

Second. I do not think it admits of a doubt that a large city or town is best adapted for the Medical Department and therefore that the City of Detroit, being by far the largest city in the State and containing in fact a greater population than all the other cities of the State put together is the best place for it. This position is greatly strengthened by the fact that this Board has deemed it advisable to establish the Clinical Course of that Department in the City of Detroit.

Third. I am also of the opinion that the interests of the University as a whole, in a practical point of view, and regardless of all notions of an ideal unity, may be best promoted by keeping all Branches or Departments of it in one locality. Which way the balance of benefits might be found to predominate with reference to the Medical Department on a more careful examination of the subject I am not prepared to say, nor do I deem it necessary now to determine. That question may be determined when the University shall be in a condition to make the removal under consideration.

Fourth. Whether or not it shall be deemed advisable at some future day that the Medical Department shall be removed to some other locality, I am of the opinion that the pecuniary affairs of the University do not authorize a removal at the present time. The expense of such removal would be considerable and there are more pressing demands upon the funds of the Institution. I recommend, therefore, that the whole subject be indefinitely postponed.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Arbor, September 28th, 1858.

LEVI BISHOP.

APPENDIX "B."

Report on the Admission of Females, Submitted September 29, 1858.

The Committee to whom was referred the application of young ladies of Michigan for admission as students to the University, respectfully report:

That they entered upon the investigation of the subject referred to them fully impressed with its importance; regarding it as second to no question which has yet engaged the attention of the present Regents. According to the various views and opinions entertained by the friends and opposers of the measure, its decision involves the destruction of the University on the one hand, and the grossest injustice to the young ladies of Michigan on the other. The advocates of the proposition claim that the ladies by every consideration of right and justice have a title to share in the educational advantages which the University may and should confer, while its opponents insist, that to admit ladies to the University would be an innovation never contemplated by its founders, or its patrons, destructive to its character and influence, and ruinous to the ladies who should avail themselves of it. Among the opponents of the measure we find many of the ablest educators of the country, and among its advocates some of the staunchest friends of education, and of the University, who think that the adoption of the measure would bring troops of friends to the Institution and greatly strengthen it in the affections of the people, as well as open to it a new and extensive field of usefulness. We have therefore sought to collect facts and opinions from such sources as we thought most likely to furnish the former of a character to be relied upon, and

the latter such as would command respect, and exert a healthful influence upon public sentiment, and aid the Board of Regents in forming an enlightened judgment and in deciding wisely upon the interesting question. We accordingly wrote to the presiding officers of Harvard and Yale, of Antioch and Oberlin, of Union and other eminent educational institutions and to several eminent politicians, statesmen and divines; we have also collected the sentiments and opinions of educational associations, and of intelligent professors and other friends of education in Michigan and elsewhere, and now submit to the Board of Regents in a condensed form the substance of the information thus collected, without enumerating all the sources from which each opinion and fact is derived.

The question of opening to young ladies universities or colleges established for the education of boys, has never before been seriously agitated anywhere that we are aware of; and although it has to some slight extent been discussed in newspapers, in associations, and by individuals, yet it has not before been formally presented for the deliberate consideration of a college Board of Trustees, or a University Board of Regents; and it may therefore be fairly considered (as applicable to the University of Michigan) a new question, and for that reason one requiring great caution and full deliberation, and one which the most judicious friends of the measure do not desire to see forced upon the University by a bare majority of the Board of Regents, against the deliberate convictions of a respectable minority, and contrary to the wishes of the President and nearly all the Faculty.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction of this State, in his published Reports, earnestly advocates the right of women to an education in the University, upon the ground that by the statute of this State, "the University shall be open to all *persons* resident of this State," claiming that women are embraced within the term persons. That women are included within the ordinary definition of the word "persons" we have no doubt, whether the Legislature in the enactment of this provision so intended or not. Aristotle has well said that the nature of everything is best seen in its smallest proportions. So, if we wish to investigate the character of a state or nation, we should first inquire into the families of which it is composed; and to do this, we must first ascertain the elements which form these;—as the husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and servants, which are in every hall and in every cottage; and would we not pronounce that an imperfect investigation, and the examiner a dolt, who should omit to notice the wives, and mothers, and daughters, as constituting parts of these families and as contributing to the formation of their character? It is claimed by some that under this statute the Board of Regents has not the power or legal authority to exclude ladies, if it is conceded that they are persons, as we think it must be. Those who thus reason can scarcely be said to have well considered their argument, nor the extent to which its logic would lead them, if by it they would tie the Regents down to the necessity of admitting every human being embraced within the ordinary signification of the term person, and this is literally the only qualification required by the statute, *viz.*, that the applicant shall be a "person." They are to be admitted if residents of the State, "under the regulations prescribed by the

Regents," and if non-residents, under "such regulations and restrictions as the Board may prescribe;" but no one will seriously argue that the Regents cannot lawfully and consistently with the statute exclude immoral persons, notwithstanding they are technically "persons." So they exclude any person whose presence would detract from the character of the Institution, or prevent it from attaining to the proper rank of a University, or from accomplishing the work of such an institution of learning.

