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**Foreword**

On Equal Terms: Educating Women at the University of Chicago is the result of collaboration between the Special Collections Research Center and the Center for Gender Studies at the University of Chicago to further our shared goal of promoting and enhancing the Library's resources for women's studies. The project draws on diverse sources in the University Archive, while also pointing to existing gaps in the documentary record that will help guide future collection building.

Over the past few decades, the Library has responded to the growing needs of students and faculty in women's studies by acquiring materials that support research and teaching and producing guides that facilitate access to relevant sources across a wide range of disciplines. Ruth Murray, the Library's Bibliographer for Education, Psychology, and Sociology, compiled a bibliography for women's studies in 1979; in 1985, she published a much expanded version and wrote in the "Introduction" that "600 titles can hardly do justice to the quantity and diversity of material on women's issues and feminist concerns located in the University of Chicago's library system." A second edition of A Guide to Resources on Women and Gender Studies at the University of Chicago was published in 1989 and a third, posthumously, in 1991. In recognition of her commitment to supporting and stimulating research in women's studies, a Ruth Murray Prize is awarded by the Center for Gender Studies for the best essay written by a University of Chicago undergraduate or graduate student in the area of women's studies, feminist criticism, or gender studies. In 1999 Sam Sutter, Assistant Director for Collections, and Frank Conaway, Social Sciences Bibliographer, produced a series of women's studies guides covering microfilm research collections, reference sources, serials, and lesbian studies.
The challenge of guiding researchers to relevant resources is even greater for archival materials. As the curators of this exhibition discovered, sources are distributed across many collections, by no means all of them obviously or specifically related to women's issues. And, as with any developing discipline, the universe of potentially pertinent materials continues to expand. In 1999, Sutter, Conaway, and Daniel Meyer, Associate Director of Special Collections and University Archivist, produced a guide to research resources that included archival and manuscript collections. Over the past several years, Special Collections staff has been putting finding aids for archival collections online in a searchable database. As a result, it is now possible to search across collections and discover a wealth of previously invisible materials pertaining to women in administrative and organizational records and professional papers.

This project began with a survey of archival sources by a group of graduate students. Their research was supported by Julia Gardner and David Pavelich, Reference and Instruction Librarians, and by Daniel Meyer. History department graduate students Monica Mercado and Katie Turk continued on to curate and write "On Equal Terms," working closely with Julia Gardner, who coordinated their work, and with Kerri Sancomb, Exhibition Specialist, who produced the exhibition and oversaw production of the publication. I extend warm thanks to them for shepherding this project to such a successful conclusion. I am especially grateful to Deborah Nelson, Director, Center for Gender Studies, for her enthusiastic, strong support of this project and the Library's program to improve access and develop archival collections to support women's studies at the University of Chicago.

Alice Schreyer
DIRECTOR, SPECIAL COLLECTIONS RESEARCH CENTER
he Center for Gender Studies at the University of Chicago, in partnership with the Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library, is proud to present the exhibition and publication, "On Equal Terms". Educating Women at the University of Chicago. This project grew out of a unique collaboration among undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty that began when faculty and students independently discovered the difficulty of finding information about the history of the University's women students, faculty, and staff; and the lack of personal stories of women's experiences at the University to supplement archival sources. We realized that to research this history, we would have to make existing collections more visible and develop others to fill the gaps. First, undergraduates, supervised by graduate students in history and sociology, began to conduct oral histories. There are now over seventy of these interviews that include women who attended or worked at the University from the 1930s to the first decade of the twenty-first century. Second, graduate students from the PhD program in history and Masters of Arts Program in the Social Sciences (MAPSS) spent a year delving into the University Archives and creating a finding guide, "Women at the University of Chicago: A Guide for Researchers in the Archives" (http://genderstudies.uchicago.edu/projects/research_guide.pdf), which we continue to update and improve. The exhibition—and a course co-taught in Fall Quarter 2008 by Monica Mercado and Katie Turk, its curators—are among the outcomes of this initiative. The Center and the University community owe an incalculable debt to the many students who worked on this project; to John Boyer, Dean of the College, and the Visiting Committee of the College, who generously funded it; and to Nancy Warner (SB '44, MD '49), who generously contributed both an oral history and funds to support the project.

The Center for Gender Studies was founded in 1996, long after the first women's studies programs were formed across the nation in the 1970s. As a result, most Chicago alumni have had no experience of the Center as a meaningful institution in campus life, as a force of curricular innovation and development, as a place for faculty research and community and, perhaps most importantly, for the social, political, and intellectual advancement of women. There are many reasons specific to this University for the late arrival of gender
studies, but one of the most important was the failure to see the study of women’s experiences as compatible with the University’s best intellectual traditions. This exhibition demonstrates how central the problems of coeducation were to the founding and development of the University of Chicago and how different the experiences of women students and faculty have been from their male counterparts.

Having now studied the archives of the College and the University more broadly, we see the Center for Gender Studies as part of a buried, but long-standing tradition of innovation in women’s education. It will surprise many of the visitors to this exhibition that women’s education has been at the heart of the University’s mission since its inception, though how the problem has been cast and how it has been addressed has changed over time. The questions each new generation of students posed to the University’s administration reflect the changing social world, but the answers—sometimes successful, sometimes not—come in the particular idioms and with the particular emphases the University brought to a great range of questions. The exhibition develops many different stories that center around how women fit into and adapted to the institution’s unique culture and how eventually the institution responded to its women students’ intellectual, personal, and professional needs and desires. This is an uneven story, filled with moments of both brilliant experiment and unfortunate retreat.

Deeply committed to inspiring and nurturing critical thinking in its students and faculty, the Center for Gender Studies is at the heart of the University of Chicago’s educational mission. We articulate the University’s critical project with a particular focus on the status of women and the nature of gender relations in academe, cultures, and society. In that spirit, it is our hope that the exhibition will offer one lens through which to make visible those individuals, men and women alike, who challenged convention, opening the door for later generations of women to pursue careers at the University of Chicago and beyond.

Deborah Nelson
DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR GENDER STUDIES
"ON EQUAL TERMS"

EDUCATING WOMEN AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Since 1892, the University of Chicago has welcomed women students, faculty, and staff to its co-educational campus. Women's inclusion was written into the University's original articles of incorporation, which stated that the institution would "provide, impart, and furnish opportunities for all departments of higher education to persons of both sexes on equal terms." Yet integrating the sexes into both the curriculum and extracurricular life proved to be a difficult and ongoing task. The history of women at the University is uneven, full of successes and failures that reflect both Chicago's unique intellectual community and larger trends in academia. Coeducation provided women with exciting social and academic opportunities, but it did not necessarily translate to equality of treatment or equal distribution of resources. While women have often stood among the most accomplished members of the University community, their history on campus raises important questions about how and where women and women's issues fit into academia—questions that still resonate today.

LEFT: MARY CALVERT, ASTRONOMY ASSISTANT, 1900, ARCHIVAL PHOTOGRAPHIC FILES
Remarkably, when the University of Chicago first opened for classes, the matter of coeducation was considered one of the least noteworthy aspects of the new venture. Although public universities in the Midwest formed under the terms of the 1862 Morrill Land-Grant Act were coeducational from the start, educating men and women together at the new, privately funded University of Chicago was not an inevitable choice at the turn of the century. Scientists and educators battled over the academic, social, and even medical effects of educating young men and women together—and worried that higher education of any sort threatened women’s "biological destiny" as wives and mothers. Founding the University of Chicago as a coeducational institution was a forward-looking decision, one that the University pursued with its customary attention to excellence, recruiting the first two deans of women from the “Seven Sisters” colleges that were the premier models of higher education for women.

Thomas W. Goodspeed, in his *History of the University of Chicago* (1916), remembered students’ response to coeducation during the first year, 1892:

An observer could not fail to be impressed with the perfectly natural, unconstrained way in which the young men and women mingled. They acted as though it was the most natural thing in the world that they were in the University together.

If Goodspeed evaluated the presence of women as comfortable and uncontested, existing records documenting women’s experiences at the University of Chicago reveal a situation many saw as anything but natural. Only months before the University opened, the founders’ plans for a coeducational institution had been rudely criticized at a dinner of prominent men and women. In front of Alice Freeman Palmer—the University’s first Dean of Women—one guest asked, “How can the University be the dignified body of scholars you intend it to be if women are to be included!” The University stood firm on its plan to educate women and men together though concerns about dignity and stature would dictate policies regulating women students for the first half of the twentieth century.

