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Believe me, it was not "thoughtless boys" who wished the girls away—it was older classmen and alumni seeking the prestige of being a man's college at a time when coeducation was looked down upon by the big colleges of the East.

Jessie Johnson Murphy, '09
Letter to LWK, March 22, 1972
CHAPTER I: THE NEW ORDER OF THINGS

During the second half of the nineteenth century, there was a rapid expansion in the numbers of positions available to women in American institutions of higher education. When Wesleyan University first admitted women in 1872, there were 237 institutions which granted degrees to women. In 1910, two years before Wesleyan graduated its last four women for the next fifty-eight years, there were 789 such institutions. Most of the growth in those forty years had occurred in the area of coeducation, where there had been an increase of 100 per cent. During the same period, the number of women's colleges and seminaries had increased by 25 per cent. Wesleyan had been among the first male colleges to accept women, yet the college was moving against the trend towards coeducation when it closed its doors to women in 1909. How had this happened, by what process?

Breaking down the statistics about higher education for women into geographic areas of the country raises more questions. During the period that Wesleyan was coeducational, more than a hundred state universities were being founded west of the Appalacians. This growth in the West was reflected in the rapid increase in the
national total of coeducational colleges and universities. Of the 344 functioning in the United States in 1913, 47 per cent were located in the North Central states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas, while 13 per cent were in the North Atlantic states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The Merrill Act of 1862, with its promise of free land for state universities, gave great impetus to the growth of higher education in the West but its existence does not sufficiently explain why coeducational schools were so uncommon in the East. Was Wesleyan's eventual rejection of coeducation related to its geographic location? Did other Eastern colleges experiment with coeducation and also reject it? We shall consider these questions again, after the story of coeducation at Wesleyan has been told.

The facts about the scarcity of places for women in colleges and universities in the 1870's imply that Wesleyan was being "liberal" or "progressive" by opening its doors to women in 1872. In light of that scarcity and Wesleyan's forty year tradition as a men's college, the adoption of coeducation was, as we shall see, an unexpected, if not a disturbing development to many alumni and students. Unfortunately, there is little information on who initiated the plan, campaigned and argued for its
institution. We do not know how the men responsible for making the decision to accept women defined the issue. Was it one of moral responsibility? As an economic necessity? We do not know the extent of the opposition or the nature of the debate.

We do know that Wesleyan became coeducational during a time of general curriculum reform. Beginning in 1869-1870, juniors and seniors were no longer required to take Latin and Greek. The trend away from the classical education was confirmed in 1873 when students were given the freedom, then unusual, of choosing to follow one of three four-year degree courses. In addition to the classical degree (BA) which required Latin and Greek, Wesleyan offered a scientific degree (BS) which required only Greek, and a Latin-scientific degree (PH B) which required only Latin. Mathematics was still required for all degrees. 4

It is possible to relate Wesleyan's curriculum reform to its adoption of coeducation, and see both as the product of a phase of liberalization. When proposed, both changes were enthusiastically supported by two young professors, John Van Vleck (Astronomy) and William North Rice (Geology). 5 Was coeducation, like the new curriculum, the product of a desire among some young professors to innovate? Without more information, it is difficult to say.

There is also the possibility that Wesleyan accepted women for the same reason that it had recently accepted a
grant and concomitant official affiliation from the National Methodist Episcopal Church: because it needed the money.

In 1868, members of the administration and faculty had met with various Methodist church boards in an effort to raise funds for the college. In 1870, the national church organization gave Wesleyan a generous grant, and the University Charter was revised to read: "At all times the majority of the Trustees, the President, and a majority of the faculty shall be members of the Methodist Episcopal Church." In a day when a student's tuition for one year amounted to $102, coeducation was not as remunerative a source of income as a religious affiliation, but for Wesleyan in 1871, it may have been enough.

The first available documented endorsement of coeducation occurred on July 19, 1871, at a "very largely attended" meeting of the Alumni Association at which a resolution in support of coeducation was passed. All graduates of Wesleyan were members of the Association. The organization, which met once a year at Commencement, had no responsibilities involving the day-to-day functioning of the college, but its voice carried advisory weight. The alumni were, after all, another source of revenue.

The origins of the coeducation resolution suggest that it is the alumni who should be credited for bringing

* Two new buildings, the Memorial Chapel and Judd Hall were to be dedicated that year.
coeducation to Wesleyan. We have one confirmation of this hypothesis. A year after the Alumni Association issued its resolution, a student author of an anti-coeducational article written for the college newspaper, the Argus, blamed a "few influential alumni" for the presence of women at Wesleyan. Although, in this case, we cannot know whether he was correct, his accusation brings to mind a further question: what is the nature of the Argus as an historical source?

Much of our knowledge of Wesleyan during its first period of coeducation is drawn from the Argus and the yearbook, the Olla Podrida. In 1872 both were relatively young organizations. The Argus had been established in 1868; the Olla Podrida ten years earlier. Since that time the yearbook has been published by the fraternities, except in 1861 and 1862, when it was put together by the freshmen class. The year that coeducation began at Wesleyan, the Olla Podrida was taken over by the Argus, in whose hands it remained until 1879, when it was established as a separate organization.

Both were entirely student publications, but as accurate sources of student opinion they had their limitations. Underclassmen were not represented on the staffs, (except for the years 1861 and 1862) which gave both publications an upperclass bias. Since, as a college newspaper, the Argus did not compete with other newspapers (except for
Perhaps the Middletown Tribune it is difficult to know what news was exaggerated and what was never reported.

On the other hand, the Argus was, in some ways, a better source of student opinion than was a public newspaper. The Argus editorial board changed every January; the paper was likely to register a change of mood on campus more quickly than was a newspaper which kept the same editor(s) over a span of many years. The fact that, despite the rapid turnover in staff, there was, over several years, little change in the paper's coverage of coeducation suggests that its coverage was representative of some kind of reality. The same could be said of the yearbook.

The Argus began by supporting coeducation in an editorial which was published July 20, 1871, during Commencement Week. The Board of Trustees, the final decision-making body of the college, had met the day before, the same day as the Alumni Association, and discussed the Association's coeducation resolution. The Board observed that there was "nothing in the charter to prevent the ladies from being admitted to the privileges of the University." Having issued this back-handed invitation, it referred the question to the Executive committee of the Board (which consisted of the elected officers plus the University president) and to the Faculty. Both groups adopted the resolution. In response to their action, the Argus editorial remarked:
In these days when the question of woman's rights has become a prolific subject of discussion, when she is demanding a position of legal and social equality with men, it may not be impertinent to inquire on what grounds man refuses to admit her claims.

"The principal argument [against coeducation,]" the editor continued, is woman's "unfittness for social and political equality, her incapacity to fulfill the obligations which her new relations to the world would impose upon her." But, he argued, her unfitness and incapacity are the result of her superficial education: "Man places the bounds and says, 'thus far shalt thou go and no farther.'" She is rarely permitted to study the classics, and her exposure to math and science is limited. Her mental training is considered complete upon her receiving "a smattering of French, Italian, Music, drawing and painting."

The editor approved of Wesleyan's intent to offer higher education to women but saw another obstacle besides lack of education blocking women's acquisition of social and political equality:

We may open the doors of every college and university in our land, we may provide every means possible for the equal education, physical and mental, of the sexes, but until we effect a change in the present existing public opinion, but few women will be found who avail themselves of the privileges offered them.

He believed that "strong-minded, masculine, unfeminine, and scores of other epithets would at once be applied to any [female college students] who might be so daring as
as to thus unsex themselves." (Italics his)\(^{15}\) Whether or not his reasoning was accurate, his prediction was. For the next seventeen years Wesleyan admitted on the average of two to six freshmen women a year (there is no record of the number of applicants), although the administration had apparently set no limit on the number of acceptances.

This first Argus editorial was notably sympathetic to the women's interests. In fact, it was the only Argus editorial of the many that were written on coeducation before the "experiment" ended in 1912 in which the editor took an un-ambivalent, reasoned stand in support of coeducation and recognized the existence of prejudice against the educated woman. Other, early editorials were to praise the women as students and affirm their right to an education but would avoid any discussion of prejudicial attitudes.

Why was this editorial different? Some conjectures are possible. There is the somewhat unlikely possibility that the administration, probably the president, was responsible for the sympathetic tone of the editorial's discussion of the women's situation. However, there is no indication either that the administration or the president was strongly in favor of coeducation or that they or he did take such a step. It seems more likely that the editorial was written by a senior who was to graduate before coeducation had become a reality and whose perceptions were therefore less immediately bound to Wesleyan.
At the same time, some of the alumni, for all of their involvement in a non-Wesleyan world, evaluated coeducation in terms of Wesleyan's interests. In a November '71 issue of the Argus, a Wesleyan alumnus of the class of '63, writing to contribute his voice to the discussion which followed the Trustee's decision described himself as "an advocate of woman's suffrage" and of woman's right to attend college, but said he was opposed to the policy of opening men's schools to women. 

Claiming that he "cannot be charged with prejudice," he described for the Argus readers an imagined scene in which he returned to his old college club to find "Miss Nellie Frizzle and Miss Jennie Strongmind living in his former room." 

If coeducation were brought to Wesleyan, the alumnus also feared for the study habits and moral development of the Wesleyan students. "I doubt if as many would see Venus through the telescope as through the sparkling eyes of some fair classmate." He rejected the ideas of "putting young people together at an age and under circumstances which shall tempt them to spend their time in courting and flirting." In the next edition of the Argus, a student who signed himself "Mulierum" (of women) responded to the alumnus' argument. He denied that the presence of women at Wesleyan would offer a new temptation to flirt. "Flirting at college," he observed, "is [already] at a discount. One can hardly walk to the P.O. without meeting half a dozen girls, who will nearly..."
break their necks to bow or twirl their handkerchief at the 'charming student'.\(^{20}\) "Mulierum" preferred to see woman, not as an object of sexual attraction, but as "the mother of coming generations.\(^{21}\) He argued that "the interests of the age, of society, or of art, and of human progress, demand for woman a more thorough training and more efficient education.\(^{22}\)

With this exchange of views, the debate on coeducation at Wesleyan was opened. The grounds for opposition and the grounds for support had been established within a year of the making of the decision to accept women at Wesleyan. Anti-coeducationalists argued that the women would lose their femininity, that Wesleyan was a men's college and that the students would be tempted towards immorality; supporters of the new policy pointed out that the women had a right to a good education, and that society needed them educated as the mothers of new generations. These arguments were not peculiar to Wesleyan; they were those employed by many Americans who were discussing the question of women's education in the press, on the podium, and in their homes during the middle of the nineteenth century. Sporadically, the debate at Wesleyan was to be argued on these grounds through the forty years of coeducation, although new, more persuasive arguments were to be added as Wesleyan changed. The debate would peak in 1898-1900 and again in 1907, until 1909, when the Trustees would decide to call an end to what some had called "the experiment."
The Reverend Joseph Cummings, President of Wesleyan in 1871, did not view coeducation as an experiment; nor, it may be implied, did he expect a prolonged debate on the question. In his President's Report of 1871-1872, he stated confidently, "I am satisfied that Coeducation is right in principle and that it will in the course of a few years be adopted by all the leading colleges." He was a hundred years early in his prediction. Any hesitation he had about the plan stemmed from his fear that the presence of women might further undermine Wesleyan's already shaky economic support. Acknowledging coeducation's present unpopularity, he predicted, "It is probable that the measure will lessen the number of students." In actuality, the undergraduate enrollment increased almost 16 per cent during the first year of coeducation. But enrollment decreased the following year, at least partially due to the new competition presented by nearby Methodist colleges, Syracuse and Boston, and continued to decline until 1880.

Aside from a decrease in the size of the freshman class, there remained the possibility that present Wesleyan students would transfer to other colleges rather than attend a coeducational school. In May, 1872, when it was widely expected that some women would enter Wesleyan in the fall, the Argus predicted that "quite a number of students" were thinking of not returning. In fact, the senior class was smaller by six, and the junior class by three, when students returned to college the following fall. The cause of their departure is not known.
In contrast to the previous year, the Argus editor's position in the spring of 1872 was one of hearty sympathy with the anti-coeducation position. He advised Wesleyan students to draw up a memorial (petition) asking the Trustees to reconsider "their hasty action." The editor found encouragement in the example of Amherst, where students had recently drawn up a memorial and had successfully blocked a proposal that women enroll.

At least one student other than the Argus editor thought such a tactic would receive majority support. In June, this student wrote an anonymous letter to the paper in which he estimated that a memorial calling for a reconsideration would receive three quarters of the signatures of the undergraduates. The student, who signed himself X, went on to argue against hurrying Wesleyan into coeducation on the grounds that Wesleyan was not well enough established to risk her reputation by "succumbing to a popular whim."

The fact that a student dismissed coeducation as a "popular whim" suggests both the novelty of the concept (at least in the East) and the superficiality with which its principles and values were understood. Yet the fact that X preferred to remain anonymous implies that his point of view towards coeducation was, at the least, something with which he did not want to be personally identified. Possibly, some students, if not enthusiastic, were willing to wait and see what coeducation was like before condemning it; others
would, in the words of the Arqus, "endure the personal inconvenience of the new order of things."  

In September, 1872, four women and fifty-one men enrolled as freshmen at Wesleyan. The low number of women confirmed another prediction of President Cummings', also made in the Report, that few women would come. It is not clear whether they were few because, as Cummings reasoned, "furnished rooms," and "the usual arrangements relative to clubs for boarding" would not at first be available to the women, causing their expenses to be greater than the men's, or whether other factors were at work. It is possible that, as the '71 Arqus editorial suggested, few women had the courage to come or knew of the opportunity.

Except for housing accommodations, the Wesleyan administration made few distinctions in their treatment of the men and women students. Women were not assigned to a separate, adapted women's degree program or made to fulfill special course requirements, like Home Economics or a class in Culture. Wesleyan's failure to require such things or even (apparently) debate their desirability was in contrast to the policy of some of the women's colleges. Henry Durant, the founder of Wellesley College, believed that women ought to have an equal but different education than men. In order to receive a degree in 1875, women at Wellesley were required to take a course in health, and perform domestic work one hour a day. Catherine Beecher, the founder of Hartford Female Seminary (1823) and organizer of the American Women's Education
Association, shared Durant's belief. However, during the same period, at other women's colleges, like Elmira and Smith, it was the policy to offer a curriculum modeled after those offered at men's schools. Wesleyan's failure to assign the women special academic standards implied a belief that women could accommodate and put to good use the same education that men received and that such an education was all that a college ought to take responsibility for providing.

The four women were permitted to take any of the courses open to freshmen men, but they were not so easily assimilated into the non-academic side of the Wesleyan community. Reporting at the end of the first year of coeducation, the Argus observed, "it was no ordinary test that these ladies were subjected to. Every action was closely scrutinized as an argument either pro or con." At the beginning of that year, the paper had seemed to be extending a welcoming hand to the women, judging from the number of short clippings about coeducation at other colleges which were included in the first issue. Then again, this may have been the Argus board's way of reassuring Wesleyan men that they were not alone in their madness. One clipping remarked optimistically, "Coeducation is making remarkable headway in this country," and listed the University of Vermont, Cornell, Swathmore, and the State Universities of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Kansas as examples. Another clipping observed that "Williams College has opened her doors to ladies." Although in June, 1871, a committee of five Williams alumni had been appointed by the College's Society of Alumni to study the question of
coeducation at Williams, a year later a majority of three had recommended that Williams postpone a decision on coeducation. They argued that the policy's unpopularity, both with the public and the Williams community, and the complexity and expense of establishing a separate curriculum for women made immediate action "inexpedient." Perhaps the Argus clipping was evidence of wishful reporting.

There was also a quotation from President White of Cornell:

I have found that coeducation of the sexes has been favorable to good order and discipline; that a mutual stimulating influence has been exerted on scholarship. The content of one of the clippings suggests that their presence in the Argus was indeed more for the purpose of reassuring the men than of welcoming the women:

There have been no scandals,--at least not more than may exist between the members of a school limited to one sex and the outside world.

Well-scrutinized though they were, by June it was evident, and acknowledged by those opposed to coeducation, that the women were excellent students and well-behaved "young ladies."

In an editorial entitled "Coeducation at Wesleyan", an editor of the Argus observed, "Their [the women's] scholarship has convinced the most skeptical that woman is able to compete with man in intellectual strife." The editors of the Olla Podrida of 1873 claimed that the women were a source of honor to Wesleyan, and described them as "earnest, faithful,
womanly women." In a more ponderous vein, President Cummings wrote in his 1872-1873 Report:

All that the most sanguine friends of the measure [coeducation] could wish has thus far been realized. The scholarship, punctuality and general character and bearing of the ladies has been such as to command highest commendation and respect.43

It is clear from these comments that there had been a question in the minds of some whether the women would properly apply themselves to study and remember to conduct themselves according to the rules of etiquette when surrounded by a majority of eligible men. The suspicion that women would prove poor students was not unique to Wesleyan students; it provided the foundation for many nineteenth century arguments against offering women a college education. In the face of clear evidence of women's intelligence, men continued to believe that women could not be trained to think rigorously.44 During the years of coeducation to follow, when Wesleyan students were to be confronted with specific examples of feminine intelligence, we shall find them arguing that it was against a woman's interests to perform so well because they would not find her "feminine" if she did so. Intellectual ability was not a characteristic of their ideal woman.

Despite the women's excellent performances as students, there was strong opposition to coeducation within its first year. In February of '73, an informal vote was taken during
recitation. Thirty-three of the 145 students present favored coeducation, one hundred were opposed and twelve abstained. In March, the Argus noted that many students were calling Wesleyan "a female seminary." In June, another vote on coeducation was taken, the first having been called a fraud. Of the 172 students voting, ninety-nine opposed coeducation, fifty-eight supported it, and fifteen were neutral. In the same month four of five members of the class of '76 refused to be in the class photograph unless the women were excluded. The Argus registered campus disapproval: "Severe censure, and justly too, was passed by many on such conduct," and, in spite of the opposition, tried to end the first year of coeducation on a positive note:

We have seen the experiment tried one year and we feel warranted in saying that, with us thus far, it is a success. [Yet] we admit that a large majority of the students are opposed to it; and their views are entitled to much respect.

Two years of silence on the topic of coeducation followed in the pages of the Argus. Then, in November of 1875, an article appeared opposing coeducation. The author praised "the four ladies of '76" and emphasized "we are not attempting an argument against coeducation per se, but ... [are expressing] the opinion of an overwhelming majority against coeducation here." The distinction was to be an important one in the minds of most of those students who were to oppose coeducation at Wesleyan during the coming years. The Argus had made the same point in more general terms in
June of 1873 when it had observed that "opposition was on the grounds of policy rather than right." Only the specific arguments, rooted in the nature of Wesleyan as she was to become, remained to be put forward.
CHAPTER II: THE IMAGE

Wesleyan's commitment to coeducation raised questions about the women student's rights and responsibilities as members of the Wesleyan community. Almost immediately events would demonstrate that many of the men students had ambivalent reactions to the women's presence in the classroom and their participation in extra-curricular activities. The women's involvement in athletics and Greek societies, which developed primarily in the nineties, will be dealt with in the next chapter; the men student's ambivalence was first made evident in the senior class elections.

As freshmen and sophomores, the first three coeducation classes--'76, '77, '78--had elected women as one of the two class secretaries. No woman had been elected to a junior class office, however, when, in December, 1875, the first coeducational class met to elect senior officers. At that meeting, the senior women were declared ineligible to hold office and on Class Day the following June, were barred from joining the other seniors in the senior class tradition of sitting in a circle on the college common and smoking a peace pipe. Excluded, the four senior women sat beneath a nearby tree and watched. 52
It is difficult to explain why the women were excluded from holding class offices as juniors and seniors when they had not been as freshmen and sophomores. One might hypothesize that freshmen and sophomores, usually stereotyped by the upperclassmen as innocent and awkward types, had spent too little time in college and had not yet realized what was obvious to the seniors—that women really had no place there. On the other hand, since the four women of '76 were the first senior "coeds" perhaps their exclusion was simply an isolated incident caused by a few students who were opposed to coeducation, but who lacked the confidence until their senior year to act on their feelings.

During the following fall, it became known that some of the men students disapproved of the way the last senior class had treated its female members. The new senior class of '77 did not bar women from the class elections, and, in December, 1876, Elizabeth Ellis was elected class poet by a vote of twenty-nine to fifteen.53 The New York Sun interpreted her election as an attempt by some seniors to compensate for what they viewed as the last senior class's earlier rudeness. If that was the intent, it backfired.

Even before the election, the class had split into two factions, the "women's party" and "the opposition." After Miss Ellis was elected, the "opposition" became obdurate. Some of the class officers who had just been elected announced they would rather resign than appear at the class day exercises
on the same platform with Ms. Ellis; other seniors threatened to boycott the event. A meeting was held to annul the election but Ms. Ellis refused to resign. The New York Sun reported that she "said it was her duty to her sex to keep the position to which she had been elected." Yet, despite her determination, at a second meeting, under increased pressure, she resigned.

Her resignation provoked a voice in her favor, that of the editor of the Argus: "the ladies have the same right as the gentlemen to take part in . . . the class day exercises." Hoping, possibly, to revive the earlier spirit of equity, he added:

From the point of view from which we prefer to see the subject, the result reached by the class was considerably in advance of that reached by '76.

For her part, Ms. Ellis placed less emphasis on the progress already made and more on the reactionary mood of the senior class. She had resigned, she told the Sun reporter, only because

I thought I should better serve the cause of coeducation of the sexes by putting a stop to the dispute that threatened to break up class day. I wanted to keep the position, not so much on my own account, as because my being elected was an honor to our sex and I appreciated it.

Her remarks reveal that she was conscious of her role as spokeswoman for her sex.

The meaning of an event is not the same thing as the event itself. One event can have many meanings, as is
evident from the range of responses Ms. Ellis's election elicited: there was disagreement between students and ambivalence within individuals. To some, Ms. Ellis's election may have been a threat in that no woman had ever been elected as class poet. But others either had expected or were willing to expect a woman to act in such a way. The confusion of response was the product of conflicting expectations held by the men students of how they thought a woman should act, and what they thought she should do. There was a tension between the reality and the ideal. What was the image that shaped their disapproval? What was the reality that was distorting the image?