In answer to what is said of the rights of women under the statute of this State, which provides that the University shall be open to all *persons* resident of the State, it is claimed by those who oppose the admission of ladies to the University, that when the University was endowed, it was not understood to mean a school for the education of both sexes. That no University had ever attempted to do that work, and that a mixed school, or a school for the co-education of the sexes, has never been understood as constituting any part of the definition of the word "University;" and that it would be a misapplication of the funds of the University to appropriate them to the education of women.

The subject of education has for some years past attracted a large share of attention from all classes of people in the United States, and nowhere has a deeper interest been manifested on this subject than in the State of Michigan. Our admirable public school system, or State system of education, has been the result of the great and growing interest felt by the people in this subject; commencing with the primary schools and advancing upward through the Union Schools with their preparatory departments, and the Normal School to educate teachers, and culminating in the University, where the broad fields of universal knowledge lie temptingly open before the student, it has been said and thought by some that the system was perfect and complete. It affords, or is designed to furnish, and will do so, when perfectly carried out, the best elementary training for children in the primary schools, where the foundation of learning for all the future generations of the people of Michigan are to be laid. Here the plastic elements are collected together which are to form the minds and characters of our future statesmen, our judges, and jurors, and witnesses, and professional men. Here too are the mothers and governesses, the female friends and companions of those to receive their first views of education and their first taste for knowledge. Here indeed is the character of the State first placed into the mould which is to give it form. Fortunately, those who organized these primary schools did not so organize them as to educate the sexes separately; had they done so, we should now probably find great difficulty in bringing them together, but as a matter of economy it is found much cheaper to educate both sexes together in the primary schools than it would be to build separate school houses and employ separate teachers for each sex. Here the co-education of the sexes works well, and is admitted by all, even the most violent opposers of co-education in colleges and universities, to be unobjectionable and eminently proper. It is not long since many persons of both sexes received all their schooling in, and graduated at, these primary schools. A want was felt to exist however, and a desire sprang up to elevate the primary schools by establishing in the districts, as a part of the primary school system, and as distinct schools, higher schools for

the education of both sexes; and the Union Schools were the result. As a matter of economy, it has been found much cheaper to educate the sexes together in these union schools, than to erect separate buildings and employ two sets of teachers to educate them separately, and to do the work which experience has shown can just as well be done in the same building and by the same teachers at the same time; and this course we believe, has been universally adopted. No one has suspected or thought that there was anything wrong in educating the sexes together in the primary schools or in the union schools, and thus far economy in expenditure and complete success harmonize. In prosecuting the examination as to the best means of advancing the cause of education in our State, it was found that there was a great deficiency of competent teachers for the primary schools, and the State Normal School was brought into existence to supply this defect. Experience has shown that female teachers could be more economically employed in the primary schools than males, and in most instances with at least equal advantage; and the principles of economy and utility induced the establishment and organization of the Normal School, upon a plan by which both sexes can be educated together; and here, too, we believe it is universally admitted that the plan works well.

Young ladies who have sat in the same class and recited the same lessons to the same teachers with young men, see *them* leave the Union School with no better scholarship than themselves and enter the University without obstacle and without objection, and when *they* ask to be admitted and are refused they wonder why it is? A Professor of the University who witnessed a recent examination of their class at one of the union schools of this State, said of them that they were head and shoulders above their male companions in scholarship and attainments. They desire to pursue their studies and see the tempting opportunity of doing so in the University, if they could only be admitted to improve it; but they have been told that no provision had been made for them, and they reply that they do not desire any other or different provision to be made for them than is made for the other sex, and they again inquire if they cannot be allowed to participate in the rich lessons of instruction so freely afforded to their brothers by the University, and to continue with them the studies which they have thus far pursued together. They very properly address this inquiry to the Board of Regents, and respectfully request an answer. In preparing an answer to this question we thought it would be proper for us to confer with the President and both Faculties of the University on the subject; and we therefore addressed a note to the President, requesting his views and the views of the several Professors, to be communicated to us, which has been done by written communications which are submitted herewith.

