist chiefly in the fact that they pay their fees into a common treasury, receive instructions from the same teachers, and that they hurrah for the same flags. This may be a good way, but it is not co-education, and it is better to avoid any sophistry in the matter. If girls and boys are to be isolated one from the other during these study years their parents may prefer to choose an isolation still more effective, that which has the advantage of clear-cut frankness, philosophic consistency, an unmixed tradition, and an unclouded title.

Behind all this movement there is the insidious promise of a million and a half or more dollars to build "model dormitories" and to make beautiful surroundings. But money does not make universities, though in these days universities may not be built without money. And there is a principle here involved for which many men and women have sacrificed and suffered and for the blurring of which no millions will atone.

We have reason to believe that this movement is further advanced than the public realizes, and that even in these days a vote is possible which may precipitate this, to many minds, grave reactionary movement. Let not this thing be done without such protest and publicity before the act as may save much strain and perhaps scandal after the act.

Let not the real thing be hid by any innocent sounding phrases, or the pedagogical problem be evaded by simply calling it an "administrative" one.

We do not propose in this issue to consider the merits of the arguments urged either for or against the movement. We simply call for that publicity which here, as in all other realms of public interest, is so sanitary.

Let the friends of co-education be on the alert; let them know what it is that is proposed, and why the proposition is made.

We have refrained from speaking of this matter until we were persuaded that it is a living issue, a pending change of vast significance. This is not a woman's question. The future quality and character of the education provided for boys as well as for girls is here involved. Let fathers and mothers look into it.
The Rev. Dr. Thomas, of the Lincoln Park Congregational Church of Chicago, had a seer's word to say last Sunday concerning woman's place and influence in the religious world. It was a plain and vivid word that he said concerning the men and their attitude to the religious education of their own children. It will become the magician's magic to raise at the fact that the churches are largely attended by women. Dr. Thomas well says, "Where are the men on these Sundays?" and answers, "Go to the baseball parks, the golf links, or perhaps the clubs." It is hard to demand an accounting of the masculine influence in these directions. Said the preacher, "Think of the dead List that the women have against the man's example, which substitutes their lessons and influences all the children's training of personal heroism and civic duty. It is a war that will never be defeated until man shall woman both engage in it, the men fathered, as well as the women mothered, of the desire and teaching of the Lord's command."

And now it is the dead, minister, other and Presbyterian "theological" that has brought the example of Harvard and Yale in breaking with the time-honored traditions that the president of a great university must be a minister. There is every reason to believe that under the head of a Layman, Peck, Woodrow Wilson, Princeton will realize the true life that has gone to Harvard and Yale under their lay presidents. This is one of the most enduring and noblest features of interest in the.
Here is a question for teachers, women's clubs, the religious conventions, and all associations related to human progress and public weal, to take hold of. If anything is to be done in the way of holding up the hands of the clear-sighted men and women in and outside of the University faculty and management who believe that co-education, thorough, consistent and unflinching, is worth maintaining, let it be done quickly, done intelligently, and done efficiently.

Unity would promote publicity and invite expression on this question, which has vastly wider significance than the policy of the University of Chicago, immeasurable as is the significance in this direction.
The third law was that permanent scepticism was the greatest factor in progress. This is partly true and partly untrue. When scepticism means a condition of doubt until proof be established, it is the truth that cannot be made false, but a test-proof should not involve a drawback, and the law is hence.

The fourth law defined the difference of results between the deductive and inductive methods of reasoning, and was illustrated with marvelous skill from the histories of England, Scotland, and Spain. The text flower contained awe-struck wonder.
President W. R. Harper,
The University.

Dear President Harper:—

I return herewith the documents relative to the equipment of the physiography work in Lexington Hall. In response to the query as to why the separation of men and women should not take place, I have to say, that the principal difficulty in the way of carrying out the separation is the expense. To separate the sections regularly would mean to provide more instruction than is now provided. It would mean six classes per year instead of four or five, as now. Sections are not duplicated during all Quarters at present. If the money for the additional instruction can be provided, and if suitable quarters in Lexington can be provided, there is nothing to stand in the way of the division.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

(Enclosure)
President W. R. Harper
The University

Dear President Harper:

I return herewith the comments relative to the employment of
the professorship work in Psychology Hall. In response to the query
of the personnel of men and women who do not take place, I have
in mind the expectation of men and women who are not members of
the faculty. I am not aware of the number or quality of the
personnel in the department. To separate the personnel in the
department, to provide more information than I have received. I would
mean to introduce you to Mr. John B. Clark, now a member of
the department.

The statement concerning the officers of the department
not being affected by the reorganization can be misleading, and it
would be desirable to know if the statement of the
employment of the officers can be misleading. These are nothing to refer to in the way
of the division.

Very truly yours,

(Signature)
Aug. 11th, 1902.

Miss Alice M. Smith,
324 No. C St., Tacoma, Wash.

My dear Madam:—

Your recent letter which I have just received is based on a misunderstanding of the situation. The University has no thought of taking any step which is backward, or any step which does not give women the fullest opportunity.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
My dear Mr. Smith,

Your recent letter which I have just received has drawn my attention to the serious problem of the unemployment in the University and in the town. It is a matter of great concern not only to the women but also to the men.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Hunter
By request of the President and by the direction of the Board of Trustees, I send to each member of the Board the enclosed letters, written by members of the Senate, on the following question:

"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?"

Some of the Senators particularly desired to communicate their views to the Trustees, and the President asked a written vote therefore, from all.

So far as received, these are enclosed. All of the members of the Senate are represented with the exception of three or four, who are absent.

Yours truly,

T. W. Goodspeed

Secretary.
October 30, 1902.

Mr. P. J. Farnsworth, M. D.
Clinton, Ill.

My dear Sir:

I am in receipt of your letter of October 21st and desire to thank you for the kind words which it contains.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
October 30, 1908

MR. F. T. L. EJONDERSEN, E.I.T.

Diploma, 1907

My dear Sir:

I am very grateful for your letter of October 26th and would like to express my gratitude for the kind words which it contains.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Hedge
Clinton, Oct. 21, 1902

Dear Sir,

Allow me to present my very humble estimate to congratulate you on the site of 'Deagregation.' It is an advance movement, which will be followed by many other institutions. As the world is observed by many enlightened teachers everywhere. Co-education is used in common and high schools up to a certain age and then the step for a time should be separation. The health and morals of the boys are often impaired as I have often seen from a physician's standpoint and many promising scholars reduced to common places.

It reflects itself in the first years of the college course.

In 1970, in connection with the required number of colleges, we opened a Medical Department of the State University of Iowa. For our first class we had 60 students. Avoiding themselves of a law of the University, that no distinction should be made in any department of arts or college 12 of them were women. Michigan was wrestling with the question and thus decided to put a condition in such lecture rooms to divide the sex. Our accommodations were cramped, we could not do that. So, both council together and came to this conclusion.

The study of medicine admits of no division. A Medical College
Dear [Name],

I am writing to convey the news that I am considering a new opportunity in [Field]. After much thought and discussion with [亲人/朋友], I believe that [公司/机构] could offer a promising career path.

The company has a reputation for innovation and excellence, and I am particularly interested in its [具体部门/项目/产品]. I have been impressed by [项目/产品/团队] and believe that my skills would be well-suited to contribute to the team.

I am eager to learn more about the opportunities available and to discuss how I might contribute to the company's goals. I am available for an interview at your convenience and would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
It is a mixed institution and its instruction adapted only to men. If these women are capable of taking a man's course they shall have every facility. We will endue them with the same treatment from fellow-students and on our part we will refrain from all ribaldry such as was common in all medical schools of that day. Some of our men have desired this clause. It took a very half the age of lecturing.

We adhered to our plan our class was as orderly and attentive as a high school. It civilized the rough body and the professors. When it came time for dissection we selected a body and a class of five women were carefully put together in a room by themselves. After the second year coming the class came to us when wished to be put into the common room.

It was more cheerful once they could be of mutual help.

Of course in paroxysm it asked after that it occurred times happened that two women and three men worked all the same subject. Some of these women were the best students we knew and the most enterprising dissectors.

Particulars entirely, the next year only four or five came back to take their degrees. Since then five or six have made their entrance each year. Mutual cost, likewise women. We have graduated in 80 years probably 100. I can count on my fingers all who have made anything like a success in practice. Women make good medical students but are generally as practitioners.

The academical department did not fare as well. It
Encourage a large class of girls. Those principal business was fulcrums. Deeds Committee of promising boys contracting large debts for lavish and extravagant bills, until they gathered from them away in disgrace of late Penn. In some time all the women in charge of a Matron.

You are right—regret than for a year or more, by that time the glorious owe will drift out, and the angry critics become cool and generous rivals of the boys in their desire for instruction. For from time immemorial a college has been a man institution and if women are admitted they come for a man's education. Give them every chance, only a limited number are capable of it. The best should go to women's institution.

Excuse a homely illustration. When we work horses and horses together we masculinize the horses. If you encourage education to too great an extent you must at least masculinize the course of study. I repeat—a university, a college, a medical school, and all for the education of men. And if women come they come for a man's course of education.

End of informalities. I am just recovering from a long fit of sickness and this is a relief from the taxation of a long day of convalescence.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

P.S. [Signature]
Dear Miss Wescott:

Your favor of 26th inst. is at hand. The kindness from which you obtained your information has proved far from trustworthy. The statement in many cases are surely at variance with fact — fact, the evidence for which does not depend on the assertions of any one person, but which may easily be ascertained by any one who cares to know the truth.

As you were misled into publishing to the alumnae a series of misstatements calculated to put the President of the University in a false light, I thought you would be glad to make the correction yourself. Do this to the best of your ability, I should like the matter to receive proper attention.

Very truly yours,
Chicago, June 5, 1903

My dear President Harper:

It may be of interest to you to know how the plan of giving separate instruction to young men and women in the Junior College impresses one when actually put into practice.

The results of it in a class of young women who are just finishing the Autumn's work have seemed to me admirable, and, if one's impressions are confirmed by future experience, will show the wisdom of the University in adopting the new policy. One of the great improvements lies in the fact that an instructor succeeds now in getting the attention of a class at the beginning of the hour and in holding it to the end. Those of us who taught mixed classes of Junior College students under the old system were aware of the fact that it required some effort and considerable time to bring their minds down to the subject in hand at the beginning of the hour, and to hold them when the hour was nearing...
an end. This state of affairs appeared to be due largely to the fact that the young men and women gathered in the corridors of Cobb Lecture Hall, and became so engrossed in their conversations with one another that it was hard to get their full attention. The same difficulty was likely to arise toward the end of the hour when the social element was again coming to the surface in their thoughts. With the separate building which we now have, the work of the hour becomes effective from the outset.

Even a more important matter is the fact that the element of self-consciousness, which is a disturbing factor in mixed classes of young people, seems to disappear when young women are alone. Little is said or done by individual students for display, and they address themselves freely without showing that constraint which the presence of members of the other sex seems sometimes to impose. This difference is especially noticeable when one tries to get them to thinking or to draw out their ideas on a subject which is essentially new to them. Under the present arrangement they do not seem to feel either a desire to do something which will distinguish them in the eyes of the others,
or a morbid dread of being laughed at, but they are more simple and natural and more likely to state their real ideas or feelings on the point under discussion.

The subject of the course has been the Odes of Horace. It has been given every year from the beginning, and hitherto the classes have been made up of students of both sexes, so that the test has been a very good one. I might also say that I was abroad last year and had no part in discussing the question of separate instruction, and so entered the work at the beginning of the quarter without having had any opinions fixed in favor of the one or the other method by active participation in debate.

Faithfully yours,

Frank F. Abbott
The students of Chicago

The University of Chicago

Dear Professor,

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to you to express my gratitude for the opportunity to study under your guidance. Your lectures have been invaluable, and I have learned so much from you.