In order to preempt criticism, early administrators focused much of their energy upon crafting the “most perfectly formed woman,” paying scrupulous attention to the intellectual, social, and physical development of women students. Despite administrators’ concerns, fears that women would detract from the educational enterprise could hardly be substantiated once students arrived on campus. By 1902, for example, undergraduate women outnumbered men in the Phi Beta Kappa honor society—a statistic that caused administrators to fear the impending “feminization” of the entire University. The fact that the controversial solution—an ill-conceived plan of sex-segregated classes for first- and second-year undergraduates—lasted just a few years highlighted

One guest asked, “How can the University be the dignified body of scholars you intend it to be if women are to be included!” The University stood firm on its plan to educate women and men together though concerns about dignity and stature would dictate policies regulating women students for the first half of the twentieth century.
the inescapable fact that coeducation, as it was practiced at the University of Chicago, had become part of the institutional culture and that faculty, in particular, were loathe to part with it. Despite their successes, Chicago women still struggled to find themselves on equal footing with men, but very few thought a retreat to single-sex education would remedy that problem.

Even when undergraduate classes returned to educating men and women together, the sense that campus was divided into two universities—one male, one female—remained. Outside of the classroom, women were still channeled into separate residential and recreational spaces on campus. Because they were so much more regulated, women undergraduates more often than their male counterparts struggled against institution-alized limitations on their extracurricular activities and living arrangements. And while women students contributed to campus government, publications, and clubs in association with men, they frequently banded together on campus and in the residence halls to form single-sex academic, service-oriented, and social associations that fostered specifically women-oriented networks and a strong tradition of female mentorship.

Time and time again, administrative decisions disappointed advocates of gender-blind policies seeking to end differential treatment. Women faculty and alumnae came out strongly against the University’s “sex segregation” plan for undergraduate classes in 1902. Twenty years later, another group of women faculty petitioned the University’s leaders to provide equal opportunities for women’s leadership in a coeducational institution, demanding a “fair shake” for the women. In the wake of second-wave feminism later in the twentieth century, University women again demanded that gender difference be taken into account in order to correct past injustices and to offset cultural constraints on women’s academic achievement. Requests for affirmative steps to recruit more women faculty and provide adequate childcare for academic families resonate on campus to this day.

Marion Talbot, Chicago’s pioneering Dean of Women, confidently declared to the University community in 1915, “The back-door stage of the education of women has passed.” Yet many students noted the lack of women faculty role models, women faculty believed their talents undervalued, and both constituencies often felt their particular concerns ignored by University administrators. The University of Chicago has provided many women with space for teaching, research, and community activism with few parallels. At the same time, some of these scholars have stood on the front lines of the University’s struggles to incorporate issues of women and gender into the life of the mind. Fields dominated by women faculty and students have demanded a recognized place in the curriculum, with varying levels of success. Despite its popularity with women students, the
University's Department of Household Administration suffered from a lack of institutional support and was discontinued by the 1950s. When a vibrant women's movement came to Chicago in the post-war era, University women asked if feminist research was really possible at Chicago. And in the late twentieth century, the University was one of the last major American research universities to establish a program in women's and gender studies.

The history of women at the University of Chicago challenges many aspects of the University's self-image. The University has been the subject of much scholarly attention over the years, but for those of us involved in this project, it soon became clear that paying particular attention to women and gender illuminates previously unexplored chapters of the University's past, making familiar stories look much different. While Chicago administrators have received notice for a host of innovations—President Harper's year-round quarter system, for example, or the Hutchins College "core curriculum" later in the century—their attempts to innovate in the field of women's education are not a part of the University's collective memory. One could argue that Chicago's late entry into women's and gender studies is a result of such forgetting. Many faculty saw women's studies as incompatible with the intellectual traditions of the college, which simply and sadly overlooks the efforts by the founders and administrators throughout the twentieth century to lead in the field of women's education.

In our research, we uncovered more material documenting the experiences of Chicago women than we ever imagined—buried in the records of administrators and faculty; in materials saved by students and staff; in student publications; and in the excellent oral histories recently collected by the Center for Gender Studies. These rich sources have answered some, but not all, of our questions. While sources on undergraduate life were particularly rich, there is still much to learn about graduate women and faculty experiences, about women of color, and about the late emergence of gender studies as a field of study at Chicago. And, time and time again, we found ourselves curious about the ways in which manhood was experienced on campus. We finish this project hopeful that our survey will encourage future research on the workings of gender in the intellectual and physical spaces of the University.

Monica Mercado and Katherine Turk

EXHIBITION CURATORS
ENVISIONING A PLACE FOR WOMEN
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

When philanthropist John D. Rockefeller and University President William Rainey Harper envisioned "an institution of the highest rank and character" at Chicago, their plan provided for the education of undergraduate and graduate students, both male and female. In the summer of 1892, President Harper sought out leaders in women's higher education to join his administration. His first pick, Alice Freeman Palmer, was the former president of Wellesley College whose national reputation Harper perceived as essential to the success of co-education at the new University. Harper also lured a young Wellesley faculty member, Marion Talbot, to Chicago. Both Freeman and Talbot were founders of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, now known as the American Association of University Women, or AAUW. "Help us do what greatly needs to be done in this growing City of the West," Harper wrote Talbot, who accepted his offer after slight hesitation.

The University of Chicago opened in the fall of 1892 having hired nine women faculty members, including librarian Zella Allen Dixon, JuliaBulkley in Pedagogy, and Martha Foote Crow in English. Early graduate students like Madeleine Wallin (PhM 1893), a Smith alum, and instructors such as Elizabeth Wallace, a Wellesley alum, came to Chicago upon their graduation from the Seven Sisters schools to take advantage of the new University's resources.

The University's inclusion of women and minority undergraduate and graduate students differentiated it from its peers. In 1900, the national average of women among those earning doctorates was six percent; at Chicago it was twenty percent. These first young women delighted in joining a small but vibrant community of
The University of Chicago  
Chicago, June 2, 1896.

My dear Miss Talbot:-

May I ask you to suggest to Miss Josephine Allen greater prudence in her public conduct. Perhaps I need not give you details. You need not hesitate to use my name in the matter.

I am wondering whether it is in accordance with the wishes of the house committee of Kelly that young gentlemen should come in on a Saturday afternoon and dance. I am under the impression that a report to this effect would not be beneficial to the best interests of the University.

Yours truly,

William Rainey Harper

---

Dear of Women, U. of C.,

Some people in the vicinity of the University are renting all the rooms of their flats to students and leaving no parlor or any public place in which to receive company. Consequently, a young lady who rooms alone will receive her gentleman friend in her own private room, close the door and entertain him to any hour of the night she sees fit.

This is no idle story; the practice is being carried on right now and has been for some time, especially since rents have been increased. It is not at all uncommon in the flat building owned by the University. One who lives among such surroundings.

---

Above: President William Rainey Harper to Marion Talbot regarding student conduct, 1896. Marion Talbot Papers

Left: Anonymous letter to Marion Talbot regarding men and women socializing unsupervised in the neighborhood, ca. 1900. Marion Talbot Papers
female scholars. One of the first Chicago women, undergraduate Demia Butler, kept a diary of her experiences during that first school year, 1892–93. In it, she recorded Dean Palmer's words to the first class of women students:

Monday, Oct 17, 1892 — In the afternoon Mrs. Palmer addressed the women of the colleges.
She spoke of the great advantages of college life, and of college life in the midst of a great progressive city...

At a time when the usefulness of women’s higher education was still being debated in many corners, Chicagoans embraced Palmer's charge. With the grand “Women's Building” of the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition just blocks away in Jackson Park, many of the first University women found Chicago a supportive environment for work and play. As one writer for the very first volume of the University of Chicago Weekly declared on October 1, 1892: “Was there ever such an opportunity for American young men and women?”