President Hopkins, of Williams College, who will be readily remembered by many of the people of Michigan as the presiding officer at the recent annual meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions held in the city of Detroit, a man whose honesty of purpose and goodness of heart no one will question, writes to a member of this Committee in answer to a note addressed to him in relation to the subject under consideration, as follows:

"The question you put me is one of no little interest, * * * There are difficulties and embarrassments connected with it. Still my impression is that the advantages of our higher institutions for young men might be shared by young women to a great extent with great advantage to both. Probably the course of study should not be the same throughout, but in many things there certainly could be no objection to the continuance of that association in study which is begun at the common school, and there would be many advantages from it. The difficulty would be social; if intercourse out of the classes and aside from study could be properly regulated it would work well. That would depend much on the arrangements you might be able to make, and on the tone of sentiment in the community. * * * My impression is that you might try the experiment safely, and I hope you will do so."

Chancellor Frelinghuysen, whose name is identified with every benevolent enterprise of the age, and who for many years presided over the deliberations of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the predecessor of President Hopkins in that position, and long intimately connected with the educational interests of the country, thus writes to a member of the Committee:

"The proposed admission to the ordinary college classes of your State University of 12 young ladies as students does not strike my mind favorably, either for the ladies or the University. Its propriety is very questionable, and its probable effects upon the interest and reputation of the University, I should fear. If necessity required such a step for female education, I should regard it as a sad exigency; but when the wives and mothers and daughters of our land have at all times found instruction certainly as useful and hopeful as among any other people, why should we do anything to impair or obscure that line of distinction between the sexes which keeps alive a refined and retiring delicacy in woman, of sacred influence; and which is in very truth, under God, one of her best safeguards."

In Union College, we are informed by Dr. Nott, its President, "there are several courses of lectures delivered to the senior class during their last term of study, which are attended by ladies, mothers and daughters, and from this attendance no inconvenience has been experienced." The ladies are regarded however as constituting the audience, and not as belonging to the class. "If by the co-education of the different sexes," says President Nott, "you mean the education acquired by mixed assemblies of different sexes in their attendance on courses of lectures delivered in lyceums and colleges, or elsewhere, subject to those restraints which the usages of well regulated society impose, I have nothing to object. But if by the co-education of the sexes you mean the co-education of youth of the same age of different sexes, in the same rooms, in the same class, in the same studies and by the same teachers, then the question is one of much graver interest, and may not be lightly decided; or rather, the same having been already decided by the common consent of mankind that decision may not be hastily or lightly reversed. A difference of sex and of destination through the entire life has in the judgment of mankind been thought to require a difference in the distinctive attributes to be called into exercise, and the peculiar type of character to be formed. Delicacy of sentiment, a feeling of dependence, and shrinking from the public view, are

attributes sought for in the one sex, in the other, decision of character, self-reliance, a feeling of personal independence, and a willingness to meet opposition and encounter difficulties. It is not easy to see how appliances for the production of such opposite results can be furnished by the same agencies at the same time and in the same place; nor is it easy to see how young, susceptible, and inexperienced individuals of different sexes can be daily brought into familiar intercourse and subjugated to such common appliances in the absence of parental supervision without endangering alike their virtue and their happiness. Whatever economy, convenience, and beneficial results may be expected from the co-education of youth of different sexes, there are, it must be admitted, great difficulties to be overcome and great dangers to be guarded against in carrying such a system into effect; and besides whatever might be thus gained to manners by diminished rudeness in one sex, would, it is to be feared, be more than counterbalanced by the loss of native modesty in the other. I am aware that old corporations, like old communities, are conservative, often unreasonably so. Still it must be remembered that if the retaining of old usages obstructs the onward movement of society, the introduction of novelties often does the same. Public opinion in this vicinity would not justify an attempt to decide the question you propose by experiment. Nor would it be easy to find teachers here who would be willing to stake their reputation on such an issue. Your University, however, has yet no long established usages to prevent freedom of action in in any direction that is wise. Your community is young, enterprising, and adventurous, and if on due reflection you shall be willing for the benefit of the race to run the hazard of the experiment we shall wish you success; judge of your acts with candor, and prepossession and prejudice apart, endeavor to profit by the result." In another letter, previously written to the Committee, the venerable Doctor states that "he should like to see the experiment tried under proper regulations, of extending to the gentler sex a participation in university privileges generally; and," he adds, "were I head of a University in Michigan and public opinion called for the trial of the experiment, I should not oppose obedience to that call. Corporations are always conservative, it is their nature not to lead but to follow public opinion, and often far in the rear. That it will not be approved by college corporations generally, may be taken for granted. But whether it will approve itself in the good sense of the public can only be ascertained by the experiment itself."