I am currently working on my thesis, and I am finding the process to be quite challenging. However, I am determined to see it through to the end. I would appreciate any advice or guidance you could offer me.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
Here are some of the things I have written but only a special reason for writing to you is to ask that question I beg you to write for another year for final action. I do not believe that such an important step should be taken without at least a year for its consideration. If I have expressed my opinion too strongly I hope you will pardon me. I do not know any other way to make this time I have to think. I believe the statement. The facts, but I think I strained the truth. Beyond a doubt your sincere.

Dr. Sarah Hackett Stevenson
Venetian Building
Chicago

Hours 11 to 1
Office Telephone, Central 1533
Residence Telephone, North 1286

July 24, 1902

My dear Dr. Harper,

I believe I know how to write you, but I must in some way express my great surprise and thank you for the attitude of the University, we express to the question of education. I know that disappointment because I hope for the greatest respect forever. O rather for your life than, because of the assurances you have
Given me from time to time. I am not dry that it would have been much better for women in the university. Need never opened its doors to them. It distinctly says to the nurses that women have never tried and found wanting. The question I should like answered is, in what are they found wanting? Women have given to the world most generously, and I think unwise to turn help to the woman club to give a large...
An education which is now open to them. The intellectual advantages of coeducation are not all in the girls' side, but these advantages exist in fuller measure at Chicago University than they do here. Then an other place where the girls have an equal chance with the boys, but there is no other place where that equal chance is as good as here. After teaching three years in one of the schools that prepare for the university. I knew something of the great difficulties to overcome in co-education.
administration which I
know is now pending at
the university.
It seems to me that the
reformation of men and women
in the undergraduate depart-
ment would be a fateful
step in education that could
never be wholly reversed.
As I see it, the two greatest
evils which would result are
these:

1st. The university would
cease to be the leading univer-
sity of its class. Now, we may
Whether it would be better for the university to stand first among whole heartedly coeducational institutions or second among the half heartedly coeducational might it be a true question in some communities. But in New, democratic Chicago - and in the West generally - when the mass of people think wise, heartily in coeducation, this loss of prestige would be a real calamity.

The second evil is that the girls of our country would lose the real opportunity for education in general, and in Chicago University in particular. I fear that I cannot face my conscience severely if I keep silence in the question.
Hotel del Prado
Hyde Park,
June 29, 1897.

President W. R. Harper:

My Dear President Harper,

I only arrived in this city
last night after a stay at
Ann Arbor and have
therefore only just received
your letter of June 24. I
have taken up my quarters
in this Hotel which was
recommended to me by
Your dinner tomorrow evening if my acceptance of your invitation is not so late as to have caused you to make other arrangements.

Believe me to be,

Very truly yours,

H. More Stephens

Professor Judson, and thank you all for your comfortable. Mr. Judson was kind enough to call last night and to answer the various questions I had to make as to my work during the coming term. I am a little weary today but hope to call upon you tomorrow. I shall be very glad to speak at
June 30, 1907

My dear President:

I had meant to come to the meeting of the Congregational Council today, to move that the question about the teaching of women in separate classes be erased from the list. It seems to me very desirable that this be done, but I am
in no condition to go. The cruel strain of these last weeks, and the heat, which always overcomes me, make it necessary for me to concentrate my work upon the things which I still have in any case, to do. I am not quite ready to finish life yet. I am sorry I hear a rumor that you

may not take the rest which your physicians and friends agree you need.

Faithfully yours,

Mrs. Hale

I hope you will get some one to make the motions which I was to make.
either of the types, but Pasadena and Los Angeles I must tell by school men that the sentiment for change in structure is growing on all sides. The greatest interest was expressed in the plan of a quadrangle of small colleges at Chicago, which some will try has come here.

In the whole our experiments, notwithstanding the "storm and stress," seem to be suggestive.

I start tomorrow for Oregon. Besides visiting Seattle, Walla Walla, and the eight secondary schools and learned about various "allies," etc.
Virtual professors vie after
Amherst are dividing their
classes in the best line.
Gayley is prominent in
the matter, and others are
following. As I see to me,
"relegation" is coming there
by a process of nature.

In Leland Stanford
the fix limit is put likely
to be extended. It is sug-
gested here and there that
in time Stanford may
be restricted to men. I do
not believe that this is
likely. But the peculiar
peculiarity limitation seems
fixed.

Mills College, on which
I shone have a degree

Report on my return, is an
institution for women, which
is desired to make the
Spirit of Wellesley, and the
true strong people are
interested in it. And the
trustees have entered in a
campaign for an end-
owment of a million.
They are hopefuly success.

In San Francisco there
are three high schools; it
serves the manual training
school. For they high
schools are mixed; one
is a girls' school. It is
uniform of with parents to
send their daughters to
the latter. In fact there
are three girls in the girls'
high school there.
Dear Dr. Harper:

The following was the action taken Oct. 22, 1402.

The President of the University has authorized the preparation of a statement on the whole question of the separation of the schools in the junior college, for submission to the Committee on Instructions and Equipment for publication.

Yours truly,

T. W. Goodspeed

Chicago April 14, 1403
Chicago
Aug. 26, 1902.

Mr. Harry Pratt Judson
Dean of the Faculties
University of Chicago.

My dear Mr. Judson:—

Your communication of Aug. 14 has been received by me. The information given in the circular...
to which you referred was obtained from trust-
worthy sources. So far as
concerns your suggestion
that we communicate to
your view by means of
another circular, we beg
to say that that
could be done perhaps
My dear Sir,—

let not the President, who has done so much for the establishment of the Chicago University, feel the one to ask the hand of prayer, or to turn it back and on the dial of time.

The world needs more education and better education for both sexes, an education which shall teach them self-control and a regard for the rights of society.

It should be the business of all, especially with the higher institutions of learning, to develop the untamed free of faith, render such aid that the pupils shall be some useful citizens, to help evolution along—not stand in the way. They should stand for progress, for evolution, and for the study of natural law all of its manifestations, physical, mental, and their senses should be brought that the only limitations to study should be the financial or temper
individual and human limitations. They should be experimental stations for the professors as well as schools for the instruction of teachers and should not be failures if
should be the success of professors and the better methods which will
ensure a maximum success if the
instructed as well as to the instructors.

The question of limitation in the schools is a fixed and unjust
one. Indeed, throughout all natural
sexes interspersed from birth to death. It is the normal condition. Human
society alone violates this natural
order and arbitrarily fixes the
limits for the female sex to others.
The result has always been disaster
to the welfare of the whole humanity.
Inconceivable is it created and harms
protesting an abnormal sexual
impulse in its sex, especially in
the male portion of humanity; and
the abnormally developed sexual
impulse, fueled by an underdeveloped
selfish will often do disaster and
Crime where man is found.

In my practice as a physician, I find that the same serious questions are not the same with education, but the core-laying of the case, though it is less strongly marked in the female than in the male person of humanity.

Youth generates energy, "animal," in a sense of their physical needs, and the energy, if mis-directed, is a fertile source of evil, especially with the balance abnormally developed sex impulses, which in youth are concentrated by the intellect and judgment of more mature years.

Educated, in a properly conducted school and under normal conditions, utilizes these energies for the good of the individual. It creates an interest, an all-absorbing desire for knowledge of some sort, and, from this, it directs the mind away from dwelling upon sexual impulses. In the developing child in youth, this is an advantage that more than compensates for the physical vantages of the female.

It is true, every matter, according to their physical ability, to regulate the amount of work for any given period;
and, in a properly conducted school under normal conditions, the degree of permanent disability from work can be reduced practically nil.

I believe that it is far better for girls—and for society—to have their surplus energies expended in acquiring a higher education, because it trains the latent tendencies of their young lives in them to live the life of careful, exact and semi-scholasticwhich makes dependent unrest, sexual excitement, or unhealthfully train attendant into, it do I think that judiciously directed education is helful and painful in its results upon the health.

Again, in the home life, the under

Education makes the study of the home so much more easy endurable. If a woman has studied science she is gratified and interested to find that knowledge is applicable to home work lives; she becomes a veritable queen of the home. Jesus

She can command its peace, and that hatred in the unreasonable end that accomplishes a definite amount
In depriving woman any chance to promote her higher development, you will not only drink a Benediction upon yourself, chastely, but the nation. Must it all be filled by her fathers, brothers, children, husband, and society itself.

After all, why need you care if you do your full duty and give to your women students justice and equal opportunities in the University? Many do fail to acquire the high scholarship which we desire. Will社会发展

The graduate of that institution? Remember, the inherent, hereditary, mental training of countless years of the male student and the percentage of failures among them.
If the Chicago University does not train the minds and energies of its women students in the upper and evolutionary cycle it shall here serve a great purpose. Nor will its unfitness be transmittable to the children of these women.

Again, what matters it, so that the world's great work is ultimately done, whether it is man or woman who does it? All cannot do great work on the same scale, although all can do helpfully by the special education which makes such work possible. All physicians cannot be surgeons, yet the special knowledge of the surgeon is equally valuable to the physician in his practice.

By their work shall men and women be known, whether they be graduates of the Chicago or another university, whether man or the limitation of their sex. In school came empowerment; it can only fit to a perfect framework of itself. By limiting the possibilities of that institution, productivity, and ability, but the reverse.
You have established a world-wide reputation as the President of a great
university. For your own sake, for
the sake of woman, for the sake of
men in general, do not let your example go
vain as that of a man who was not
great enough to fulfill the requirements
of the high position which he had gained.
You have gathered together splendid
buildings and equipment, the nucleus
of a great university. Let it stand
for the highest development of the individual
male and female. Give all equal
opportunities and facilities, and then
select students, not the Eminent,
of having performed the full duty, for time
and the graduates think to add glory
to their Alma Mater and to the name
of the man who made such a university
possible. I am,
Very respectfully yours,
Alice D. White
To President Harper,
The Chicago University.
October 30th, 1908.

The Editor of the Independent,

130 Fulton St., New York.

My dear Sir:-

My attention is called to your editorial on "Segregated Chicago" in the Independent of October 25th. I am surprised to see The Independent basing an editorial upon an unverified press rumor. There has been no action whatever by the University with reference to the subject of co-education since the original action several years ago. Dean MacClintock did not state that the University of Chicago is carrying out plans for the immediate complete separation of the male and female students in all their work. No such plans are contemplated or ever have been contemplated. The erroneous press despatch which was a clear perversion of Mr. MacClintock's statement was corrected by the New York Evening Post of October 19th, the Boston Post of the same date and the Springfield Republican of October 23rd.

Very truly yours,

H. P. Judson
The text on the page is not legible due to the handwriting and conditions.
April 5, 1906

Registrar Chicago University,

Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

A lady whose daughter is now in Wellesley College made inquiry of me today as to conditions at Chicago University. I was unable to answer her questions fully, but undertook to find out from you what she wanted to know. She feels that the entirely feminine atmosphere at Wellesley is liable to have a narrowing tendency and is contemplating changing her daughter to a co-educational institution.

To what extent has the scheme of segregation of sexes been carried in Chicago University? Is it the plan to develop it further and if so, to what extent? Do the women's classes have the same teachers as the men's classes? Under what conditions do the women in your university find residence in the dormitories? What is the system of management of these dormitories, and how closely are the occupants of them looked after by faculty members? What is the nature of the social life in the dormitories? Is the atmosphere nominally democratic or really so? How many women's dormitories are there on the campus and how many women do they accommodate?

Information upon the above points will be much appreciated.

Very truly yours,

J. M. Donnen

4 dormitories
Capacity 22-22

Henry P. Chandler,
Secretary to the President
April 5, 1934

Registrar of Grinnell University

Ottawa, III.