The publications that the students wrote for themselves are as likely a place as any to find descriptions of their feminine ideal. In the pages of those Argus and Olla Poquidas which were published between 1875 and 1897, before the opposition to coeducation intensified in 1898, we find editorials, poems, illustrations, and scattered remarks, all on the subject of women; enough to make it possible for us to imagine for ourselves the dimensions of their ideal woman, and understand the cause of their ambivalence.

Within a year of Ms. Ellis's defeat as class poet, the Argus editor ventured to flatter the women with the following observations:
At least some of us enjoy the sweet and refining influence which the presence of the ladies seems to inspire. '79, we envy you! . . . We can already notice a decided 'tonic up' in your morals as well as personal appearance. The rudeness of sophomore year is fast wearing away, to the great satisfaction of certain sedate members of the class. We think that no one would object to a dose of 'coeducation' if taken in this sugar-coated form.

The editor believed that the women's moral example had "refined" the men, and he was not surprised. It was what he had expected. To lend to those rougher, ruder men their "sweet influence" was the women's responsibility.

The editor, a member of the senior class of '78, could only envy '79 because '78 was, by a quirk of fate, an all-male class.

An illustration on the title page of the "Secret Fraternities" section of the '85 Olla Podrida offered another example of the female image. Pictured was a young man kneeling, his face uplifted to the vision of what was, to nineteenth century eyes, a beautiful woman. She stood before him, dressed in Greek Revival draperies, replete with fairy wings, dubbing his shoulder with a sword. Beneath the figures appeared the words, "Trouthe and Honor, Freedom and Curtesie."

The similarity between the student's fantasy and the Western medieval concept of courtly love, as suggested by the spelling of the motto and the choice of scene, is apparent. No doubt the Wesleyan male students of the 1870's and '80's liked to credit their ideal with such a respectable
past. For the chivalrous knight and the Wesleyan student, she was woman: moral and lovely.

She was also distant. As the symbol of certain ideals, she could not be otherwise. And so, the Olla Podrida editor of the same '85 yearbook remarked:

We delight to have our names on their lips and our praises in their hearts. This, with an occasional glimpse of their pretty faces, is enough to make us happy.61

He did not expect to have closer contact with the women, but was content to admire their beauty and listen to their flattery. Women belonged to a world apart; one looked at them with some awe that they could be so different.

Wesleyan students were not alone in their dedication to such a feminine ideal. Indeed, the habit of setting woman apart and applying separate standards of evaluation to her was not unique to the nineteenth century or even to Western culture. But during the period between the Civil War and World War I, when women were enrolled at Wesleyan as undergraduates, excessive femininity was admired by men and cultivated by women in England, Europe, and the United States. Natural differences between men and women were exaggerated by differences in dress and etiquette. The ideal man was the gentleman: courteous, articulate and a man of the world. The ideal woman was the lady: beautiful, moral, and silently sympathetic.

The Wesleyan students recognized the feminine quality of sympathy in their "coeds": 
'Tis of you I speak, fair maidens. You who have smoothed the scholars' brow of care and by your charming presence have often kept us away from the beastly grind until one a.m. To you we owe a debt that can never be repaid.62

Curiously, the author of this remark implied of his fellow women classmates that they had no scholar's brows of care that might need smoothing, or beastly grind to be kept away from. He did not expect the woman to be a serious student, and, as the ideal woman was above all else, beautiful, it followed that a woman could not commit herself to study without decreasing her beauty and therefore her feminine appeal.

Consider the following poem:

To Our Coeds

Waiting maids of Pale-eye Learning, hear;
And heed the honest warning we display;
Suffer not your wizened queen severe
From your sweet hearts young Love to drive away.

Mark while yet your cheeks are bright with youth,
Your pulse yet with bounding life elate
Nor eyes yet dimmed with too much seeking 'truth,'
The four steps of a sister's mournful fate.

A charming girl she came to college halls,
A fitter maid to love than to admire,
Whose dainty ear had never heard these 'calls'
To preach, or write, or set the world on fire.

As Sophomore she showed a taste for dressing,
And made one whisper slyly 'style,'
But kept her former fondness for caressing,
And mixed enticing art with every smile.

A trifle cruel, with her speaking eyes,
A trifle careless whom her wiles were dazing;
But that should not occasion much surprise,--
'Twas but a bit of Sophomoric hazing.
The 'call' is coming; mark the thoughtful brow,
The lines that gather round the mouth and eyes;
But sometimes tenderer glances gleam e'en now,
As o'er her face the rosy love-light flies.

So waxeth hot the contest for the maid
'Twixt roguish Cupid and Minerva pale;
A class-mate waits the issue, and--his love betrayed--
Sees the grave goddess o'er the boy prevail.

And Cupid flies to sit on sweeter brows,
And men, discouraged by her chilling looks,
To other maidens pay their lover's vows,
And leave our Senior with her musty books.

And thus she makes a farce of this fair life
By stepping out of Nature's goodly plan
Into the dusty tumult and the strife,
Absurdly trying to become a man.

Waiting maids of pale-eyed Learning, hear;
Hear and heed our honest warning, pray;
From some hearts among you, we have fear
That beauteous Love is being driven away.

But if the Queen of Beauty and the Queen of Learning
were rival queens, what was the point in educating women
at all? A sophomore's disappointment in one young woman sug-
gests an answer:

I rang the bell and was ushered into one of the
cosiest parlors imaginable. Classic pictures
adorned the walls. A plaster cast of Homer was
over the mantle. Books, leather-bound and gilt-
edged, were here and there, placed in perfect
order, and there was a general air of intelligence
about the place that just suited my hours of
deepest reverie.

I noticed on the centre table some well-worn
volumes of Dickens', and was glad to think that
a subject so pleasing to me could be the theme
of our first conversation.

Presently she entered, blushing and beautiful.
A brow, broad and marble-like, surmounted a pair
of pensive blue eyes, and her whole face beamed
with intelligence gained by deep thought and
ready sympathy.
We passed the compliments of the day and then I began at once upon our favored topic. 'Dickens!' I exclaimed. 'Did you ever find an author so deeply studied in human nature? One who could so ably get at the intangible niceties of our individual selves and bring so clearly before our minds the complex creations of the human imagination? Isn't he grand, deep, glorious?' She was looking thoughtfully—listening intently. All the light of her mind shone in her eyes. 'What think you?' I cried enrapt. 'I was wondering,' she said, 'whether you like my hair better as it is or à la Greece.'

A woman who was only interested in her appearance was not only a dull companion; she could not appreciate the quality of a man's education, and therefore, she could not appreciate him. The sophomore was hoping to meet a woman who could listen to his insightful remarks about Dickens with intelligence. But one wonders if it would have pleased him if she had replied to him with insightful remarks of her own.

The situation posed two problems; the first was that training the female intellect had an inevitably equalizing effect. The Queen of a man's heart could not do battle with his intellect on its own terms without losing some of her divinity because, at least in the area of knowledge, she had become his competitor. Still, for the purposes of companionship, it was desirable that a woman be moderately educated. Unfortunately, and this was the second problem, all the women were not willing to be educated moderately. Some were, of course. But there were also women students at Wesleyan who were very successful competitors. In an not unusual year, 1879, the only two women in a senior class
of thirty-three took three of the twenty-one senior prizes.

Threatened, the men made jokes about the women's intelligence. The 1896 *Olla Podrida* reports, "Ackerly in "Ethics thinks that women can't vote for the same reason that babies and fools can't." In the same yearbook there was a three page description of a "Lecture in Physiological Psychology." It is the story of a professor who stands before the class and speaks syllogisms and inanities. The male students ignore him completely, occupying themselves with writing letters or balancing their bank accounts, while the only woman in the class is portrayed as having no intellectual discrimination: "Miss De Forest [the actual name of one of the women students, who later wrote several novels] continues to take down every word...."

In the eyes of the men, the women's invasion into the world of the intellect had serious implications. Given the definition of the ideal Woman, it followed logically that, as the *Argus* put it in June, 1872, a woman who seeks an education "unsexes" herself. This perception was translated into a pen and ink sketch, which appeared in the '87 *Olla Podrida*, of a male student and a female student seated at a table. The man is smoking, has a parasol over his shoulder and is wearing a lady's straw hat. The woman is lighting a cigarette from his. She wears a graduation cap, is holding a cane (symbol of freshman indoctrination at Wesleyan), and has a tough, unsympathetic expression on her face."
picture makes an obvious point: in the logic of opposites, the woman's loss of her sexual identity also meant the man's loss. Women's enrollment and education at what was formerly a men's college had, at the unconscious level, emasculating implications. Some of this broke through in public discussions: "We hope," wrote the Argus editors of 1882, "the time will never come when of us, as of our sister college [Boston University]... it can be said; 'It is a ladies' college that admits a few gentlemen.'" 68

For the men students, Wesleyan's becoming a ladies' college was a fearful future to contemplate. When we consider the fact that, in an average year like 1882, thirteen women composed not quite ten per cent of the undergraduate student body, the fear seems far-fetched, yet the reality of it should not be minimized. The ideal woman was real enough to the Wesleyan men that the Olla Podrida editors could dedicate the '86 yearbook to her: "The Fair, the Chaste, the Unexpressive She." The fear of her dethronement was just as real. The ideal woman, perhaps moderately educated, defined their expectations of what women should be; their commitment to her indicated their commitment to the gentlemanly ideal. But some women were immoderate in their desire to be educated, and by that enthusiasm it seemed they would burst the image of the ideal woman, without which the gentlemanly ideal and popular definition of masculinity could not stand.
CHAPTER III: THE REALITY

While the men continued to admire the Ideal Woman, average women of varying degrees of beauty, morality and talkativeness enrolled as Wesleyan students. Until 1891, when there was a 50 per cent increase in the number of freshmen women, they represented, on the average, 7 per cent of a class. By the mid 1880's, there was usually one or two women enrolled as special students, and in the 1890's two or three doing graduate work. Often, the women who enrolled as students already had some tie with Wesleyan through a father or brother who was an alumnus, or a close family friend. Many of these and others came because the college was convenient to their homes. No doubt some did not have the courage to go away to school, while others did not have parents who would permit them, or enough money to pay for the expense of boarding.

At first, all of the women who boarded at Wesleyan lived in rented rooms in Middletown. For a while, some lived in what had been formerly the president's house. Then, in March, 1889, Wesleyan purchased a large pillared house located opposite the campus on the corner of William and High Streets. The building had formerly housed a boys' boarding school which had been run by a Mr. Webb. The women called their new dormitory Webb Hall. The men students called it the Quail Roost.
No reference is made in the available sources to the origins of the term "Quail" at Wesleyan. Women are often compared to birds and it seems likely that Wesleyan students did not invent the expression. By the eighties, women were usually referred to as "Quails" in the college yearbook.

Some students wanted to believe that the name was meant only as a synonym for "coeds," and was perfectly polite. In 1892, one freshman named Norris wrote to a girl named Nettie (his sister?, his girlfriend?), perhaps in reply to some remark she had made, "I think it is just as proper to say 'Quails' as it is to say coeds. It is just a name that we use for them." But the next sentence indicated the direction of his thoughts: "The fellows here don't regard the Quails very favorably as a general thing. They think that they are a kind of bother."70

By 1892-3, when twenty of the thirty-nine women, who were attending Wesleyan lived at the "Quail Roost," the dormitory had become the center of the boarding women's community life.71 At first, it was a center more by circumstance than intent since the women had no organized social activities. The men's student life included membership in a variety of formal social and athletic organizations which, by unstated custom, the women could not join. Neither were they permitted to use the gymnasium facilities or join in the Friday night fraternity sings.
The women decided to organize their own social events. They held evenings of song in the parlor of Webb Hall. Observed a Webb Hall resident in 1894, "Not one of our number is missing at such a time." Sometimes the girls would gather in the parlor during the winter and tell ghost stories. One of them described the scene for an article about Webb Hall in the '94 Olla Podrida:

We huddle on the floor ... shut the door, and turn the gas way down .... Then the ghosts troop past in their rustling robes and we thrust our hands out now this way and now that to assure ourselves that there are still some 'real life' people left in the world. 73

In 1891, perhaps in an attempt to meet the men on their own terms, the women organized a nine member baseball team. On the page opposite the Wesleyan Baseball Association's page, the '92 Olla Podrida listed the team members of the "Ladies' Baseball Team" and their positions. Below the list appeared the statement:

The Manager desires to state that having won the championship of the University, this nine is prepared to play all nines that vanquish the 'Varsity.' This is done to maintain the reputation of Wesleyan on the diamond. 74

Did the women play the 'Varsity'? Did the women win? The Olla Podrida and the Argus are silent. We can only suppose that for all the opposition to Ms. Ellis's election, taboos against joining organizations, and the existence of strongly felt opinions against coeducation, the men and women were sometimes friendly. Even playful.
In spite of the unity created by Webb Hall, the baseball team, and the smallness of their numbers, the women want more organized sociability. In 1893, the second chapter of the Phi Sigma sorority was established at Wesleyan. The first chapter had been founded at Wellesley in 1879. At the end of Phi Sigma's first year at Wesleyan thirteen of the thirty-two women were members. The sorority's coat of arms and membership list were included among the fraternity pages of the '94 Olla Podrida.

Then, in 1894, several women, observing that "the need for a society which would be open to all women has been felt for some time," established the Alpha Kappa Upsilon Literary Society. In the '95 Olla Podrida, the founders stated, "the purpose of this society is to furnish literary and social entertainment to its members and to promote, as far as possible, the best interests of the college community." Within another year, two more sororities had been established. At the end of the year, Delta Delta had thirteen members and Zeta Epsilon had seventeen.

The popularity of the Greek societies suggests that they answered a need of the women at Wesleyan, or several needs: the need of getting to know a few people well and the need for the status given by belonging to a small selected group. Perhaps also, in establishing societies, the women desired to emulate the men in their traditions and thereby confirm in the men's eyes, as well as in their own, their legitimacy as members of the college community.
As for their intellectual lives, it was true enough that the women were in college to receive only a moderate education. Some studied steadily throughout the school year, but almost all prepared seriously for the examinations. In an article written for the '94 Olla Podrida, one Webb Hall resident imagined that a visitor to the dormitory during the week before examinations "would assert with much firmness that these solemn serious creatures who pass each other with cold glances and monosyllabic utterances are nuns, and that this still and seemingly deserted house is a nunnery." The Olla Podrida of '98 recorded for history one woman student's creative effort to request silence:

ALL you people who are friends of mine, PLEASE remember, "I have to grind" KEEP if you will this caution in mind, STILL is the word at the time of a grind.

Whether it was because the women were, on the average, more intelligent than the men, or that they worked harder because they were more committed (or had nothing else to do), they collected more than their share of Phi Beta Kappa Keys. All of the first four women to graduate received them. During the years that followed there was almost always one woman on the list, and more often two and sometimes three. In the year 1894, four of the twelve who received Phi Beta Kappa Keys were women. The women's fondness for the keys did not escape the notice of the men. In 1899, as a result of a sudden surge of opposition to coeducation, a committee was appointed to investigate the advantages and disadvantages of
the system. The women's tendency to take more than their representative ratio of the keys, and thus reduce the number of keys available to the men was a point that the committee remarked upon. They recommended that the women be assigned a separate quota for Phi Beta Kappa Keys, in order that they would no longer have an effect on the men's quota.

Although equal earners of the Phi Beta Kappa, the women were not equal to the men in other respects of their roles as students. Their participation was differentiated from the men's by the fact that fewer of the women would make a professional livelihood with the fruits of their education. Wesleyan graduated one woman doctor, and no women lawyers. The women used their college educations as teachers, and principals of schools, but only a few became professors. Society did not expect them, nor did they often expect themselves, to have professional careers. A good deal of public prejudice existed against the self-sufficient woman. In 1874, a female author of one of a group of essays published under the title, *The Education of American Girls*, observed: "in our present social system, it is still considered out of place for a lady to work for her living." Although by 1890, many more women were attending college, and working in jobs which gave them a social status other than that of wife and mother, women were, as they even are today, insecure about their right to move and act in a world usually dominated
by men. Women who held jobs or earned college degrees were often looked upon as "manning."

One woman at Wesleyan whose achievements may have been a challenge to the expectations of some was Doctor Kate Meade, the wife of "Billy" Meade, the linguistics professor. She was not insecure about her rights. When the Meades travelled in Europe, she would sign the hotel ledger, "Dr. Meade and husband." During the '90's, they often entertained the women students in their home. Dr. Meade must have set the women students an example of how to move in the men's world which clashed with the examples their mothers had offered.

Caught between several roles, the women who attended Wesleyan before the turn of the century probably vacillated between feelings of belonging and not belonging. They were welcome in the classroom and did well there, but were not permitted to participate in much of the rest of the student life, except by invitation. They were barred from use of the gymnasium, and from membership in the Greek societies, social clubs, Argus or Olla Podrida boards. At times, as we have seen, they were prevented from running for a class office (following Miss Ellis's resignation, senior women were not elected to a class office until 1885). In summary, the women were Wesleyan students but in a strange way. As seekers of higher education, they risked losing the quality of femininity which was making their position at Wesleyan awkward. And yet, their possession of that quality, which excused or barred them from so many tasks and opportunities, made no difference
in their responsibilities as students. In a poem which appeared in the '87 Olla Podrida, some of the women expressed their feelings:

Prelims, exclusions, warnings, - everything
That college life and college duties bring,
To us apply; there is no added grace
For any girl, what e'er her case,
We must do all and suffer all the rest,-
'Tis but an equal privilege at best.80

For those women who were sisters or daughters of Wesleyan alumni, or children of professors, another element was added to the peculiarity of their position:

Here girls, behold yourselves, "admitted," then,
"To equal privilege with the gentlemen,"
And pour out sobbing thanks on bended knees,
To festive Faculty and grave Trustees,
Tho', true, this college where we are allow'd,
Our fathers founded and our friends endowed.81

They ended their poem with appropriate words of praise for the Wesleyan gentlemen, but the exaggerated spirit of their sentiment suggests that it was not free from sarcasm:

But oh! the "gentlemen!" Each is a knight!
A Philip Sidney or a Raleigh, quite,
Their "Honor, truth and courtesy" they show
Where e'er they meet us, and where e'er they go.
No slurring speech behind our backs they make,
But hold all women sacred for our sake.82

Was it really the opposite that was sometimes the case? We cannot tell.

We actually know very little about personal relationships between the male and female students during this period but we have clues that some women enjoyed social interaction with the men from remarks made by the younger alumna. Women
who graduated after 1900 recalled in conversation sixty or so years later that women who graduated in earlier classes often returned to Wesleyan and told them how friendly and sociable some of the men student of earlier days had been. It seems likely that some of the women were invited by the men to go on various social outings, fraternity parties, picnics, boat trips and the like because we know for a fact that between 1872 and 1898, 50 per cent of the women who married (one-third of the women graduates never did) married Wesleyan men.

Apparently, despite continued grumbling about coeducation, by the 1890's, if not sooner, the women at Wesleyan had found their individual and collective ways of accommodating themselves to their situation. More as students than as women they were established as "belonging." The success of their effort was reflected in the fact that, in 1891, the number of freshmen women enrolled had doubled from the previous year. Some of the men students, however, did not see this as an encouraging sign.
CHAPTER IV: CONFRONTATION

During the 1890's most of the grumbling against coeducation focused on the fact that more and more women were enrolling at Wesleyan. In 1891, there were seven freshman women; the next year there were fifteen. For the date September 25, 1893, the Olla Podrida reported, "Sportsmen report an unusually large migration of young quail to this locality." In that year, eighteen freshman women had enrolled. Two months later, in November, 1893, some of the grumbling became organized. Four upperclassmen and sixteen other students established themselves as the P.D.Q. Society. Several of them were campus leaders, one was captain of the varsity football team, another was Glee Club manager, and a third was president of the YMCA and a member of the Argus Board. The Society's motto was "Press the Damsels Quietly." Officers were elected to the offices of Principal Presser, Alternate Presser, Qu’il Holder, and Treasure Her. As stated in the Argus, their intent was "to prevent the undue spread of the obnoxious pest." The Society had its own page in the "Secret Society" section of the 1995 Olla Podrida. It followed the page for the Women's Literary Society, Alpha Kappa Upsilon.
The spirit of the P.D.Q. Society was playful but its playfulness was ambivalent. Although organized in a humorous spirit, the society had a serious purpose—to focus and give voice to the anti-coeducation position. The members left no record of why they desired the women to leave. We do know one member's opposition was probably not to the women personally or to their receiving an education; after graduating from Wesleyan, Arthur Scudder, who had co-founded the P.D.Q. Society, married a "quail."

In September of 1897, the junior class published the '98 Olla Podrida. Perhaps as an indication of the increasing tension over coeducation, the yearbook paid an unusual amount of attention to Woman and to women at Wesleyan. With remarkable illogic, the juniors wrote in the Olla Podrida of the women as pests to be gotten rid of while they decorated the book's pages with Woman's lovely image.

The student's continued loyalty to the ideal Woman was evident in the yearbook's two-page frontspiece. The picture: a beautiful woman was standing in a boat. Before her stood eight young men who represented different types of students—the athlete, the "grind," the ladies' man. The reins in her hands were attached to their shoulders. A poem was spread across the two pages which ended with the stanza:

A shrine of dearest mystery
All mortal men shall bow before,
Leave books or gridiron to adore
Eternal femininity.
The students' increasing disaffection with the women was evident in their class histories. The seniors wrote, "and as for the numbers of quails, why we have them to . . .
to take our PBK's".

The junior class, '98, which published the yearbook, spent six of their eight paragraphs of class history talking about the "quails":

We have begun a crusade against the Quails . . . . We were the first class to prefer a man to a female (sui generis) as a Vice President, and every class in college has followed our example.

They noted the transformation of the YMCA:

We have seen the Young Men's Christian Association grow into a Young Men's Association for seeing that the quails get home safely, while the religious interests of the college waned.

The administration's report of steady growth in the number of students at Wesleyan was reinterpreted:

Someone with a head for figures has exposed this pious lie by showing that the sole increase (if under the circumstances it could be called an increase) has been in the Quail registration. This has increased 50 per cent in spite of many curses and prayers.