MARION TALBOT — DEAN OF WOMEN

When Alice Freeman Palmer resigned from the University in 1895, thirty-seven-year-old Marion Talbot assumed the title of Dean of Women, a position she held until her retirement in 1925. As Dean, Marion Talbot supervised nearly every aspect of undergraduate and graduate student women's lives at Chicago. She lived with students, first at temporary quarters in the Beatrice Hotel, just east of campus, and then on the main quad as head of Kelly Hall. Administrators, parents, and even Hyde Park neighbors corresponded regularly with Talbot, asking her to supervise the behavior of women students and, at times, suggesting she discipline them. In addition to these duties, Talbot taught in the Department of Social Science and Anthropology beginning in the 1892–93 academic year. Her elevation to full professor occurred a decade later with the establishment of the Department of Household Administration. She served as a director of the American Association of University Women and authored numerous publications including The Education of Women (1911), The Modern Household (1912) coauthored with Sophonisba P. Breckinridge (PhD '01, JD '04), and More Than Lore (1936), a memoir of her long career at the University of Chicago.

Talbot often joked about her many duties at Chicago. Writing the night before classes began in October 1892, she declared, “Tomorrow I begin my part as dear-professor instead of dear-scrubwoman!” She wore many hats in her three decades at Chicago: instructor and administrator, dorm mother and housekeeper, disciplinarian and mentor. Inspired by their role model, many of Talbot’s early students went on to take similar positions directing the education of women at Chicago and other American colleges and universities.

ABOVE
Marion Talbot at her desk, n.d. Archival Photographic Files

15
THE DEBATE OVER SEX SEGREGATION

Marion Talbot worked diligently to foster a supportive environment for women scholars. She organized monthly meetings for the women graduate students so they could socialize outside of their own departments, share their research with each other, and discuss “general problems” in women’s education. She encouraged her younger undergraduate charges to pursue their studies with the same rigor that their male classmates exhibited. And she insisted as early as 1902 that “the presence of women should never mean the lowering of any standards, intellectual or social.”

University founders privileged faculty research and the education of graduate students, but by the turn of the century undergraduate admissions were outpacing the rest of the schools, and the percentage of women students was increasingly rapid. By 1902, women were in the majority of students elected to the Phi Beta Kappa honor society. Disturbed by these trends, the administration pursued a controversial policy to limit the coeducational experience for undergraduates, who had followed the same curriculum during the University’s first decade.

President Harper had always made a distinction between the “lower work” of the first two years of undergraduate study in the “Junior College” and the “higher work” of third- and fourth-year students in the “Senior College.” In February 1902, the University Senate voted thirteen to eight to approve what Harper referred to as the “so-called segregation” of the sexes in the Junior College. Men and women would be admitted to the University on equal terms but would be instructed in separate classes until their third year. Objections to this proposal poured in from faculty, parents, friends, and neighbors of the University. That July, fifty-eight University instructors—including Marion Talbot and John Dewey—urged a reconsideration of the proposal. They complained that the plan was vague and misguided, a “first step in the overthrow of co-education.” These dissenters valued the “intellectual association” of young men and women in the classroom, arguing that sex segregation would be a step backwards for women’s education in general and a blow to the self-esteem of women undergraduates in particular.

Despite complaints, the Board of Trustees approved sex segregation in the Junior College in time for the 1902–03 academic year. The University offered multiple explanations for the short-lived plan. Some administrators simply explained sex segregation as “a matter of expediency,” given the crowded conditions in Cobb Hall’s classrooms. Critics of sex segregation countered that administrators and board members feared the “effeminizing” impact of increasing numbers of women undergraduates. Marion Talbot even reported to President Harper that she heard rumors “the women will soon be put off the campus.” A topic of unending administrative debate, Chicago’s attempt at “adapted coeducation” ended without fanfare just a few years later. The mandatory single-sex classes attracted fewer students and gradually disappeared.
WOMEN’S ACADEMICS
AND ALUMNAE ACTIVITIES

While women could pursue any course of study at the University, many specialized in Marion Talbot’s own academic discipline, home economics. Talbot had previously taught courses on germ theory and dietetics at Wellesley College. When she arrived at the University of Chicago, Talbot tried to convince President Harper to let her head a Department of Sanitary Science, a program that would study problems of sanitation, urban planning, and industrialization. Talbot abandoned this vision in 1904, forming the Department of Household Administration in response to pressures from donors and administrators who felt a Chicago education in home economics would enable women alumnae to teach in nearby universities. Department courses were designed to address “the problems of the home and the household” through such existing disciplines as physics, chemistry, physiology, bacteriology, political economy, and sociology. While undergraduate courses were meant to impart basic information about home ownership, child development, and sanitation, Talbot also encouraged students to pursue careers in these areas. Chicago built a leading graduate program whose alumnae went on to teach in high schools and colleges nationwide.

Despite the department’s success, home economics at Chicago faced unique challenges from its inception. The department seemed to defy traditional categorization. Administrators were never sure where to house the department or whether the study of the household deserved the University’s distinguished name. Scholars such as Sophonisba Breckinridge—the first woman to receive a PhD in political science from the University and the first woman to graduate from the Law School—found a home in the Household Administration department when other schools refused to hire women. Breckinridge taught courses on household management, budgeting, and family law to female-dominated classes. Household Administration graduates were enthusiastic alumnae but could not donate enough resources to keep the department going once University administrators began withdrawing financial support in the 1940s. In 1929, 1,150 undergraduates majored in Household Administration, and by 1949, that number had dwindled to forty-five. The program was terminated in 1956.
University administrators took seriously their charge to prepare students to meet the challenges and opportunities of the wider world beyond campus. To Marion Talbot, Household Administration was one course of study that could furnish women students with practical and professional skills, but early women graduates pursued a variety of careers and lifestyles. While some went on to graduate study, others worked in offices, in educational institutions, and in hospitals. Still others became full-time homemakers. Many women graduates of the College remained in Hyde Park, working in University offices or furthering their education at Chicago. However, as many oral histories attest, informal quotas limited the number of women admitted to the professional schools.

Alumnae, women graduate students, and even faculty wives often engaged in woman-centered philanthropy and community service to remain connected to the University. As early as 1892, women’s committees funded departmental fellowships for female graduate students and supported the first campus building projects, including men’s and women’s dormitories on campus. Chicago women’s efforts outside of and beyond the classroom...
Chicago women's efforts outside of and beyond the classroom were also aimed at improving the surrounding city of Chicago. A major campus philanthropic organization, the exclusively female Service League, was formed in 1895 to support the University of Chicago Settlement House. Chicago women's efforts outside of and beyond the classroom were also aimed at improving the surrounding city of Chicago.

were also aimed at improving the surrounding city. A major campus philanthropic organization, the exclusively female Service League, was formed in 1895 to support the University of Chicago Settlement House. The wife of the University President was honorary President of the League, and the organization consisted of women faculty, faculty wives, students, and alumnae. These early League members provided many services to settlement house residents, from leading classes and trips to the countryside to building a library and mending residents' clothes.

Like Jane Addams's better-known Hull House, the University of Chicago Settlement was located in an impoverished neighborhood to the west of campus populated by unskilled industrial workers. According to the League's president, Mary McDowell, the Back of the Yards neighborhood "doubles its population in a decade and changes its nationality every fifteen years." The settlement house aimed to improve neighborhood conditions through education and reform and to help immigrants adjust to life in the United States. By the 1910s, the League took on a more indirect role, sending money and donated goods to the settlement house instead of volunteers. After World War II, the League maintained its philanthropic spirit but shifted its organizational focus toward service work in the Hyde Park neighborhood. Such initiatives continued to solidify social and professional networks of women while addressing pressing community needs.