Dear Sir:  

I am writing this letter to express my concern regarding the current situation at Wellesey College. I have been informed by a reliable source that the administration is planning to make significant changes to the curriculum and faculty composition. I am worried that these changes may negatively impact the overall quality of education at the institution.

It is important that Wellesey College maintain its reputation for academic excellence. I urge you to consider the potential consequences of these changes before proceeding. It is my hope that you will take the time to carefully evaluate the evidence and make an informed decision.

I remain available for any further discussion you may require.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
quarters or more of the courses which the University conducts. There is no plan to restrict it beyond the limitation in the Junior Colleges to which I have already referred. A reprint concerning this subject from the President's Decennial Report will perhaps serve to make clearer the reasons for our policy.

I enclose a diagram of rooms in the women's dormitories which will indicate our accommodations. The four halls, Beecher, Green, Kelly, and Foster, are all within one building but they are separated by partition walls so that the residents of each hall form a separate house under the general supervision of a member of the Faculties who is known as the House Head. In general the members of the various halls are self-governing. That is, they elect their committees and act on their own volition in giving receptions and entertainments and developing a house life. It is the judgment of almost everybody who has lived in the women's halls that the spirit is democratic, helpful, and home like.
discussed on more of the courses with the university.

There is no plan to return to the Fine art program. A report concerning fine art has been

forwarded to the President, with a request that the President's report will receive

such a large audience that the lecture on the women's

I enclose a list of room in the home to the women's

department which will include our accommodation.

The four halls, Seager, Green, Kelly, and House, are all within one building, but their management

by participation will be such that the residence of each

Hall forms a separate home under the General theme.

Halls form a separate home under the General theme.

An attempt to a member of the Faculties who is known as the Home Head. In General the members of the various

Halls the self-governing. That is they select

their committees and secure on their own action in

giving recognition and expressing sentiments and developing

a home life. In the judgment of staff

employees who feel there in the women's halls that

the spirit is democratic, helpful and home-like.
Chicago March 27th, 1903.

My dear Mr. Salisbury:

I endorse a statement from Mr. Vincent.

I had not understood that we were to equip the work in Lexington Hall. Will you tell me what is your idea about the matter?

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
The great K. M. Grandpa

I am a statement from the V. M. A.

I have not received your letter. I wrote to them and they wrote to me.

May 1941.

Yours ever, Frank.
November 1st, 1906.

The Editor,

The Times,

South Bend, Indiana.

My dear Sir:

In your issue of October 29th is an editorial commenting upon the press announcement that "The University of Chicago has decided to segregate the sexes. Hereafter there will be two separate institutions so far as class work is concerned." The University has not made any new announcement concerning separate instruction for men and women since 1902. The pamphlet which contains the reprint from the President's report in the Decennial Publications, Series 1, Volume 1, page 97, we forward to you. You will note that the young man who received at second hand the report of Dean MacClintock's remarks in the chapel assembly of Junior College women has failed to appreciate the significance of those remarks. Mr. MacClintock was merely explaining the system already in progress:
In your letter of October 28th...
that is, simply the desire of the University to offer separate instruction in the courses of the Junior Colleges to men and to women. At no time have we considered the separation of men and women in the upper classes of the University.

Ordinarily it is not our policy to correct statements of this sort in the daily press, but because of the character of your journal we know that the editorial has been written under a misapprehension. I am sure, therefore, that you will not permit the impression to go further abroad that the University of Chicago has abandoned the teaching of men and women together.

Yours very truly,

Secretary to the President.
that the majority of the faculty of the University to other educational institutions of the same class of
Jenner College to men and to women. At no time
have we contended the superiority of men and women
in the upper classes of the University.

At present it is not our business to connect
statements of this sort to the faculty, but
acceptance of the proposition of yourフォン,t we know
that these matters have been written under a
supervision. I am sure, therefore, that you will
not deem it improper to go farther along the
path of the University of Chicago and emphasize the
teaching of men and women together.

Yours, very truly,

Secretary to the President.
Stanton became a full-fledged Republican and was intensely hated by certain type of Democrats.

The University of Chicago has decided to segregate the sexes. Hereafter there will be two separate institutions so far as class work is concerned. The promise is that they shall be in every respect equal as to opportunities for instruction and culture. The educational world will await the result with interest. In the eastern universities where separate instruction has been provided, the facilities for the women have not been equal to those for men, and even in co-educational institutions the prejudices of professors have often made the path of the girl student more difficult than that of the boy.

Conservative England was shocked by the presence of over 100 determined women suffragists at the re-opening of parliament. They thronged the lobby, button-holing and haranguing
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BILL JOHNSON'S GRIN.
Dec. 17, 1904.

President Harper,

My dear Dr. Harper:-

I have investigated the question which you raised concerning the attendance of men in classes in Lexington Hall.

I find that three men have been attending German 2 under Mr. Schutze. The circumstances under which this occurred will be explained to you by Mr. Judson to whom I am referring the correspondence.

Sincerely yours,

V.

Dean.
Dec. 14, 1900

President Harper:

My dear Dr. Harper:

I have investigated the question with
you regarding concerning the attendance of men in classes in Lexington,

I find that three men have been attended by German S. number
Mr. Scovette, the circumstances under which this occurred will
be explained to you by Mr. Jaggar to whom I am referring the

Sincerely yours,

Dean
My dear Mr. Vincent:

Are men going to classes in Lexington Hall? Some one has made the statement concerning Schutze.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

My dear President:

This was a mere blunder. In some way after the separate sections were consolidated, although it was intended to transfer the class to Cobb it remained in Lexington. Shall look into shortly for that.
CHICAGO March 4th, 1903.

My Dear Mr. Judson:

I send to you the enclosed proposal for the equipment for Physiography in Lexington Hall. I do not know with whom this should be filed. I have been unable to find out just who is administering the appropriation for that building.

Yours sincerely,

George E. Vincent.

Dean.
## I. Maps and Globes

| Item Description                                                                 | Price
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) 200 U. S. topographic maps</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounting</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 1 set Rand &amp; McNally's physical maps of the continents, including one map of the world</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 1 mercator's map of the world</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 1 outline map of the U.S. on blackboard cloth</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Relief globe</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) 1 12-inch slated globe</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) 1 6-inch globe</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) 25 Coast Survey charts</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) 1 relief model of the U.S.</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) 25 U. S. folios</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Mississippi river charts</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. Reference Books

| Item Description                                                                 | Price
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 copies &quot;Physical Geology&quot;, Jukes-Brown</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 copies &quot;Physiography of the U.S.&quot;</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 copies &quot;Earth Sculpture&quot;, James Geikie</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 copies &quot;Rivers of North America&quot;, Russell</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 copies &quot;Lakes of North America&quot;, Russell</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Glaciers of North America&quot;, Russell</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Volcanoes of North America&quot;, Russell</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Textbook on Geology&quot;, A. Geikie</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Manual of Geology&quot;, Dana</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Elements of Geology&quot;, Le Conte</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 copies &quot;Geology&quot;, Brigham</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Realm of Nature&quot;, Mill</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Nature and Man in America&quot;, Shaler</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Aspects of the Earth&quot;, Shaler</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Sea and Land&quot;, Shaler</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 copies &quot;Elementary Meteorology&quot;, Davis</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Great Ice Age&quot;, Geikie</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 copies &quot;International Geography&quot;, Mill</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 copies &quot;A Commercial Geography&quot;, Adams</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 copies &quot;Thalassa&quot;, Wyld</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Exercises in Meteorology&quot;, D.C. Ward</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy Century atlas</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy Berghaus' Physikalisches Atlas</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 copy &quot;Volcanoes&quot;, Judd</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Popular Astronomy, Flammarion</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot;Depths of the Sea&quot;, Thompson</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot;Island Life&quot;, Wallace</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200 U. &amp; Japanese maps--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Original scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I set 134,000 &amp; World's largest maps of the continents, including one map of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3) I outline map of the U.S. on tracing paper only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4) I outline map of the U.S. on tracing paper only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5) I outline map of the U.S. on tracing paper only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6) Pictorial globe--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7) 12-part atlas globe--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>8) 25 Great Survey Charts--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>9) I relief model of the U.S., with topographical features--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10) I relief model of the U.S., with topographical features--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>II) Miscellaneous pictures--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>II) Miscellaneous pictures--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>II) Miscellaneous pictures--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>II) Miscellaneous pictures--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>II) Miscellaneous pictures--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>II) Miscellaneous pictures--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>II) Miscellaneous pictures--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>II) Miscellaneous pictures--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>II) Miscellaneous pictures--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>II) Miscellaneous pictures--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reference books. (continued)

1 copy "Structure of Coral Reefs", Darwin, 2.00
1 copy "Forms of Water", Tyndall--------- 1.00
1 copy "Earthquakes", Milne---------------- 1.00
1 copy "Tides", Darwin---------------------

Periodicals.

Meteorological chart of Great Lakes-monthly.
1 copy National Geographic Magazine, Washington, 2.00
1 copy Journal of Geography, New York------ 2.00
1 copy Journal of Geology, Chicago-------- 3.00
1 copy Monthly Weather Review-------------

Survey publications.

3 copies "Physical Geography of New Jersey", Salisbury-- 3.00
3 copies "Bull.VIII, Wisconsin", Fenneman---- 1.50
1 copy "Mono.I, Lake Bonneville", U.S. Geol. Surv. 1.50
3 copies "Glacial Geology of New Jersey", Vol.V, Salisbury-- 1.25
1 copy "Mono.XXVIII, Illinois Glacial Lobe", U.S. Geol. Surv. 1.60
1 copy "Mono.XLI, Erie and Ohio Basin", 1.75

Other equipment.

1) Rock specimens for laboratory work------ 20.00
2) 1 lantern----------------------------- 100.00
3) Photographs-------------------------- 100.00

Statement.

The above affords a meagre equipment for Physiology.

It presumes on the use of the models in Walker Museum, and on the use of lantern slides from the Department of Geology. It does not make provision for general Geology, the equipment for which would be much more expensive. The list of books has been made short, and does not include all our students now use. The duplicates and triplicates are necessary.

The above equipment will need to be duplicated in the men's building when this work is given in a separate building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra geologic reports, New York State, General Geology of New York</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Nevada, California, General Geology of California</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana, Geologic Atlas, Volume I, Geology of Montana</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont, Geology of Vermont, Volume II, Geology of Vermont</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona, General Geology of Arizona</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California, General Geology of Baja California</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Rock exposures for laboratory work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. If available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. If not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement:
The scope of the needs of the Department for information on the geology of the western United States is so large and the need for such information is so great that the Department of the Interior must provide for the acquisition of the necessary materials. The fact that we have been able to meet these needs is due to the efficient and effective work of the staff of the Geology Division.

The need for such information continues to grow and it is necessary to provide for its acquisition in the future.

[Continued]
November 9th, 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 in the plan. The question of extending separate instruction in the colleges beyond the first two years has never been considered by any faculty of the University. The plan as adopted in 1903 is the plan which is now being carried out and the whole subject with us is regarded as a closed incident.

In the editorial to which I referred not merely was
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
the University criticisms on the pace of an unmitigated press campaign which carries us into the potential consequences of the invasion. It seems to me under these circumstances that if the Ingbemgbeut were to make a statement showing our beach on the effect that the abortive efforts were based on a misinterpretation. I have no doubt that the Ingbemgbeut's gesture to be unilaterally clear and that a suitable correction will be made.

Very truly yours,

H.R. Jacob
New York, Nov. 2, 1906.

Professor Harry Pratt,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ills.

My Dear Sir:-

We received your letter in regard to our editorial on the University of Chicago and also letters from Professor Shailer Matthews and Professor Albion W. Small.