Although the number of men at Wesleyan has increased by 34 per cent since 1888, it was true that the percentage of women had increased more rapidly. In 1888, women has been 7 per cent of the total student body. By 1898 they were 23 per cent. To some, this trend was ample evidence that Wesleyan was indeed going to suffer Boston University's fate (as interpreted by Wesleyan) and become a predominantly women's school.
The '98 *Olla Podrida*, with its disparaging attitude towards the quails, was published in the fall of '97. The women in the class of '99 read it and complained to the '99 *Olla Podrida* Board about "the nature of remarks in previous issues." The women decided that unless they or a third party were permitted to inspect the proof sheets before the yearbook was published, they would refuse to pay their class tax, part of which went to pay for the yearbook. At first, the board did not take the threat seriously, but in an interview with the president of the college, Editor-in-Chief Tackaberry gave his personal assurance "that nothing objectionable would appear." To the women he offered a compromise. Those who wished could withhold their tax until after the *Olla Podrida* had been published and a third party had judged that there was nothing objectionable within its covers. The women refused.

The members of the board, feeling they had been more than reasonable, announced that unless their concession was accepted, "all mention of the ladies' names, societies, etc. would be cut out." In May, 1898, they called a meeting of the class of '99 to learn if the class supported their action. All the junior women attended, which, in the words of an *Argus* reporter, "was an unwonted feature in the meetings of ninety-nine." The meeting began with a motion that the class support any action of the board. As part of the hour-long discussion on the motion which followed, the women presented their case.
They said that they wished to be treated as a body, and not as individuals. They felt that their standards were different from the men's. The board spoke of its need for money to pay the printers, since the book was soon to go to press. Frustrated at the direction the discussion was taking, some students tried to "explain to the meeting that this was the beginning of a fight for representation and that the principle of coeducation was the point at issue," but their attempt was "shunted off, the president ruling that the remarks were not on the motion." The women withdrew to reconsider. Ten minutes later they returned with their minds unchanged. A rising vote on the motion to remove all mention of the women from the '99 Olla Podrida was taken. The Argus reported that all the men voted in the affirmative. Ten of the thirteen women voted against it. The meeting was adjourned with the ninety-nine yell.

Until this time, except for the debate about Elizabeth Ellis's election, coeducation at Wesleyan had not been publicly recognized as a campus issue, or as a subject for more than individual alarm. Generally, the women had not seemed to concern themselves, beyond establishing sororities, with improving their group's position in the college community. If the women did give any collective response to some of the men's pressuring Elizabeth Ellis to resign, it was not recorded in the Argus or Olla Podrida. The challenge of the women of '99 to the Olla Podrida board in the fall of '97 was the first
clearly intentional effort made by the women to define a new position for themselves.

Why was the effort not made sooner? A partial explanation for the timing of their aggressiveness can be found at the national level. Since 1872, the woman's position in American society had been changing. More women could work at white collar jobs in the 1890s because more women had college degrees. In 1870, 11,000 women were enrolled in institutions of higher learning. By 1890, the number was 56,000. As a result of this trend fewer women saw a college degree as something it was a privilege to possess, and more women saw it as their right.

At the same time, as a result of the leadership of several female national figures, women were becoming involved in new areas of social concern and developing a self-consciousness of themselves as a minority group. In 1891, Jane Addams was making a large success of her settlement house in Chicago and Frances Willard had just been elected chairman of the new National Council on Women. Miss Willard called attention to the new opportunities women were opening up for women to be in positions of public power and responsibility. In a speech at the first meeting in Washington, D.C., she noted that at a recent national convention of Public School Teachers, "women were made vice presidents for the first time, and given equal voice in all proceedings."
Unfortunately, we have only the brief biographies of the alumni record to tell us what extent Wesleyan women graduates were reflecting the national trend by seeking out occupations other than the traditional ones of housewife, mother, and teacher. Of the 147 women who graduated from Wesleyan between 1876 and 1899, sixty-two did not marry. Of those sixty-two, thirty-nine had careers other than high school teaching. Although two-thirds of the 147 were teachers at one time or another, eighty-five (fifty-six of whom were married) were also professors at colleges and universities, missionaries to the Far East (China, Japan), preachers, a doctor, principals of academies and high schools, authors, librarians, presidents of state-wide organizations, a state superintendent of religious education, a representative in the state legislature, journalists, and an editor of the woman's page of the New York Evening Post. For these eighty-five, their college degrees were necessary first steps to their future positions. The whole process involved a raising of the level of their expectations.

Despite their aggressiveness, the women in the class of '99 did not succeed in gaining editorial power over the Olla Podrida board. At the end of the Argus article on the junior class meeting, the reporter wrote:

It is worth noting that subsequently the ladies concluded to yield to the board's concession and the board, though this came so late, agreed to accept it by a majority vote. The Olla Podrida therefore will be issued in the usual form.
Perhaps it meant more to the women to have their names in the Olla Podrida and an opportunity to evaluate the book after it had been published, than to refuse to compromise and be left out of the book completely. Perhaps they sensed that the board was not going to change its mind. Or, if we follow another theory, that their intention had not been to acquire the power of censure over the Olla Podrida board, but rather, to create an awareness on campus of their existence as a rightful interest group, we may conclude that they agreed to the concession because they had already achieved their goal.

In an editorial which appeared a week after the junior class meeting, an Argus editor suggested this as a possibility:

"What the ladies really wanted was representation." Otherwise, he asked, why did they wait until the last moment to accept the concession? "The whole matter reduces to coeducation." 102 He closed the editorial with a statement of opposition: "The great majority of the college is opposed to the principle of coeducation at Wesleyan--to the principle at Wesleyan we say." The students' "honest desire for the well-being of the college" made their position "firm," although he wanted to stress it was also "gentlemanly and indeed, friendly." 103

Between 1890 and the spring of 1898, there had been a change in the mood on campus. The number of women had been doubled and, what seemed even worse to some, it was continuing to rise. During the school year '97-'98, the women had become more aggressive as a group. Increasingly confident
of their right to speak, and probably feeling the strength of their larger numbers (although they never constituted more than one quarter of a class) the women had asserted themselves as members of the community—but were quickly put in their place. Afterwards, from their point of view, nothing seemed changed, but the pressure they applied to the Olla Podrida board combined with their increase in numbers was setting in motion an unprecedented wave of opposition to coeducation.
CHAPTER V: "A DISTINCTIVE CLASS OF COLLEGES"

In the fall of 1898, a freshman named Carrie Sarah Hallock enrolled at Wesleyan with twenty-one other women and seventy-nine men. The women were 22 per cent of the class and the men were worried. The Argus spoke of "the strengthening of the hold of the burden [of coeducation] upon Wesleyan." References were made to an unofficial 15 per cent limit. Why had it been exceeded? In spite of her newness to Wesleyan, Carrie must have sensed the issue immediately because the scrapbook of her newspaper clippings about coeducation begins with two articles from the Argus's first issue. The first article reported that at a meeting of the new junior class, the members of '00 passed the following resolution of the Olla Podrida board:

That the names of the ladies of the college be omitted from the 1900 Olla Podrida and that a statement be printed in the opening pages of the book signifying that it is published in the interests of the male members of the college.

Evidently the debate concerning the '99 board in June had created hostility that the '00 board wanted to avoid. The board decided to make its policy clear from the beginning in order to prevent the women from raising the issue again. In the absence of further comment in the Argus, we may suppose that there was little opposition to the board's decision,
but we do know that there was some because in the following November, when commenting on a similar decision made by the '01 board, an Argus editor referred to "what was said last year by some who were opposed to this action . . . ."106

Whether it was because those students who disapproved of the '00 board's decision had decided to boycott the Olla Podrida, or for some other reason like student apathy, in February, 1899 the '00 Olla Podridas were not selling very well. In March, and again in May, the Argus thought it necessary to ask the students to support their yearbook.

Unless there is . . . an increase of voluntary support, the board will have to suffer financially, a personal loss through the weak support of those who were strong in their enunciation of those principles for which this year's Olla Podrida stands.107

If, as the editor implied, the '00 Olla Podrida had come to stand for an anti-coeducation position, then the fact that it was not selling was an indication that coeducation had numerous supporters. In the preface to the '00 Olla Podrida, the editors has been worried enough about how the students would respond to their "radical change" that they had felt it necessary to remind the reader that the young alumni supported the board's decision to omit the women's names.

"In the discussion which is soon to come [about the omission] they [the young alumni] are the ones whom experience has taught; their testimony should be given weight."108 The Yearbook was even dedicated to them: "To the Young Alumni Associations of New York and Boston, in appreciation of
their loyalty and devotion to the interests of the Alma Mater. From this the impression emerges of a student body split on the issue of coeducation, with those opposed turning to the alumni for support. When, in the fall of 1898, the Argus editors wrote "A Protest" against coeducation, they did so "on behalf of those whose organ we are, the undergraduate men and very clear-headed alumni, a body of men who have no trivial part in making Wesleyan, Wesleyan." Evidently, some of the alumni, particularly the young alumni, were strongly opposed to coeducation. Suddenly, that fall, their opposition became vocal. From the October 12 and 19 issues of the Argus, Carrie clipped letters to the editors from two young alumni. Mr. Edward Smith, who graduated in 1893, wrote, "the time has come to have stated definitely the policy of the college in regard to coeducation." He blamed coeducation for "turning good men away from the college." The other alumnus, who graduated in 1890, opposed coeducation for a different reason: he feared for athletics.

Banish football! . . . Banish baseball! I expect you fellows, excuse me, you girls, will soon be sending little pink envelopes to the alumni soliciting subscriptions to the Wesleyan Croquet Club, Wesleyan Sewing Circles and similar organizations. Say, girls, please take my name off the list, won't you?

Although few alumni were as sarcastic, this alumnus was not alone in his fear that coeducation would ruin Wesleyan's athletics program. Beyond the fact that women could make no positive contribution to its development, it seemed to
some students and alumni that the presence of women created an image of Wesleyan that discouraged good athletics. The Hartford Courant quoted a "prominent athlete" at Wesleyan as saying, "We are the only college endeavoring to claim prominence in athletics that is hampered by the term 'quail institution' . . . " He emphasized the seriousness of the situation:

Only last year we lost a star pitcher for the baseball team, and this year four crack-a-jack football men, three of whom eventually entered Princeton, owing to their feeling on the matter of coeducation. 115

As was true of all colleges and universities, Wesleyan had not always been enthusiastic about athletics. A rapid increase in Wesleyan's commitment, particularly to the new games of football and baseball, had occurred within the span of years that women had been enrolled. In the 1870's the most popular sport was crew. Advised the Argus in 1876: "let us drop football and baseball and turn our attention to rowing." 116 But by 1881, Wesleyan's football team had sent game challenges to Amherst, Trinity and Brown, and four years later, having defeated Harvard (it should be confessed that Harvard had a weak team that year), was admitted into the Intercollegiate Football Association (I. F. A.) which Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and University of Pennsylvania had organized in 1876. The I. F. A. was the first football league in the country. Wesleyan's membership in it signified that the school's involvement in football was becoming more than a pleasant distraction from academics.
By 1890, the last five classes of alumni to graduate from Wesleyan remembered their Alma Mater as, among other things, a place where everyone talked about football and cheered at the home games. In that year, the Alumni Association appointed a committee of two alumni, Frank Beattys, '85, and Steward Coffin, '89, to meet with a faculty member and a committee of undergraduates "to confer . . . on the organization of the athletic interests of the university." It seems likely that the committee was responsible for the Alumni Association's announcement, made in the following June, that a new gymnasium was "the most pressing need of the college." It was probably true. The old gymnasium was a small one room wood-frame building that many made jokes about.

A Building Committee of President Raymond, Professor Van Vleck, D. W. Northrop, Stephen S. Olin and S. T. Camp was appointed to supervise the development of plans for the gymnasium. Three years later, aided by the generous financial support of the alumni, Wesleyan had a new gymnasium. The Wesleyan University Bulletin, which was sent to the alumni in May and November and served as a source of news, observed in May, 1894,

"It is probable that nothing will be of so much interest during the approaching Commencement season, at least to all the younger alumni, as the completion of the new gymnasium."

In the eyes of Cornelius R. Berrien, class of '96, who was baseball manager in his senior year, the alumni's enthusiasm for athletics was mild when compared to the students':
It would not be too much to say that two-thirds of undergraduate emotion, interest and attention is aroused by or devoted to the athletics of his Alma Mater. The enthusiasm of his college days becomes properly tempered in the alumnus, but it is always smouldering.

Emotions were so high that in an article on "Athletics at Wesleyan" which he wrote for the University Bulletin, Berrien felt it necessary to explain and justify Wesleyan's excessive commitment to athletics.

Perhaps we give athletics too much prominence, but it is the fault of the age. The end of the century is an era of rampant athleticism. But these contests play their part in making sturdy citizens, and training men in the invaluable qualities of loyalty, self-sacrifice, obedience and temperance.

In keeping with this philosophy, beginning in the fall following the spring during which the gymnasium had been completed, all freshmen and sophomore men were required to work out in the gymnasium three hours a week. As initially discussed in the Faculty meeting, the requirement also stipulated that freshmen and sophomore women be required to work out twice a week. No vote was taken on this part of the motion. When the faculty adopted the gymnasium requirement three weeks later, the women were not mentioned.

Somewhere, someone or group of people, had decided that the women did not need or should not be permitted to use the gymnasium. A statement of the purpose of the gymnasium activities made by the new gymnasium director, Aldrich, clarifies why this may have been so:
Given the prevailing attitude towards women, and the assumptions about their role in society, it is not surprising that they were not required to take gymnasium activities.

In the fall of 1893, at the height of Wesleyan's zeal for football, the I. F. A. began to fall apart. New tactics had increased the roughness of the game and the different members of the Association could not agree about how much roughness should be permitted. For the next five years Wesleyan continued to play the same teams, but belonged to no league. Then, in February 1899, during Carrie's freshman year, Wesleyan, Williams, and Amherst formed the Triangular Athletic League. We do not know what prompted the creation of the organization, but its existence may be taken as an indication of the "Little Three's" increased self-consciousness as a distinct group of small New England elite men's schools. None of the three, it might be added, were doing particularly well against the powerful teams of Yale, Harvard, Columbia and Pennsylvania. Indeed, for all of Wesleyan's zeal for football, between 1885 and 1893 the Cardinals had only one good season, and they sometimes lost to Yale or Harvard by as much as 120 points. The Triangular League offered a less humiliating arena where Wesleyan could test its mettle.
More important, however, than the fact that Amherst, Wesleyan and Williams provided each other with fairly equal competition, was the fact that by 1899 many Wesleyan students viewed Wesleyan as belonging to a particular group of small New England men's colleges of which Amherst and Williams were the best examples. Membership in the Triangular League confirmed Wesleyan's new identity. The editor of the *Argus* wrote in the fall of 1898: "We are in a well-defined, distinctive class of colleges... we mean the class of small New England colleges, a class peculiar to themselves."¹²⁴ Twenty years earlier, a student would not have made such a statement because at that time prestige derived from geographic location was not something that the majority of students at New England colleges gave much thought to. One student, X. Y., writing in the *Argus* in 1873, told of some students who had decided to attend Yale or Harvard rather than Wesleyan, but X. Y.'s criticism of their disloyalty, and of their calling Wesleyan a "female seminary," indicates that for some students loyalty was more important than fame:

For myself, I have joined hands with Wesleyan for life or death. If I am unable to win a name for myself; if my position in life is to depend on the name of the college that stands on the top of my diploma, then I would prefer to commence life, making as little boast as possible, and live in a humble way.¹²⁵

The difference between X. Y.'s position and the pretentious attitude of the '98 *Argus* editor is apparent. No student took X. Y.'s position in the pages of the *Argus* in 1898.
What explanation can be made for the change? During the 1880's and 1890's, newspapers and travel had become increasingly cheap and accessible. More Americans were aware that a particular group of colleges and universities in the northeastern part of the United States was older and more selective in admission standards than most of the other schools in the country. Also, during the same period, there had been a significant increase in the number of American colleges and universities. The desirability and prestige of the older, more selective schools was increasing proportionately to their relative scarcity.

Prestige was the new standard of evaluation. Given that a school was old enough, small enough and located in the proper area of the country, it could strive to establish itself as one of the elite colleges of New England. What could it do? Play football. The most famous and respected Ivy League colleges and universities were investing much money and enthusiasm in football by the 1880's. Football was an agreeably masculine means of proving prestige by performance and association. As Wesleyan never performed well, it was important that the school belonged to the prestigious league.

For Wesleyan, as well as for most of the other Ivy League schools, prestige was also defined by another characteristic—the schools were men's schools. In 1898 Harvard, Brown, and Columbia had coordinate colleges, but only one,
Pennsylvania, was actually, like Wesleyan, coeducational. And Pennsylvania, being a state school, was the least "Ivy League" of the three. More importantly, Wesleyan had found for itself a smaller, more secure role within the Ivy League as a member of the "Little Three." Williams and Amherst admitted no women. Therefore, it made sense that the women were viewed by Wesleyan as a threat to athletics; the women's presence threatened the school's identity as a member of the "Little Three," and of the Ivy League. They undermined the school's prestige. The problem was a serious one, as it affected the quality of the student body. The Argus editor explained:

Where coeducation exists, there is invariably a noticeable weakness in the calibre of the large majority of men attending such institutions, and a corresponding loss of rank of such institutions among the colleges in the country.126

In its November issue, the Wesleyan Literary Magazine made the same point: "[if coeducation remains] Wesleyan will lose its prestigious position among the New England elite."127

The young alumni, proud to have graduated from a small New England men's college whose football team played Yale, Harvard and Columbia, saw coeducation threatening what they loved. They had two choices. In the face of the threat, they could choose to remove their affection. In October, 1898, the Argus observed, "Men are being graduated year after year whose affection for their Alma Mater is estranged, and who will not lend their support to the college so long as coeducation
prevails." Their other choice was to do something about the cause of their estrangement, coeducation.
CHAPTER VI: PUBLIC BATTLES AND PRIVATE TRUCES

The suddenly heated debate over coeducation at Wesleyan in the fall of 1898 did not go unnoticed by the public press. Stories involving arguments between men and women rarely do. Reporters from Hartford and New York, as well as Middletown, hastened to Wesleyan to get a story sure to "sell." On December 11, the New York World reserved a double page spread for a story on coeducation. "The Feud of the Sexes at Wesleyan" shouted the headline across the top of the two pages. The Middletown Tribune, choosing to focus on the women's point of view, sent a man up the hill to gather information for a story on "The Women's Side of the Coed Discussion at Wesleyan." The reporter saw himself as being the mouthpiece through which seventy-six women could finally express their anger and frustration; he must have been disappointed to find them "loath to express their views for publication." The women, believing that the issue was one on which the students ought not to have a decisive voice, had made a group decision to remain publicly silent until the trustees acted. The reporter had to put into his own words a summary of their feelings:

Coeducation is in no way injurious to Wesleyan, and it is a great help to us, as it enables many to get a college education who do not wish to leave their own state to pursue a college course.
Other members of the Middletown community besides the editor of the *Middletown Tribune* sympathized with the women's situation. The *Hartford Courant* thought that the girls had the community's support because "the college students make a lot of noise in the streets with their raids and parades [while] the girls are studious and quiet."\(^{131}\) Middletown residents may also have sympathized with the women because they had heard rumors of the rude treatment the women were suddenly receiving from some of the men students. The *Hartford Globe* reported" "A new edict was passed among the male members [of the Athletic Association] . . . . No woman is recognized on the campus unless she is a resident of the town or a professor's wife."\(^{132}\) "For a boy to break this edict," observed the *Globe*, "is today to invite social ostracism."\(^{133}\) The statement is extravagant, but suggestive of the mood on campus. There was other evidence that, during the fall of '98, the women suffered at the hands of anti-coeducationalists. In a letter to the *Middletown Tribune*, an "old resident" reported that in front of "a certain chapter house" he had seen the young men line up on either side [of a sidewalk] and make remarks about [the women] or sing uncomplimentary songs as the women passed by.\(^{134}\) The "old resident" praised the women for having the dignity to endure the students' insults.\(^{135}\)

An alumnus came forward in support of the women. On December 10, the *Penny Press*, a newspaper serving mid-Connecticut, reported an interview with Daniel M. Chase,
Wesleyan's oldest living graduate. Mr. Chase who was then eighty-four, thought that the women should remain at Wesleyan for their "softening and ennobling influence." The Press reported:

He instances the employment of women stenographers in business offices, and says he believes they have quietly but effectively been doing a missionary work in raising the general tone of offices on account of their presence and believes that the young women at Wesleyan are doing a very similar work.

Mr. Chase also wrote a letter to the New York Daily Tribune in which he spoke of the women's need for a better education in order to fill new occupations. He argued that since boys and girls grow up together, go to high school together and marry (together), they should also be educated at college together. He saw coeducation as an arrangement decreed by "divine wisdom." He closed with the point that "nothing is more important than complete moral, physical training of mothers. . . ."

The notion of Woman from which the majority of his arguments in support of coeducation were drawn was the same notion of Woman admired by Wesleyan students: "the Beautiful, the Chaste, the Unexpressive She." Although the image was to endure, and it has even to the present day, some men of that period desired to free themselves from such stereotypes.

A reporter from the New Republic, writing under the pseudonym, "Uncle Murray," seemed at least initially to be seeking such a freedom in an article he addressed to "Ye Daughters Of Wesleyan": 
You and I, my young sisters, are as ignorant as horseblocks* touching the relations between the sexes. Our laws and customs have made us so. From the ancient Hebrew we have been over four thousand years coming up or down, to a point of extreme ignorance regarding each other as male and female. Let us look each other squarely in the face and say it. Woman is superior to man. 140

Although the women undergraduates had decided not to make a public statement, the alumnae were not similarly bound. Aroused by the debate, one young alumna wrote an anonymous letter to the Argus which was published in the October 23, 1898 issue. She refused to discuss the principle of coeducation but, perhaps in an effort to speak to Wesleyan’s sporting mood, she called her argument for coeducation “a plea for fairplay.” 141

After giving a brief history of the growth in the field of women’s education, she made three points: (1) Wesleyan was a better place to study than were women’s colleges because Wesleyan could afford to hire better professors; (2) many of the women at Wesleyan had fathers or brothers who had come there; (3) for many, the school was convenient to their homes. 142 On the practical level, she argued that Wesleyan men might as well adjust since many of them would go on to coeducational graduate schools. In any case,

No man enters Wesleyan who does not know that coeducation exists there. If, not withstanding, he freely chooses to go, is it the part of a man to turn sulky and resort to petty persecutions in order to drive the girls away? Turn the pages of history and see if any movement,

horseblock: A block of stone or wood, from which one climbed into a carriage or mounted a horse.
growing out of the spirit of the age, was ever killed by persecution. 143

The alumna's letter ended with a statement summarizing her interpretation of the rights of women at Wesleyan:

They have a right to all that Wesleyan can do for them; they have a right to respect for their aims and purposes on the part of students and faculty; they have a right to the courtesies which men everywhere pay women. 144

Until the alumna's letter was printed in the Argus, the question of whether or not the women had rights as Wesleyan students had not been raised in public debate. Still, it had been implicit in the effort of the women of '99's effort the previous year to have some voice in the production of the Olla Podrida. The alumna's letter forthrightly laid the question of the women's rights on the table, but no one picked it up. The Argus editor replied to the letter in an editorial in the same issue and rejected several of her arguments, but he did not discuss the question of rights. Judging from the evidence, it seems that most of the students who did support the women's position did so because they saw no reason to end coeducation altogether, or because they sympathized with women's awkward situation.