Other community-oriented groups of University women more explicitly promoted networking and sociability during the University's early years. The Chicago Alumnae Club was founded in 1898 by twenty-seven women residents of Nancy Foster Hall who wanted to remain connected to their dormitory friends once they left college. The Alumnae Club was an active organization, offering social and academic events, scholarships, and community service programs. An "associate membership" was available to women who matriculated at the University but did not graduate. Typical gatherings celebrated women's careers, accomplishments, and continuing education.
While alumnae themselves worked to maintain their ties to their alma mater, administrators kept track of the postgraduate careers of Chicago's women graduates. "Our first principle," wrote University Trustee Harold Swift to President Ernest Burton on the eve of Marion Talbot's retirement in 1925, "should be to bring, if feasible, three or four quite capable women to our Faculty and if they are alumnæ, so much the better." Many women on campus were typically pleased with the University's intellectual rigor but dismayed at their treatment by male colleagues and the administration. A year earlier, Talbot, along with Professors Edith Foster Flint (English) and Elizabeth Wallace (French Literature), had urged the President and Board of Trustees to pay greater attention to female voices within the University. The conditions they noted — no women trustees, few women faculty and difficulty in promoting them, low numbers of fellowships for women graduate students; and a lack of public roles for women such as guest lecturers or honorary degree recipients — would remain largely uncorrected for more than a generation. Other gains during this decade were more promising: one of the first African-American women to earn a doctorate in the United States, Georgiana Simpson (AB '11, AM '20), completed her studies at the University of Chicago in 1921.

HOUSING WOMEN ON CAMPUS

Administrators took far more interest in women students than simply stimulating the "life of the mind." As Dean, Marion Talbot seized the opportunity to build a strong community within the limited on-campus housing available to women undergraduate and graduate students. Living in Kelly Hall on the main quad, she played an active role in the supervision of women's studying, socializing, diet, and exercise. Talbot believed strongly that balance, moderation, and variety were key to women's collegiate success.

For Talbot, refinement and order were important principles for the women's residences. The dorms were equipped with formal entertaining spaces for rituals like "class night," as well as more informal mentoring between the undergraduate and graduate women students. In the public receiving rooms, residential students entertained visitors and planned social events under the watchful eyes of their house mothers.
Parents asked Dean Talbot for assurance that their daughters would receive all the "necessary protections" at Chicago. In turn, the University operated in loco parentis, creating curfews and other rules aimed at limiting the interaction of men and women students outside of the classroom. Thus, it was particularly important to administrators that as many women as possible live on campus, instead of seeking out cheaper, unsupervised rooms in Hyde Park.

While many students from the Chicago area lived at home, fundraising campaigns emphasized that the University students deserved a "safe and comfortable home" on the main quad where they could be under surveillance and protected. Such efforts echoed wider concerns about the safety and propriety of women in a rapidly urbanizing society.

The first female dormitories on the main quad—Foster, Kelly, Beecher, and Green Halls—could house only a few hundred women. Due to lack of funding, plans for a new women's dormitory were cancelled in 1931 at the same time that Burton-Judson Courts, which provided housing for men, and International House, which allowed for some women residents, opened on the edges of campus. Not until the late 1950s did the University complete a successful building campaign for new women's dorms.
As early as 1898, administrators lamented the lack of a "college spirit" at the University of Chicago—attributed at times to the quarter system, to the division between the Junior and Senior Colleges, to the sizable commuter student population, and to the school's emphasis on graduate study. Despite these concerns, the University was home to a rich array of extracurricular activities, particularly for undergraduates.

Marion Talbot and other administrators encouraged women students to form social allegiances through the dormitory house system, to the dismay of those who wanted to bring national Greek letter sororities to campus. Even though men's fraternities and secret societies flourished on campus (they were not banned until the late 1940s), Talbot feared that sororities were divisive and elitist and would undermine local control over women's experience at the University. Talbot also discouraged organizations from publicly humiliating new members or otherwise undermining women's respectability on campus and in the wider community. One day, Talbot noticed President Harper's daughter, an undergraduate student, was "very grotesquely garbed... walking outside and attracting ridicule." Talbot told her to change into proper clothing at once, for campus leaders and visitors were "critical of the university and especially of the women, and we could not afford to tolerate conduct which might amuse a small and intimate group but which reflected no credit on this group in the eyes of the public." To Talbot, the importance of respectable public demeanor trumped students' desire to bond, unsupervised, through their own clubs and rituals.

Despite her trepidation about the selectivity and potential divisiveness of clubs, Talbot acknowledged that extracurricular activities could enhance women's lives by fostering academic achievement and mentorship. Thus, a compromise was born: women's "academic clubs." These groups, including the Esoteric Club (est. 1894), the Quadranglers (est. 1916), and many others, served as respectful forums for women to engage in academic and social activities, contributing to the overall college experience.
1895), and Nu Pi Sigma (est. 1896), offered dinner parties, teas, and other opportunities for young women to gather outside of the classroom.

Of the women’s academic clubs at the turn of the century, Mortar Board (est. 1894) was the most active and remained a presence on campus until the 1960s. Academic success was the main criteria for membership, but club members also participated in community service outings, held social events, and organized an elaborate mentorship program wherein more senior women students helped newer students navigate the University. Women followed strict rules of conduct and performed elaborate rituals meant to demonstrate their solidarity and respect for their club’s traditions. Despite their popularity, the women’s academic clubs periodically faced criticism for their selectivity and potential to weaken campus unity.

Another campus organization, the Women’s Union, avoided such criticism. With Dean Talbot’s encouragement, the Women’s Union was formed in 1901 to help all interested women students and faculty pursue “happy companionship” and other common aims. For a small quarterly fee, any woman on campus could join and attend the frequent lunch meetings, teas, and cultural events organized by and for campus women.

The “most perfectly formed” University of Chicago woman was expected to do more than cultivate personal interests and achieve academic success. University administrators believed female students should become strong in body as well as in mind. Thus, every incoming student was examined by a college physician and enrolled in a sex-specific physical education course. Women students chose from such offerings as swimming, tennis, archery, volleyball, golf, and gymnastics. These activities provided more than physical benefits, according to Gertrude Dudley, the first Director of Women’s Athletics at Chicago. Dudley argued that sports were just as important to women’s maturation and development of cooperative and competitive instincts as were social clubs and academic societies. She worked with Amos Alonzo Stagg—the first men’s Athletic Director and University football coach—to establish strong intramural and intercollegiate sports teams and tournaments.
No. 6—The Club Girl

OH! OH! What have we here? This, beloved, is Florence Leavitt and Helen Norris. They are Club Girls. This is the first day of the year and they have just returned from their vacations. After they have paid the registrar they will go a-hunting for Freshman girls wherewith to recruit their ranks. How will they know when they have found a good one? That, dear readers, is a question which neither we nor any other mortal man can answer. The girls tell us that a Club Girl is a Club Girl because she is, and we'll have to let it go at that. Who is yon disdainful person passing in the left-hand corner of the picture? That is a Mortar Board, or maybe it is Dean Talbot. At this distance it is hard to tell which.

No. 7—The Hustler

THE HUSTLER is a man who tries to take three majors, play soccer, edit the Daily Maroon and the Monthly Maroon, be a cheer leader, and a student councillor, and a class officer, and officer of the Reynolds Club, all at the same time. He is a selfish individual who refuses to let anyone but himself do any work. Although he is a very useful man, he is not nearly so necessary as he considers himself. Marvellous as it may seem, the University existed many years without his aid. And yet, we would not knock this type. The only trouble with the species is that there are too few examples of it. McDermaid, omnipresent old Mac, is the prize hustler. He'll be a great man some day, if he doesn't die first of nervous prostration.
To help organize these events, the Women’s Athletic Association (WAA) was formed at the turn of the century and quickly became one of the largest and most active women’s organizations on campus. All women students could join the WAA, earning membership points through competitive sports or independent exercise such as hiking or skating. In the early 1930s, Stagg and Dudley fought other University administrators’ decision to eliminate required physical education from the curriculum. Young women did not come to college knowing how to play many sports, they argued, and they needed formal instruction to teach them the benefits of exercise. Indeed, when gym class became voluntary, women’s attendance declined by sixty-three percent while men’s participation held steady. Thereupon, while maintaining its support of women’s intercollegiate athletics, the WAA increasingly organized intramurals and emphasized the social aspects of sports for female undergraduates.