President Walker, of Harvard University, tells us that there is an immense preponderance of enlightened public opinion against this experiment, in which opinion he entirely concurs, and that its decision must turn in no small measure, on the question whether we propose to educate females for public or private life.

President Woolsey of Yale College expresses himself to the Committee that as they have had no experience and the subject is new to him he can answer only on the ground of general considerations. He is averse to mingling the sexes in any place of education above the school for the elements, more on account of girls than of boys. He thinks different studies in part ought to be pursued so that they cannot be in classes together. He adds, "Of what use degrees are to be to girls I don't see, unless they addict themselves to professional life;" and that he should expect the intro-

duction of such a plan would be met with ridicule. This he admits however would be nothing if there be reasons for it.

We have numerous other letters from Union College, Dartmouth College, Hamilton College, Wabash College, University of Virginia, Columbia College, Dickinson College, and from eminent men in different parts of the country, from which brevity will compel us to omit making as full extracts as we could desire. We may, however, say generally that in the opinion of the writers of these letters, the co-education of the sexes in colleges and universities is considered inexpedient. Some of them expressing the opinion that wherever the experiment shall be tried, it will prove demoralizing to the students, incompatible with the maintenance of a high standard of scholarship, and subversive of the best interest of the institution which undertakes it. That an University contemplates the education of candidates for professional and public life, which is not the end of female education. That a different end requires different means; that the effects of such a system upon young ladies would probably be to give them false ideas of life in general and of their particular sphere, than which nothing could be more injurious in the forming stage of character. That young men would be likely to lose in a corresponding ratio in proper sense of the dignity of their own pursuits. That both parties failing in a just appreciation of their respective callings would insensibly become shaped to unworthy standards, and the general consequence would ultimately be a degradation of society. That this consequence would be hastened by occasional lapses from virtue and by such foolish and corrupting thoughts, imaginations, interviews, correspondence, artifices, etc., as seem necessarily incidental to the grouping of young people of both sexes in the same routine of college life, in the same halls, lecture rooms, chapels, anniversaries, etc. That boys and girls at school and young men and women at college are different subjects. That a present and local popularity might be gained but at fearful ultimate expense and the disapprobation of men of science and learning throughout the country. That the country is not sufficiently advanced toward perfection to make the plan acceptable to thinking men. That to confound the higher education of the two sexes would lead to lamentable consequences while it should last, that it could not last long, that it would necessarily deprive both sexes of the cultivation peculiar to each, according to its own physiological and psychologic character, and according to the pursuits and spheres of action for which they are destined by their different physical and mental structures, the advanced cultivation of each would be sadly imperiled, the delicacy of the female character, one of the most important elements of modern civilization, and especially so in self governed countries, would be necessarily destroyed, and that even common morality would suffer. That it would tend to unwoman the woman, and thus produce deplorable effects in all spheres of life, private and national; that we live in a period in which there is already a marked tendency toward unreserve and boldness in fashion, taste, literature, and intercourse, in which rude publicity has invaded many spheres where privacy and reserve ought to rule, and that the success of this movement would equally promote this boldness and inopportune publicity, and injure the commonwealth which is deeply interested in the true position and important activity of woman; and it would thus tend

to lower the woman instead of elevating her; that what we stand in need of is the truthful, high-minded Christian woman whose refinement does not interfere with broadly acknowledged duty; that we stand in need of womanly earnestness and delicacy equally far removed from the unmeaning doll of fashion, and from unsexed mannishness; that the success of this measure would produce confusion; that all confusion leads to corruption, and that this confusion would not make an exception; that the position and sphere of action of the woman are indissolubly connected as effect and cause with the civilization of a people; and that this position with occasional undulations indeed has risen higher and higher from the time when the mother and matron were first truly honored in early Rome and Christianity wove the names of women in the history of its origin and of its victories by martyrdom; that society has always suffered when woman left her own and true sphere of action and thus deprived herself of her own and true character.

We might continue these extracts to much greater length but we think we have given sufficient to show the general tone of the opposition and the reasons upon which it is based. To notice all the reasons and arguments urged against the application of these young ladies would require reams of paper, and much more time than we can devote to the subject and more than the Regents would have patience to spend in listening to them.