The newspaper stories gave the impression that the debate over coeducation had completely disrupted the normal college routine; actually, classes met through the fall and social relationships between the men and women students did not cease altogether. A small news article which appeared
in the *Argus* in the spring of '99 gave clear proof that the supposed declaration of social ostracism was not always observed.

A reception was tendered to the gentlemen of the senior class by the young ladies of the college... on April 13--Mrs. Curry, Miss Van Vleck [graduate of Wesleyan and daughter of a professor] and Miss Brazos [another alumna] received. The leading feature of the evening was a pantomine, after which refreshments were served. An enjoyable time was spent by all.145

Although the last sentence has a ring of insincerity, we cannot know what the party was like. The fact that it occurred at all suggests that behind the public battle lines there were private truces.

During the fall of 1898, students and the administration were disturbed by the kind of newspaper coverage Wesleyan was receiving. They believed that the newspapers were not only spreading untruths, but changing Wesleyan's public image from that of being a scholarly college for gentlemen to being a place where men were rude.

Angered by a story in the New York Sun, the editor of the *Argus*, Finchbaugh, wrote to the editor of the New York paper, "The newspaper rant has been decidedly erroneous and misleading."146 In the pages of his own newspaper Finchbaugh developed his point:

The reports which have been published are false in toto; and have been the work of a Midas-eared scandal-monger*, known to a long line of Wesleyan alumni who at any time in their undergraduate course had occasion to investigate similar newspaper misrepresentations.147

*scandal-monger - evidently a specific individual.
In addition to resenting the newspaper's implications that Wesleyan students were uncivil and boorish, Finchbaugh was angered by what he viewed as the untrue statement the _Sun_ had recently printed. The statement concerned a Wesleyan college meeting held December 10 to elect the usual delegate to send to the annual meeting of the New York Alumni Association which was to meet in the city on December 12. In his letter to the _Sun_, Finchbaugh wished to make it clear that "the meeting at which the delegate was elected did not vote on the question of coeducation, but on the instructions to the delegate." He did not explain why he thought this distinction important. The instructions to the delegate, as reported in the _Argus_ were that he "express the attitude of the college body against coeducation." In a rising vote, the _Argus_ reporter counted only seven men who were opposed to sending the delegate with these instructions, but it is doubtful that in a room of many men standing he could get an accurate count of all who were not.

Finchbaugh also thought that the _Sun_ and its readers were in no position to judge the situation for "the double reason that they are not cognizant of the conditions at Wesleyan, and are, for the most part, unfamiliar with the distinct character of the college life of the small New England colleges." The implication was that it was obvious to those who, like Finchbaugh, were familiar with college life in the New England colleges, that coeducation
was inappropriate. To the young alumni and students who were worried about Wesleyan's football future and the negative effect coeducation could have on that future, Finchbaugh's criticism of the Sun no doubt seemed just. A year later, in October '99, the editors of the Olla Podrida were to justify the omission of the women's names from the yearbook (for the third consecutive year) on the same grounds. The board argued that it was the uniqueness of Wesleyan's position as a small New England men's college, and not the principle of coeducation, that was at issue. 152

On December 12, the president of Wesleyan University, Samuel Raymond, spoke to the New York Alumni Association Annual Meeting at the Hotel Savoy. The New York Association was the oldest, largest, and most influential organization of Wesleyan alumni; it was important that the president maintain good relations with the group. In his speech at the annual meeting, the president's opening words indicated that he was concerned with the effects the recent newspaper coverage would have on Wesleyan's reputation:

We have had a good deal of free advertising in the papers lately, and under the circumstances I cannot ignore the question which has given rise to that advertising. 153

According to the Hartford Courant, Raymond viewed himself as a strong supporter of coeducation at Wesleyan. He had told that paper's reporter on December 5, "It is well-known that I favor coeducation." 154 What he disfavored, as he remarked to the New York alumni on December 12, was
a change in the male-female ratio:

If the number of women now in Wesleyan University were to be largely increased, we should lose something of that strength and courage that come from the intercourse of men with men.\textsuperscript{155}

Raymond felt that his first commitment was to develop the character of the male students:

The supreme demand of our time is for robust, honest, manly, independent, forceful men . . . . I believe that the college has the important work of developing this type of manhood.\textsuperscript{156}

The implication was clear: if, by its expansion, coeducation interfered with the college's "important work" by causing the loss of "that strength and courage that come from the intercourse of men with men," then coeducation would end.

Raymond was unwilling, however, to make any quick decision. He told the New York alumni that recognition of the fact that an increase in the number of women would have an undesirable effect on Wesleyan "doesn't necessarily settle the question that there should be no women at Wesleyan."\textsuperscript{157} He wanted to leave the question of coeducation open. It is possible that he was himself unsure of whether to take a personal stand on the issue. It is also possible that he wished to follow the will of the majority of the alumni on the question and he needed more time to perceive which solution to the situation would be the most popular.

One fact was obvious to Raymond: the alumni had strong and dissimilar feelings about coeducation. Some remarks
made in the *Argus* a year later about the New York Alumni Annual Meeting of December, 1899 suggest that fierce dissent characterized the meeting in 1898:

> The idea of establishing a joint committee to study coeducation had first been conceived of by a committee which had been appointed at a Faculty meeting in November. 160 At a meeting December 10, the committee's report, which recommended the trustees to authorize a joint committee of trustees, alumni and faculty to study the question of coeducation, was adopted. 161 The proposal was the logical next step for several reasons. The creation of a joint committee would take the responsibility of recommending a solution for the situation out of the president's hands, and would pacify those anti-coeducationalists who wanted something done about coeducation. At the same time it would reassure those
supporters who feared that an anti-coeducational decision would be made in undue haste.

Four months after the New York alumni meeting, in March 1899, the trustees met and authorized the appointment of a joint committee to investigate coeducation. There were no women on the committee. The trustees varied from the president's recommendation by enlarging the number of trustees on the committee to four, making it a committee of nine. They elected John E. Andrus, Cyrus Foss, Joseph King and Stephen Henry Olin to represent them. All four had graduate from Wesleyan before 1867, and were therefore over fifty years old. Olin, the son of Wesleyan's second president, had grown up in Middletown, but had gone away to law school before women had enrolled. He had been a trustee since 1880. The Reverend Joseph King, class of '47, had been a trustee nine years longer. In 1871, when the trustees approved the Alumni Association's coeducation resolution, he was serving his first year on the board. Two of his daughters had married Wesleyan graduates, and one of his sons-in-law had attended Wesleyan while it was coeducational. His daughter, who could have gone to Wesleyan, went to Wellesley. If this was an act of obedience to her father, it could be taken as an indication of her father's attitude towards coeducation at Wesleyan; but we do not know. Wellesley may have been her own choice. At the time that King was a member of the joint committee, he was a trustee at the Woman's College of Baltimore.
The fourth trustee, John E. Andrus, class of '62, was to become one of Wesleyan's most prominent graduates but in 1898 he had not yet been elected Mayor of Yonkers or New York representative to the United States Congress. His early lesser prominence was based on wealth. By 1898 he had given large amounts of money to renovate North College, the male student dormitory, and to improve the athletic field which, thereafter, bore his name. His position on coeducation is difficult to surmise. His daughter, Edith, had graduated from Wesleyan two years before. She had married Frederick Davenport, the Wesleyan alumnus who chaired the committee that compiled the "New York Alumni's Report on Coeducation." The "Report" issued the following October 1899, was, as we shall see, strongly critical of the existing system of coeducation.

The Alumni Association met in June and elected Herbert Welch, '87 and Seward V. Coffin, '89 to represent them on the committee. As a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Reverand Welch chanced to be stationed in Middletown during the years that the issue of coeducation dominated Wesleyan dinner-table conversations, 1898 to 1902. Coffin had lived in Middletown since his birth. Both had their biases on the issue. The Argus reported of the Alumni Association's election: it "was regarded as a sweeping victory for the anti-coeducationalists." Both alumni were young, and each had been the school's football manager during his years as an undergraduate.
By July 5, the faculty had appointed its two representatives — John M. Van Vleck, '50 and Caleb T. Winchester, '69. Van Vleck's preference for coeducation was well-known. In 1872, as a young faculty member, he had given his support to the coeducation resolution. Since 1872, Wesleyan had awarded degrees to all three of his daughters. Moreover, Van Vleck's knowledge of the college was thorough. He had served as Vice President of Wesleyan since 1890, and as Acting President during the periods 1872-73, 1887-89 and 1896-97.

If Van Vleck was a pro-coeducationalist, Winchester's appointment balanced the scales; he was known to be opposed, and as one of Wesleyan's most popular professors, his opinion no doubt carried weight. Except for a year's travel in Europe, he had been at Wesleyan since his graduation in 1869.

The ninth member of the committee, President Raymond, was the member who was least informed about Wesleyan, never having been to Middletown before he was elected president. Yet his speech to the New York alumni revealed that he had quickly developed a loyalty and appreciation for Wesleyan's responsibility to developing fine men. He had attended coeducational universities as a graduate student, and had been president of coeducational Lawrence for six years previous to his arrival at Wesleyan.

On Wednesday, July 5, the committee met for the first time. Of the nine members, it was known that four had
doubts about coeducation and one supported it. Bishop Foss was appointed chairman and Herbert Welch secretary. A subcommittee of President Raymond, Van Vleck, Olin and Welch was appointed to "consider the question of the higher education of women, with specific reference to the condition at Wesleyan." This statement of the topic casts light on the nature of the problem: the principle and the particular were in tension. The committee was assigned the responsibility of working out a satisfactory relationship between them. However, given the fact that Wesleyan was already committed to fulfilling as best it could the particular function of the prestigious small New England men's college, it seems likely that a solution which served the principle of higher education of women was already beyond the committee's grasp.
CHAPTER VII: COMMUNICATION

Prior to the Joint Committee on Coeducation, there had been no official authority to whom members of the Wesleyan community with strong opinions about coeducation could express their convictions. Among other things, the committee provided this focus for comment. Even so, during the months that the nine deliberated, from July 1899 to March, 1900, only one group organized a statement of their position on coeducation and submitted it to the committee: the New York Young Alumni. The Young Alumni's report was the first attempt of members of the Wesleyan community to formally articulate a reasoned position on the question of coeducation. It was to be followed, first in March and again in June, by the reports of different factions of the Joint Committee on Coeducation.

The reports covered a range of positions, but several of them, including the Young Alumni's, found fault with coeducation for alienating alumni and proposed the establishment of a Woman's College as a solution to the problem. The possibility that Wesleyan would found a woman's college was to hang over the heads of the pro-coeducationalists and the anti-coeducationalists, looking sometimes like a threat and sometimes like a promise, for the next nine years.

The New York Young Alumni had organized as a group six years earlier, in 1893; a similar organization
in Boston was three years old. We do not know what caused the young alumni to organize themselves—for some reason they wanted to meet separately—but as the young alumni remained members of the New York Alumni Association, no ill-will or battle for loyalties seems to have been aroused by the change. For example, Charles Rockwell, a former member of the P.D.Q. Society and a member of the class of '97 was, although a young alumnus, elected to be secretary of the New York Alumni Association. In November 1900, he wrote a letter to the Association's members announcing the date of the Annual Dinner and requesting the attendance of the younger alumni: "Our elder members are faithful, but our younger forgetful . . . ." 164 Although we cannot be sure, he could have been hinting at the issue over which the young alumni had split from the older group when he went on to observe: "while the privileges of the former [elder alumni] should be preserved, the influence and interest of the latter should be increased."165

What ever their other differences the older and younger alumni disagreed over coeducation. That had been made evident to President Raymond and the alumni during the discussion which followed the president's speech to the Association in March of 1899. In the spring of '99, perhaps as a result of the dissention at the March meeting, the Young Alumni of New York elected a committee of which Andrus's son-in-law Frederick Davenport, was elected chairman, to investigate
the question of coeducation and write up a report. Other members of the committee included Frank Beattys, a brother of George Beattys, the newly elected president of the Alumni Association, and Arthur Pomeroy, who during his college days had been an officer of the P. D. Q. Society.

The committee decided to solicit the opinions of the alumni on the issue. They sent out requests, but their mailing list had an anti-coeducational bias. The committee sent requests only to those alumni who had graduated from Wesleyan within the most recent ten years because it believed that those alumni would be "best able to judge the altered conditions and tendencies of which they had had personal experience."166 Of the five hundred requests sent out, there were 332 replies. Eighty-eight per cent of those who replied (55 per cent of the total mailing list) were definitely opposed to the present system of coeducation, 12 per cent entirely favorable, and the remainder were undecided or indifferent. Although their opinions were unsolicited, some of the older alumni wrote or spoke to the Young Alumni Committee of their views. Interestingly enough, the committee did not report on how many of the older men were in favor of coeducation and how many were not, but simply observed that some, although not opposed to coeducation in principle, were opposed to it at Wesleyan, while others thought coeducation was "rational in theory and practice" and necessary "in order to achieve the highest results in education and life."167 Perhaps the
committee's decision not to solicit the opinions of the older alumni and their failure to give statistics about the opinions offered were the result of an instinct of the younger group that told them it would be wiser to avoid creating opportunities for the opposition to solidify.

In reporting the results of the poll, the committee noted two complaints about coeducation which were shared by most of those who opposed the present system: that "present conditions" were "breaking Wesleyan's grip on her male alumni" and that "many young men in the east seem disinclined to matriculate at those colleges widely known as tending in their constituency towards female majorities." The phrase was delicately worded. Turning to a study on the facts, the committee had compiled statistics about the numbers and percentages of men and women at Wesleyan since 1888 to demonstrate that Wesleyan constituency was heading in that direction. Although the college had grown 50 per cent in ten years, the number of men had only increased 24 per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1888/89</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898/99</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee was convinced that "unless measures are taken to check it," the increase of women was likely to transform Wesleyan into a women's college. They gave three reasons for this belief. First, Wesleyan was "the sole example
among the New England colleges of the highest grade to admit women on complete equality with men." In using the words "complete equality" the committee apparently intended to exclude to the coordinate systems at Columbia (Barnard), Brown (Pembroke) and Harvard (Radcliffe). The term "highest grade" must have been meant to establish the inferiority of schools like Boston University and University of Vermont, both of which were coeducational. Second, the committee did not expect the number of men applying to Wesleyan to increase since there was strong competition for "a limited body" of Methodist men among several New England Methodist schools.

Third, the committee felt

the question for Wesleyan and the older New England institutions to decide is, whether it is wise to graft female education upon half a century or a century old system which has its peculiar customs and traditions and its own peculiar spirit. 170

At all costs, they argued, Wesleyan should be maintained "as a thorough-going men's college." 171

In closing their report, the Young Alumni Coeducation Committee wanted to make it clear that they had no ill feeling towards the women then attending Wesleyan, and "no sympathy with unmannerly criticism" of students who were rude to them. 172

At the same time they wished to register their full opposition to the present system and propose to the trustees that it be replaced by a system of coordinate education. This would mean that "A women's college, ... with equal standards, opportunities, and degrees ... [but with] a distinct
collegiate and social life" would be organized within the university. Coordinate education would mean the end of shared classrooms. The Young Alumni Committee imagined it as planting "a new tree beside the old."  

Although this idea of a coordinate system was new to Wesleyan, by 1899 several eastern colleges and universities, (Brown, Columbia, and Harvard) had subscribed to it. Usually, the coordinate school had another name (Pembroke, Barnard, Radcliffe) separate administration and collegiate organizations and, most important of all, distinct reputations. The coordinate system had it shortcomings: the duplication of administrative functions and course offerings. But by its structure it publicly clarified the nature of the relationship between the men and women enrolled: they were separate groups. For a men's college already nervous about its masculine national image, such features were appealing.  

In order to establish a coordinate college, the young alumni realized that Wesleyan would need money. Collecting it would take time. As a temporary expedient, they proposed that the trustees limit the number of women at Wesleyan to the present number. As of October, 1899, when the report was written, there were sixty-three women attending Wesleyan, fifty-seven of whom were undergraduates. "If," the report concluded, "at the end of seven years, the women's college has not been established, the Committee believes that coeducation at Wesleyan should cease."
The statement is abrupt. The finality of its tone suggests that some of the committee members felt strongly that it was necessary to limit the duration of coeducation. An Argus editorial of March 7, 1900, entitled, "Our Attitude Toward the New York Young Alumni Report" told of a break within the Young Alumni Committee for which including the seven year clause was probably the repairing gesture. According to the Argus, the committee appears to have been divided into two factions: those who opposed the present system of coeducation and those who did not. Reported the Argus, "When the anti-coeducation faction investigated the trustees' position, it discovered that any proposal to eliminate coeducation completely would not pass."¹⁷⁶ The committee could therefore either "sanction the present system"and limit the number of women, or choose some middle alternative, like co-ordinaition (sometimes called the annex system) which would insure the continued presence of women at Wesleyan and meet with the approval of a majority of the trustees. The editor argued, "The annex proposal could possibly win the support of the alumni, younger faculty and undergraduates who would not support the first proposal [to end coeducation]."¹⁷⁷ The Young Alumni decided to accommodate their recommendations to political reality.

Finally, the report ended with a suggestive statement:

The New York Young Alumni Association respectfully and earnestly urge their convictions upon the Board of trustees, not because they can claim to represent the who body of graduates,
but because they feel that any policy for our beloved Alma Mater would be unwise and perhaps disastrous which should fail to inspire the men of the younger generation with faith in Wesleyan's future.178

Who were the men "of the younger generation"? If the committee meant the undergraduates or the prospective students, the statement sounds like advice from the alumni to the trustees concerning the importance of maintaining student support. If by men "of the younger generation," the Young Alumni meant themselves, it sounds like an ominous warning. Did the Young Alumni intend to take further action if the trustees did not agree to end the present system of coeducation? By "disastrous" did they mean the university's loss of alumni support in the event that coeducation remained?

In response to the Young Alumni's report, members of the Wesleyan community followed its recommendation: "The particular form which discussion is taking now is given it by the Young Alumni," commented the Argus. "They recommend a compromise in the building of a women's college which shall be part of Wesleyan."179 The necessity for a compromise was as evident to the Argus editor as it had been to the two factions of the Young Alumni Committee:

It is infinitely better that we should support a plan which will remove many of the evils against which we justly complain, than that we should hold stubbornly to the battle-cry, 'Extermination or nothing!' and in the end gain nothing... [except] a bad name.180

In a letter to the editor which appeared in the March 7 issue of the Argus a senior confirmed the wisdom of the Young
Alumni's compromise. He observed, "The trustees and a majority of the faculty will permanently refuse to consider... getting rid of the women altogether." 181

Aside from the Young Alumni's Report, the joint committee had formal communication about coeducation with one other Wesleyan group: the Academic Council. The Council included all full professors, the president, and any other members of the faculty who had been elected by the trustees. Since its creation in 1892, the Council had had the responsibility of approving the president's nominations for faculty positions, after which the Board of Trustees elected or rejected the candidate. 182 The Council's other responsibilities included enacting administrative reforms, writing the college catalogue and recommending candidates for honorary degrees.

Although saddled with these uninteresting technical responsibilities, the Council was an important and authoritative body. Its members including Professors Winchester, and Van Vleck, as well as President Raymond, all of whom were on the joint committee. It was easy enough for these three acting as a subcommittee, to consult the Council—and they did. Why they did not also consult the more representative body of the entire faculty is an unanswered question. Perhaps the subcommittee leaned towards ending coeducation. By turning only to the Academic Council, the subcommittee excluded the opinions of the younger, and if the Argus was correct, pro-coeducationalist faculty.
On March 12, 1900, the three members of the joint committee presented the Council with an informal report on coeducation, "with a view to eliciting expressions of opinion." The Council assigned two of its members, Professor William North Rice and Professor Rosa, to meet with Raymond, Van Vleck and Winchester and report to the Council at the next meeting. Rice was a professor of geology and a member of the class of '65. He was also a licensed preacher, and prominent member of the faculty. Rosa was a physics professor and had graduated from Wesleyan in 1886.

Two days after the subcommittee's first visit to the Council, there was another meeting. The secretary of the Council reported: "the discussion on coeducation continued--no votes were passed." The council did not meet again before the trustees met on March 19. When confronted with an opportunity to take a formal position on the issue of coeducation, the Academic Council turned away.

The creation of the Committee on Coeducation opened a formal channel of communication between members of the immediate and larger Wesleyan community and the decision-making body of the Board of Trustees. Members of the committee might have solicited opinions, particularly from those persons whose perspectives differed from their own. Instead, a subcommittee of two full professors and the president discussed the question with other full professors--individuals most like themselves--
with whom they already spent much of their time. As far as is known, the committee made no effort to formally investigate either male or female student opinion.

As for initiation from the other side, the only members of the Wesleyan community to take advantage of the formal channel were the Young Alumni of New York. Neither the students nor the older alumni nor the alumnae had issued formal statements on coeducation by the end of the committee's first year of existence. Why their inaction?

One would have expected the alumnae to be verbal and involved in a debate over coeducation. But it was only later, following the publication of the joint committee's first group of reports on coeducation in April that the alumnae did organize and petition the trustees. At that time, they indicated that they would have acted sooner if they had known of the joint committee's deliberations. They learned of them by reading the newspapers. Their ignorance indicates that they were not members of the Alumni Association. Members of the Alumni Association had elected two representatives for the joint committee the previous June. For the older alumni, that appears to have been all the participation in the issue they desired.