While campus organizations such as the WAA, Mortar Board, and the Women’s Union emphasized single-sex socializing, many other groups—including student publications, ethnic and cultural associations, and student government—brought men and women together around their mutual academic and extracurricular interests. Through these integrated and gender-neutral student activities, women at the University of Chicago developed their personal and academic abilities.
By 1903, University men had received the gifts of the Reynolds Club and the Charles L. Hutchinson Commons as well as athletic facilities in Bartlett Gym. University women, by contrast, lacked equivalent social and recreational spaces for more than another decade. At the June 1913 convocation ceremonies, the University of Chicago announced a $300,000 gift from industrialist Laverno Noyes for a women’s clubhouse in memory of his late wife, Ida. Dean Talbot immediately began to conceptualize the space and its functions. In planning memos, Talbot outlined a clubhouse where a young woman could “share in the social life in such a way as to give expression to her individual qualities, to serve as hostess not only to other women but to men, and to give her training in forms of social expression which will make her academic training more effective as she minglest among people.” As part of this vision—and unlike the “manly atmosphere” of the Reynolds Club and Hutch Commons—designers built and furnished Ida Noyes Hall in the style of an English manor home. A committee of fifteen women—including young alumnae and faculty—chose the building’s tasteful décor.

Ida Noyes Hall opened in June 1916 with a lavish student performance held in the women’s quadrangle. Painter Jessie Arms Botke captured the “Masque of Youth” in her murals for the theater on the third floor of Ida Noyes Hall. Visitors toured the new dining rooms, theater, club meeting spaces, ballroom, and athletic facilities—including a gymnasium, swimming pool, and trophy room for the WAA. While Ida Noyes Hall was designed to fulfill a specific need for women’s sociability, it was never an entirely all-female space. If the sexes were to commingle, University administrators preferred they did so in supervised campus locations. Thus, Ida Noyes hosted a busy calendar of public lectures, club meetings, and social events open to the entire University community. In the first-floor social rooms, students scheduled informal weekly “dancing hours.” During the 1920s, when some administrators worried that dancing was a frivolous distraction, Professor Edith Foster Flint argued that these mixers actually had value as “wholesome and invigorating recreation.” The new building as well as some neighborhood hotels also served as the sites of popular University formal events, including the year-end Interclass Hop, club-sponsored dances, and the Washington Prom, first held in 1894.

Ida Noyes Hall and other campus venues inspired students to socialize and express themselves. Despite the studious reputation of the University of Chicago, many midcentury student activities centered on fashion and glamour. In the 1930s, the Cap and Gown yearbook staff sponsored beauty contests for University women. During the 1940s, the student-run Pulse magazine featured a bevy of alluring co-eds posing for its monthly covers.
And the annual Washington Prom—perhaps the most anticipated social event of the year—offered students, faculty, and administrators an evening of dinner and dancing followed by the crowning of "Miss U of C" from a court of popular women undergraduates. University press releases touted the achievements and beauty of these young women, and city social columnists rushed to cover the event for their newspapers each year.

**THE WELFARE STATE AND WOMEN'S POLITICS IN THE ERA OF WORLD WARS**

University women also made news as social activists and public servants. Woman-led community activism entered the formal curriculum when the independent Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy became part of the University of Chicago. Sophonisba Breckinridge and Edith Abbott (PhD '05) led efforts to merge the Chicago School with the philanthropic division of the University’s School of Commerce and Administration, forming the School of Social Service Administration (SSA) in 1920.

SSA aimed "to help to standardize and improve the work of the social agencies, particularly the agencies of the Midwest." Woman-led public policy was written into state and national politics in the 1920s and 1930s, and from its founding, the student body and faculty of SSA were dominated by women. Early coursework combined classroom focus on public relief, care of delinquents, and state policy, with fieldwork in various government and humanitarian relief organizations. Many SSA alumnæ worked in state agencies, and guided by Dean Edith Abbott—the first woman dean of an American graduate school when she was appointed in 1924—SSA became a magnet and training ground for women welfare leaders. In 1934, Edith’s sister, Grace Abbott (PhM '09), left her position as chief of the United States Children’s Bureau to join the faculty of SSA as Professor of Public Welfare Administration. SSA grew significantly during the Depression era, establishing several scholarships for African-American women students, benefiting women including Elizabeth Butler (MA '48), who would return to SSA as a field work professor and lecturer in later decades. Expansion of state-supported social programs created jobs for women reformers and activists.

The Great Depression and World War II affected campus life in other profound and unexpected ways. When men withdrew from college to aid the war effort, women’s presence and visibility on campus increased. Women’s proportion of the
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Edith Abbott, n.d.
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UNDERGRADUATE POPULATION INCREASED FROM TWENTY-TWO PERCENT IN 1910 TO THIRTY-FOUR PERCENT IN 1920. DURING WORLD WAR II, WOMEN OUTNUMBERED MEN ON CAMPUS, CONSTITUTING FIFTY-SEVEN PERCENT OF THE UNDERGRADUATE POPULATION IN 1945. FORMERLY MAJORITY-FEMALE CLASSES IN SSA AND SANITARY SCIENCE WERE OFTEN POPULATED ENTIRELY BY WOMEN STUDENTS. IN ADDITION, THE NATIONWIDE ETHIC OF SELF-SACRIFICE AND INVOLVEMENT IN NATIONAL POLITICS PERMEATED CAMPUS LIFE. WOMEN STUDENTS AND FACULTY PUBLICLY PLEDGED TO READY THEMSELVES TO SERVE THEIR NATION IN THEIR HOMES AND THEIR CAREERS.

WARTIME IMPERATIVES ALSO SHAPED WOMEN'S EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES, PROVIDING OPENINGS FOR THEM TO ENGAGE IN NATIONAL POLITICS AND FIND CREATIVE WAYS TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE WAR EFFORT. DURING THE WORLD WARS, SETTLEMENT LEAGUE MEMBERS ROLL BANDAGES FOR THE RED CROSS AND HELD DANCES FOR SERVICE- MEN AT IDA NOYES HALL. THE NATIONAL TREND TOWARD PRACTICALISM AND SACRIFICE WAS ALSO EVIDENT IN WOMEN'S WARTIME ATTIRE. IMAGES OF YOUNG WOMEN IN THE MANDEL HALL COFFEE SHOP AND A 1943 FASHION SHOW PRESENTED THE "IDEAL WARTIME COED," WHOSE HAIR, SHOES, AND PANTS EXEMPLIFIED LOW-MAINTENANCE, ACTIVE, AND INEXPENSIVE STYLE. BY 1947, FASHIONS VEERED TOWARD THE FEMINIZED AND ROMANTIC, RETURNING G.I.'S JOINED THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY, AND WOMEN'S PROPORTION OF THE UNIVERSITY ENROLLMENT DROPPED TO THIRTY PERCENT.
Student Members of the University of Chicago Youth Committee Against the War are shown with signs, 1939. Archival Photographic Files
I will not support my government in any war which it may undertake.
Questions and Areas for Discussion
at Green House, November 4, 1947

1. When does love play become immoral?

2. Is it advisable to have intercourse with your future husband in order to discover sexual compatibility considering the number of marriage failures due to sexual incompatibilities?

3. What is the distinction if any between sexual attraction, intellectual attraction and love?

4. What are the causes of homosexuality? What are the manifestations of homosexuality in normal individuals?

5. What part do dirty jokes play in sexual psychology?

6. Would masturbation now have serious effects on later sex normality?

7. Is stimulation without fulfillment detrimental to happy sexual development?


9. How are venereal disease germs spread?

10. Do men go through a physiological period analogous to menopause? If so, what are its manifestations?

11. Please explain infant sexuality.

12. Are abortions dangerous? If so, in what way?

13. What is the danger of French kissing?

14. Why is virginity so sacred?

15. Should you tell your fiancé if you have been intimate with other men?

16. Can you abort by use of medicine? (Quinine, ergot, etc.).

17. How far should you go with your fiancé?

18. How can you sublimate sex impulse? (Other than physical exercise.)

19. What is an erection? A "head"?

20. How can you say "no" and still make the boy want to date you?

21. Does your menstrual flow always stop as soon as you are pregnant?

22. What is the difference between pornographic and scientific literature?

23. What is the fertility period?
COURTSHIP AND DATING

While the position of Dean of Women was eliminated after Marion Talbot’s retirement in 1925, women students’ behavior outside of the classroom remained closely supervised and governed by seemingly arbitrary and frequently changing rules. “Social regulations” required a certain number of chaperones at campus mixers. “Women’s hours” created a system of flexible but complicated curfews for undergraduate women. Housing staff continued to monitor “intervisitation” of the sexes in each other’s rooms. When Ruth McCormick became the first woman to hold the post of Assistant Dean of Students in the fall of 1950, more than one hundred women students protested the requirement that residents of the women’s dorms wear skirts to dinner. (Their petition was denied.)