We now give extracts from letters by Horace Mann, President of Antioch College, and by C. G. Finney, President of Oberlin College. The former writes: "I have long been in favor of the joint education of the sexes. 1st, Because woman has as good a right to an education as man,—even better if only one of them could be educated; and, 2nd, Because both can be educated *together* not only more cheaply but much better than either of them can be apart from the other. I think this is the result of sound theorizing on the subject, but I had had many years of practical observation before I came to this State though not under circumstances precisely similar. Since I have been connected with Antioch College, that is for almost five years, I have had an opportunity to see the experiment wrought upon a large scale, with students of advanced age and under what I should not consider to be more or less favorable or better or worse than average circumstances. This experience has not altered my view of the general question, but it has made certain collateral or accompanying circumstances more prominent in my mind than they were before. The advantages of a joint education are *very great*. The dangers of it are *terrible*. Unless those dangers can be excluded with a degree of probability *amounting almost to certainty*, I must say that I should rather forego the advantages than incur the dangers.

"These dangers consist in their opportunities for association together *without supervision, or privately*. If these dangers cannot be excluded I would not with all my partiality in favor of the object incur the risks. If, for instance, they must be permitted in a city like yours to board promiscuously among the inhabitants, I should prefer that the young woman of the age should lose the advantages of an education rather than incur the moral danger of obtaining it in that way. * * * Strongly, therefore, as I am in favor of the joint education of the sexes, I should first demand what security can be furnished for moral protection; and until this ques-

tion should be satisfactorily answered, I should not dare vote in favor of my own side of the question.

"I should make such inquiries as these: Can the sexes have separate lodgings? Can they take their meals together and then be separated, for it is well that they should eat together. Can they have opportunities for meeting each other, say once a fortnight or three weeks, in general company as people moving in the same circle meet each other in ordinary parties? This is a great safety-valve, and should be provided for. Can you make yourselves secure against *clandestine* meetings? And also against clandestine correspondence,—reasonably so, for absolute security is impossible. Are your President and Faculty in a state of mind to exercise vigilance over the girls committed to their care as conscientiously as they would over their own daughters or sisters?

"You may think these are collateral matters. I think they are vital to the question. We never have had here the happening of one of those events mildly called accidents, but it is only because of our constant sleepless vigilance. Our security has arisen from our care.

"The system works well here and there are great advantages in it. I ought not to say this, however, without adding that very serious danger must attend the introduction of such a system, and that its administration should command the highest degree of caution and vigilance. We have conducted the system for five years without a disaster, when perhaps and probably some of our youth who have been here would have suffered one at home. But we have succeeded in introducing a high tone of moral sentiment among our students. We have no rowdyism, no drinking, no profligacy. We will not have it. Order, regularity, sobriety, and an observance of the decencies and proprieties of life, give elevation to public feeling and conduct which is a great safe-guard and guaranty against the indulgence of passion. I believe, however, that schools for both sexes can be conducted safely; that when so conducted the intercourse of the sexes is mutually advantageous; that daily intercourse with young ladies refines the manners of young men, and actual association with young men and a knowledge of character and the duties of life has a strong tendency to expel all girlish romance and to exorcise the miserable nonsense which comes from novel reading. We began with both sexes. I can conceive that you might have more difficulty than we had, especially if your young men are not under good discipline now. We also have a boarding-house for the young ladies. I should deprecate exceedingly turning our young ladies out into the street for their meals."

President Finney, of Oberlin, writes to the Committee: "With us the results are quite satisfactory and even, we think, admirable. But the details of our arrangements cannot well be understood except by those who will come on to the ground and examine the particulars. You will need a wise and pious matron with such lady assistants as to keep up sufficient supervision. You will need a powerful religious influence to act upon the whole mass of students. You will need a surrounding community who are united in sustaining the regulations and laws of the University in their details, so far as the moral conduct of the young is concerned. Under these and other necessary conditions, the young ladies and gentlemen exert upon each other a powerful influence for good and none of

consequence for evil. A public sentiment is formed among themselves that acts more powerfully and healthfully than any discipline which could be administered by the Faculty. The question is so important that some of your Faculty, I should think your President if possible, should come down and spend at least a week and go into the details of all our experience."