The students' silence is at first puzzling but explicable. The change in the admission policy between the fall of '98 and '99 may have given the impression that the administration intended to mollify muttering students by simply admitting
fewer women. The number of women in that year's class had dropped 28 per cent, from twenty-four to seven. To many of the students and faculty it may have seemed that efforts to campaign for or against coeducation would no longer be necessary. Certainly it was against this kind of an assumption that the editor of the Argus warned in November, 1899:

Just now is the time when the college must affirm even more strongly its unchanging opinion, its unswerving opposition to the present system at Wesleyan until the goal [the end of coeducation] has been reached.185

Then again, the students may have decided that anything they could do would have little effect. Judging from the majority of the opinions on coeducation that had been expressed in print during the past two years, there existed in the Wesleyan community a determined consensus that if Wesleyan was to maintain its image as an elite New England men's college, the present system of coeducation would have to end. Whether or not that was actually the opinion of a majority of male students, faculty and alumni, the newspaper coverage gave the impression that it was. For the anti-coeducationalists there seemed no need to speak; for the pro-coeducationalists no reason to hope that their speaking out would make a difference.
CHAPTER VIII: PRESSURES

The Joint Committee on Coeducation, after having heard from the Academic Council and read the Young Alumni's Report, drew up its own report which it presented to the Board of Trustees on March 26, 1900. The Report of the Committee, which had been unanimously approved at the committee's last meeting, recommended to the Trustees that a Women's College be established which would grant women the same degrees as the Wesleyan men. It was not clear in the report whether separate facilities would be built. Rather a reference to facilities equal in quality to those at the university was made. What was clear was that the Women's College would have a separate name, separate chapel exercises, and class declamations, a separate section of the catalogue assigned to it, a separate administration, a separate part of Commencement during which the women would receive their degrees, and a separate quota for Phi Beta Kappa membership. All but one of these stipulations would go into effect in the fall of 1900. Classes would not be separate until the fall of 1901 for freshmen and 1902 for sophomores. Separate instruction of the junior and senior classes would be established.
... as speedily and as to such extent as shall seem wise to the Academic Council and the trustees in view of the size of the classes, the character of instruction, the financial condition of the university and the best educational ideals of the time.

The number of women in the university would not exceed 20 per cent of the student body.187

The Joint Committee's proposals constituted a serious attempt on the part of the trustees to restructure the relationship of the women to the university. If enacted, the recommendations would redefine the women as a separate community. The most important changes proposed by the report and the ones which stimulated the most debate between March and June of 1900 were those that most seriously embodied the concept of separateness: separate instruction and the naming of a Women's College.

Two days after the Committee on Coeducation submitted its report to the trustees, the editor of the Argus commented on some of the proposals. He was bothered that the question of separate instruction for upperclassmen was left unsettled by the report and stated his disapproval of the proposed "semi-separation."188 He had expected that the committee would propose something tangible on which the trustees could take final action. It seemed to him that in leaving open the question of separate instruction of the upperclassmen, "the committee was unnecessarily extending the discussion on coeducation."189
Others besides the Argus editor had opinions on the report they wished to make public. At the same March meeting of the trustees, the alumni representative, Herbert Welch, and Professor Van Vleck each presented a paper on coeducation. Welch was Secretary of the Joint Committee. In his paper he used the pronoun "we" which suggests that it had been originally written as the committee's final report. For some reason it was not used; presumably because the rest of the committee could not agree with all Welch said.

Welch's opposition rested on two criticisms of the policy of coeducation: that it "aroused profound dissatisfaction among the undergraduates and a portion of the faculty and alumni" and that it "did not do justice to the women students and graduates." Welch believed that some of the dissatisfaction was caused by the feeling that coeducation introduced "an alien element . . . into the college life, an element that cannot be assimilated, but must remain largely distinct in its interests and employments." As the dissatisfaction turned to alienation, Welch observed that coeducation dampened the alumni's enthusiasm for the university, "which means so much for its support both in students and money." Meanwhile, the women were suffering from a lack of a gymnasium and reading room, and "the embarrassment coming from association in mixed classes in some courses in science,"
history, literature and economics," but more importantly, they were being denied full participation in the college life and the opportunity to take a college course suited to their needs as women.193

Establishing a quota did not solve these problems, and Welch's belief in the importance of following the national trend towards coeducation caused him to reject the possibility of excluding the women completely. The "remaining possibility," as he saw it was to establish a women's college. As he imagined it, the college would have an "independent social and collegiate life."195 Beginning with the freshman class, there would be enacted a plan of progressive separation in classroom work.

Since Welch agreed with the joint committee's recommendations, why did the committee use a different report? The only difference between the two is that Welch's reasons for making the recommendations were explicitly stated, while the committee's were not. Perhaps we can assume that although the committee could agree on what to do, it could not agree on why.

The second paper submitted was written by Professor William North Rice, and presented to the Trustees by committee member Professor John Van Vleck. Rice also used the pronoun "we". Either the paper was the product of his and Van Vleck's joint commitment, and/or it had been written, like Welch's, to stand as the joint committee's final report. The latter
is more doubtful, as the Rice paper approached the issue of coeducation with a very different point of view from that of the Welch paper and the committee report.

In his paper Rice stated that he supported coeducation at Wesleyan because he supported the principle of higher education for women. Believing that "elegant helplessness can no longer be imagined to be the highest virtue of womanhood," he argued not only for making high quality education available to women, but also for offering it in the form of coeducation:

The thoughts of young men about women and the thoughts of young women about men are likely to be more normal and wholesome, more free from impurity and from fantastic dreaminess, when they meet as intellectual beings in the daily work of the lecture room and the laboratory, than when they see each other only in occasional social assemblies.

The argument that coeducation should cease because it was destroying Wesleyan's unique character as an old New England school did not impress Rice. He did not value that form of tradition. Calling coeducation "the policy of the future," he described some of the public schools in the west as "superior to those in New England, because [they are] not hampered by traditions which [have] come down from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries." Like Welch, Rice saw a trend towards an increase in the number of educational opportunities for women in New England, but unlike Welch
and the majority of the committee, he preferred the trend to take the form of coeducation rather than coordination for economic as well as educational reasons:

To attempt to provide separate instruction for women in all studies, or in the majority of studies of the course, we [Rice and Van Vleck] should consider absolutely wasteful.\(^{199}\)

Having presented his arguments for coeducation, Rice then shifted his position and conceded the present value of organizing the women in a separate administration, describing their role at the college in a separate part of the catalogue, etc. He was willing to agree to these changes because he desired a compromise which would bring "an end to the controversy."\(^{200}\) He was also willing to impose a percentage limit on the number of women enrolled if this would "tend to restore confidence in the future of the institution."\(^{201}\) By the time he had finished compromising, he differed from the recommendations of the committee only on the plan for establishing a Women's College and separate instruction. The report had guaranteed separate instruction for the freshmen and sophomores, but for the upperclassmen only as the college could afford it and educational opinion required it. In his paper, Rice did not stipulate a particular year, but recommended that women and men be separated in the classroom in most of those studies in which the aggregate number of students and the proportionate number of the two sexes rendered a division into sections reasonable and convenient.\(^{202}\)

The difference was important because when put into effect
the two recommendations could have different results. The first could lead to complete separation while, since many classes would be too small to divide into sections, the second would always be partial. Rice did not like partial separation because of what he feared it could lead to.

If the proposed partial separation of the women is to be interpreted as implying a promise of substantially complete separation, . . . it is far better that the first step in the way of separation in the classroom never be taken.203

He also did not want "a completely distinct women's college . . . standing in the way of every step of progress in the improvements of educational facilities for men as well as women."204

Sensitive to the criticism many at Wesleyan had made that the college was losing students because of coeducation, Rice remarked:

If any thing in connection with coeducation is threatening to keep away students from the college, it is not the fact of coeducation but the controversy over coeducation.205

Rice was thinking of the Young Alumni's remark about students not preferring colleges that tended towards female majorities. In his report he specifically rejected the Young Alumni's theory and pointed out a number of schools in New England where such had not been the case. Welch had shared the Young Alumni's deep concern for the alumni's alienation but he had also disagreed with their argument, although he did not identify it as theirs, that Wesleyan's failure to increase significantly
in size was the fault of coeducation. He thought it the result of financial conditions and actions of the administration. 206

Welch and Rice disagreed with the Young Alumni, but they had apparently felt it necessary to respond to the arguments the alumni put forward. Why? Remarks made in the Argus and Olla Podrida before 1899 indicate that the fear that Wesleyan would become a women's school and concern over alumni alienation both predated the Report. At the same time, the Young Alumni Report was the first and only formal examination of the issues until the joint committee reported. Its uniqueness may have given it undue weight.

Yet given the fact that the Young Alumni had raised some viable issues, the question remains: how representative was their report? How extensive was the alumni's alienation they claimed to be articulating? Welch apparently did not ask himself this question, but Rice and Van Vleck did. They concluded:

We do not believe that the sentiment of the undergraduates or that of the alumni of recent classes is as strongly against coeducation as has been commonly represented. 207

They cited the "not always temperate declarations in the college periodicals, at the Washington's Birthday Banquets"  

* It was a Wesleyan tradition to celebrate Washington's Birthday in a big way; steal the cannon, etc.
and in the alumni clubs . . . which the friends of coeducation, desiring to avoid controversy, have for the most part left unanswered. Elsewhere Rice pointed out, "it is always the party in opposition that makes itself heard." He remarked on the fact that in their report the Young Alumni had asked only young alumni to give their opinions on coeducation, and summarized his attitude toward the lobbying efforts of the New York group with the statement, "We do not believe that college ought to be governed by the graduates of the last ten classes, or by the undergraduates." Rice feared the tyranny of a vocal opposition. The criticism was a subtle challenge to the trustees to involve more of the Wesleyan community in the debate.

Perhaps in response to Rice's criticism, the trustees decided to publish the committee's report, consisting of thirteen points, and the two reports of Welch and Rice under the title "Papers on Coeducation" in the May issue of the Wesleyan University Bulletin. A copy of this Bulletin would be sent to all the alumni who "should be invited to express their opinions on the proposed change." Then, the plans were cancelled. The May Bulletin explained that, following the March meeting, some members of the joint committee had changed their minds about the report:

On reflection [they] are no longer prepared to assent to the report, believing it to involve a wider departure from the present system [of coeducation] than they can consistently favor.
Since the report "no longer represents a unanimous Committee," it could no longer be judged as final, and therefore would not be published in the Bulletin. Instead a limited edition of the "Papers" would be published as a pamphlet for the trustees. The Bulletin promised that the alumni would be sent a copy upon request.

Apparently, some members of the committee had suddenly begun to have doubts about drastically reforming the coeducational system. Why had they not acted on their hesitations earlier? A realignment of pro- and anti-coeducational pressures must have caused their quick reversal of position. The event reveals that the trustees were being pressured from many sides.

The decision not to ask the alumni to express their opinions on the report is equally suggestive. Whoever made the decision seemed to view the opportunity to solicit their responses more as a means of gaining an indication of their approval or disapproval than as a means of polling the range of their opinion. Wesleyan's economic dependency on alumni support would produce such a viewpoint. The administration would want to know the alumni's opinion on whatever final solution was proposed. This implies that other interested groups like the non-alumni faculty, the men students and the women students were not asked to express their opinions because a decision on the question did not rest on their approval.
Published as a separate pamphlet in the spring of 1900, the "Papers on Coeducation" brought changes to the mood on campus. Suddenly the students and alumni and alumnae were roused to responsibility. The committee's failure to reach a consensus and apparent intent to recommend the establishment of a coordinate system aroused the hope of the pro-coeducationalists and the fear of the opposition. Perhaps coeducation was not such a settled question after all. At the June trustees' meeting, some new voices were to enter the debate.
CHAPTER IX: A CHANGE OF MIND

In June of 1900, one alumnus, Warren Sheldon, '99, whose wife was a graduate of Wesleyan, wrote a letter to William North Rice expressing his approval of Rice's paper, which he had just received in the mail. He closed his letter of June 11 with the words, "I wish that the alumni--all of them--could be heard from by ballot. The cause of coeducation would not suffer from the result." The men students and the alumnae shared Sheldon's concern about the need for communication, but instead of sending ballots, they circulated petitions. They intended to present to the trustees at the June 25 meeting. The committee report and Welch's and Rice's papers had been the result of a process of representation organized and supervised by a decision-making body of Wesleyan University, the trustees. By contrast, the petitions were temporary tools, created in response to a perceived need: that the trustees remained largely ignorant of the opinions on coeducation held by the less vocal members of the community, and a perceived opportunity: that the committee's lack of unanimity made the trustees vulnerable to persuasion.

Meanwhile, the faculty and the alumni had access to formal channels of communication. Individual faculty members had, as members of the joint committee, expressed their views on coeducation, and the idea of having a joint committee
discuss the topic had been initiated by faculty members at a faculty meeting. Still, the faculty did not choose at this time to make a collective statement to the trustees on the question. There is no record that the two faculty representatives to the joint committee, Van Vleck and Winchester, either asked the faculty to approve or were asked by the faculty to have approved the reports which they planned to submit to the trustees on June 25. The fact that Van Vleck and Winchester disagreed in their recommendations and therefore signed different reports may explain the faculty's silence. Also, the faculty may not have felt the need for representation as they could conveniently speak to the trustees on an individual basis. In contrast to the faculty, the alumni, many of whom were not in Middletown for most or all of the year, made appropriate use of the representatives they had elected to the joint committee. In June, 1900, the week before the trustees were to meet, the Alumni Association gathered in Middletown to hear Coffin and Welch present their minority report. Of the other members of the joint committee, only Professor Winchester supported their position and signed their report.

Since the March meeting, the original committee of nine had remained in three factions, and each faction came to the June 25 meeting with its own report. Welch, now joined by Winchester and Coffin constituted one faction; Van Vleck another; and Raymond, Foss, Olin and King, making a majority
were the third. It is not known why Andrus did not sign a report. Earlier, the three March reports had all recommended the appropriateness of separate organization for the women in regards to honors, graduation, administration, chapel, etc. although with varying degrees of enthusiasm. The three June reports were also agreed on these points. Dissent among the June reports focused on the issue of separate instruction, the size of the quota of women enrolled and the question of whether the separate organization would be called a Women's College.

On the first issue, the majority report of Olin, Foss, Raymond and King called for the establishment of a "Women's Department" and prescribed separate instruction of all courses for freshmen women, and of required courses for sophomores, "whenever the funds of the college warrant it." However, the clause on separate instruction was not included in the list of those points which the report stipulated were to "become operative upon the opening of the University in the fall of 1900." In dissent from the majority report, Winchester, Welch and Coffin must have been thinking of this clause when they explained in their minority report,

We cannot assent to that [majority report], because, in our opinion, it gives no assurance of any adequate changes in the system of coeducation which now obtains in the University, and because it contains no unequivocal and consistent statement of policy for the future.

In regard to the question of separate instruction, the Winchester minority report remarked:
We do not think that the subjects of study and methods of discipline . . . best fitted for the education of the average young man during the four years of his college life are of necessity best fitted for the education of the average young woman during the same period.220

In this the authors implied a preference for separate instruction although the point is not made explicit in the "Declaration of Policy" which followed. Welch, Winchester and Coffin expressed in the introduction their preference for "the foundation of a bona fide Women's College," but also omitted that point from the "Declaration".221 In the end the only difference between the majority and Winchester reports was in the matter of quotas, the former report recommending 20 per cent, the latter 15 per cent.

From March to June, Welch's position had hardly changed. He still supported a Women's College as the best solution, but, recognizing the impossibility of it "in the near future," was willing now, as he had not been in March, to permit limited coeducation.222 Evidently, opposition had been hardening.

His earlier concern for the alienation of the alumni was reaffirmed in the introduction of his report:

Still less do we believe that [coeducation] . . . is ever consistent with the full realization of that community life upon which depends . . . the profit as well as the pleasure of the student's undergraduate days, and his loyalty and enthusiasm after graduation.223

He did, however, differ from his first report in his implied distrust of the progressive method of arriving at separate instruction, yet the absence of the point from the "Declaration
of Policy" makes the distinction questionable. At times, one wonders whether he and the majority really disagreed at all.

In Van Vleck's case, at least, there was no question. Like the others, he called for separate organization, but he was absolutely opposed, for educational and economic reasons, to the establishment of a Women's College. Taking the majority report's recommendation to establish a "Women's Department" to be something different than a Women's College, he declared that he would protest such a name unless "the male students be likewise designated." He was opposed to any name or ruling which states or implies that women are students of Wesleyan University in any other relation that such as shall apply equally to men.

In the Rice paper, his position on the question of separate instruction had been based on his belief in the educational and economic advantages of coeducation. He could condone separate classes where the number of women in a particular course made it feasible. He was still of that opinion, and as distrustful as before of a partial separation policy which could lead to ultimate separation. His essential concern for the women's equal right to an education, as reflected in his reason for opposing the naming of a Women's Department, (a concern which distinguished him from the other members of the committee) remained constant. As in the first paper, he would permit only a temporary, five years quota on the
number of women enrolled. "For this purpose," he remarked, "20 per cent as has been proposed by some, is in my opinion decidedly too small."

Despite the number of words expended, dissent within the committee focused on only three issues: the establishment of a Women's College, the establishment of a female quota, and the establishment of a policy of separate instruction. All committee members were agreed that the women's administration should be organized separately, but even on the three issues, disagreement was fuzzy. The majority report and the Winchester report both expressed a preference for a Women's College and separate instruction in the introductions of their reports, but neither included those points in their recommendations. Van Vleck was opposed to both, but was willing to permit separate instruction although he feared it would lead to full separation when the size of the classes made it economically feasible. None of the reports questioned the necessity of a quota. Their unanimity on that point implied their unanimity on another: that the mood on campus was calling for some kind of change in coeducational policy.

Van Vleck's interest in and commitment to women's education may have been stimulated or at least reinforced by his love for his three daughters and one daughter-in-law, all of whom were Wesleyan graduates. Higher education at Wesleyan may have helped to form in forty-one year old Clara, the second oldest of the
four women, a distaste for the "elegant helplessness" of the uneducated women which her father had earlier criticized. At least she did not need her father to represent her interests. She could do that for herself.

In the spring of 1900, Clara Van Vleck ('81) and Caroline Rice Crawford ('79), the married sister of William North Rice, took it upon themselves to organize their sister alumnae and "to present our protest against the proposed change."227 Before calling a meeting of all the alumnae who lived nearby, Van Vleck and Crawford named themselves as a committee to write what they hoped would be a memorial moderate enough that "alumnae of varying shades of opinion may unite in signing it."228 In their own words, it aimed to be "a vigorous protest against the establishment of a women's college . . . [yet] pleads for several features of a women's college, in respect both to administration and student organization."229

It was probably no coincidence that this position was the same as that taken by their respective father and brother in their joint report presented to the trustees two months earlier. It is likely that their position was the product of discussions both between family and between friends. The two women also shared the men's concern for the unreasonable
economics of co-ordinate education. They argued in their memorial that Wesleyan would spend a great deal of money in order to found a Women's College when the money would be better spend "perfecting the equipment of the existing college." They found fault with the graduated solution to separate instruction because, like their father and brother, they feared that partial separation would not remain partial.

Moving on to the offensive, Van Vleck and Crawford requested the creation of a women's administration, which would be under a Dean of Women, "appointed by the Board of Trustees, who should be a member of the faculty with a recognized and definite authority." They also asked for a new dormitory, study and reception rooms, and a new gymnasium.

Their final request was less precise than the rest, and since it involved a changing of attitudes, the most difficult to fulfill:

In view of the extended and embarassed discussion of education, we venture to hope that you will make such a reaffirmation of the policy of the college on this subject as shall definitely indicate that women may be recognized among the members of Wesleyan University by right and not by sufferance.

The point was delicate but important. Although stated tentatively ("we venture to hope"), this request to the trustees to reconstitute the women's worth in the eyes of the Wesleyan community was an acknowledgement by Van Vleck and Crawford of their fellow alumnae's discomfort as only partially tolerated members of the Wesleyan community. Whether or not the trustees
had the power to ease their condition, the women's statement called their attention to the need.

In an attempt to respond to the fears (or what some might have called the paranoia) of the anti-coeducationalists, the two women made it clear to the trustees that they were "no more desirous than are the men to see the number of women rapidly increase." 234 They were willing to concede that since such an apprehension is wide spread among the alumni, we can readily understand that it may seem wise to adopt some definite limitation of numbers, provided the limit be large enough to permit the maintenance of a healthy community life among the women. 235

Why did they agree to limited coeducation? The concession may have been a diplomatic maneuver, made in the realization that the situation called for a compromise, or it may have been the honest expression of Van Vleck's and Crawford's perception of Wesleyan's role in women's education. During the years that these two women, both now in their forties, were growing up in Middletown, Wesleyan had been solely a men's school. The idea that Wesleyan would ever divide its educational attention equally between men and women may well have been too strange a thought for them even to contemplate.

Crawford's and Van Vleck's memorial was voted upon at a meeting of the alumnae who lived in the nearby area on May 26, 1900 and adopted "with hardly a shadow of dissent." It was the consensus of those present.
that the question of the relation of Wesleyan University to the higher education of women should not be finally settled by the Board of Trustees without some expression of opinion on the part of the women who are so deeply concerned. 238

Since they were also agreed that "such an expression to have weight must be nearly unanimous," 239 they decided to mail a copy of the memorial to all the women graduates of Wesleyan, pointing out the need for their unanimous support, and requesting their signatures.

Crawford and Van Vleck wrote the letter to the alumnae which accompanied the memorial and in it they listed the names of the twenty-three graduates who had already signed. They closed with a gentle warning, "you will easily see that no publicity should be given to memorial before it has been submitted to the Board of Trustees." 240

The women wanted to be careful to time their presentation to the best advantage.

The method they employed was a letter to the trustees, written June 12. In the letter, Crawford and Van Vleck informed the trustees of the alumnae's activities, and reported that "two-thirds of the women graduates have sent their signatures, and more names are being received daily." 241

They noted the need for "some expression of opinion on the part of the women themselves" and closed with a paragraph probably intended to appeal to the trustee's sense of justice:

Knowing that other papers on the subject have already been presented to you, we venture to send this, in order that all sides of the question may receive due consideration in advance of your annual meeting, when the petition with the names of all the signers will be presented. 242
Their right to speak and be heard was indisputable, but we may ask why the alumnae did not speak sooner. Apparently they had not known that Wesleyan was reviewing its coeducational policy. In the opening paragraph of the memorial, the women explained that it was the publication of a summary of the "Papers on Coeducation" in the daily newspaper which had indicated to them that the trustees had a proposal for a Woman's College "under serious consideration." Knowing that the women believed their opinion on the subject ought to be heard, we may suppose that some were angry at having to depend for information on such haphazard and secondhand means of communication as the daily newspapers. It may have been this anger which supplied Van Vleck and Crawford with the energy to write the memorial, have it printed, solicit the alumnae for signatures, and distribute copies of the memorial to the trustees. Possibly the appeal they made to the trustees' sense of justice at the end of the letter was intended to be a coolly polite criticism of the trustee's failure to inform the women of the situation and ask for their opinion.