At the same time, staff in the Dean of Students office saw a growing need to provide comprehensive sex education in the dorms. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, doctors from the University’s Student Health Center met with groups of young men, while caseworkers from Chicago’s Association for Family Living conducted frank discussions with young women about dating, sex, marriage, and pregnancy.

Undergraduate dating often befuddled administrators. In the 1950s, when the ratio of men to women was almost four to one, an internal memo from the Dean of Students office lamented the
“terrific competition” young men faced finding a date on campus. Yet in 1963, another administrator worried that the “deadly intensity with which students work and play” doomed student relationships. “Watch the couples who are dating,” read one internal communication. “If you take a discreet look at the couples necking in the New Dorm or at the C-Group entry, do you see any expression of joy, happiness, relaxation, or general euphoria? No…For good and for ill, our undergraduates are terribly serious.” It was perhaps this seriousness of purpose—combined with budget shortfalls and campus politics—that doomed the annual Washington Prom and “Miss U of C” competition, held for the last time in 1970.

MARRIED WOMEN ON CAMPUS

As early as 1900, wives of married University of Chicago students organized as the “Dames Club,” yet another example of the building of women’s networks in turn-of-the-century Chicago. Primarily a social organization, in its early years the Dames Club also petitioned the administration for benefits, including tuition grants for the children of graduate students to attend the University’s Laboratory School.

In the late 1940s and 1950s, young wives of returning World War II veterans made an even more visible mark on campus. With the expansion of financial aid for returning veterans, including the federal government’s GI Bill, and University-specific scholarships, men returned in droves to campus as undergraduate and graduate students. Many were already married. Their wives were rarely students at the University, but they were granted access to the recreational facilities located at Ida Noyes and encouraged (along with their husbands) to chaperone undergraduate social events. To meet the needs of these growing families, in December 1945 University trustees approved $300,000 to move 190 prefabricated homes onto the Midway for married veterans registered as students. By 1949, an additional 600 families lived in nearby married student apartments owned by the University.

Beginning in September 1946, the “profabbers,” as the couples and their families were known, received monthly updates on their neighbors via the Apartment & Prefab Newsletter. The newsletter published suggestions for women seeking part-time work and volunteer opportunities. A “Wives Discussion Group” received regular mention for hosting speakers on such topics as polio, “painless childbirth” national security issues, and “Negro history.” The
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Prefab houses on campus, 1946. Archival Photographic Files
newsletters also advertised small businesses that wives conducted out of their homes: selling seeds, painting portraits, drafting maps, and conducting "cosmetic analysis" were all services listed in one 1947 issue. Prefab couples also supported an active Married Students Association, open to "any married bona-fide student, or junior member of the faculty, hospital resident, intern, fellow, research assistant or associate whose family is living in the vicinity of Chicago."

The prefabs were a temporary solution to an ongoing problem of meeting student housing needs in Hyde Park. While the poorly constructed pre-fab structures did not remain on the Midway, additional married student apartments were added west and north of campus. By the 1970s, the University gave a reinvigorated Dames Club access to new meeting space in the Fairfax Apartments on East Hyde Park Boulevard. The Club restated its mission as providing "creative outlets and opportunities running the gamut [sic] from artistic endeavors to provocative group discussions" during the years that women accompanied their husbands to Hyde Park.

Some married women on campus were in fact University students and researchers; many recall a double standard that was hard for scholar-wives to escape. In an oral history recently collected by the Center for Gender Studies, Narcinda Lerner (SM '59, PhD '62) described the presumed relationship between men, women, and money:

> When I got married [to Lawrence Lerner, AB '53, SM '55, PhD '62], I had an assistantship and it paid money. And it was a research assistantship, which meant that I could do my research and get paid for it. And when I got married, my thesis advisor said he didn't see why I needed a research assistantship anymore because I had a husband to support me. And I was rather mad about that and I did manage to get a teaching assistantship, but I still thought I was treated very unfairly... especially since many of my male colleagues had wives who were out there supporting them.

Joanne Spencer Kantrowitz (MA '57, PhD '62) noted an official rule at Chicago and other schools that discouraged hiring academic couples. "Academic women," she noted, "were in effect not allowed to be married"; those who were often held positions on campus off the tenure track or were forced to seek out teaching and research jobs at neighboring universities. In the middle decades of the twentieth century, she explains, "the University had a habit of hiring the man, and letting the woman fend for herself." She repeated an often-told story: "I remember someone describing Hyde Park in the 1950s. He said, 'In the morning when each tidy housewife opens the front door to sweep the row house steps, nine out of ten have PhDs.'"
FACULTY WIVES’ DINNERS

Just as women students adapted to changes in the social mores and physical structures in Hyde Park, so did a group of women in the University community whose status was increasingly ambiguous: the wives of male faculty members. A varied and visible group within the Hyde Park community, faculty wives formed the backbone of Hyde Park’s social scene and civic activism. They aided their professor husbands as unofficial philanthropists, caregivers, partners, research assistants, entertainers, muses, and more. Often, these women relocated to Chicago to accommodate their husbands’ careers, and they built close friendships with other faculty spouses based on this shared experience.

In 1935, a small group of faculty wives organized an informal dinner to take place during their husbands’ yearly dinner with the University Trustees. By the 1960s, the annual women’s dinner had grown to include more than 400 professors’ wives and a full-scale original theatrical production dramatizing various aspects of life for the faculty wife. In their shows, faculty wives mixed confident messages about their essential part in their husbands’ careers with insecurity about their role within rapidly changing academia. The 1970 show, a spoof of feminism on campus, ignited a firestorm of controversy among women students, women professors, and the faculty wives. In the years following, this dinner show began to seem like an outdated relic as the faculty and student body included more women and the feminist movement demanded women’s campus inclusion as individuals, rather than as men’s appendages. The dinner and show ended in 1980, soon after the University selected its first woman president.

EXPANSION OF STUDENT HOUSING

Improving and expanding undergraduate housing was a pressing issue for the University after World War II. To attract more women applicants, administrators hoped to replace the original women’s dorms on the quad with larger, “modern” dormitories. For a brief moment in the mid-1950s, University Chancellor Lawrence Kimpton even toyed with the idea of consolidating women’s resources into a single-sex undergraduate college, in the hopes that such an arrangement might serve as an attractive selling point for parents reluctant to send their daughters to the “slum-ridden” University during a period of controversial urban renewal plans. While he received lukewarm support from College deans on this issue, Kimpton went so far as to meet with the wives of University Trustees about such an arrangement, but it was quietly rejected. Instead, attention returned to the fundraising for and construction of architect Eero Saarinen’s “New Dorm” north of Ida Noyes Hall.

New Dorm—later renamed Woodward Court—opened in 1958 with rooms for men and women on separate floors. Here, women undergraduates faced restrictions that their male counterparts did not. By 1960, all
Dear Henderson House,

Recently, you sent invitations to a punch party and champagne dance contest to the female residents of Lower Flint House. As female lower Flintians, we are dismayed (though not shocked) at your disregard of the male members of our house. Inasmuch as the invitations were not based upon personal acquaintance with individuals in the house, nor on the desire to increase communication and interaction between the houses as whole units, we must conclude that the invitations were based upon purely sexist considerations. This is in poor taste and offensive to us; therefore none of us will be in attendance at the party, nor do we wish to be considered for further invitations of this type.
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[Signature]
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Co-ed dormitories sometimes posed new social dilemmas for the undergraduate student body.
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women students were required to live in a University residence hall, unless they were living at home or with relatives. Undergraduate men, by contrast, were only required to live in residence halls during the first two years. (Any undergraduate older than age twenty-one could petition to live off campus.) Other differences marked men’s and women’s dorm life. In the early 1960s, for example, housekeeping manuals instructed staff to clean the men’s rooms and change bed linens once a week. But women living in the dorms were expected to clean their own rooms and exchange their own bed linens in a basement laundry.