The immediate cause of the editorial to which you object was the report which was published in the Chicago and New York papers, and editorially commented upon by them, stating that complete segregation was the ultimate aim of the plans now being carried out.

We are aware of the fact that newspaper accounts of the doings of the University of Chicago are especially apt to be erroneous, but in this case the item purported to give Professor McClinton's words in literal quotation, and they were not so inconsistent with what we knew of the general tendency of the University that we had any reason to doubt them. The editorial was in press before we saw any denial of the report.

I assure you that we desire to be perfectly fair to the University of Chicago, and in order to set the matter right before our readers, I should like to get an article on the situation, stating how far segregation has been carried out, its results, and especially what the future policy of the institution in regard to co-education will be. We could devote three pages to such an article, about 2500 words, and could use two or three photographs or plans of the new buildings in the Woman's Quadrangle, etc., if convenient. Perhaps it would be well to have Professor McClinton write the article, as he was the one who made the remarks that were misconstrued, but we should be equally pleased to have you or anyone else in authority write it. I assure you that there are many others who are as much in the dark as we were in regard to the real attitude of the University of Chicago on this question, and this will be a good opportunity to clear up the matter in the minds of the public. We have received several expressions of approval of our editorial from people formerly of the University of Chicago, and no doubt they will be as pleased as we are to learn that conditions are not so bad as they think.

I thank you for writing us in regard to the matter and for the confidence you express in the willingness of THE INDEPENDENT to correct any false impressions it may have given.

Yours very truly,

Hamilton Hoct
Managing Editor.

P.S. I have written a similar reply to Professor Matthews and Albion Small.
Chicago. January 30th, 1904.

My dear Mr. Salisbury:-

I am sending you certain material which came to me March 31st, 1903. Is there anything in this which we ought to take up at the present time?

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

[Additional notes crossed out]
March 26th, 1903.

Miss Gertrude S. Cathcart,
Whittier Hall, 1230 Amsterdam Ave.,
New York City.

Dear Madam:—

I take pleasure in sending you a copy of the official statement of the University regarding separate instruction for men and women.

Yours truly,

W. R. Harper
Dear Sir Francis W. Shepardson,
Secretary to the President.

Would you kindly let me know where I may get a statement of President Harper's reasons for his recent action, by which I believe the men and women of the University are separated in their work during the Freshman and Sophomore
Years of the college course.

A statement of this kind, which thus far I have been unable to find, would greatly help me in my study of the subject of Co-education.

Very sincerely yours,

Gertrude C. Calvert

March 24, 1903.
January 5, 1903.

President A. S. Draper,

University of Illinois,

Champaign, Ill.

My dear Mr. Draper:—

I am much obliged to you for the sheets which you have sent me. I think, when you come to appreciate our situation here at Chicago that you will agree with me that we have taken a step which was necessary and which was fully justified by the circumstances.

It is exceedingly easy to discuss matters from a theoretical point of view. Some matters have to be settled from a practical point of view. This is one of them.

I am trying to reduce the amount of my outside work, and this, together with the uncertainty of my being in the country during the next few months, made me give up my lecture in Boston.

Hoping that I may see you soon, I remain,

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
January 2, 1903

Clerk.

Hon. Mr. McPhee:

I am much obliged to you for the service which you have done me. I think you now come to appreciate our point of view. Some matters here to be settled from a practical point of view. This is one of them. I am trying to reduce the amount of my outside work, and this together with the uncertainty of my health in the coming winter, this hope that I may see you soon. I remain, yours very truly,

W.R. Halsey
Champaign, Illinois
December 29, 1902

President William R. Harper
University of Chicago
CHICAGO
Illinois

My dear President Harper:

I received your letter with enclosure this morning. Your statement is certainly very elaborate, and I think conclusive, upon the point that the university is not going back on the principle of co-education very decisively. I cannot help wondering that you have done anything upon what seems to me so slight reason. However, you know much more about that than I do.

My address was finished last week. I was obliged to modify it some, and have done so today. I send you the second copy of the only parts that relate to you or your university. You will find those parts within the green marks. I have had no reason to pitch into you, but of course I must say something in reference to your action.

I am very sorry that you are not to make the address in Boston. Why is it? Are you going out of the country?

With best regards,

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

O.F.S.
1 enclosure

[Handwritten note: You need not return this enclosed sheet. I am sorry that we must separate a little—only a little.]
December 20, 1902.

President A. S. Draper,
University of Illinois,
Champaign, Ill.

My dear Dr. Draper:

I am enclosing uncorrected proof sheets on "Segregation". This, I think, will give you all you desire.

I have declined to discuss the subject of "Co-education" before the Twentieth Century Club of Boston. So you can "pitch into" me all you desire. I shall not have a chance to reply.

I think this printed statement gives you everything from our point of view that we can give.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
President A. E. Proctor,

University of Illinois,

Champaign, Ill.

My dear Dr. Proctor,

I am searching everywhere for a place on

"carteration". This I think will give you if you know who

I have noticed to believe the subject of "co-encapsulation"

before the Tenth British Chemical Conference, as you can "pickle"

into me if you cannot. I afraid not have a chance to reply.

I think this brief statement gives you everything from

our point of view that we can give.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
Champaign, Illinois
December 17, 1902

President William R. Harper
University of Chicago
CHICAGO
Illinois

My dear President Harper:—

In August Mr. Monroe of the Twentieth Century Club of Boston called me by telephone at Lake Mohonk, New York, and invited me to deliver one of the lectures in their course this winter, and said they expected to secure you. He wanted each of us to discuss "Co-education." With some reluctance, and telling him he could not get us into a quarrel I consented. We are likely to take somewhat different views, though possibly not so very different. I have observed the statement of your views on the subject in one of your reports as set forth by Commissioner Harris in his latest report. I also observed the statement by your board of trustees sometime ago that you would soon state what was and was not meant by "segregation." I have looked for this statement, and judge it was made to your convocation yesterday, but the TRIBUNE report is so meager as to be of no value. Will you kindly send me anything touching the matter which you may have in print, or tell me anything I ought to have as the basis of intelligent and friendly comment? I am now in the midst of my Boston address, and would like it at once. I am to go January 17, earlier than the time set in their list.

With regards,

Very sincerely yours,
June 19th, 1902.

My dear Miss Falconer:-

I am very much obliged to you for your full letter of June fourteenth which you have been good enough to send me. I shall read it with pleasure and shall derive much valuable information from it.

Yours very truly,

Miss Elizabeth Falconer,

98 Oakwood Avenue, Chicago.
June 19th, 1908.

My dear Miss Fayconer:

I am very much obliged to you for your last letter of June twenty-second which you have been good enough to send. I am thoroughly with pleasure and shall arrange much necessary information.

Yours very truly,

Miss Eliza Fayconer

36 Oakwood Avenue, Chicago.
July 1st, 1902.

Dear Doctor Harper:

I enclose a copy of a letter to my Mother from Miss Talbot, also one from Jenkins Lloyd Jones to my Father. These I send for your information. Please regard them as confidential.

Very truly,

[Signature]

President W.R. Harper,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.
April 7th, 1965

Dear Doctor Hume:

I enclose a copy of a letter to my mother from FINELAN.

If you have any information, please let me know.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Francesca M. Hume
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois
July 14th, 1902.

My dear Mr. Vincent:

I am writing to propose that you prepare as strong a statement as possible on the segregation business. The vote is to be counted July 26th and presented immediately to the trustees. We wish very much to present your statement of the case with others.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
Mr. George W. Hinderer:

I am writing to probe into your preparations for the segregation process. The note is to be completed by July 30th and presented immediately to the President.

We wish very much to present your statement at the case with others.

Yours very truly,

W.E. Hinderer
Aug. 15th, 1902.

Mr. George C. Walker,
Lake Geneva, Wis.

My dear Mr. Walker:—

I am hoping that there may be an opportunity for us to go over the segregation question again together before the next Board meeting. I infer that the matter has been presented to you very strongly by certain adherents of the other side. I feel that it is only justice to myself that you should give the position which I represent a your most careful consideration. With only one in five in the faculty against the proposition, and in view of the past history of other similar propositions, I feel that I have some claim to ask your sympathy for this new plan, even if it does not at first strike you favorably.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
MR. B. Hubbard

I am much obliged by your very kind offer of a copy of your book; upon receipt of which I shall be most pleased to write you a brief letter in reply.

I have some very valuable information that I wish to impart to you, which I shall be glad to send to you as soon as I am able to do so.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Mr. Geo. Rea C. Motley
Aug. 9th, 1902.

Miss Angeline Loesch,
46 Lincoln Place, Chicago.

My dear Miss Loesch:

I have just received, through your kindness, a copy of the printed circular sent to the alumni and the public. I regret very much that a statement should have been made public which contains on the face of it so large a number of misstatements of facts. I have asked Mr. Judson to send you corrections of some of these.

I can hardly believe that you and your colleague, Miss Hirschl, deliberately desired to misrepresented the facts. It would seem proper for you, as representatives of the Alumnae Association, to send to the alumni and the public the corrections which Mr. Judson will furnish you.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
Miss Margaret encuenta,

Miss Francisco Pinto, Chicago

I hope that receiving, through your kindness a copy of the printed oratorical sent to the Senate and the public, I express very much that testimonials which have been made by public witnesses concerning the case of it to readers a number of mistakes made in the I have no idea. I thank to many you.

consecution of some of these

I can hardly believe that you and your colleagues, Miss McIlveen, yourself regarding tobreak as you and as you regarding to the

would seem broked for you, as representatives of the American Association to send to the Senate and the public the
collection which Mr. Johnson will furnish you,

Yours very truly,

W.R. Heber
July 26th, 1902.

Dr. Sarah Hackett Stevenson,
Venetiaun Building, Chicago.

My dear Dr. Stevenson:—

Your letter has been received and will be fully considered. I am afraid that the statement made to you is hardly correct in view of the conclusions you base upon it. The question is not the one which the Press has represented it to be, nor do I think it is so serious as you imagine. But in a letter it is hardly possible to explain all the plans and purposes of the University, and sometime we shall be able to have a chat over the matter and I shall then be glad to take it up with you.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
July 1903

Dr. Erskine Hooker

Secretary British Ornithologists

May 14th Dr. E. Scanlon:

Your letter has been received and will be

fully considered. I am afraid that the statement made to you is partly

correct in view of the circumstances you have quoted. The situation is not

the one which I have in mind, and I hold that to go on with it is to

vastly enlarge its extent. But in a letter it is partly possible to explain

with the prior and subsequent of the University and associate we might be

able to have a clear over the matter and I am left to take it

with you.

Yours very truly,

W.R. Hudson
Chicago, 7/30/1902

Dr. T. W. Goodspeed,
Secretary The University of Chicago,
Chicago.

My dear Sir:—

As I am leaving tomorrow for a short visit to Europe, I wish to place in your hands my vote, which I hereby authorize you to record for me in my absence at the next meeting of the Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago, to be held August 19th. (or at any time to which it is adjourned) in favor of the proposition for the segregation of men and women during the two junior years of the University course. I have read all the statements and correspondence relating to this subject with great care; I have participated in the discussion by the Board of this matter at a meeting held yesterday July 29, and my judgment is clear as to the wisdom of adopting the policy recommended by the Junior Faculty and the Senate.

I am

Yours truly,

[Signature]
Secr. T. W. Goodspeed

My dear Sir:

As I am leaving tomorrow for a short visit to Boston, I
wish to seize this moment to ask your permission to
attend to the important matter of the Board of
Trustees of the University of Chicago, to be held
August 17th, at the time to which it is deferred (in favor of the
presentation of my own personal views and experience to the
university committee). I have kept all the statements and
correspondence relating to this subject with great care; I have participated in the
discussion of the Board, and have a matter of pressing necessity,
within 36 hours, my judgment to offer as to the wisdom of adopting the
policy recommended by the junior faculty and the Senate.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

[Signatures]

Henry Chamberlain
A. J. Moore
Thos. L. Meff
Wm. Hill
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far-reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

Elizabeth Wallace
Florence Lym
Myra Reynolds
J. ini Ebert
We present our severe and sincere letter that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret.