In contrast to the alumnae, the students were fairly well informed of the progress of events. The trustees had not sought their opinion. Like the alumnae, the men students finally decided to offer their opinion unasked. The women students remained enigmatically silent.

On June 19 the undergraduate men met to consider a memorial on coeducation drawn up by a committee of five students. An
unknown number of them signed the strongly anti-coeducational memorial. It included almost every argument against coeducation that students had raised since women had first entered in 1872. The memorial argued: Wesleyan is traditionally a men's school; coeducation conflicts with tradition, causing anxiety among "nearly all" the undergraduates and straining the loyalty of the alumni; it is known absolutely that "many young men" have left Wesleyan because of coeducation; coeducational classroom situations are "inconvenient, and unpleasant" and the university's reputation is suffering as a result of the extended discussion on coeducation. The memorial found the Joint Committee on Coeducation's first recommendation, to establish a Women's College unsatisfactory because it was expensive and because "unlimited" coeducation would continue during the years that the college was being created. Remarkably that establishing a woman's college was a compromise "unsatisfactory to both parties," the memorial concluded that

"The simplest, most satisfactory change would be the non-admission of women, since such a change would incur no expense and would remove the root of the whole trouble."\(^{245}\)

This memorial, with a note explaining its origins and destiny was mailed to the trustees soon after the undergraduate meeting.\(^{246}\)

Within a week, on Monday, June 25, the trustees met. After electing the new officers of the board, listening to President Raymond's annual report, and authorizing the granting of degrees, the trustees took up the matter of coeducation.
They were presented with the women's memorial and the signatures of one hundred women graduates. They then received the committee's majority and minority reports. Phineas Lounsbury, an honorary graduate of Wesleyan, moved that all the reports and memorials be printed and sent to the members of the board (twenty-two of the fifty-two were absent) pending a discussion of the matter at the mid-winter meeting. A motion to lay this motion on the table, and thereby leave the issue unsettled, was defeated by one vote. Mr. Lounsbury withdrew his motion. J. M. King, trustee and member of the committee, moved that the committee members who were not members of the board be invited to speak about their reports. Van Vleck spoke about his minority report, and Winchester about the other. Then the undergraduates presented their memorial, which was followed by a communication from the members of the Common's Club. They wished to indicate to the trustees that "no member of the Commons had signed the above undergraduate memorial." By a motion, the discussion on education was postponed until Tuesday morning.

The next day, after the trustees had conducted other business, J. M. Buckley moved that a committee of five be appointed to consider the various reports and memorials and report to the board that afternoon. President Raymond was to be an advisory member of the committee. Buckley, Henry Ingraham, Williams, Kelley, George Coleman, and James King

*This was a living and eating club designed to provide less wealthy students with the fellowship and convenience of a fraternity with fewer rituals and at less expense.
were appointed. In the afternoon these old men (all were in their seventies) returned with their report.

Except for a change in the size of the quota from 15 to 20 per cent, the committee submitted a report which duplicated the "Declaration of Policy" of the Winchester minority report. The women would have a separate organization for administration, separate rhetorical exercises, catalogue advertisements and commencement activities, but a separate college for women would not be established. There was no mention of the issue of separate instruction. Like the Winchester report, the new "Final Report" included a recommendation that, concerning eligibility for Phi Beta Kappa Society, the women be put on a separate quota from the men. This would mean that the number of women who received Phi Beta Kappa keys would not effect the number of men similarly honored. Later, by a motion, the new report was amended to omit this clause.

One member of the five-man committee had dissented from the report. The dissenter, George Coleman, offered a substitute resolution that coeducation be abolished upon the graduation of the class of 1904 and that no new women be admitted to the undergraduate department after the fall of 1900. The Coleman Resolution was defeated. All the trustees except Coleman voted against it. The Final Report was then voted on and adopted.
By approving the Final Report the trustees indicated a change of mind since March. The original Report of the Committee had called for the establishment of a Women's College and separate instruction, and the June report did not. Those members of the Joint Committee who had withdrawn their support from the Report of the Committee had evidently gained the votes of the majority of the trustees and been able to bring about a very different looking Final Report. Somewhere the trustees had lost the conviction that Wesleyan was due for a substantial reform in its coeducational policy. Certainly, within the events of the two June meetings, the Board had indicated by its action its determination to make an immediate decision that avoided the radical solution of abolishing coeducation.

Many anti-coeducationalists must have been displeased with the trustees' decision. Those undergraduates who had been hoping that coeducation would be abolished were faced with the perpetuation of what they found to be an uncomfortable situation. Frustrated and perhaps angry at their alma mater's apparent insensitivity to matters of reputation, the Young Alumni may have fumed at the slow-moving temerity of academic institutions. The necessity and wisdom of founding a Women's College had seemed so self-evident.

The supporters of coeducation had won what looked like a substantial victory. Clara Van Vleck and Caroline Crawford wrote to the alumnae following the trustees' adoption of the
Final Report:

While regretting the phraseology in which some of the terms of the trustees' decision are couched, we believe, nevertheless, that in the main points at issue the women have been the gainers by the discussion and outcome.252

The establishing of a separate organization was not perceived by them as a threat to their cause because they had requested it themselves. The 20 per cent quota was smaller than they had wanted it to be, but at least it was not 15 per cent. Separate instruction, either progressive or across the board, had not been established, neither had a Women's College been founded. Altogether they seemed to have caused to celebrate.

Yet in other ways, ways which measured victory by the evolutionary standards of survival, the Final Report may have been more of a triumph for the anti-coeducationalists. If a Women's College ever were established, there would be small likelihood that Wesleyan could return to its pre-coeducational, masculine state. The perpetuation of things as they were at least had this advantage—that no permanent ground had been lost; and for that reason, a good deal more stood to be gained.
CHAPTER X: PRESSING THE DAMSELS QUIETLY

With the trustees' approval of the Final Report, Wesleyan entered a new phase of its "experiment" with coeducation. If we may believe the estimates of the anti-coeducationalists, a majority of the male undergraduates disapproved of the women's presence. Yet the women remained. The trustees had recommended, and the Academic Council was soon to enact regulations which would make ministering to the women's needs into a separate responsibility, but for some of the anti-coeducationalists this was an insufficient separateness. As an expression of their disapproval, they began to practice an explicitly anti-coeducational policy of social ostracism against the women.

In accord with the issues raised in the trustees' final report, the Academic Council met in the fall of 1900 to reorganize and rewrite sections in the catalogue about women and choose a method of regulating the number of women to be admitted to the college. At the Council's November meeting, two standing committees, the committee on the catalogue, and the committee on administration, were assigned to investigate these two questions. At the next meeting, on January 11, 1901, the committee on the catalogue recommended that in the list of class members, and of winners of prizes and honors, the women's names appear after the men's. Women would no longer be
eligible for the Junior Exhibition and Commencement appointments. The statement in the catalogue, "women are admitted to equal privileges in the university with men" would be replaced by a statement describing the new regulations pertaining to the admission of women and other related information. New categories, such as "expenses of women," and "admission of women" would be added to the index. The committee's recommendations were adopted.

At the same meeting, the committee on administration gave its report, which was also adopted. The committee proposed that "all women desiring admission should make application to the Secretary of the Faculty before June 15." Applicants would be required to present certificates (presumably demonstrating their completion of a secondary curriculum) by that date or take a June examination. In the case of an excess of qualified candidates, members of the committee on admission and the Dean of Women (the first Dean, Miss Anna Fisher, had been appointed earlier during the same meeting) would admit "those who . . . gave the best promise of honorable completion of a college course." How had women previously been admitted? Apparently on the noncompetitive basis of individual merit. An exception occurred, perhaps, in the fall of 1899, when the number of freshmen women entering suddenly dropped. With coeducation such a contested issue, the administration may have decided to admit fewer women, and therefore not accept all qualified candidates. But if this was the case, their process of selection was not recorded.
In June, the issue of commencement exercises was settled. The Council interpreted the trustees' regulation "that women shall not receive degrees before the men" to mean that all the men would receive their bachelor degrees before any of the women, but that they would be presented "altogether" to the trustees by the president. The women's names would be printed after the men's in the Commencement Program.

Within a year of the Report's adoption, the Council had acted upon all of the trustee's proposals. The one proposal on which the Council took no apparent action, that of establishing separate class declamation and rhetorical exercises, may have been put into effect without the Council's participation, or perhaps was omitted altogether--the record gave no indication. What was accomplished by the Academic Council? Reorganizing the catalogue and lists of names on the graduation and awards lists, and organization of the men and women into separate ceremonies served to formally and publicly establish the women as a special group within the university. If, as it has been argued here, many of those who opposed coeducation did so because they feared its effects on Wesleyan's reputation, then it is not surprising that the reforms introduced to mitigate those fears would produce essentially conceptual changes in the attitudes of people both inside and outside of Wesleyan, while having small effect on the coeducational process. For those outside the university who opposed coeducation, such an organizational setting apart of the women
from the men may have sufficiently reassured them that coeducation was now under more rigorous and methodical control. But to some of those inside the university, particularly the students, the reforms of the report were insufficient, as they did not fully communicate to those outside Wesleyan what the students perceived to be the college's deep dissatisfaction with coeducation.

The trustees' decision to continue coeducation met with the Argus editor's immediate disgust. In the June, '00 issue of the paper, in an editorial which appeared opposite the page where the final report was printed, he observed that the report had only one merit: "it is a positive declaration of policy regarding coeducation." 260 His impatience for a definite statement of policy was understandable. Two years had passed since the women in the class of '99 had asked the '99 Olla Podrida Board to grant to them the right to censor the yearbook.

Carrie Hallock, who had been a freshman the year the debate began in earnest, would be a junior by next September. Now, a year after the joint committee had met for the first time, the trustees had made a decision which, to the editor, seemed contradictory. How could the report recommend that it be the policy of the college to maintain "standards of admission, educational methods, curriculum and community life primarily adapted to men," while at the same time recommending that women be admitted to the college course? 261 The editor was angry that women could still enroll at Wesleyan, and believed
that, in his disapproval of the report’s conclusion, he represented the majority opinion among the young alumni and undergraduates.262

Was there a non-revolutionary solution to the situation? The editor, fearful of causing harm to Wesleyan by calling for “agitation,” wishing to respect the trustees’ decision, and yet desiring to be true to his own convictions, proposed that the students take individual action: “It remains within the power of each man in college to see to it that the women shall find no attraction at Wesleyan except the advantages offered in the curriculum.”263 Specifically, he suggested that the fraternities drop the women’s names from their social lists. Two fraternities had done this earlier in the year. Realizing that to many students, such treatment would seem unnecessarily rude, he argued for its reasonableness:

Since the women are seeking only the educational advantages, they would not feel slighted, and such a move, if generally practiced instead of only partially, as now, would be free of any personal element.... We who are so thoroughly opposed to coeducation would [no longer] appear to be fostering the system, which we so strongly denounce.264

His last point was an oblique reference to a recent newspaper article in which the reporter had observed that women must be welcome at Wesleyan since they were always invited to social functions. The editor fumed at this “misinterpretation” of the men’s “courtesy.”265 He believed that his proposal to make Wesleyan as socially unattractive to the women as possible would help to clarify to those outside
of Wesleyan the position of the students on the question of coeducation. 266

Beginning in the fall of 1900, many students ignored the women. The idea had not originated with the Argus editor; some students had begun ignoring the women as a formal policy as early as in the fall of 1898. Following the Trustees' decision to maintain coeducation, the student's determination may have solidified. Perhaps the advice of the Argus editor, triggered by the trustees' decision, sped the rate of the trend. Still, the direction had been indicated long before.

Within a few years, ignoring the women had become a college tradition. Henry Legg, '04/ recalled, "every freshman was informed that Wesleyan men just had nothing to do with the 'quails'. It just was not done." 267 Other alumni of other years, selected on the basis of their survival until the year 1971, and their willingness to reply to a questionnaire, described the situation as they recalled it:

Gordon Gatch, '06: We ignored them. It was understood. 268

Stanley Barker, '09: Very soon after my arrival at Wesleyan in the fall of 1905, I was informed that the girls who were there as coeds were strictly 'off-limits' for freshmen. 269

By what process and by whose iniative were the freshmen thus indoctrinated? From the information now available, the second question cannot be answered. One newspaper reporter who wrote an article on the situation at Wesleyan believed
the policy to reflect the "general feeling" on campus? Was there a small group of students who organized or strengthened the campaign? Perhaps the P.D.Q. Society? Were the young alumni involved? Or did the policy develop organically out of the students' frustration at the trustees' decision?

The only thing descriptive that can be said about the anti-coeducationalists is an observation about their economic class. Fred Shapleigh, who graduated from Wesleyan in 1908 and remained as a graduate student during the year 1909-1910, was a staunch supporter of coeducation and a close observer of the anti-coeducationalists. In a letter he wrote to Rice in February, 1909, when Rice was taking a brief trip to Chicago, he described his impression of the kind of student who supported coeducation in 1909 and implied a description of those who did not:

I know that some of the most sturdy, hard working Christian men of the college cannot reconcile themselves to the prevailing college attitude. 271

These were the students "who are obliged to fight their way up from the lower walks of life, who have had to sacrifice to go thru college." 272 If Shapleigh's observation is accurate, and not the product of an anti-upperclass prejudice superimposed upon his pro-coeducation bias, it is not surprising. Students from a wealthier background, who are on familiar terms with power and respect, are likely to find it easy to treat other people as inferior and deny them power. Having come to college more often out of social necessity than out of a desire to
learn, the students from the upper class would be less likely to appreciate the women's desire to receive an education, and more likely to interpret their presence as an unnecessary intrusion.

The justice of Shapleigh's observation is confirmed by the fact that the members of Commons Club, a non-Greek living society for students who needed cheap housing, consistently distinguished themselves as friends of coeducation. Shapleigh was himself a member of the Club. In addition to signing and submitting the petition to the trustees indicating their disapproval of the student anti-coeducation petition, the members of Commons Club gave parties to which the Wesleyan women were always invited throughout the period of social ostracism.

The first question: by what process were the freshmen indoctrinated? is more easily answered. All the evidence indicates that the policy of ignoring the women was quickly incorporated into the traditional freshmen hazing procedure. Wrote Stanley Barker, '09:

Naturally, I complied with this custom [of ignoring the women] just as I did with the custom that required the freshmen to wear a cap with a green tassel.

Hazing, which was widely practiced at many men's colleges, inculcated non-rebellious behavior in the freshman students and initiated them into the college community by a system of rules and punishments. If a freshman addressed an upper-classman disrespectfully, if he walked on the grass instead of the campus sidewalk, if he walked down the north side
College Street instead of the south side, or if he failed to wear his beanie, he was given a paddling or awakened from sleep with a bucketful of cold water. 275 "Any underclassman who disobeyed the rules in regard to completely ignoring the women students was in for a clash with the upperclassmen that he would long remember," wrote one alumnus. 276

Although hazing was harsh on underclassmen, the system had its benefits. For one thing, it gave students power, and power transforms insecurity into confidence and makes a man out of a boy. Football—playing it or watching it—offered the same attraction. For another thing, hazing defined an approved behavior. Many students, then as now, drew comfort from the security they gained by conforming to that definition. One Wesleyan woman student, if not more, understood what was happening. In a song she wrote about coeducation in 1903 she said,

> Among the train there's many a swain can find no other way To please the other laddies than to wish the girls away Can a lassie blame a laddie's doing all he can? Let us pray that heaven will let him some day be a man. 277

For these reasons, the policy of social ostracism was quickly established and perpetuated. It was a satisfactory outlet for the feelings of the anti-coeducationalists, while it also accommodated the personal insecurities of individual students.

Yet the policy of social ostracism had still a third function: to convert supporters of coeducation, or at least those who refused to ignore the women, to the other side of
the issue. We do not have enough information to make generalizations, but we do know that at least a few of the critics of coeducation felt no hesitation about compelling freshmen to observe the established taboo. The specifics of one case illustrate the point.

Arthur Patterson was a Middletown boy, and graduate of the local high school. As a freshman at Wesleyan in the fall of 1902, he already knew some of the women as they had been high school classmates. One of these girls, Edith Say, often walked up the hill to evening Chapel along the same street that Arthur walked from his home in town. Sometimes, as chance would have it, they would meet and walk up the hill together.

Their sociability displeased some upperclassmen. One evening as Arthur was walking with Edith, a wagon pulled up beside them, and four seniors jumped out. They seized Arthur, threw him in the wagon, jumped in themselves and drove away, leaving Edith standing alone and confused on the sidewalk. In the back of the rumbling wagon, the seniors bound and gagged their captive. When the wagon stopped, they unloaded him, and, in his words, "gave me a good paddling." Some seventy years later, Miss Say, now Mrs. Hewitt, gave her version of the incident: "he was taken to a remote spot in the country and severely beaten." The seniors warned Arthur never to walk with a "quail" again, but he ignored the warning. As he saw it, seventy years later, "I wasn't going to let them tell me who I could walk with and who I couldn't."
Arthur Patterson's refusal to conform to the policy of social ostracism had other, more intentional manifestations. Indeed, he had partners in the "crime" and they were organized. While in college he and five other men students formed a social group with five women. Rather than risk detection, they always gathered together away from campus. Edith, who was a member of the group, recalled that she often invited them to her house. Once they met at Arthur's uncle's, and another time they rented a gasoline launch and took a trip down the Connecticut River to Saybrook, where they had a picnic. Self-conscious of their non-conformity, they called themselves the "Surreptitious Fussers." "Fussers" is a slang expression meaning "male escort, spooner, petter, flirt or ladies' man." The fact that the two identified members of the "Surreptitious Fussers" were both from Middletown suggests that students from the immediate area were less likely to follow the pattern of ignoring the women. It would be helpful to know who else belonged to the "Surreptitious Fussers." The statistics about marriages between women and men students from 1900 to 1909 are also suggestive. Although the women from Middletown constituted 41.6 per cent of the women who married, they numbered 50 per cent of those who married Wesleyan men. The "Surreptitious Fussers" were not the only individuals who countered the policy of social ostracism. Undoubtedly, there were more than have been recorded. Specifically, we know that Alice Raymond, Fredrika Van Benschoten and Myra
Wilcox Sloper, and Christabel Coe, all members of the class of '01, were often invited to social functions even during their senior year. Why were they the exceptions? Miss Raymond was the president's daughter, Frederika was the daughter of a professor, and Myra and Christabel were reputed to be very attractive. For these women, life at Wesleyan, at least as recalled through the unrigorous filter of seventy years' memory, was a period of sociability and freedom. Frederika remembers, "my sister [class of '04] and I had innumerable friends among the male students and during our college days nothing but friendly relations." Gordon Gatch, '06, having observed during an interview that "a few girls were not under the general stigma," mentioned Margaret Van Benschoten as a "beautiful Amazon: tall."

For those women who were not particularly attractive, or who were not daughters of Wesleyan professors or presidents, the experience of living at Wesleyan was more often colored by the men students' relentless inscrutability and punctuated by the mild persecution of student pranks. Edith Hewitt remembered, "students tried to trip the women on the winding stairs of the Chapel." In 1903*, the class of '05 had a picnic down by the river. As they were returning home "late that night, a group of them stopped at the 'Quail Roost' and wrote or painted some disparaging sentences on the outside walls of the house." Displeased, President Raymond called the class to his office the next day. A student reported that they were "severely reprimanded."
Henderson Van Surdam, a member of that class, either did not take the president's scolding to heart, or, if he did his prank before the picnic, perhaps he was the one who set the example. Using some old paint from the basement of Dike House, Van Surdam attacked the sidewalk in front of North College dormitory in the middle of the night with a paint brush: "To hell with the quails." "Down with Co-education." 291

According to Van Surdam, who is the only source for the story, the administration questioned every student the next morning but reprehended no one. As in those days paint stores made their own paint, the administration tried to trace the origins of the paint by checking the paint from the sidewalk with the paint made by stores in the area. As Van Surdam tells the story, the method could not succeed because the paint he used had belonged to a Dike brother who had bought it in Crounksby, Pennsylvania. 292

Another incident was reported by Henry Sutton, '07. During the freshman parade at the end of his freshman year, he impersonated the Dean of Women. Afterwards he was sharply criticized by Professor Rice and suspended by the faculty for four months. 293

Taken together, the stories of these three pranks indicate that the administration was concerned about the treatment the women were receiving, but it is interesting to note that in each of these three cases the offense that they punished was a public one. In two instances, something was done to property
that people walking by would see, and in the third a person was impersonated at a public gathering. It is limited evidence that the administration's first concern was with its public image.

But it is also interesting to note that the administration did not seriously interfere with the policy of social ostracism. Was this an implied sanction of the policy or did the administration lack the moral courage to thwart a student movement? Lack of information makes it difficult to answer the first question, but there is evidence that the second was the case.

In the fall of 1900, during the first week of school when freshmen were pledging fraternities and hazing was particularly intense, some sophomores entered a room where some freshmen were gathered, and when they had finished "hazing" them, left the room with two of the freshmen lying unconscious.294 Frank Nichols, Professor of Latin, told the Middletown Tribune reporter that the incident was being investigated. Apparently the administration was having difficulty getting the names of the guilty sophomores.295 How was this so? One would have expected the freshmen to spread the word . . . unless, perhaps, they feared for the safety of their own heads. Was hazing so omnipotent a tyranny? There is no record the Middletown Tribune of how the administration resolved the case. The Argus never reported it.

While the administration largely avoided asserting its authority on the question of treatment of the women, the
students had to confront their own responsibilities in the matter. Claude Hardy's ('11) inconsistent behavior towards the women may have been typical of more than a few students:

During my freshman year ('07-'08) I was required to use a wooden gun in front of their dormitory and aim it at any girl who came out. We called her a 'Quail.' I was reluctant to do this and am still ashamed of that kind of conduct. We went hunting during the fall . . . . Except as explained above, I treated [the women] with the utmost respect. I met them at churches and athletic events. If out of doors, I always tipped my hat when I met them after my freshman year.296

Claude may or may not have been typical. Certainly his position on coeducation is difficult to place. Was he ashamed because he did not have the courage to show his support for coeducation, or did he agree with the anti-coeducationalists in principle and only spurn their method?