During the 1960s, the student-run Chicago Maroon newspaper tracked a series of debates between students and the administration over regulations of student life in the dorms, including the women's curfew and co-ed visiting hours. By 1966, there was consensus that undergraduate dorms should be coeducational whenever possible. Single-sex houses within the dorms remained into the 1980s, and women’s hours and intervisitation restrictions were not completely eliminated until the 1970s. Not surprisingly, tensions related to student housing and administrators’ control over students’ personal lives spilled over into a host of other political movements on campus during the same period.

POSTWAR STUDENT MOVEMENTS
AND “SECOND-WAVE” FEMINISM ON CAMPUS

Campus culture in the postwar era was marked by contradiction, unrest, and change. Most noticeably, the national New Left and youth movements buttressed against tradition and authority at the University of Chicago. In the 1950s, students vocally protested all elements of in loco parentis: administrators’ policies of constraint and surveillance over students’ living quarters and activities. With increasing fervor in the 1960s, students organized to oppose what they perceived as paternalistic, condescending, and even racist housing and disciplinary policies. Many students participated in national movements for civil rights and against the Vietnam War and organized political events on campus.

Evidence of New Left culture on campus was undeniable, as more than half of incoming freshman joined Students for a Democratic Society in 1968. Another change was women’s increased presence on campus. Women students comprised thirty-two percent of the undergraduate population in 1952 and approached fifty percent by 1970. While women pressed for inclusion in such existing institutions as student government, many objected to
their treatment in both traditional and radical student organizations. The result was an outpouring of women's dissatisfaction, feminist organizing, and new demands upon the University for inclusion and broader change on women's own terms.

"Second-wave" feminism was soon apparent and active at the University of Chicago. Female and male students, faculty, and administrators alike took aim at the academic culture and curriculum. Feminist organizations on campus were informed by and part of the nationwide women's movement. In 1967, the Women's Radical Action Project (WRAP) formed as the University's first women's liberation group. WRAP members gathered to discuss politics, learn about self-defense, and create art through consciousness-raising sessions, classes, and coffeehouses. Chicago feminists also focused on spreading their movement to women throughout the city through organizing and outreach projects.

Feminist pressure led the administration to open a women's center near campus. The location offered resources, fielded women's health concerns, distributed reading materials, and held workshops on topics of particular interest to women. To impart knowledge absent from the Chicago curriculum, the Women's Experimental College of Hyde Park offered courses in home economics, women's literature, and computer programming. Increasingly, women's and gay rights organizations cosponsored alternative social and cultural events. Questions of sexuality dominated activism and social life in this era as well: the annual Washington Prom was replaced by the Lascivious Costume Ball in February 1970, and in the same month 180 members of Students for Non-Violent Action took part in a co-ed skinny dip in the pool at Ida Noyes. Such events challenged traditional norms at Chicago, providing alternatives to students who opposed a heterocentric or sexist culture.

An important strand of women's liberation on campus involved greater attention to women's health issues and women's right to a safe, legal abortion. Sex education and marriage preparation classes — popular in the late 1940s and early 1950s — no longer met the needs of students experiencing the "sexual revolution" firsthand. In 1963, the University first offered gynecological services for women students, staffed by the Chicago Lying-In Hospital, the University maternity and women's hospital. By the end of the decade, public debate about abortion rights exploded on campus, sponsored by a range of groups — including the Law School, the University of Chicago Service League, the Center for Continuing Education, and the Lying-In
Spencer Parsons, Dean of Rockefeller Memorial Chapel, chaired Chicago’s Clergy Consultation Service on Problem Pregnancies; at the Divinity School he conducted a seminar on abortion for law and medical students in 1969 and 1970.

At the same time, a group of young women at the University of Chicago secretly began to take matters into their own hands. Between 1969 and 1973, the Abortion Counseling Service of the Chicago Women’s Liberation Union, later known as JANE, confronted abortion as “a problem of society” and argued that laws prohibiting the procedure were evidence of “the sometimes subtle, but often blatant, oppression of women.” Based in Hyde Park, JANE included University of Chicago students and other community members, providing counseling and arranging abortions; eventually, JANE members performed underground abortions themselves. By the time of the 1973 Supreme Court decision Roe v. Wade, JANE members estimated they had arranged more than 11,000 illegal abortions in Chicago and the neighboring suburbs.

“THE WOMAN QUESTION IN ACADEMIA”

Chicago women’s movements also stood in opposition to the male-dominated culture of the University’s faculty and administration. Campus feminist organizations argued that women faculty and staff deserved parity in hiring, promotion, and remuneration. One such demand led to a militant standoff between students and administration when the Department of Sociology rejected the contract renewal request of Assistant Professor Marlene Dixon in 1969. A group of students, claiming that Dixon had been unfairly dismissed because of her gender and militant political beliefs, demanded her reinstatement. The administration formed a review committee on the matter, chaired by faculty member and future University president Hanna Holborn Gray—who first began teaching at the University in 1961, a year after her husband was appointed to the faculty. While the Gray Committee studied Dixon’s case, a group of about one hundred students occupied the administration building for seven days. Following the sit-in, eighty-six students were suspended, and twenty-two were expelled; the review committee refused Dixon’s reappointment. To smooth over a tense situation, University administrators appointed a second committee to inquire into “the status and opportunities open to academic women on this campus.” This committee, chaired by Behavioral Science Professor Bernice L. Neugarten (AB ’36, AM ’37, PhD ’43), held hearings, performed
Cleveland Women's Liberation Movement
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Cleveland, Ohio 44112
11 February 1969

Edward H. Levi, President
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Morris Janowtiz, Chairman
Department of Sociology
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Gentle[?]men:

We recently found out that you had decided not to renew Marlene Dixon's contract, against the wishes of her students and the Human Development Department. We are appalled by this act. Not only is it an indication of the absence of academic freedom at the University of Chicago; it also indicates the lengths to which men will go to fight the ideas and research which would threaten their (your) domination.

Sociology of women is a woefully neglected field of study -- so neglected that one would think that the academic discipline wishes to maintain the current situation of women's unequal and oppressed role through continued ignorance. Marlene Dixon is one of the few sociologists in this country dealing with this area. Her writings have been useful to us; more important have been her spoken thoughts and actions, where real learning and teaching happen.

We support -- and will do whatever else is in our power to support -- the demands of her students that Marlene Dixon's contract be renewed.

Sincerely,

Jane Adams
for the Cleveland Women's Liberation Movement

cc: Maroon
Women's Radical Action Project, U. of C. file
research, and administered a survey to all women on campus.

The Committee on University Women published its findings in May 1970. The report argued, "The University of Chicago, despite its auspicious beginnings as a place where distinguished women were part of the original faculty and where special encouragement was given to student women, no longer occupies the same position in this regard."

It recommended that the University work to recruit and retain talented women, yet many on campus felt that the report sidestepped the unique challenges facing women faculty.

WOMEN'S PLACE IN THE UNIVERSITY, REVISITED

In 1969, Katharine Graham (AB '38) became the first woman elected to the Board of Trustees. Nine years later, the University appointed Professor of History Hanna Holborn Gray its tenth president, making her the first woman to serve as president of a major research university in the United States. Concerns about women's place in the University did not subside in the wake of these appointments, however, and the findings of the 1970 Committee on University Women Report reverberated amongst different communities on campus for decades. While some women made the case that University policies disadvantaged women, others were concerned that special consideration for women could interfere with the free marketplace of ideas.

Increased student and faculty activism centered on the University's employment policies and women's representation in fields from which they had generally been excluded. In 1970, the Rev. Peggy Way, an assistant professor at the University's Divinity School, gave a sermon entitled "You Are Not My God, Jehovah!" in which she condemned male-dominated interpretations of Protestant theology. At the Law School, women also criticized the patriarchal culture of academia. In a recent interview, Martha Albertson Fineman (JD '75) remembered a particularly searing incident:

When I was a second-year student at the University of Chicago Law School the only woman law professor I knew — Soia Mentschikoff — left to become Dean at the University of Miami. The few women students at the school petitioned requesting that another woman be hired. We were told that "there is not a woman in the country qualified to be a law professor at the University of Chicago."

Many students and faculty felt that still more work remained to fully incorporate women and feminist theory into the curriculum, the classroom, and the faculty — particularly when many other U.S. colleges and research
The Committee on University Women report argued, “The University of Chicago, despite its auspicious beginnings as a place where distinguished women were part of the original faculty and where special encouragement was given to student women, no longer occupies the same position in this regard.” It recommended that the University work to recruit and retain talented women, yet many women on campus felt that the report sidestepped the unique challenges facing women faculty.