At a meeting of the Michigan State Teachers' Association held at Ann Arbor in April, 1855, which the Michigan Journal of Education says was the most interesting and important meeting ever held by that body, a report was presented by Professor Putnam, of Kalamazoo, on the subject of the co-education of the sexes in our schools including colleges and universities. This report took strong ground in favor of the measure as being the most natural method, the most just to both sexes, and the most economical, the most conservative of morals, and best calculated to develop symmetrical character in both males and females. The report closes, however, with the admission that the measure was but an experiment calculated to settle certain vexed and somewhat exciting questions of the day and which if found injurious would speedily be abandoned. In the discussion of this report Reverend J. M. Gregory, President of the Association, Professor Stone of Romeo, Professor Dunlap, of Jonesville, Mr. Cochran, of Detroit, Professor Haven, of the University, Professor Nutting, of Lodi, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Mr. Hubbard, of Adrian, Miss Cutcheon, Mrs. Dunlap, and Miss A. C. Rogers participated, the latter by a written paper which was read before the Association and in which she affirms that "as the wants of the community demand, mixed schools will increase; and when public sentiment demands it imperatively the triple gates of universities and colleges will give way and their courts will echo to the now profane steps of woman." Of these several teachers who took part in this discussion, most of them warmly favored mixed schools or the co-education of the sexes. Some opposed it and one lady expressed herself as still undecided in her own mind. The following resolution was adopted by the Association:

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Association that the co-education of the sexes is in accordance with true philosophy and is practically expedient."

Since the adoption of this resolution, some of those who advocated its passage have changed their views and are now opposed to admitting ladies to the University.

In support of the application of the ladies for admission to the University it is urged that their education has been neglected; that ample provision is now made by the State for the education of boys, while there is no equal provision made by the State for the higher education of girls; and that the reason why the higher education of the latter has been neglected has been because the same schools do not educate both sexes, or rather because the University, which is the only State institution which furnishes the highest education, does not educate both sexes.

It seems to be a truth which has been well expressed by some one, we think Professor Fairchild, that the view which some young as well as old men obtain and cherish of the female character is grossly false and corrupting; that there is a period in the lives of many young men while passing from the innocent ignorance of

childhood to the sobriety and decency of manhood when they have a strong tendency to low, gross, and vulgar thoughts, and impure imaginings. Thrown together in a society by themselves, away from the restraining influences of home, they stimulate each other to debasing thoughts, words, and deeds; and their souls receive a stain from which years cannot restore them; that the strongest check upon these is the society of modest, virtuous women, and upon no class of persons are these influences more powerful than upon young men.

The whole difficulty between the advocates and opposers of the co-education of the sexes seems to arise from the existence of this truth. The friends of co-education claiming that because brothers and sisters and parents associate safely together in the family, and as the family relations between the sexes is safely sustained, they insist that it proves that the sexes out of that relation may safely mingle in college classes, and that they there would exert upon each other a refining and salutary influence and without danger to either. We do not think there is any parallel in this respect between the family and the school or any analogy between the relations of brothers and sisters in the family and students of both sexes in a college or university. A mother's or sister's influence at home is a very different thing from that of a female aspirant or competitor in a college class; and yet we believe that the society of a modest and virtuous Christian woman does exert a beneficial and refining influence upon the conduct and character of young men.

The people of Michigan, though somewhat divided on the question of admitting ladies to the University, all feel a very deep interest in the decision which the Board of Regents shall make upon it. Many of them say, and with much force, that they have daughters and no sons to educate and that if ladies are to be excluded from the University it must extinguish the personal interest which would otherwise be felt in the institution by all such families as have no sons to educate and work an unmerited injury to all parents who have children of the gentler sex who desire to obtain a thorough education; that the basis of our National and State system is equal rights and that to rest on a substantial and enduring foundation, the University should confer equal rights upon all persons of both sexes; that though it may not confer equal attainments, it should afford equal opportunities. That to exclude ladies from the advantages of education which the University might afford and confer these exclusively on the other sex is injurious, unjust, and unequal; that though the young men may be much stronger, much wiser, much better, and much more useful than the ladies, yet all this does not, or ought not, to interfere with the right of the ladies to be as strong, as wise, as good, and as useful as they can; that their right to be so is perfect and cannot justly be interfered with. That right should be preferred to policy, and if a woman wants to study she has a right to all the public facilities for doing so, and that because some might abuse the privilege is no reason for denying her claim; for if it were, all the Universities and Colleges in the land should be empty for the same reason.

That Universities were not made for women may be true, but it should not be forgotten that when Universities were brought into being, very little, indeed, almost no attention was given to the education of women. Indeed the early history of our race and of their

education shows that there was a period when the chief business of education was to develop the physical powers of man and that his intellectual powers were comparatively neglected; that muscle and not brain was to be developed and trained; that men might be strong and skillful in the use of the rude implements of war then employed for defence and conquest; and, strange as it may seem, the introduction of gun-powder wrought a complete revolution in the business of education. The development of intellect at once became more important than the development of muscle and the former system of training boys (in which there was much that was excellent and which ought now to be practiced, especially in relation to diet and exercise) was abandoned.