In a measure of such far-reaching importance as this, the earnest to the faculty of a more time to which to strive at a more thorough and satisfactory improvement of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.
We present our concert and sincere thanks that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret. In a measure of such high importance as this, the extension to the faculty of a few extra time to prepare to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of their work, to be done here.

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Notation]
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

Frank Bigelow Tarbell

George Lincoln, Jr. Dickinson

F. J. Carpenter

Henry J. Donaldson

Chas. Chas. Jr. (In favor of delay, but not agreeing with all of the above given statement.)

James B. Ingalls
We present our serene and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never forget
in a moment of such far reaching importance as this, the
contrition of the faculty at a year’s time in which to
examine and develop its resources and understand
of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

[Handwritten text]

[Handwritten text]
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year’s time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.
We present our reasons and evidence forthwith.

President and Trustees of the University with never regret

in a measure of such due respect and importance as this the

granting to the faculty of a year's time in order to

straighten out more thoroughly and satisfactorily the certain

of the nature and extent of that which is to be done.

[Signature]
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

[Signatures]

James Haden, Jr.
J. Lawrence, Vaughn
Harr Willard Cutting
Karl Pietsch
Martin Schatz
J. Alton, Yancey
G. B. Foster
We present our remarks and sincere faith that the
President and Trustees of the University will never regret
in a measure of such far reaching importance as this. The
gratitude to the faculty of a year's time in which to
arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding
of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

[Signature]
We present our sincere and sincere thanks for the President and Trustees of the University with our very best wishes.

In a message of many far-reaching importance as this, the Governor of the Faculty of a year's time in which to prepare for a more thorough and systematic understanding, strive for a more thorough and systematic understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

[Signature]

Dr. J. F. [Signature]
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

Oscar L. Triggs
We present our warm and sincere thanks for the President and Trustees of the University and never forget, in a measure of such far-reaching importance as this, the Brenton to the Faculty of a new's time in which to strive for a more thorough and systematic understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be gone.
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

[Signature]

Jas. W. Nimmo Boyd
We present our verdict and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret.

In a measure of much far reaching importance as this, the President to the faculty of a year's time is to which is writing at a more profound and satisfying understanding. Of the nature and merit of which is to be gone.
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

Ela S. Young
We present our service and assistance forthwith.

President and Trustees of the University will receive
in a measure of each for receiving importance as such the
extension to the faculty of a year's time in which to
arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding
of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

[Signature]
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

[Signature]

[Signature]
We present our resignation and resign from the position of President and Trustee of the University with regret.

In a measure of such far-reaching importance as this, the President and the faculty of a venerable institution are entitled to the fullest confidence and faith in their unswerving principles of wisdom and integrity.

We return any warrants or letters of credit to be done.

[Signature]
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

Charles E. Damon
A. B. Seaman
A. B. Perry
Albert E. Cuyler
L. E. Dickson
We present our verdict and sincere faith that the
President and Trustees of the University will never regret,

in a measure of such far-reaching importance as this, the

emergence of a faculty of a era's time in which to

survive of a more thorough and satisfactory understanding

of the nature and merit of that which is to be done.

[Signature]

[Date]

[Handwritten Notes]
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

John M. Coulter  
Susan N. Ballou  
Chas. J. Blackburn  
Florence Legon  

John C. Jordan  
Geo. H. Med.  
James Westfall Thompson
We present our renewed and sincere belief that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure, the research importance of the faculty of a year's time in which to strive of a more thorough and systematic understanding of the nature and mystery of that which is to be done.

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

[Signature]

Amy E. James
We present our report and sincere belief that the
President and Trustees of the University will never regret
in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the
expectation of the Faculty at a particular time to
arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding
of the nature and merits of their subject to be gone.

[Signature]
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

[Signature]

Charles Zueblin
We present our sincere and sincere felicitations to the President and Trustees of the University with never regret in a measure of such far-reaching importance as this. It is a measure of the faculty to the faculty of a year's time in which to strive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and matter of great merit to be gone.
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

Edward L. Buzz, Instructor in Philosophy

John Dewey, Professor of Philosophy & Director of Mental Hygiene

Frances Talbot, Associate Professor & Dean of Women

[Handwritten notes] For more thorough consideration by the general faculty.
We present our sincere and sincere thanks for President and Treasurer of the University as well as never forget in a measure of such far reaching importance as this:

Encouraging the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and realistic understanding of the nature and merits of the work to be done.

[Handwritten notes below]
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

In signing this memorial we do not wish it to be considered as an expression of our opinions on the merits of the proposed changes but, as one of us was away from the city in June and the other was in favor of delay at the Congregation meeting, we feel that further time for consideration is desirable.

Woods Hole.
July 21, 1902.

Bradley Moore Davis.
Henry Chandler Cowles.
We present our reasons and sincere belief to the President and Trustees of the University with the hope of a

more prominent and satisfactory representation of the

strength and merit of the faculty to whom the

increase of the number and variety of arts may be

attributed. We have been

longer and more

pursued in the

study of it and

have had

more

experience

in this field.

Yours faithfully,

[Handwritten Signature]

Jan. 18, 1911.
We present our serious and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regret, in a measure of such far reaching importance as this, the granting to the faculty of a year's time in which to arrive at a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be done.

[Signatures]

Rollin D. Kellog

Jos. P. Eddy

Stuart Weller

Natt Flint

Henry G. Gale

James W. Pinn

J. Stregby

F. R. Houlton

R. Chamberlain
We present our sincere and sincere faith that the President and Trustees of the University will never regard in a measure of such far-reaching importance as this, the event of the society of a year's time in which to strive for a more thorough and satisfactory understanding of the nature and merits of that which is to be gone.

[Signature]

[Signature]
college woman who has been
sheltered from contact with
men, with the virility, the
frankness, the genuineness of
her college brother has become
almost a type of woman,
marked by timidity, self-con-
sciousness, inability to adapt-

herself to her environment
and to society upon leaving
college.

This opinion is again based
upon observation of the many

98 Oakwood Avenue
June 6th, 1902
To
President William R. Harper
The University of Chicago

My dear President Harper,

You have asked me to state my reasons for feeling

that a separation of men and
women in the Junior College
is undesirable.

In my opinion:

1. The normal, natural at-
titude of men and women toward
life and study is kept in
the coeducational classes more
more than in those of separate instruction. This opinion is based first upon observations extending over my scholastic life as pupil in public grammar schools and high schools, coducational college and university, and as instructor, first for seven years in a large public high school, second for an equal period of years in a school exclusively for girls, during a part of which time my work has been divided with an adjoining school exclusively for boys.

It is my honest conviction that there have been more consciousness of each other, more foolishness, more distracting desires in the schools last referred to, than where young men and women, boys and girls are constantly associated with each other in natural normal relations.

2. In my opinion the
College men and women the training outside the classroom which college men and women in an exclusively college community acquire. It has thus far been impossible for them to have the larger club life under its proper stimuli, the gymnastic facilities which are so soon to be granted. In the case of the women the result has been a product—often called girls. I have prepared and sent to different eastern colleges and to our university. There is no comparison between the womanly bearing, the graciousness, the wholesomeness of some of our own university trained women, I do not refer to the artificial, purely society-loving girls who have occasionally appeared for a year or two, and the self-conscious young women
who have come back to me from
Eastern schools, who have had
to learn, often at painfulest, the lessons of life and
the mutual attitude men and
women should have in its relations.
not only in my own girls,
whom I need not name to
you, is this true, but it seems

to me often noticeable in
our own \textit{Graduate School} in
the women who have come here
from colleges exclusively for women.

3. In my opinion the
merits of coeducation have
not been fully tried in the
existing conditions at the Uni-
city.

This opinion is based upon
observations extending over my
eight years connection as a
student with the University,
with the exception of the
dormitories, which care for a
limited number of women,
the University has not yet
been able to give its junior
that the University will take
so backward movement.
I am willing to trust to
your wisdom so ably shown
in the University upbuilding.
I know your desires for its
future well-being must
be stronger than mine by
the very nature of the case;
but I still have the longing
desire that this decision should
be postponed until a better
environment for men, and
by some of my city friends,
who hear her talk in cars
and shops, "the typical
Co-educational girl" — who
coming into the University
from homes lacking refinement
and social culture, illiterate
sometimes in speech and
"common" in bearing, has
had no opportunity to acquire
the changed speech and manner
that the absolute change of
environment would bring.
She is taken as an argument against Co-education. She should rather be taken as an argument against the day student in a city college with limited advantages offered to its women.

If I fear, though I conclude this cannot be based upon so definite observations as my other opinions, I fear that Co-instruction in separate classes will tend to give the weaker form of instruction. I am led to believe does exist in the lower classes of each.

Lively women's college. There may be a diluted form of seminary instruction which will merely steep before women the two years leading to an Associate degree and then the social world.

I grant this may be an imaginary dread, but none the less it is present.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity of voicing in this manner my firm convictions, and my earnest desire...
better facilities for the city women who attend the university, can show what co-education under proper conditions can accomplish.

The present arrangement is not right; it does not afford the attractiveness to men nor the means of development to women, and it seems to me that rather than co-education
that has made the subject one of discussion.

Very respectfully and faithfully,

your supporter always.

Elizabeth Thirlmere.
Reply to a Memorial
Relating to the Plan for Separate Instruction
for men and women in the Junior Colleges.
Has the Plan been adequately considered?

Yes.

1. "The plan has only been before the Junior College Faculty at two meetings, and no consideration has been accorded to alternatives constructive plans".

It has been thoroughly debated at three meetings of the Junior College Faculty. The whole ground was traversed so exhaustively that the Faculty became impatient of further debate and unanimously ordered a vote.

Besides this a debate in private conversation has been going on ever since last Autumn. Every member of the Faculty has been fully informed as to the every phase of the discussion.

Such alternative constructive plans as were offered in the Senate were considered by that body, and negatived by a large majority as undesirable and impracticable. No tangible alternative plans were offered in the Junior College Faculty.

2. "It has been before the Congregation once, and was overwhelm-
ingly disapproved".

The Congregation took the matter up at the end of a small meeting, (6:00 P.M.) after a large number had left. Those in the majority (the vote of disapproval was 24 to 7) refused to lay the matter over for until there could be a full meeting, adequate discussion, and refused to discuss the matter on its merits. They insisted on using their majority to put a vote of disapproval on record. Under the rules, the Junior College Faculty thereupon met, reconsidered the question, and reaffirmed their former action by a decisive vote (25 to 18).

3. "It has never been before a meeting of the United Faculties."

The United Faculties have no jurisdiction in the case, any more than have the Faculties of Law, Medicine or Theology.

The plan of a mass faculty was decisively voted down a year ago. It is hardly reasonable to protest now because business is not done in the very way in which at that time it was decided that it should be done.

4. "Many members of the Senate have never heard the plan discussed from the Junior College point of view".

Every member of the Senate has had ample opportunity to hear the Junior College point of view—both in the very abundant private discussion and in the report of the Junior College committee recommending the action. Moreover, in fact several members of faculties other than
that of the Junior Colleges did attend the meetings of that body in order to hear the debate— as any senator might have done had he so chosen.

5. "No committee of the Senate has ever considered the strictly educational aspects of the plan."

The Senate is so small a body and opinions on the matter were so clearly defined that debate in the full Senate easily covered the whole ground. In fact several meetings of the Senate have been devoted to debating this question alone; and there has been no subject before the University which has been more thoroughly canvassed on all sides than this question.