Universities had already committed to fostering scholarship and supporting research institutes in the growing field of women’s and gender studies.

Federal policy including Roe v. Wade and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 established new rights for women in sports, education, and bodily autonomy. A group of Hyde Park women established the Rape Action Group Hotline in 1973, a University Women’s Center opened its doors in 1974, and feminist groups on campus multiplied, along with a host of feminist student publications. In 1975, the separate men’s and women’s PE departments merged, with Mary Jean Mulvaney, the women’s department head, named chair. This reorganization, said Vice President and Dean of Students Charles O’Connell, was a natural development. “We don’t make such arbitrary [sex-based] distinctions in any other department of the University, and I think it’s time we stopped doing so in athletics,” he reasoned at the time. Two years earlier, the University had received attention by offering a new scholarship named for the first women’s athletic director, Gertrude Dudley. The Dudley awards were some of the first four-year athletic scholarships for women in the United States.

In the newly built Regenstein Library in the 1970s, Ruth Murray, bibliographer for the Education, Psychology, Sociology, and Women’s Studies collections, began to compile lists of library resources for research on women and served as an encouraging resource for faculty, staff, and students doing work in the burgeoning field of women’s and gender studies. In addition, scholarly workshops, informal gatherings, and courses on women and gender difference began to take shape. In April 1992, the University of Chicago hosted a conference entitled “Women in American Higher Education.” Female professors and students expressed feelings of isolation and concern that their particular issues were still being ignored. One student claimed that “the University’s attempt to remain academically gender-blind” required women to “lose their identities.” While more women attended graduate school and the College, women had yet to achieve parity on the faculty.

After a decade of campus organizing, faculty in the Humanities and Social Sciences Divisions—led by Leora Auslander (History), Lauren Berlant (English), and Elizabeth Helsinger (English and Art History)—established the Center for
Women and the University

By Caroline Heck

in the midst of trying to assemble this issue — contacting people to write articles, meeting women, thinking up ideas for the male, female, and staff members who suggested that the women's supplement should center on campus fashion, favorite student recipes for kid-down cake, and the most popular patterns of dowryware. I arrived home after a weary day to open my mailbox and find the following letter:

"WHY COLLEGE WOMEN NEED SECRETARIAL SKILLS?"

"As an executive secretary, you have the opportunity to use your initiative and creative power to study your chosen business from the executive point of view."

"HOW CAN I MEET THE CHALLENGE FOR AN EXCITING CAREER?"

"With secretarial skills, you will be equipped for the competitive business world."

"I thought it was pretty funny. I wasn't upset. I like any other woman my age. I have heard many similar communications — invitations to secretarial schools, to finish schools that offer to teach me the graces I need to be a 'lady,' advertising from cosmetic firms that tell me that no man will look at me unless I spend so many dollars on their beautifying preparations, teachers who congratulate me for being so articulate — for a woman. The patent dismissal of women as silly, twittery creatures, either content in their positions or to be indignantly tolerated in their shell presence, is so widespread, so persuasive throughout our lives that we accept it as inevitable, or else we don't even see it.

"This last is particularly problematic. So many men I have spoken to don't believe or understand that women are treated unfairly in our society. To these men, I address the following questions:

What would you think of someone who told you that you should do for the rest of your life is clean a house, change diapers, and serve on committees in the local library? You'd probably think he was crazy.

What would you think of someone who then told you that if you didn't want to spend your life doing this, then you must be immoral, unattractive, and incapable of truly living your spouse and children? You'd think he was crazy.

What would you think of this person if he then told you that if you absolutely refused to pursue this, your natural destiny, then you might be allowed to pursue your ambitions by trying someone else's letters, adding up his bills, teaching his children up to age of around 15, nursing, but not teaching — him, or if you were very, very lucky, modeling his clothes? You'd think he was crazy.

Of course you'd think he was crazy. And if he should tell you that this was how everyone in the society should think, and if the he should live his life in a way that he tried to force you to go along with his ideas, you'd think that he was a dangerous miscreant who needed to be removed from any position of power.

"This 'crazy man,' this 'dangerous miscreant' represents the prevalent opinion that dictates the lives of over one half of the population. Those who think that University is somehow a haven from this suppression ought to talk to some women around here. Attending a University does not absolve one from the prejudices of society, and society's oppression of women is evident in the lives of all women, unlike the University and without.

"Walk into a classroom here. You see a certain number of women. Then shut your eyes and listen. The women disappear. It's difficult, you see, to go against years and years of early training that tell you ladies don't argue, women should be quiet, nice girls don't talk back.

"Do some girl watching. Or watch some man do some girl watching. Girls who take 10 minutes to get dressed in the morning — wash their faces, to back their hair, put on a pair of old jeans, — are bitterly criticized: they're "meany," "shabby," "typical underachieving female intellectuals." To be an attractive person, a woman not only has to be pleasant and kind, she has to spend astronomical amounts of money and time on clothes and cosmetics. Ask a friend to name an outstanding man, and he'll answer, "Sh-h-h-o-o-s-s-it's just brilliant." Ask the same about a woman, the answer is "oh so-and-so is just gorgeous."

"Talk to some recent alumnae. The men are in grad school, or working as executives, or making some progress in pursuing their careers. The women are in grad school (though less than the men), working as secretaries (yes, most women with RA's have trouble getting anything other than glorified secretarial jobs), or using their expensive education, their philosophy of chemistry majors, to help them solve the problems of freezing shirts, waxing floors, and blowing four or five 'old' men.

"For many women on campus, some sort of revolution came during last winter's strikes. The constant emphasis on the issue of women's rights, and the fact that for the first time women found themselves being treated as equals to men — in disciplinary committee hearings, where they had at least to attempt to articulate some statement of what they were doing with their lives — helped to make women examine their existence.

"For women to come to some collective realization of their situation is no simple matter. We women have been taught since childhood to dislike and distrust each other, as competitors for the only people who must in this society — men. The prejudices against women are by no means entirely external. Taught by our own mothers since early childhood, the idea that the "woman's place is in the home" is indirectly ingrained in the characters of many women who are older content to be housewives, or who feel guilty and destined if they are not content.

"The realization that women are entitled to more than they now get is something that will come only with further education. In the hope of furthering such education, the women's magazine publishes its first women's supplement. We hope that it will be read by both men and women, and that it contributes toward destroying the prejudices that now oppress the lives of women and that make our society a poorer place."
Gender Studies (CGS) in 1996. In its first year, CGS boasted fifty-five affiliated faculty members and outlined ambitious plans for curriculum, programming, and fundraising. It proposed an undergraduate concentration in Gender Studies, approved by the College in 1997. In space shared with the Center for the Study of Race, Politics, and Culture, CGS is now home to an interdisciplinary Gender and Sexuality Studies Workshop as well as a Lesbian & Gay Studies Project, and it supports graduate research fellowships and a student caucus that brings together both undergraduate and graduate students.

Student life outside of the classroom has also reflected changing sexual and gendered mores. As a service to entering students, women in the mid-1990s published A Woman's Guide to the U of C, sharing information on student health care, nutrition, sexual harassment, and resources for lesbian and gay students. University support for a student-centered space at 5710 South Woodlawn has made additional space available for students of color and a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (LGBTQ) Resource Center, yet a series of articles in the 2008 Chicago Maroon pointed out the continuing need to address quality of life issues for transgendered students on campus.

Other developments have remade tradition across campus, referencing the long history of women at the University of Chicago. In 1935, women organized the University's first sorority, Alpha Omicron Pi. Today there are multiple Greek-letter sororities on campus, overturning Marion Talbot's historic prohibition of such groups in the early years of the University. Female athletes continue to make the Women's Athletic Association a thriving organization. Residents of Breckinridge Hall, named after pioneering scholar Sophonisba Breckenridge in the late 1970s, call their annual Spring Quarter house party “Sophie Day.” Combined with new methods of studying women and gender in the academy, these traditions remind us that Chicago women have always made rich contributions to the University and continue to have distinct stories to tell about the coeducational experience, both inside and outside of the classroom.
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