As the venerable Dr. Nott very justly remarks, "corporations are always conservative; it is their nature not to lead, but to follow public opinion and often far in the rear." The University of Michigan differs in this respect from most other corporations in that the whole people of the State are the corporators and the Regents are the Board of Directors, chosen by the people and hence it is not strange that it should not possess that conservative character which belongs to other and older institutions which have more of the character of private corporations and which induces them to lag far behind public opinion; and it is under these circumstances, natural enough, that it should seek to keep quite up with the enlightened public sentiment of its own corporators, the people of Michigan. It cannot be denied that in the history of the world each succeeding age has granted some thing to woman that in preceding ages had been regarded as incompatible with the then existing notions of female character; and hence we need not be surprised that this application is pressed upon our consideration. Public intelligence is not, as hitherto, over-tolerant of prescriptive abuses and we need not be surprised that some portion of the people of our State (the ladies leading the van) should demand that what they regard as an endowment for the common weal should no longer be administered for the sole advantage of one half of the people to the exclusion of the other and better half.

There are those who would exclude ladies from University education because, though unrestrained by law, they have never become captains of vessels, or engineers, or occupied various other fields of employment requiring physical endurance. If all were to be excluded from Universities and Colleges who, though not prohibited by law, did not enter these fields of useful occupation, the numbers in either would be very small, but it is said that they are incompetent to meet the rougher encounters of life. Though it is their right and privilege to avoid these and to choose their occupations and employments, yet were it important to show that women are by no means destitute of the courage, skill, energy, and powers of endurance necessary for these employments and that they possess minds worthy of the highest culture, we might in proof of all this refer to Grace Darling who, to save human life (at the peril of her own) braved the angry ocean in its wildest fury in circumstances of imminent danger before which the stoutest hearts of most University seniors would have quailed; to Mrs. Captain Patton, who mounted the deck of her sick and disabled husband's craft and conducted it in safety from the Pacific ocean amid the dangerous navigation around Cape Horn, through the calms of the Gulf

Stream and the sudden squalls and violent tempests of the Atlantic coast, to the commercial metropolis of our country; or to the sublime meekness and humility and the unwearied perseverance of Florence Nightingale amid scenes and trials which few of the sterner sex would so patiently and successfully have encountered and endured. Florence Nightingale bore away from the bloody fields of the Crimea the only laurels won there that were worth wearing, and her name will live and shine brighter and brighter and be honored and blessed long after the names of Raglan, Canrobert, and Pellissier, and other heroes of that war, shall have been obliterated from the remembrance by the effacing fingers of time. To show that the cultivation of the mind of woman is not in vain, and that when cultivated its productions are appreciated and are profitable to our race, we might refer to Hannah More, herself a school teacher, to whom the best literary society of London was at all times open and who was always welcomed in the same literary circles in which Johnson, and Burke, and Sir Joshua Reynolds moved, of one of the productions of whose pen it is said one million copies were sold in a single year, a work which startled the whole infidel world and which having found its way into almost every hamlet and cottage and every counting house and workshop throughout the civilized world, awakened to the joys of salvation many a benighted and sin-sick soul.

We do not sympathize much with the argument based upon the assertion that if ladies shall be admitted to the University as students, it will lose its present high character and standing, that it will be ridiculed by other institutions, that eminent professors will refuse its appointments, that its degrees would lose their value, and that its alumni would burn up their diplomas; and we are induced to ask why these things should occur from such a cause. Is the education of ladies such an ignoble employment as to produce such disastrous results to any Institution that shall attempt it? Is it such a despicable business to produce a harmonious and symmetrical development of human character as to cause eminent professors, distinguished instructors, and intelligent men to turn away with scorn and contempt from the University that shall dare to engage in the work merely because it is the mind and character of women that is thus to be trained and developed, or can it be an enlightened public opinion which would thus denounce an Institution because and only because it shall undertake to educate young ladies? Is such a public opinion one that should claim the respect or influence the conduct of the Regents? Is it not rather proof of the wisdom and correctness of the sentiment expressed by President Nott that it is the nature of corporations not to lead but to follow public opinion and often far in the rear?

The President of the University has said that he by no means considers the education of women a degrading employment, and that he would consider himself quite as highly honored if called to preside over an institution for the education of young ladies as if placed at the head of one devoted exclusively to the education of young men. The gentlemen, and ladies too, who oppose this application are by no means opposed to the proper education of woman. How can they be?