It is impossible to state what proportion of the students opposed coeducation but the material suggests that many were not asserting their own opinions. Observed one alumnus: "Personally, I had no objection to [the women]. I was simply not in possession of any personal independent attitude."297 Beyond the usual human tendency to avoid taking responsibility, and to follow the crowd, we may credit their lack of backbone to feelings of confusion about the educated woman. The training of her intellect was a threat to their masculinity, but her sexual beauty rejuvenated their male self-esteem. The policy of social ostracism ordered them to ignore her, but if she was the daughter of a professor or president, her father's
position redefined her as socially acceptable. The woman at Wesleyan was a symbol of the college's emasculation, the girl they went to high school with, and the victim of their obedience to a principle of conformity. It is no wonder that many chose the easiest solution: ignoring them altogether.

As for the women's perceptions of the situation, they varied according to their levels of tolerance for the anti-coeducation atmosphere. Katie Wilcox, '01, who described herself as "very timid," said that the fact that the men were not to speak with her "didn't trouble me much. I just went my own way." 298 On the other hand, one of her classmates, May T. Palmer, admitted in a questionnaire, "I almost decided to change [schools] when I discovered how unpleasant the feeling [was] about coeducation." 299 Between those whom it didn't bother at all and those whom it really annoyed could be found the probable majority of women studying at Wesleyan after 1900 who felt that the situation was ridiculous. One of the women, Ethel Sawyer, '03 wrote a song to the tune of "Coming Through the Rye," to describe the insanity of the situation. She must have captured a popular sentiment, because according to Ruth Shattucks, '10, the song was still being sung in 1910. 300

"The Sentiments of Wesleyan Girls"

1. If a laddie and a lassie come to Wesleyan
   Will they love each other dearly as before they came?
   If the laddie meet the lassie on the campus walk,
   Will the laddie greet the lassie? Will they stop
   and talk?
2. If a lassie and a laddie for a prize should try
If a lassie beat the laddie, need the laddie cry?
If the laddie has some whimsy floating in his head
Why, then, should a lassie mind them railing at coed?

3. Among the train there's many a swain can find
no other way
To please the other laddies than to wish the
girls away
Can a lassie blame a laddie's doing all he can?
Let us pray that heaven will let him some day be a man.

4. If this lassie and this laddie meet some future day
Won't the laddie woo the lassie in the same old way?
If the lassie loved the laddie, won't they both
be wed?
Then why all this opposition to good old coed? 

For sensitivity to paradox, Ethel's song was matched by a
comment of an alumnus of '09. Speaking of a particular
coed, he remarked, "I could have loved her but I couldn't
talk to her." 

Ethel's observation that, despite the circumstances, the
men and women students continued to marry was accurate.
Between 1900 and 1909, twenty-eight women married Wesleyan
men. Was this evidence that the policy of social ostracism
was not as powerful as it seemed? Not necessarily. The
circumstances of Perry Howe's ('09) marriage to Mary Elizabeth
Smith ('04) is a good example of an historic event which
denies the apparent. Howe never knew Mary Smith until two
years after he graduated from Wesleyan, when she came to
teach languages at a high school in New York state where he
was the principal. As Howe reported it in an interview on June
4, 1971, the treatment Mary had received at Wesleyan "had
irked her some."
new school was a "Wesleyan man" she "made up her mind to hate him." She did not succeed. 305

On the whole, the women did not seem to respond to the men's treatment one way or the other. There is record of only one case when they showed some aggression. One year, on the eve of the Cannon Scrap, some sophomores rolled a large empty beer barrel onto the front steps of the Webb Hall. Some of the women were ready for them in the room above the front door. Opening the window as the men stood beneath it, they dumped a bucket of cold water into the February air. 306

Otherwise, the women seemed imperturable. Jessie Murphy, '09, believed that this was a conscious policy on their part:

The girls tried very hard to be dignified and inconspicuous always and not admit they were hurt by the men's attitude that they were not socially acceptable. 307

She told the story of a newspaper reporter from New York who came to the door of Webb Hall to ask for an interview with one of the girls and was refused. 308 We may suppose that the women were closed-mouthed not only because, as Ethel's song conveyed, they saw the situation as ridiculous, but also because they desired an education more than retaliation, and were unwilling to do something that would jeopardize their opportunity.

Taking the situation into their own hands, the anti-coeducationalists had not only found a way to express their alienation from the school's coeducational policy but also to broaden the base of their support among the students.
Whether or not they had intended to, a question which lack of information prevents us from answering, the anti-coeducationalists' policy of social ostracism also created an atmosphere of discord about which members of the community on both sides of the issue shared a concern. We may gauge the depth of the discord from a statement made by William North Rice, one of coeducation's staunchest supporters, in a letter he wrote to Vida Moore, a Wesleyan alumna:

I should be very glad if, with a fair degree of harmony on the part of our constituency, we could maintain the policy of coeducation. . . . I have, however, very reluctantly come to the belief that some change in our policy is necessary. 309
In the New York Young Alumni's Report on Coeducation of 1899, the five members of the Committee on Coeducation who authored the report had recommended that the university establish a women's college. They had further stated, "If, at the end of seven years, the Women's College has not been established, coeducation at Wesleyan should cease." 310 In December, 1907, seven years after the trustees had issued the "Final Report on Coeducation," the Academic Council passed the following resolution:

Resolved: that in the opinion of the Council the early establishment of a separate Woman's College is the wisest solution of the problem of the education of women at Wesleyan. 311

In the resolution, the Council proposed that they and the trustees create a joint committee to study "the feasibility and the details of this plan." 312

Was there a causal relationship between the Young Alumni's recommendation and the timing of the Council's resolution? There is no evidence for or against it. The members of the Joint Committee did not include the seven year clause in any of their minority or majority reports. Only the Young Alumni mentioned it. It is possible that the Young Alumni wrote letters or spoke with the members of the Council about the necessity of doing something about the "coeducation problem"
but there is no record of their doing so. If the Young Alumni were not responsible then the question remains: why did the Council decide to make its resolution at the time it did? The Minutes of the Council give no clue. Did an individual introduce and campaign for the resolution or was it the outgrowth of faculty consensus? Was there a particularly unpleasant anti-coeducational incident during the fall of 1907 which spurred the community to reconsider the question of coeducation? The Argus offers no answer. Neither does the Olla Podrida since all mention of the women had ceased in the yearbook since 1899.

The resolution may possibly have been the culmination of concern over the dissent generated by the women's presence. President Raymond, the Young Alumni, Welch and Rice had commented the disharmony caused by coeducation. Despite the reforms enacted by the trustees, the controversy had continued, exacerbated by the policy of social ostracism. Elizabeth Wright, who graduated in 1897, wrote to Professor Rice in 1910:

Of course I understand that you . . . and others at Wesleyan have no hand in producing the unfortunate conditions . . . but it is useless to blind ourselves to the fact that these conditions have existed and that Wesleyan and its president have done nothing to eliminate the unpleasant feeling which has arisen among the numerous friends of the alumnae and women students.313
Meanwhile Rice himself was wondering whether it was worthwhile to continue the policy of coeducation. He wrote, "I think that we're achieving in the education of this very small number no results which compensate for the lack of harmony and positive disaffection in our constituency." If a pro-coeducationalist like Rice had these doubts, we may assume that there were other faculty, students, alumni, and alumnae who had similar doubts much sooner. Writing in 1909, Rice observed that over the last decade there had been "a growing prevalence of opposition to coeducation through our constituency." Still, all of Wesleyan had not abandoned the cause of women's education; those who continued to feel responsible believed the solution was to found a women's college. Rice was their spokesman. He wrote to his son, Edward, in March, 1909:

I have for a number of years been drifting towards the plan of a woman's college as the best escape from the evils of the present situation.

Two months earlier he had received a letter from an alumna who did not want the trustees to abolish coeducation and found a women's college. To her he replied:

We believe that on the whole we should do a better work educating two hundred women under peaceful and happy conditions than in educating thirty women under conditions disagreeable to themselves and involving prolonged disharmony in our whole constituency.
Having opposed the founding of a women's college in 1900, Rice found himself seven years later looking at the proposal in a new light. In 1900, when he believed that coeducation could be a success at Wesleyan, founding a women's college looked to him like a dangerous proposal because it offered Wesleyan a graceful way to back out of coeducation. Now, in 1909, when feelings against coeducation and concern about the unpleasantness of those feelings threatened to bring Wesleyan's whole experiment with educating women to an abrupt end, the proposal looked like a way to end the controversy without ending Wesleyan's commitment to women's education.

Meanwhile, during the opening years of the twentieth century, the coordinate college system had been spreading in the East. In the letter to the concerned alumna, written January 9, 1909, Rice remarked that three New England colleges had changed or were changing from coeducation to coordination. Rice was probably thinking of Tufts, which established Jackson in 1910, Adelbert College (later Western Reserve) which established Flora Mather in 1919 and Rochester which set up a College for Women in 1912.

With the Academic Council's recommending to the trustees that Wesleyan establish a Women's College, Rice's own institution seemed about to share in the trend. Three days after the Council issued the resolution, the trustees met and ordered that a joint committee be appointed to study, "without prejudice to the merits of the case," the feasibility and desirability
of the plan. Wesley Pearne, John Andrus, James Buckley, William Keeley, and David Downey were appointed to the committee by Henry Ingraham, the Chairman of the Board. At its next meeting on December 17, the Council elected five members, Rice, Winchester, Harrington, Bradley and Fife, to represent the Council on the joint committee.

Events had been moving quickly but once the matter was in committee, the pace slowed down. On April 9, Wesley Pearne informed the trustees that the committee on the Women's College "reported progress" and at the next trustees meeting on June 22, he reported the same. Then, a few minutes later, the initiative was taken out of the committee's hands.

Charles Scott, '86, introduced a resolution:

That after the opening of the college year 1909-1910 no women be admitted to Wesleyan University, but nothing in this action is to be construed as in any way interfering with the rights and privileges of the women who may be students in the college at the opening of the college year 1909-1910.

That it is desirable to establish a coordinate college for women and that we pledge ourselves to establish such an institution as soon as the necessary funds are available.

If the resolution was intended to prod the trustees to action, it had that effect. After dividing the Scott Resolution into two parts, the trustees decided to vote on the first part at the mid-year meeting in February. By that time, all the trustees would have been notified that a decision on coeducation was pending. The second resolution was referred to the existing Committee on a Women's College.
significant to note that the resolution to abolish coeducation was not referred to a committee. The Minutes of the Trustee Meetings are too brief to be enlightening, but in reading of the fate of the Scott Resolution one has a sense that it was all prearranged. The decision to vote on coeducation seemed to slip by so quietly. Perhaps the anti-coeducationalists had been lobbying.

Whatever the explanation, the decision to vote may also be taken as an indication of the change in attitude towards coeducation that Wesleyan had experienced since 1900—indeed, since 1872. We have traced the phenomenal growth of football and related it to Wesleyan's increased concern with prestige as an explanation for the increase in hostility against coeducation. Both developments were indicative that Wesleyan was undergoing a larger kind of change, one which involved the college's own identity. Although the process had begun earlier, most of the change had occurred while Bradford Raymond was president. In 1907 Raymond, who was not in good health, announced his resignation. His action brought an important period for Wesleyan to an end.

During Raymond's administration, Wesleyan had changed from a small, provincial Methodist college to a larger, more sophisticated and self-conscious liberal arts college. Between 1895 and 1907 the college had built a new gymnasium, a laboratory, a classroom building and a new dormitory. Enrollment had increased 50 per cent since 1889, but alumni
and faculty were dissatisfied with Wesleyan's rate of growth. Other New England colleges were expanding more rapidly. In 1901, the Academic Council appointed a committee who were responsible for making "the college better known to the public with a view to increasing the number of students." The Boston Alumni did their share by giving money to pay for hanging photographs of Wesleyan in the Boston area high schools.

The alumni's support which was one indication of their increasing interest in their alma mater was in turn an indication and cause of the college's increased self-consciousness. Between 1900 and 1907 the number of alumni organizations in existence had more than doubled, while interest in football never lagged. It was through a large financial contribution from the New York Young Alumni in 1901 that Wesleyan was able to hire its first permanent full-time football coach.

Wesleyan's growth in size and reputation occurred during a period when American colleges were trying to adapt their images and educational programs to meet the demands of an increasingly industrialized society. Developments in curriculum reflected and clarified the nature of the change. A Wesleyan history professor, George Dutcher, who wrote a pamphlet on the history of Wesleyan's curriculum, observed:

The growing complexity of life and increasing demands of specialization in the professions required a broader program of collegiate education with greater emphasis on the sciences.
In 1906 the faculty decided to abandon the Latin-Scientific course and offer only the B.A. and B.S. degrees. Latin was the tool of ministers, scholars, lawyers and doctors, and fewer of Wesleyan's graduates were following those professions and a greater number were becoming businessmen. Within a year the elective system was introduced. Students were permitted greater flexibility in their choice of courses and required to specialize in a major area. In 1909 William North Rice remarked on the trend:

> Not alone the devotees of the ancient learned professions, but multitudes of those who are going into the variety of pursuits embraced under the general name of business, throng to college.

The occasion of the remark was a speech given to the Section on Education of the American Association for the Advancement of Science on the topic, "A Danger Arising from the Popularization of the College." In his speech, Rice described the new academic needs of the business-oriented college students: "The careers for which they intend to fit themselves will demand . . . a considerable degree of special knowledge." What he found dangerous was the unscholarly attitude their commitment to business produced. As they did not take studying seriously, their presence on campus created an atmosphere which Rice believed demoralized the serious students. Education was being desanctified. It may have been indicative of the same trend that just two years earlier Wesleyan's trustees had voted to end the college's denominational allegiance to the Methodist Episcopal Church.
The trend towards worldliness in the colleges was reflected in the change in style of college presidents. As the century turned and advanced, the new college presidents were less often evangelical firm-lipped ministers, and more frequently urban and political types with some knowledge of business. 336 Although the man chosen to be Wesleyan's new president, William Shanklin, was a Methodist minister, it was his skill in money raising which first attracted the interest of the trustees. If the college was to continue expanding it would need a much larger endowment. Increased expenses were quickly putting Wesleyan into debt. In November, 1909, when Shanklin was inaugurated, Wesleyan had a deficit of $51,000.00. By June the deficit had reached $93,000.00. 338 Alumni and faculty looked to Shanklin, described by Rice as "... a hustler, who brings things to pass. ..." 339 to solve Wesleyan's financial problems.

Many also looked to the new president for a solution to the problem of coeducation. Reported the Hartford Times:

Strong sentiment and powerful influence are being exerted that the new president ... shall be in sympathy with the men who stand against the presence of women on campus. 340

If this was true, then the efforts were successful. Shanklin gave an indication of his anti-coeducational point of view, although probably unintentionally, sometime during the year preceding his inauguration. He made a speech to the Wesleyan
students and addressed it to "the men of Wesleyan." An alumnus of '09 reported that Acting-President Rice escorted Shanklin down to Webb Hall in order for him to apologize to the women. By March, 1909, Shanklin had made his position clear. Henry Ingraham, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, wrote to Rice on March 18:

When I learned ... [that the new president]
did not believe in coeducation anywhere, ... 
it did not seem to me that he could walk upon
the troubled waters ... and bring peace ... 
among men and women at Wesleyan.342

In April, President-Elect Shanklin gave a speech to the Chicago Alumni in which he "expressed the belief that Wesleyan should aim to be a distinctly man's college."343 The future did not look hopeful for coeducation.

The solidification of opposition to coeducation coincided with the end of Raymond's administration and the beginning of Shanklin's. Did the college's growing commitment to the interests of business contribute to the strength of feeling against coeducation? Competence in the business world was becoming an aspect of Wesleyan's new identity and the presence of women may have seemed less appropriate to the business image. The business world was preeminently a man's world. If that was so, then the college that was preparing men for business should be a man's college. Students of the highest caliber, the businessmen of the future, would be attracted to the college that simulated the world and values of that future. Such may have been the unexpressed feelings of some of those who opposed
coeducation. The only manifestation may have been an inarticulate sense of uncomfortableness that the women remained enrolled as Wesleyan students.

On November 13, 1908, William Shanklin was elected as the new president by the Board of Trustees. At the same meeting Acting-President Rice presented two resolutions forwarded from the New York Young Alumni, "one in opposition to coeducation, and one with regard to the election of a new President."\(^{344}\) Presumably, the Young Alumni supported Shanklin's election. There was also a resolution from the Academic Council to the trustees "in favor of the establishment of a Woman's College."\(^{345}\) Apparently the Young Alumni and the faculty were anxious for the trustees to act. They did not have long to wait. The Scott Resolution to abolish coeducation was to be voted on at the approaching February meeting.
CHAPTER XII: "THE BEST ESCAPE"

The Board of Trustees were faced with several alternatives at the February meeting: to end coeducation immediately; to end it in several years; or to continue coeducation until a Women's College was established. Which ever alternative was chosen, the decision was sure to displease some. In June of 1900, the alumnae and students had communicated their opinions to the trustees. Would such communication take place at the February meeting?

The most energetic supporter of coeducation, William North Rice, had remained a defender of the women's point of view, but had come to support the plan to found a Women's College. He wrote:

> In the shaping of institutions, compromise is a necessity; and the question which wise men have to answer is not what plan is ideal, but what plan promises on the whole the best practical results.346

Of the three alternatives Rice supported the second because he feared that if the trustees voted to abolish coeducation immediately and did not act to found a Women's College, the college would never be founded. Writing to Rice a few weeks before the February meeting, a fellow trustee, Frank North, agreed with him that continuing to educate women at Wesleyan until a Women's College could be established
It was Rice's plan to have a modification of Scott's motion introduced at the trustee's meeting which would guarantee that coeducation continued in some form until the Women's College was established. Rice left no record of the modification but Henry Ingraham implied in a letter he wrote to Rice just four days before the meeting that Rice's plan took the form of requiring that "a space of three years be allowed before coeducation should terminate."

To whom could Rice look among the trustees for support of the proposal? Ingraham suggested that George Reynolds, another trustee, might help Professor Rice by introducing the modification. Reynolds did not favor founding a Women's College but did not want coeducation to end abruptly.

Could Rice look to North? In his letter to Rice, North sounded dubious. He followed this remark that continuing coeducation would be a "surer method for educating women at Wesleyan in the future," with the observation:

If this opinion is not shared by others or if it be the occasion of embarrassment to the new administration, I shall not be in the slightest degree contentious about it. I almost fear that I am beginning to lose something of my positiveness of conviction on many matters.
He added, perhaps to give Rice hope that the situation was redeemable, "I think I need to get a little or your fellowship to brace me up."

Unless Frank North was simply a person without backbone, his remark suggests that the trustees who supported a continuation of coeducation until a Women's College could be founded were under some pressure to change their minds. There may have been many like North whose lack of strong feelings on the issue of women's education caused them to seek the least controversial position. The part played by the Board of Trustees in Wesleyan's gradual decision to end its commitment to women's education was most often that of conciliator of extremes. When the anti-coeducationalists had called for a Women's College in 1899 and 1900, the trustees had instead recommended that coeducation continue in a modified form. Now, in 1909, the issue was whether and when to found a Women's College. In this decision also the trustees sought the middle ground. Responsive to the criticisms of alumni and the press, the trustees chose not to initiate leadership.

Despite North's lack of determination, Rice was optimistic about the chances that a Women's College would be founded. He wrote to Vida Moore, "A very large majority [of our constituency] are in favor of this plan and that majority includes both coeducationalists and anti-coeducationalists." To Vida Moore this was not necessarily good news: she had her doubts about the wisdom of ending coeducation and
establishing a Women's College:

I cannot but think that if either of these resolutions is accepted a wrong will be done to the women whom Wesleyan has already graduated.\(^{353}\)

Her specific fear was that classes at the Women's College would be taught by less outstanding professors than those at Wesleyan, and that the college would earn a reputation with which she, as a graduate of Wesleyan, would not wish to be affiliated.\(^{354}\) Rice replied with the reassurance that those faculty who were working on the proposal would make every effort to keep the quality of education available at the coordinate college on a par with Wesleyan's.\(^{355}\)

Were Vida Moore's feelings representative of the feelings of most of the alumnae? Rice did not believe so. He wrote to her:

I think the opinion is coming to be quite general among our alumnae that the organization of a women's college is the best solution to our problem which is offered. I have certainly heard that opinion expressed by a good many of our alumnae with whom I have talked.\(^{356}\)

It is difficult to know whether Rice's reading of the mood of the alumnae was accurate. Was he being overly optimistic? Bertha Bass, the only other alumna whose opinion has survived, doubted that founding a Women's College was the best solution. She indicated in a letter to the *New York Sun* a week before the trustees met that she hoped coeducation would continue.\(^{357}\)
The news that Wesleyan was again reviewing the policy of coeducation elicited strong opinions among the alumnae, as the existence of Vida Moore's and Bertha Bass's letters indicated. Bass felt that these opinions should reach the ears of the trustees and criticized the Committee on a Coordinate College for not soliciting the alumnae's opinions:

It's [the committee's] very existence was not known to the alumnae for months after it was appointed. So far as is known, not one woman's opinion has been sought by that committee, although the alumnae number two hundred, one-ninth of the graduate body. 358

When the Committee did not ask for the women's opinions, did the women organize a petition, as they had in 1900? The minutes of the trustees' meeting of February 26 mention no petitions, but an article in the New York Sun recorded that "many petitions had been sent to the members of the Board of Trustees," and that these were read at the meeting. 359

Unfortunately none of these petitions found their way to the Wesleyan Archives. One of them may have been organized by Frederick Shapleigh, the pro-coeducationalist graduate student. As was mentioned earlier, he wrote a letter to Professor Rice in January of 1909 in which he discussed the coeducation situation. Shapleigh wanted to be sure that if the young alumni and undergraduates presented their anticoeducational petitions at the trustees' meeting, as he expected they would, that there would be "a counter petition or statement in favor of preserving coeducation . . . backed by the other alumni and undergraduates." 360 He told Rice:
When you return, I wish to talk with you to find out if any plan may be wise, in regard to getting the sentiments of some of the undergraduates or recent alumni, also the sentiments possibly of the undergraduate girls or alumnae. In Shapleigh, at least, Rice had a staunch ally.