II.

Are the administrative features of the plan thoroughly worked out and understood?

Yes.

1. "Are the departments to be accorded responsibility in administering the measure? If so, there will be radical variance in the mode of administration due to divergent opinion in many departments."

Departments will carry out the policy of the University, as in other matters, irrespective of personal opinions.

2. "There must be undesirable coercion of departments."

It is customary to administer what has been decided as it has been decided, and not as the personal judgment of individuals may dictate. This is order in place of chaos. It is not coercion for the minority to yield to the majority.

3. "Does the measure apply to elective work in the Junior Colleges, or only to required work?"

The plan applies to all Junior work, both elective and required, wherever the size of the class permits. This has been repeatedly stated and is well understood.

4. "What is there to preclude the transfer to the Junior Colleges of elective courses now offered in the Senior Colleges?"

This seems to imply that those who may be entrusted with administration will by some underhanded means extend the working by the plan farther than is implied in its adoption. An answer is hardly necessary.

5. "Are co-education sections to be provided in elective courses?"

This will be decided by experience. It is not necessary to attempt forecasting every detail in advance.
6. "Will Instructors be allowed any choice of the sections they are to teach?"

This will of course be decided, as all other matters are, by the head of the department in consultation with the President. There will be such conformity to the wishes of Instructors as is usual in other cases.

7. "Is it judicious to enforce a measure with the disapproval of many instructors?"

This is merely asking whether the policy of the University shall be decided by majorities or minorities.

III.

Have the general educational consequences of the plan been sufficiently considered?

Yes.

1. "Aggravated by the proposed change which leaves untouched the real danger point", etc.

It is not a question of a "danger point" at all. The plan is favored by its advocates from no apprehension of dangers in the present system, but because it is believed that better results can be secured by the new one—better results in scholarship, and in dignity and refinement of life.

The steadying influence of association in the class rooms doubtless is of value; but those who have had the opportunity of observing the reciprocal influence of men and women studying in adjacent schools, or in different divisions of the same school, but not in the same classes, as strongly of the opinion that this influence is in every way healthful at a certain stage of education as that which is exerted where the plan of full co-instruction is followed.

In this connection much stress is laid on the assertion that men and women by meeting in the class-room, learn a just estimate of one another, free from the glamour which comes from partial knowledge.

There is truth in this proposition; but like many sweeping generalizations on educational subjects, it should be received with caution. It is true in many cases. In many other cases it is not true at all. In still other cases it would be impossible to tell whether it is true or not.

Further, even if assumed to be true in all cases, it by no means follows that it is desirable that men and women should in every instance
be associated in the class room. Quite enough of the desired disillusionment may be secured by association for a part of the time. Sooner or later all students who receive the University degrees will have ample opportunity for association in mixed classes. Meantime being for a while kept in separate classes they may receive the unqualified benefits which come from separate instruction. Thus at least a measure of the good results of both systems may be secured.

2. "The wisdom of seeking more rather than less of such competition is a stimulus"

The opposite inference should be drawn. It is not a question, however, of inability so much as of unwillingness. Men will compete with one another, but not with women. This is especially true at the age at which college is usually entered.

Further, it is a fact of common observation that at that age girls are usually further developed socially than boys, and for that reason are far from exerting such an influence on the latter as will draw them rather out. The reverse is likely to happen. It is well known that girls who enter the Junior Colleges commonly have their associates among men who are older, and are apt to think and speak slightlyingly of young men of their own age. There is little mental stimulus for either in such an attitude.

IV. "Where is the System to End?"

The arguments in favor of the plan most distinctly do not apply "from kindergarten to graduate school." On the contrary it may easily be pointed out that the considerations which lead the majority to favor the plan apply with especial force in the Junior Colleges, very little in elementary schools, very little in real University work (which begins with the Senior Colleges). Moreover, the financial consideration would render separation in real University work impracticable. There are no sections in Senior College and Graduate Classes. To multiply sections at this point would be expensive to such an extent as would not be warrant ed by any considerations now apparent.

V. Will not the adoption of the proposed plan reflect inevitably and unjustly on our students?

No more, for instance, than revision of our athletic rules, or adoption of revised definition of professionalism, or improvements in the
administration of the house system, or any other changes which experience suggests. It is wholly gratuitous to imply that culpable conduct on the part of students is the ground urged for the change. The conditions which it is desired to modify are a handicap upon the most wholesome development of student life. Change of those conditions is no more a reflection upon the conduct of students under those conditions than giving to them better dormitories, or better dining room and club facilities would be. It is not true that the observations upon which these conclusions are based were made recently for the first time. They have been the subject of private comment among many members of the faculty from the opening of the University. They did not think it would be timely, until very recently, to attempt creation of better conditions.

VI.

Have the effects of the measure on the higher education of women at the University of Chicago and elsewhere been sufficiently recognized?

The dangers recited in this paragraph may seem very real to certain members of the faculty. To others they seem wholly groundless. How either of the consequences suggested can follow from the plan is surely not apparent. The plan is an attempt to diminish the ratio of distractions which interfere with serious attention to college work. The course of reasoning is surely not apparent by which it can be concluded that the attainment of such result, or even an honest effort after it, can either be stigmatized as "coercive", or can "set back the cause of woman's education", or can put a premium on the presence of an undesirable class of women. These conceivable consequences can hardly be considered sufficiently within the range of probability to rank as practical objections.

The attitude of the women of the University toward the plan may be explained by their fears of possible results, and by the persistent contention on the part of certain members of the faculty that the whole plan is an attempt to drive women out of the University; perhaps by the apprehension that in case the change women will presently be allowed to teach only women.

VII.

Has the influence of recent changes affecting the men in the University been thoroughly considered?

The establishment of new divisions in the University which will increase the number of men, and the erection of new buildings intended especially for the use of the men, do not favor the recommendation to delay, for no one of these buildings or new schools will be sufficiently
far advanced within a year to furnish data. Besides it has never been suggested that the plan was intended to do away with the danger of feminizing men. It is intended rather to reinforce the effects of the new gymnasium, the club house, the commons, and like agencies.

VIII.

Has public opinion been sufficiently regarded?

It is Utopian to expect the general public to succeed even in correctly presenting to itself the problem of an academic situation until it is first before them in the concrete. The agitation thus far conducted has thrown so much dust in the air, and has stirred up so much irrelevant feeling, that trial of the question in the court of public opinion can result in nothing but more confusion, until the public can be confronted with the plain facts in working form. When the real character of the plan is on exhibition in its operation, it can be judged intelligently by the public, whereas further speculative argument would simply result in greater confusion and increased incapacity to maintain a judicial attitude. Everybody familiar with the educational history of Chicago, knows that the public was led to fight Colonel Parker relentlessly when he was making some of his most important experiments. The analogy throws direct light upon the question of permitting the general public to dictate the policy of the University. That policy should be determined by those to whom the institution has been entrusted.

Furthermore, the epithet "irrevocable" is entirely inappropriate. On the contrary, the plan is not irrevocable. The majority believe that with full trial the disposition to reverse it will diminish. Should experience prove the plan a mistake, return to co-instruction in the Junior Colleges will be entirely practicable.

IX.

Have the financial consequences of the plan been adequately considered in their bearing on the University's educational procedure?

The financial consequences have been carefully studied; and it is evident that large sums of money are not necessarily involved. For example:

a) Greek, Latin, French, German and English, Mathematics and History, are subjects which require no laboratory equipment. The ordinary books used by Junior College students must in any case be duplicated many times.
It makes no difference in cost whether there are 12 copies of a book in one place, or 6 copies in each of two places.

b) It costs no more to arrange laboratory accommodations for 600 or more students in two places than in one.

c) It is necessary, in any case, to provide other space for laboratories, or crowd out the higher students. The present laboratories are about full. In a year or two there must be further provision for laboratory work. The most economical plan of extension would involve a building or buildings for elementary work. It can make little difference in cost whether there be one large building for such purposes, or two smaller ones. This is a very different problem from that involved in constructing highly specialized laboratories for advanced work.

d) In only one department is there possible increase of cost, that of physiography, the entire equipment of which for an elementary course does not exceed $8,000 to $10,000.

e) Additional dormitories would be erected only as needed, and these would, as heretofore, furnish an income on the investment. The separation question is therefore entirely distinct from the architectural question.

f) If, for any reason, the expense of separate sections for instruction proves to be serious, the plan provides that in such cases the separation shall not be made. But in few cases would it be necessary to provide more sections than now.

It should be kept in mind that the plan of buildings for a women's quadrangle is one thing, and the plan of providing separate instruction for men and women in the Junior Colleges is quite another thing. It is the second of these only which is now under discussion.

X.

Is it certain that the proposed plan meets more efficiently than any other the asserted difficulties of the present situation?

If the reasons for the proposed change were to any great extent architectural, it would be wise to postpone action until all reasonable schemes for its amelioration of the architectural situation had been considered. If, however, there are good and sufficient reasons for the change independent of the matter of buildings, and if the question has already been so fully discussed that further delay could only bring fruitless and harmful agitation, then delay is unwise.

The Junior College Faculty voted unanimously (May 17) for
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the adoption of a report recommending a residence quadrangle for women
on the east and for men on the west of the central grounds. There is
no confusion of architectural and educational questions. It is clear that
the buildings can be so constructed as to call for the slightest possible
change in case later it shall be desired to revert to the co-instruction
plan.

Finally:

To throw the matter back for further discussion by the faculties
would answer no good purpose. It has been fully considered by each
faculty body which has jurisdiction, and further discussion would be quite
unlikely to give any new light or to change any opinions.

Further agitation by the public, who are not charged with the
administration of the University, and who are not in a position either to
understand all the facts at issue or to judge without bias the questions
involved, can do no good. The matter can be decided quite as well now
as a year hence, and its early determination will be a benefit to all
concerned. It is true that the memorial asking for delay is signed by
members of the faculty who are entitled to all respect. But the signers
comprise only about a fifth of the entire faculty, and several of these
are in favor of the plan. Under these circumstances it is respectfully
urged that the plan repeatedly and deliberately recommended by the
faculty and by the senate be put into effect.

In behalf of the majority who favor the plan.

H.P. Judson
President W. R. Harper,
The University.

Dear President Harper:—

With reference to the enclosed matter, I have to say that we understood that the University desired us to separate the men and the women in the Junior College work, the classes for the women to be held in Lexington Hall. The Department has no desire to do this, except that it would relieve the pressure in Walker Museum. If the separation is made and the work in Physiography done in Lexington Hall, the enclosed represents the minimum equipment on which the work can be satisfactorily done.

Very truly yours,

(Enclosure)
THE UNIVERSITY

Dear Professor Harper,

I am forwarding to you the following letter I have received from our department head, Dr. Smith, regarding the situation with the University Grants Committee. He suggests that we take immediate action to address the concerns raised in the letter. The committee has requested more information regarding our department's budget and the allocation of funds.

I believe it is important for us to respond quickly to the committee's request to ensure that our department remains in good standing with the university. I have copied Dr. Smith's letter for your reference.

Please let me know if you require any further information or assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Handwritten note:]

[Signature]
Oct. 16, 1902.