We live in an age when the education of woman is a settled work to be done and when her higher education is attracting atten-

tion and exciting interest. Woman is the parent and the nurse of the human race. From her the opening buds of moral principle which guide and govern human action receive their first sunlight, and by her they are kissed into the fresh full bloom and beauty of virtue and goodness, or blasted and withered into the premature decay of early vice and rampant crime. Our statesmen and scholars, our moral and intellectual teachers, and our spiritual guides are her offspring and receive from her their earliest and most lasting impressions. Withdraw woman and the world dies out, and it may literally be said in more than one sense, "Chaos has come again." She is everywhere present where human beings exist, and wherever she is she exerts an influence upon her kind for weal or for woe which, though not boisterous, is ever active, ever powerful, and its results are seen and felt through successive generations. No society or community exists without her. At her bidding the stoutest and most obdurate hearts soften like wax and are fashioned to suit her most wayward caprice or her noblest and most sacred aspirations. How important then is it that an agency so potent for good or evil should be properly trained and educated, extending as it does its power over the whole of society, the entire family of man, and bringing under its influence and moulding the principles and action of our future statesmen, our educators, the members of the various professions, our electors, jurors, witnesses, judges, and the mothers and governesses of those who shall succeed us on the stage of life. No one pretends that woman should not be educated, they must and they will have education whether it be good or whether it be bad and the obligation is upon this generation to see to it that they have that kind of education, and the best of it, that will most thoroughly fit them to act well their parts in the great drama of life. No intelligent person will insist upon confining women to any sphere which they now occupy merely because they have hitherto been thus confined, nor will any intelligent person desire to place them in new spheres merely for the sake of having them occupy different ones from those in which they have hitherto moved, nor unless such new spheres are better for them and such as will enable them more perfectly to fulfill the object of their creation, which we will define to be the promotion of the glory of their Creator and the advancement of the welfare of their kind. We give no heed to those who attempt to connect or identify the application of the young ladies which we are now considering with the political or social movements known as "Women's Rights," "Free Love," etc., etc. This application has no such connection in our minds, and we would not have the question prejudiced or the request of these young ladies spurned because some persons who advocate the Free Love movement or attend Women's Rights conventions may also advocate the co-education of the sexes. The true reason why this measure is opposed by the President and the Professors, by Regents, and by persons connected with other universities and colleges, and by good men and women everywhere, is not because they do not wish women to be educated and thoroughly educated, but it is for the sake of the young ladies themselves and for fear that though some might pass the trying ordeal unharmed, yet as a class, and a most interesting class of the community, they would lose more than they would gain by the experiment.

From what has been said it would be seen that among all these great and good men there is a wide diversity of opinion in regard to

the proposed measure referred to us, that it seems with most of them to be a new question, by many it is regarded as a doubtful experiment, by some as a very dangerous experiment, and by others as impracticable and certain to be ruinous to the young ladies who should avail themselves of it if it were introduced into the University, and disastrous to the Institution which should attempt to carry it out; while others feel confident that it would succeed without difficulty or danger. The eminent gentlemen at the head of the only two colleges of distinction where the experiment has been tried, and with which we have corresponded, speak of it as surrounded with difficulties and dangers; that these are, in their judgment, increased in our case by the fact that this University has been organized and established for the education of young men alone, and that to adapt it to the education of both sexes would require a complete revolution in the management and conduct of the Institution. The Regents themselves and even our Committee are divided on the question and we therefore think it wiser, under all the circumstances, to agree and report that at present it is inexpedient to introduce this change into the University. The petition of the young ladies for admission to the University, however humble in form, may be regarded as a protest against the partiality of the State in providing so amply for the education of young men in every form and neglecting to provide for the higher education of the gentler sex, and it is not easy to see why this protest is not just. We believe all concede that it is so. The State itself would not like to be told that it had deliberately decided that it is under obligation to educate the youth of one sex and not of the other, and there would probably be no difference of opinion upon the question—"Is the State bound to make equal provision for the education of both sexes?"

We therefore beg leave, in conclusion, to suggest that we think it would be well for the State, in some suitable way, to provide for the higher education of young ladies and thus relieve itself from the opprobrium of longer neglecting the higher education of its daughters, while it has so abundantly provided for the education of its sons.

All which is respectfully submitted.

D. McINTYRE,
LUKE H. PARSONS,
B. L. BAXTER.

Dated September 28th, 1858.

DECEMBER MEETING, 1858.

Tuesday, Dec. 21st, 1858, 10 A. M.

The Board assembled and was called to order by the President.

Present: Regents Baxter, Johnson, Bishop, McIntyre, Brown, Whiting, Parsons, Spaulding, Ferry.

The Minutes of the last session were read, amended, and approved.