On February 26, 1909, the Board of Trustees met in New York City. Slightly more than half of the board's fifty-four members were present. Although not a member of the board, Rice had traveled to New York for the meeting. Ingraham had encouraged him, as one of the people best informed of the situation, to speak his thoughts to the trustees. Financial matters were the first order of business. Following the Treasurer's decision to purchase twenty shares of Swift and Company's stock at par, the trustees came to the question of coeducation. This too they first approached from a monetary perspective. A motion was carried:

It is the unanimous opinion of the Finance Committee that there is no Trust attached to any property held by Wesleyan University, except possible a bequest of two thousand dollars by Mrs. Helen Ackley, that would be violated by the termination of coeducation at Middletown.

Mrs. Ackley's bequest had paid for four year scholarships for several if not many of the women.

* Mrs Ackley was probably the wife of Joseph B. Ackley, '84.
The Committee on a Coordinate College for Women's report was laid on the table. It recommended that a coordinate college

... be established by the Board as soon as the necessary funds are provided and that the matter of details, including the consideration of the amount of money necessary to such establishment, be referred to a committee to report at the annual meeting in June. 365

The trustees then voted to discuss the question of the abolition of coeducation and the establishment of a coordinate college together, and that they would vote on the question of abolition first. As Ingraham had suggested might happen, George Reynolds offered an amendment to the Scott Resolution which made it possible for women to enter as members of the class of '09 or previous classes, even after the fall of 1909. This was apparently an attempt, no doubt supported by Rice, to prevent the break between coeducation and coordination by making it possible for the number of girls at Wesleyan to increase even after coeducation had been abolished.

Frank North, perhaps bolstered up by Rice's fellowship, offered a further amendment; that 1910 be substituted for 1909. North's amendment lost, but Reynolds' carried. The original resolution, as amended, was adopted. 356

The report of the Committee on a Coordinate College for Women was taken from the table and adopted. A joint committee of seven trustees and five faculty was appointed to, as Rice later described it, "consider the details of a Women's college." 367

The description in the minutes of the trustees was even more
vague: "a committee on the subject of a coordinate college."

James Buckley, Samuel Brown, Edmund Mills, Darius Baker, Clinton Burdick, John Leaycraft, and Wesley Pearne were appointed from the board and Rice, Winchester, Harrison, Nicholson and Bradley from the faculty. The meeting moved on to other topics, but before it was adjourned, the Secretary was authorized to issue a news release on coeducation to the press.

Coeducation at Wesleyan still held the interest of the New York press. Articles on the decision appeared in the papers the next day. The reporters tried to analyze what caused the trustees to vote the way they did. The reporter from the New York Sun believed that the trustees voted to abolish coeducation, "not because they were opposed to the idea, but for the purpose of doing away with the treatment which they knew would be accorded the women as long as they were allowed to enter." Elsewhere in the same article the reporter observed, "It seemed to be the general impression that the college would increase in numbers if the coeducation system were abolished." From the point of view of those who were worried about Wesleyan's reputation, such publicity was good for the university; what was more commendable than desiring to grow and not wishing to expose the women to further bad treatment?

Not all of the press thought so highly of Wesleyan's decision. The Independent of New York, a popular weekly
magazine, ran an editorial titled, "The Shame of Wesleyan" in which it berated Wesleyan for its "unChristian" treatment of the "weaker members of society," and gave details of how the women had been mistreated. The Independent's insult could not be left unchallenged. The president of the Wesleyan student body, Roy Chamberlin, responded to the editorial in a letter to the editor, which The Independent published the following week. He defended the Wesleyan men's policy of ignoring the women by explaining that

the majority of the women in college are not those that would be invited to college social affairs under any circumstances; that does not happen simply because they are women.

He denied the truthfulness of other points made in the editorial, and invited a staff member of The Independent to visit Wesleyan incognito, at Roy's expense, to see the situation for himself.

When Frederick Shapleigh read Roy's letter in The Independent, he found it "so misleading" that he could not "refrain from explaining the real situation." In an article entitled, "The View of the Graduate Student," which was published in an April issue of The Independent, he challenged Roy's description that the students' attitude towards the women "has been one of passive ignoring."

On the contrary, although the policy of passive ignoring has been the avowed policy of undergraduate body, the real attitude has been a rather sporadic series of bold and flagrant insults connected by more frequent
slight insults and the daily ignoring of many of those slight courtesies which are inborn in the true gentlemen. 375

Shapleigh agreed with the observation made by one Wesleyan woman, and he quoted her in his article: "No man can long remain a student without undergoing a deterioration of character." 377

The writing of the article brought Frederick his share of criticism. Roy Chamberlin was very upset by Frederick's article, according to a friend of Frederick's, Jessie Johnson, '09. She wrote that Frederick "suffered much criticism from one of the leading men on campus ..." 378 She had been angry at Frederick herself for publishing the article. She had the feeling that "the matter [of Roy's letter] had better be laughed about at Webb Hall and forgotten." 379 For Frederick, even the money he had received from The Independent, which might have bought him something to enjoy, was tainted. He used it to pay for having Jessie's Phi Beta Kappa key engraved. He told her, "I couldn't use that money; it was blood money." 380

What was it about Frederick's article that made Jessie angry? Perhaps it was the fact that Roy took the situation seriously. As was mentioned earlier, Jessie had observed:

The girls tried very hard to be dignified and inconspicuous always and not admit they were hurt by the men's attitude that they were not socially acceptable. 381

Their method seemed to have been not to take the situation to heart. Frederick's article in The Independent threatened to break down the wall of indifference that the women had built to protect themselves from the men's insults.
Between March and June the trustees' Joint Committee on the Coordinate College investigated the details of the Women's College. During that time there is no record that groups were organizing to oppose the plan. Was the Coordinate College as popular with the trustees and the alumni as Rice thought? Where did the young alumni stand on this question? In 1899 they had recommended that a coordinate college be founded. In the ten years that Rice's views had changed, had theirs also? The incompleteness of the record of the trustees' meeting leaves many questions unanswered. But the opinions expressed before and after the meeting suggest that although some alumnae and students regretted that coeducation was ending, few actively opposed the trustees decision.

Why was this so? Coeducation was abolished because many alumni, faculty and students sought to end the disharmony and criticism that had characterized the past ten years. Those who were opposed to founding a coordinate college may have chosen not to speak out of a desire to avoid further dissent.

Chairman of the Board, Henry Ingraham, who was less optimistic than Rice about the popularity of the Coordinate College plan, had another explanation for the lack of opposition. He wrote to Rice on March 19:

I am not sure that our alumni would welcome a coordinate college at Wesleyan. I find some that are only quiet because they think such a school cannot be founded.382
Those who disliked the idea of Wesleyan establishing a coordinate college would have been the first to doubt that it could become a reality. They would have been joined by those who wondered about the expense. A coordinate college would cost a great deal of money to establish and maintain and the alumni knew that Wesleyan did not have that money to spend. Shanklin had yet to begin his endowment campaign. The debts had been accumulating.

At a special meeting of the trustees on May 29, the Committee on the Coordinate College gave a report which squarely confronted the issue of money. The members of the committee

. . . expressed the opinion that it was not desirable to start a separate college for women at Middletown until at least $250,000 had been raised as an endowment fund and in addition thereto, from $250,000 to $150,000 for a proper building.383

The report gave no indication that Wesleyan's debts and needs for endowment might interfere or prevent the money for the coordinate college from being raised. Apparently to rectify this error, George Reynolds introduced a substitute resolution:

Resolved, that this Board of Trustees . . . secure . . . additional endowment for the more efficient and successful prosecution of the work it is now doing, without attempting to establish at present, in any form, a Woman's College in connection therewith.384

The trustees voted to table both the report and the substitute resolution until the Annual Meeting.385
At the Annual Meeting on June 28, the trustees voted to consider the committee's report by sections. The section that recommended that a separate college not be started until $400,000 could be raised was approved. The trustees voted that the remainder of the report, which recommended that a committee be appointed by the Board to be in charge of raising funds for the separate college, be referred to a standing committee of five trustees which would be chaired by Dr. Shanklin. Reynolds then re-introduced his resolution with a sentence added:

> We leave, however, upon the record, the declaration of the Board at the meeting of February 26, 1909 in favor of a Coordinate College for Women, as soon as the necessary funds are provided.

His resolution was defeated.

Apparently the trustees felt there was a significant enough difference between the two resolutions to pass one and defeat the other. The words of the Committee's resolution were unhesitant. The resolution gave the impression that there was no question that a coordinate college would be established. It was simply a matter of raising the money. Reynolds' resolution said the same thing but discussed the college's need for endowment as its first commitment, whereas the committee's did not. By the phrasing of his resolution, Reynolds pushed the founding of a coordinate college into the future; the Committee, and by their vote, the trustees, chose to support the resolution which kept the coordinate college a present possibility.
The trustees' choice of resolution implied that the majority were optimistic that, despite Wesleyan's debts, the coordinate college would be founded soon. But the way they dealt with the second half of the committee's resolution suggests otherwise. Instead of following the committee's recommendation to appoint a committee to raise the money necessary, the trustees created a standing committee and gave it no specific responsibilities. The Minutes stated: "All matters relating to a Coordinate College for Women shall be referred to the Committee." The trustees had chosen the resolution that encouraged the supporters of coordination to believe that a coordinate college would be established soon, but had avoided establishing the committee that would convert the belief to a reality.

These events cast light on the trustees' intentions. In recommending that a Women's College be established some of the trustees had not intended that one would. Instead it seemed that by approving such a resolution some had hoped to avoid a confrontation with the supporters of the coordinate system and further discord. Their action served to create as little friction as possible and no endowment for the Women's College. The Wesleyan community's desire to avoid conflict had brought about the end of coeducation, and signalled the defeat of the coordinate plan.
CHAPTER XIII: PERPLEXITIES

The trustees' failure to assign the responsibility of raising money for the coordinate college to a committee left the future of the coordinate college in Rice's hands. Although cognizant of Wesleyan's financial problems, Rice was cheerful about the chances that a coordinate college would soon be founded. He wrote to Bertha Bass in June:

I still hope that before the vote of exclusion takes effect, we may be able to have a woman's college organized and may have a large number of women enjoying in the privileges of education in Wesleyan University.389

Earlier, in March, he had remarked to his son Edward that Shanklin's first priority was to raise Wesleyan's own endowment. He realized that the coordinate college could not receive much, if any, support from those individuals to whom Shanklin would be making his appeal. A Women's College could not be founded unless

... a considerable amount of money is given specifically for that object. ... We may get some money from sources entirely outside those to which we should naturally appeal for other plans of the college.390

He added with uncharacteristic despair, "The situation is full of perplexities in every direction,"391 but the next day he wrote a letter to a Ms. Cummings in which he sounded more optimistic. Speaking of the necessity of getting money that was earmarked especially for the Women's College, he said, "I hope we can do just that. Nor is that hope utterly
a vague and general one. I have some hope of money being
given by certain individuals." 392 Julia Brazos, a former
Dean of Women at Wesleyan, described Ms. Cummings as,
"without doubt the best-informed woman in our state on the
history of a woman's college in Connecticut." 393 Professor
Rice had apparently learned of Ms. Cummings through Julia
Brazos in August of 1908. In reply to a letter from Rice,
Brazos shared with him all she had learned about the situation
from Ms. Cummings:

About five or six years ago there was
considerable favorable talk in our state
and a wealthy woman stood ready to contribute
a desirable site ... 395

But nothing had come of it, and the woman who knew the name
of the rich woman had died. 396

Rice had remained in contact with Ms. Cummings for
the next two years, hoping that she could serve Wesleyan
in some way. In his letter to her on March 4, he implied that
she had some helpful contacts with many women's organizations
and knew people who were supporting a program to incorporate
a coeducational state university. 397 He was opposed to the
program. To Ms. Cummings he wrote:

I hope that some of the other women will
pretty soon get ready to abandon the
Chimerical scheme of getting the Legislature
in incorporate a State University." 398

In her reply two days later, Ms. Cummings did not comment
upon Rice's criticism of the plan, but assured him that she
was "truly interested in the establishment of a women's
college there [Middletown] and regret that my acquaintance with people of wealth is so limited that I can hardly do anything directly to gain financial support for the project."^399

Ms. Cummings had been unable to give Rice much help in his campaign, but he had other "pots cooking". The records reveal the identity of only one of the "certain individuals" Rich had mentioned: a Ms. Sage. In his letter to Rice on March 18, 1909, Henry Ingraham informed Rice that he had spoken with another trustee, David Downey, the previous May about "inducing Mrs. Sage to help us establish such a school."^400 But Ms. Sage was also a disappointment. Now Ingraham noted that Downey was very busy and he added, "I do not know how to reach her."^401 A week before Downey had himself written to Rice, "I am not sure I can do anything about the Sage matter."^402 That was the last reference to Ms. Sage in Rice's correspondence.

Undaunted, Rice persisted. In July, 1910 he wrote another letter to Ms. Cummings. With the letter he sent a newspaper clipping from a local paper which implied that "the principle thing necessary to make a [woman's college] is a lot of land."^402 What was really needed, he indicated to Ms. Cummings, was some endowment. He pointed out that the Trustees at Wesleyan

* Rice observed to Ms. Cummings that the clipping was "one of many indications that a movement for a women's college in Connecticut is a good deal talked about at present. I think the discussion has to a considerable extent emanated from the Daughters of the American Revolution."^403
recognized this fact and stood ready to establish a Women's college as soon as an endowment had been raised. To enhance Wesleyan's appeal he added,

Although [President Shanklin] is emphatically not a believer in the policy of coeducation as it formerly existed at Wesleyan University, he is heartily in favor of the establishment of a woman's college. Rice was doing all he could to paint a rosy picture.

A week later he made another effort to rally support from outside the university community. He wrote a letter to Elizabeth Wright, '97. She was, as he acknowledged in the letter, "Chairman of the Committee of the Hartford College Club on the proposed woman's college in Connecticut." He tried to persuade her to locate the college in Middletown. Wesleyan's library, Museum and other facilities were easily available, and the trustees, and the president, and "a large and influential majority of our constituency" were receptive to the plan. Knowing that as an alumnae of Wesleyan, Elizabeth Wright was aware of the history of Wesleyan's treatment of the women, he added, "I do not believe that there would be . . . any danger of repetition of some experiences of the past which I need not say no one regrets more deeply than I do." In a closing gesture of cordiality, he offered to meet with her to discuss these matters in Hartford at her convenience.

Elizabeth Wright's reply left no doubt as to her view of Wesleyan's offer:

* Ingraham disagreed. He wrote to Rice on March 18, "I doubt whether Dr. Shanklin would favor it."
If Wesleyan University wishes to cooperate with us, let the trustees make us a definite proposition, stating clearly what they are willing to do, i.e., what location they would allow us for the new buildings, what share the new college would have in the plant and endowment of Wesleyan; what guarantee they would give that after a few years they would not vote to abolish the coordinate college and devote to other purposes the money raised for that object; what assurance they would furnish that the girls of the new college would be protected from the sort of treatment which women students, during the past few years, have endured at the hands of the undergraduates. 411

She quickly established that the women had no need for Wesleyan:

We have had offers of various attractive sites with large buildings and land. This morning's mail, in fact, brought in the offer of the gift of one hundred and thirty acres of land near New London and a number of large buildings. 412

Even in closing, she did not let an opportunity slip by to put him in his place:

I should be very happy to renew my acquaintance with you and to talk the matter over, showing you some of the very interesting offers which we have received. 413

If Rice had expected Mrs. Wright to seize upon his offer gratefully, he must have been disappointed. The spirit of her reply may have even discouraged him from meeting with her in Hartford at all. If he did meet with her, nothing came of it. No Women's College was established in Middletown. By coincidence, the site "near New London" to which Elizabeth Wright had referred in her letter to Rice was eventually chosen by Wright's committee as the best place to found the new "Connecticut College for Women." Why did they reject Wesleyan's offer? Perhaps because the trustees did
not supply the Committee with a definite proposal. But one senses that even if they had, Elizabeth Wright would have rejected it. The pride with which she established the strength of her bargaining position in her letter to Rice implies that Wesleyan lost its last opportunity to found a Women's college because of an angry alumna.
CHAPTER XIV: TWO VIGNETTES

In June of 1912, Faith Bonfoey, Hester Reynolds, Amy Sheldon, and Helen Willis graduated from Wesleyan. All four received Phi Beta Kappa keys and two received Highest Honors. These were the last women to graduate from Wesleyan for the next fifty-eight years. Their graduation, which signalled the end of forty years of coeducation, received no comment in the Argus. The Special Edition of the paper, published on the day of Commencement, was devoted to announcing the successful conclusion of President Shanklin's fund-raising campaign. A million dollars had been raised in two years. In the best style of the New York Sun, the usually sedate Argus banded the headline, "The Greatest Announcement in the History of Wesleyan--Dawn of a New Era for the 'College on the Hill.'" 414

Of course, it was necessary to compare Wesleyan's fund-raising drive with those of other New England colleges. The Argus reported that one New England college with twice as many alumni had raised the same amount but over a longer period of time. At another New England College, a student body nearly twice Wesleyan's size had given $1,640 less to their endowment fund. These facts were cited as "indisputable evidence of the college 'Spirit' at Wesleyan." 415
In all the gaiety of the Commencement Week there had been one less pleasant event. John Andrus returned for his class's fiftieth reunion and at Commencement, was awarded an honorary degree. All were expecting that as Wesleyan's wealthiest alumnus, he would give a generous sum to top off the campaign. Instead, he gave nothing. The college was rudely shocked. Why had he been so ungenerous? George Morrill, Andrus's biographer offered three explanations: Andrus, who had served as the Board of Trustees' treasurer for many years was displeased with the way the finances were being handled. A second explanation was that his wife Julia, who had prompted his conscience in such matters had died three years earlier. Third, he was angry because coeducation had ended. If Morrill is correct, the situation was ironic. Wesleyan's most successful businessman had denied the college the funds it needed for continued expansion because he wanted coeducation to continue.
CHAPTER XV: CONCLUSION

The conclusion of coeducation coincided with the ending of an important period of growth for Wesleyan University. The growth had brought with it a new self-consciousness and gradually a new image. These factors together ended Wesleyan's involvement with women's education.

From the beginning many of the students had been ambivalent in their attitudes towards the educated woman. Then other factors emerged to push more and more students out of their ambivalence and into an anti-coeducational position. The increase in the numbers of women threatened them with the possibility that Wesleyan would become a "female seminary" at the very time when it was most important to both the students and the alumni that Wesleyan communicate a masculine image. Football was a means. By the 1880's the sport was the first passion of the elite New England colleges. Wesleyan, eager to be included as a member of the group, was worried that its policy of coeducation might discredit it in the eyes of the public. The young alumni were the first to organize a formal protest. Following their recommendation, and without making much effort to investigate the situation further, a joint committee of trustees, faculty, and alumni proposed that a Women's College be founded, but then withdrew the proposal. Coeducation had more supporters than had first been supposed. A more moderate proposal which did much to create the impression that the
women were a separate community from the men but effected no change in the coeducational process was adopted in June of 1900.

Some of the opposition were not content with the reforms introduced by the trustees. Confident of their position and the support of the alumni, the anti-coeducational students pursued the issue. The policy of social ostracism proved an extremely effective tool. With the men students treating the women as if they didn't exist, coeducation was again responsible for giving Wesleyan an unfavorable reputation and for alienating the alumni from their alma mater. For a college interested in securing a position as a highly respected and prospering college, a good reputation and the enthusiastic support of the alumni were indispensable. Although a committee was appointed to review the situation, an impatient Trustee, Charles Scott, offered a resolution which produced action. Since 1900, opposition to coeducation had increased and broadened to such an extent that even Rice could not support the policy any longer. In February, 1909, the trustees abolished coeducation.

After the trustees failed to create a committee to raise money for the coordinate college, Rice still hoped and made efforts to insure that before long the college would be founded. But he did not have support for his idea in the places that mattered. Much of Wesleyan's energy and attention was absorbed in its quickly mobilized fund-raising drive. The Wesleyan
alumna who was in a position to do the most to aid Rice in his plan took the opportunity to show Rice and Wesleyan that she had no need for the offer. The coordinate college was never founded.

Against the forces of growth, the efforts of John Van Vleck, Caroline Crawford, Clara Van Vleck, Fred Shapleigh and William North Rice and the others whose efforts and names were not recorded could in the long run accomplish little. Their presence in the debate guaranteed that the issue of a woman's right to an education was not forgotten, but instead it was ignored. It seemed to the majority of the members of the Wesleyan community that the first right to be defended was Wesleyan's right to define its own image and position in the circle of its choice. Those who might have wished to challenge that right could have asked: How private ought the private college be? What is its responsibility to the women in its community, in its state? But such questions did not occur to many of the individuals involved with Wesleyan during the opening years of the twentieth century; neither was the public Wesleyan was wooing concerned with such questions. If the patrons and parents of future students of the New England elite colleges had viewed coeducation or coordination as an impressive and enlightened educational trend, and one well-suited to the interests of an expanding, increasingly business-oriented academic institution, coeducation would not have been abolished at Wesleyan or a coordinate college would have been established.
The problem was that despite the increase in the number of coordinate colleges, educating women was not yet necessary to establish a school's respectability in the East. In 1971 that was becoming the case. But a great deal of change had had to occur in between. By 1971 women had demonstrated in ways they had not in 1909 that they could and would seek means of participating more fully in the business of society. Receiving a solid college education had been the first and necessary step in that achievement. In 1871 in an editorial, the Argus editor had recognized that fact. At the same time, he had put his finger on the factor which, in 1909, would cause Wesleyan to no longer help women to take that first step:

Education comes first in the revolution that is going on; everything else depends on this, and necessary education cannot be hers until a radical change is effected in public opinion.

In that moment, an Argus editor spoke with the voice of a prophet.
EXPLANATION TO FOOTNOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Most of the information in this thesis was drawn from materials deposited in the Wesleyan Collection, on the third floor of Olin Library, in Middletown, Connecticut. For brevity's sake, I have used symbols to indicate when a particular source was kept in the Wesleyan Collection, and when necessary, the "name" or "title" of the collection under which it is filed. I list these symbols below.
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H. - The Hallock Scrapbook of newspaper clippings, entitled, "Press Clippings of the Coeducation Controversy at Wesleyan University," shelved next to "Coeducation at Wesleyan."
R. - The Rice Papers. All the letters I used came from two boxes: "Rice to Son Edward, 1890-1920," and "Rice Letters, to and from him."

It is understood that C., H., and R. are all located in the Wesleyan Collection.
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