Dr. William R. Harper,
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Dear Dr. Harper:

Replying to your esteemed favor of Oct. 13th:-

From May, 1888 to May, 1893 I was the Corresponding Secretary and Executive Officer of the American Baptist Education Society. I first met Mr. John D. Rockefeller in the winter of 1889. He had already been favorably considering for sometime with you the question of the establishment of an institution of learning in Chicago. From my conversations with him, I gathered that the sentiment in favor of such an institution throughout the Baptist denomination had not yet taken such definite shape as to the character, scope, and initial expenditure, as to justify present action on his part. I then suggested to him that the American Baptist Education Society invite a conference of a few representative Baptists in New York, and asked this conference to define the character, location, and scope of an institution of learning in Chicago which would meet, in their opinion, the approval and active cooperation of the Baptists of the whole country. Mr. Rockefeller approved the suggestion. The Executive Committee of the American Baptist Education Society immediately adopted the suggestion, and instructed me to invite the following gentlemen to the proposed conference: President Andrews, then of Brown University; President Hovey, then of Newton Theological Semin-
Dr. William R. Harper
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Dear Dr. Harper:

Replying to your esteemed favor of Oct. 15th-

From May 1898 to May 1900 I was the Carbohydrate Secretary and Executive Officer of the American Hospital Association. I then met Mr. John D. Rockefeller in the winter of 1899. He paid an express call on the establishment of a committee on the nutrition of carbohydrates and invited many of the authorities who were then available upon the subject. He suggested to him that the American Hospital Association have a conference of a few representative hospitals in New York and California for the conference to get the conference in Chicago which would meet in their opinion the approval and active cooperation of the hospitals of the Knox.

President Rockefeller altogether the suggestion. He wrote the Committee of the American Hospital Association immediately to object the suggestion and for us to invite the following gentlemen to the proposed conference:

Professor Howard, Chair of the Department of Physiology of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
ary; President Weston, of Crozier Theological Seminary; the Rev. Dr. Elder, then of Albany, N. Y.; President Taylor, of Wassar College; Rev. Dr. Henry L. Morehouse, of New York; Dr. W. R. Harper, then of Yale University; Dr. Samuel Duncan, then of Haverhill, Mass.; and the Hon. Charles L. Colby, of New York.

At the same time, the Executive Committee instructed me to send to each of the gentlemen named a series of printed questions to serve as a guide to the deliberations of the conference on the character and scope of the proposed institution.

The gentlemen invited duly met in the rooms of the American Baptist Home Mission Society in New York, and considered the questions submitted to them in their order. On most of the questions there was substantially unanimity of opinion; on the twelfth question there was some diversity of opinion. This question was as follows: "Should such an institution be co-educative", referring to the institution which it was proposed to found at Chicago. This question admitted of a categorical answer, yes or no. The answer actually given was as follows: "The privileges of the institution should be extended to both sexes on equal terms". The committee avoided a categorical answer. In the discussion of this question it was conceded by all that an institution of learning located in the west, where co-education was almost universal, should freely open its doors to women. It was pointed out, however, that certain subjects in the curriculum could better be studied by men and women apart, that the institution was likely to grow and expand in every direction, and in the course of its history would doubtless teach many subjects not equally adapted for men and women, and that it would be unwise so to phrase the reply to this question as would
seem to commit the institution at all times and under all circumstances to common classes for the sexes. It was thought that the demand for the education of women would be sufficiently met if the institution admitted both sexes on equal terms, without requiring the institution to give instruction to both sexes in the same classroom. On this, all varieties of opinion in the committee finally united.

The findings of the committee were submitted to Mr. Rockefeller. He held them for a considerable time under advisement. Early in May, 1888, I met him by appointment in New York, just previous to the meeting of the American Baptist Education Society about to be held in Boston. The findings of the committee were written out under his own eye in the form of a series of resolutions to be submitted to that body. At the same time Mr. Rockefeller gave me his pledge for $600,000 toward the first million, with the verbal instructions to hold this pledge in escrow, and not to communicate its contents until the Executive Board of the Society, independently of the pledge, and without knowledge of the pledge, should adopt the resolutions. If the resolutions were adopted without change, then the pledge was to be submitted to the Board; if the resolutions were not adopted, the pledge was to be returned to him. The third resolution was as follows:

"RESOLVED that the privileges of the institution be extended to persons of both sexes on equal terms".

The resolutions were all unanimously adopted, including the one recited above. This, then, fixed the character of the institution.

The Society immediately appealed to the public for the remaining $400,000 to complete the million dollars, which had been fixed by the conference in New York as the smallest sum on which the institution could probably begin. The resolutions defining the character
I was fortunate that the committee were in favor of the proposition of issuing a bond for the purchase of the property, which had been leased on the condition that the committee would have the right to purchase the property in the future at a fair market value. The committee immediately appealed to the members for the purchase, and the Society immediately responded with a pledge to purchase the property. The committee was divided on the subject, but the majority voted in favor of the proposition. The committee then proceeded to lay out a plan for the purchase of the property, which was submitted to the members for consideration. The members voted in favor of the plan, and the committee was authorized to proceed with the purchase. The committee was then instructed to make a detailed report of the proceedings at the next meeting. The committee was then adjourned.
location, and scope of the institution, including the third resolution, were published and made the basis of the appeal for funds; they formed, in fact, practically a contract with every contributor. A year later, namely, in the spring of 1869, the necessary funds having been raised, the duty of drawing the charter was entrusted to Judge J. M. Bailey, then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois. Judge Bailey was instructed to draw the charter in such a way as to preserve all the permanent features of the resolutions, so as to carry out the implied contract with all the donors. Resolution third, Judge Bailey adopted with as slight change as possible. The following is the language of the charter:

"The particular objects for which said corporation is formed are to provide, impart, and furnish opportunities for all departments of higher education to persons of both sexes on equal terms."

Thus was actually carried out the purpose of the conference, which was to require the institution to open its doors to men and women on equal terms, but to leave the institution free to impart instruction to both sexes in the same class rooms, or apart, as circumstances might require.

Of the gentlemen present at the conference all are living except Dr. Samuel Duncan and the Hon. Charles L. Colby. I am very clear in my recollection of what happened at the conference. It would be interesting, however, to inquire if the recollections of the other gentlemen are the same as mine. I think all will recall that the difficulties attending common class room work were specially emphasized by President Taylor of Vassar, and the precise form of the deliverance of the conference on this subject is perhaps more due to him than any other single member.

Yours very truly,
Your very truly,

W.H.
April 17, 1902.

My dear President Harper:

Since your admirable statement to the Junior College Faculty last Saturday I have been thinking about the problem of the sexes and have conversed with a number of persons representing various views on the subject. There is a tendency among the younger men to look at the problem fairly, though some of the solutions suggested are novel to them, and I think there will be little disposition to raise opposition to any fair proposition simply for the sake of opposing. But I have reached the conviction in my own mind that, before the sex question can be dealt with satisfactorily, another question of which it is, after all, a part, must be solved first. You will recall Owen's objection, viz. that it would be artificial to separate boys and girls, who have been together in the class room for four years, during the two years of the Junior College, and then put them together again for the last two years of the college. This objection contains, it seems to me, the very elements of the real solution. Owen is now opposed to the separation in the Junior Colleges, largely on this ground. There are probably many like him. But put the whole question of the School plus Junior College before them as a whole, and they will at least agree that separation is rational and possibly better.

You have always, Mr. President, stood for the Gymnasium idea. The idea has brought into being such institutions as Lewis and Bradley institutes.
Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Date]
and is rapidly taking effect on the older academies and high schools. There will
will soon be a goodly number of secondary schools about here shaping themselves
on the same model, and, with the magnificent equipment which the public is giving
the best high schools, where the free elective system prevails, motives of economy
are going to lead to the extension of the course to what they now call post-grad-
uate work, which they will soon come to look upon as one of the highest functions
of the first-class school. The University should not be the last to carry into effect
its own ideals. We are now establishing the principle but not ourselves putting it
into operation. Our Medical, Technological preliminary courses are to be Junior
College courses. We are creating a two-years' college, instead of the six years'
Gymnasium.

With our South Side Academy at our doors we have the basis for the Gymnasium
ready at hand. It seems to me that we should do here what we are doing at Morgan
Park—erect the Academy into a Gymnasium. The work of our freshman year is almost
entirely of a preparatory grade. Take out the Greek, Latin, and a few other advanced
courses and we have only such courses left as are taught in every good secondary
school. Why should there be duplication, absolutely necessary in distinct and sep-
parate institutions, be continued in two institutions practically under one roof?
It seems to me that the logical result, taught us further by you these ten years,
should lead to the amalgamation of these two institutions in a close organization
with only the necessary distinctions between the three grades of work—the three
two-year divisions, the last being the present Junior College.
So far I know that I am only repeating an idea of which I am coming to. If we had a six-year institution, a Gymnasium, within the quadrangles, then it would obviously be a simple matter to separate the sexes throughout until the time when the electives leading to the courses of the University College (oh for the old name!) should be entered upon. I believe that the advantages of separation would be as marked in the preparatory years as in the first two of college. And we should have the further advantage of being consistent in the whole course. I take it that parents in large numbers prefer the unmixed schools both for their daughters and their sons. I judge that your experience at Morgan Park grew out of such a preference. I am told that over one third of the girls who go away to college go to women colleges for women, and the proportions for the schools is probably greater. We should be appealing then to a large, and perhaps the best, element in our constituency in thus setting up schools side by side, under the same faculty—one for boys, the other for girls—while the two would be in reality, for purposes of economy, quality of instruction, prestige, etc., one institution. And we should not, I think, lose the support of those who have no objections to the coeducational institution, or who prefer it.

But there is no need of my enlarging upon this thought. I only wished to present it to you—what I regard as the whole problem of which the separation in the Junior Colleges is only a part. If the larger question is attacked and settled first, the smaller will follow suite as a matter of course.
So far I have not ascribe to any particular line of thought. It is
not for me to dictate to the New Mexico people how to vote.
I shall say that I agree with the conservative views that
New Mexico's constitution and way of life shall be left in
the hands of the people. I believe that the people of New
Mexico are capable of making the right decisions for them-

...
April 25th, 1902.

My dear Mr. Caps:—

I have read with interest your letter of April seventeenth. You make a great point in your letter, and I am not sure that you have not struck the nail on the head, at the same time, we must keep in mind this fact—that the reason why Mr. Owen’s point was not well taken lies in the fact that in the four years of the South Side Academy, the girls are at home with their parents. There are practically no girls who are away from home. This will also be true if the preparatory course. Now we do not think we ought in any way at present to bring the South Side Academy and Manual Training School, which are to be ostensibly and distinctly practice schools in connection with the training school for teachers, into connection with our Junior College work. The latter is something to be treated by itself. We have a ground for the separation of the sexes in the Junior College which we do not have in the South Side Academy. The same ground exists at Morgan Park. Let me discuss this with you.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
April 28th, 1908

Dear Mr. Harper,

I have long with interest your letter of April 17th. You make a great point in your letter, and I am not sure that you have not touched the nail on the head at the same time. We must keep in mind the fact that the reason why the Open's Point was not taken and the fact that in the last half of the year we at the South Side Academy, the girls ate at home with their parents. This will also go true in the present year. No girls who are away from home. This will also go true in the present year. How we do not think we ought to any way at present to print the South Side Academy and Manual Training School, which also to be.

I have the South Side Academy and Manual Training School in connection with the training school for teachers into connection with our Junior College work. The letter is something to be taught by itself. We have a great deal of the preparation of the boys in the Junior College. Which we go not have in the South Side Academy.

The same manner a little of

Mother's Day. Let me give you this with you.

Yours very truly,

Miss [Signature]
June 18th, 1902.

Rev. Cleland B. McAfee,
3911 Grand Boulevard, Chicago.

My dear Sir:—

Your letter of June fourteenth has been received. I think that you need have no anxiety in reference to the proposed plans of the University. I appreciate the courtesy of your letter, and think that a statement which I shall soon be able to make will cover the difficulties which have been suggested. The University has no desire to do anything more than to take an important step forward in the cause of education.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
June 16th, 1901

Rev. Cleland R. Motley
301 East Bonnaventure, Chicago

My dear Sir:

Your letter of June 16th has been received.

I think that you need three or four weeks before the people plan to return to the University. I appreciate the courtesy of your letter and think it will be a great moment which I shall soon be able to make with great pleasure. The University has been advised to go on with the building with great dispatch. No plan to make any important effort towards the cause of education.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
14th June, 1902.

President W. R. Harper,
University of Chicago,

My dear sir:

I have been asked a number of times recently to take part in the movement of protest against the supposed purpose of the University to "segregate" the sexes in the Junior College. Petitions of various sorts have come my way, and other movements coming to the same thing have appeared. I have declined to take any part in such a protest, for the very good reason that I do not know anything about the real purpose in the mind of the governing body of the University. Newspaper reports are not invariably reliable, even in our own city. I have little else to guide me.

But you will allow me to add my urging to that of others on one point. The University is a public institution in the best senses, and its acts concern the public, or least the thinking part of the public. Some of us would be very backward in attempting to determine the duty of men who are charged, as we are not, with the control of so great an institution. At the same time, the movement it may make at this time in so important a matter, is certain to influence educational thought and movement in the whole country. The proposed segregation seems to some of us a distinct backward step in everything but the financial side of the institution, and if it is determined upon, we feel that it will be only fair to give the widest publicity to the reasons and expectations of the institution. For that I present a most urgent plea. You will not act without reasons that seem to you good and sufficient. May not those reasons be fully and frankly given to the public?

With highest respect, I remain yours sincerely...

[Signature]
I have been asked a number of times recently to give part to the movement of protest against the annoyance brought to the University of various sources. "sanctuaries," the weeks in the summer colleges. I add my name to the list of people who have done by my own other annoyance occasion to the same slight pain. For the very reasons that I am not aware of, and because I have nothing to gain any part in such a protest, for the very reasons that I am not aware of, and because I have nothing to gain any part in such a protest, for the very reasons that I am not aware of, and because I have nothing to gain any part in such a protest.

The University is a national institution in the best sense of the word. As the nation's conscience, the University is a moral institution in the best sense of the word, to which every part, to which every part, to which every part should be grateful. The problem of education and the problem of the future are of the utmost importance. If we are going to retain our nation's position and maintain our movement in the world, we must have some of our generation and be grateful.

You will not find without some risk that there is a movement in the world. I believe a movement in the world. I believe a movement in the world. I believe a movement in the world. I believe a movement in the world. I believe a movement in the world.
To the Alumni of the University:

Our attention is called to a circular headed "Segregation of Sexes at the University of Chicago," and signed by the Recording Secretary of the Chicago Branch of the Association of Collegetage Alumni and by the Secretary of the Chicago Alumni Association of the University of Chicago. The circular contains what purports to be a statement of facts with regard to action of University authorities, a statement of arguments alleged to have been advanced in faculty meetings favoring segregation, and a summary of arguments against segregation.

To the customary newspaper misinformation with which the public is supplied as to University affairs, and to anonymous communications on this particular subject, it is not worth while to pay any attention. But as the above mentioned circular is in a way official in character, and as it contains a great number of misstatements on matters of fact, we owe it to our alumni to furnish a correction. As the main question is now pending before the Board of Trustees it would obviously be improper at this time for us to go into any argument on that subject. Our comments on the circular, therefore, relate solely to questions of fact.

In the statements of the circular the following inaccuracies should be pointed out:

1. "At the time the gift was offered to a gift for the purpose of building separate quadrangles for the men and women of the Junior Colleges."

2. "No gift of $1,000 was ever offered for such special purpose, and no such gift was ever suggested by any prospective donor. The question raised in the first discussion of the Senate was whether, in case money could be had for a woman's quadrangle, it would be advisable to provide class-rooms and laboratories as well as dormitories. However, it was thought advisable to settle the educational question independently of all financial considerations, and accordingly when the subject was taken up the second time the whole question of money was put aside. The President thereafter repeatedly announced that the money question must not be confused with the issue under discussion, and that whatever policy of future development might be thought best, means would be found for carrying it out."

3. "It was noticed by them that in the terms of the offer 'quadrangles' was meant to include not only separate dormitories, but separate class-rooms and laboratories as well."

4. "No such offer was made — therefore the offer had no "terms."

5. "As this made the matter a question of educational policy, the Board of Trustees referred for advice to the Senate."

The matter was not referred by the Board of Trustees to the Senate. The President laid the matter before the Senate as a question of general policy, as he is accustomed to do with all important questions.

6. "The Senate, after discussion, voted to ask for an opinion of the Finance Committee before giving its own decision."

The Senate took no such action. The matter was brought before the Junior College Faculty by the President without reference to the action of the Senate, because it related to Junior College work.

7. "The committee's majority report was disapproved by a vote of 19 to 14. After the adjournment of the meeting, President Harper spoke to two, and their votes were then changed from negative to affirmative, making the vote 17 to 16 still against separation. President Harper himself then voted, and threw out the opposing votes of six other persons. This was done on the ground that they were disqualified because they were on one-year appointments only, a rule of the University, so far as can be ascertained, never before enforced."

Scarcely one of the above statements is correct. The facts are as follows:

Before the ballot was taken the President called attention in the Faculty meeting to the statute of the University with regard to voting: "Instructors appointed for one year attend the meetings of the faculty with which their work is connected,
and take part in the deliberations, but do not vote" (Register of 1201-9, p. 10). This statute was enacted by the Board of Trustees at the beginning of the University, has been printed in every Annual Register, and has been in force and has been applied from the first on fundamental questions. Of course, on ordinary questions there is no roll-call.

The tellers reported 10 negative votes and 14 affirmative, neglecting to take the President’s ballot. The list was then scrutinized by the Recorder, with the aid of the Dean of the Faculties and the Secretary of the Board of Trustees, in order that no error might be made. It was found that six negative votes were cast by persons disqualified under the statute to which attention had been called in advance. Others present who were in like manner disqualified, but who, had they voted, would have voted in the affirmative, did not vote. Before the vote was recorded two who had voted in the negative under misapprehension of the purport of the resolution asked to change their votes. One of those asked the President for information as to the meaning of the resolution — with the other the President had no words on the subject at all.

The motion, therefore, was carried without the President’s vote, and even counting in the negative the two votes which were changed at request of the persons concerned.

The President did not announce the final vote. It was reported to the Senate by the Recorder in regular course.

6. After the action of the Congregation, a meeting of the Junior College Faculty was called to reconsider the question.

"Its vote this time was informally announced 25 to 18 in favor of segregation. Among the members of the Faculty themselves it is not known positively whose votes were this time allowed and whose not."

The tellers, Messrs. Judson and Salisbury, one representing each side, formally announced the vote as 25 in the affirmative and 17 in the negative, with six negative votes believed to be disqualified. On verification one of the questioned votes was found to be valid, and was counted accordingly. Each person whose vote was not counted was personally notified to that effect.

It is difficult to comprehend how so many misstatements could be compressed into so few lines as is the case with the preamble of the letter to the alumni.

Nineteen arguments for segregation, purporting to have been noted at Faculty meetings, then follow. No comment is necessary on them, except on the last four.

"16. No further development in Junior College until proposed step is taken.” No such assertion has been made by any responsible authority.

"17. Large gifts available if measure is adopted.” No such assertion has been made by any responsible authority. The truth appears in what has been said above.

"18. Opportunity to do ‘conspicuous’ thing in education.” This is a perversion of what has been said.

"19. Appeal to approval (financial and otherwise) of many persons hostile to unvarnished co-education, especially persons of wealth, who want their girls treated from ‘society’ point of view, and their boys from the fashionable Yale-Harvard standpoint, as they conceive this.” This also is an utter perversion of anything which has been said.

The women whose names are signed to the statement on which the above comment is made, are incapable of intentionally misrepresenting facts. It is to be regretted that the sources of their information should have been so untrustworthy.

Harry Pratt Judson,
Dean of the Faculties of Arts, Literature, and Science.

Alonzo E. Parker,
University Recorder.

The University of Chicago,
September 25, 1902.
COPY.

Chicago, June 27th, 1902.

John D. Rockefeller,
New York City.

Dear Sir:

The future usefulness of the University founded by you in breadth and wisdom, is being greatly threatened by the honest but reactionary movement that is being forced through in the face of hundreds of remonstrants and in spite of such a significant opposition inside the University itself that to defy it is disruptive in its tendency. We beg a delay of proceedings to enable a better sifting of the facts upon which this demand for a change is based, and ask you to use your influence to secure such postponement.

In the name of thousands who believe that co-education is the better education of young men and women, I am,

Respectfully yours,

Jenkin Lloyd Jones.
Dear Mr. Rockefeller,

New York City

Dear Sir:

The future maintenance of the University Colony by you is praised and

wished to pointed greatly forward by the present and recessional movement

that is going forward from the face of troubles of recession and in spite of

such a remarkable opposition inside the University Trust that to gain it to

achieve in the tendency, we put the belief of possibilities to amuse a better

situation of the latter which finite capacity for change in passing and seek you

all to your influence to become such development.

In the name of those who believe that co-operation is the better

solution of many difficulties I am

Respectfully yours,

Jenkin Mead Jones.
Mrs. Margaret F. Sullivan
376 Oak St., Chicago.

My dear Mrs. Sullivan:

It was very good of you to write the editorial on "Obscuring the Facts", and to send me a copy of the same. I can assure you that this gives me the greatest possible pleasure. How easily you are able to state the facts in the case! I am wondering whether an even longer treatment of the subject would be acceptable to the Chronicle.

With much appreciation of your courtesy, I remain

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
The President of Parliament

The Censor of Censorship

My dear Sir,

I trust you are very busy with your work at the moment. I understand there is a lot of activity in the government circles at the moment, which is a good sign of the times. I hope you are coping well.

I was very pleased to receive your letter of 10th October regarding the situation in the country. I am confident that we will overcome the current challenges and emerge stronger than ever. I am also pleased to hear that the government is taking necessary steps to address the economic situation.

I understand that there is a lot of pressure on you to ensure that the interests of the people are represented in the best possible way. I am proud of the work you are doing and I know that you will continue to do your best.

I am writing to express my appreciation of your efforts and to thank you for your hard work. I remain deeply impressed by your dedication and commitment.

With warm regards and best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

W. R. Harper
Obscuring the Facts.

It is the interest of the city of Chicago that the University of Chicago shall not be misrepresented to its injury.

It is necessary, therefore, to state clearly that separation of the men and women students in the first two years of class work, as the trustees have almost unanimously voted, does not deprive any student of either sex of any educational advantage now existing or hereafter to exist in that institution.

The segregation will give the women students during their junior period a seclusion which every student knows to be conducive to comfort, composure and the best intellectual results. Restoration of association with the other half of the students during postgraduate work refutes the allegation that the University of Chicago rejects coeducation as a failure.

Coordinate education is more efficacious than coeducation. Equal opportunities for men and women in education the spirit of the time demands. The University of Chicago meets this demand and will never recede from it.

These are the facts. No good is to be accomplished by obscuring them.
winter breakfasts—all with the finest spices

Company

PERCY PYNE, JR., GETS BEST SCORE

Trial Against Time.

Trotter Gives an Exhibition, Though, Which Is Quite Remarkable.

MEMPHIS, Tenn., Oct. 22.—Two world's records broken, another one tied and a gallant attempt by the great Crescents to lower his trotting mark were the sensational features at the driving park this afternoon. The exhibitions of Crescents and Onward Silver were reserved for the end of the day's sport.

It was after 5 o'clock when Onward Silver, accompanied by a runner, appeared for his great effort to lower the two-mile trotting record of 2:29 1/2, made by himself last week at Lexington. At the second trial the starter gave Hudson the word and the handsome trotter fairly flew around the first turn. Hudson, apparently, checked his speed at the