

THE UNIVERSITY'S POLICY

ON CO-EDUCATION

We are carrying herewith the full statement by President Chase to the faculty of the University explaining the policy of the University of North Carolina on co-education. His statement follows:

The question of co-education at the University has aroused so much discussion that it seems to me the position of the University administration should be made clear. The position is, in a word, that the policy under which the University is now operating, and which has been decided upon after careful thought, is altogether in keeping with the logic of the situation, and with the mature thought of the great majority of both men and women in the state. There appears no evidence that it should be changed. What does appear, however, is a considerable misunderstanding of just what that policy is, and a begging of the question brought about by the division of opinion as to whether a building for women should be erected at this time.

The question as to the immediate erection of a woman's building is one to be determined in terms of what is practicable now. The University's attitude toward women students, on the other hand, can be considered only, as it has been considered, in the large and permanent terms of state policy. Let us see, then, on what the University's policy is founded.

In the first place, no great democracy is possible today without full and free recognition on the part of its citizens of the fact that there must be for both sexes equality of educational opportunity. The state of North Carolina in her rapid progress needs trained women, women of wide horizons and clear vision, every whit as badly as she needs trained men. In so far as higher education opens a way to life, to larger life, that way must be open to young women and young men alike. In so far as higher education is a means, as the framers of our Constitution said it was, to promote "the happiness of the rising generations," the rising generation without distinction of sex is entitled to its benefits.

Second. The University of North Carolina is the State University, the head of the state's educational system, maintained from the public funds, to serve the state whose creation and instrument it is. It is, as it is described in the Constitution, for the benefit of the "youth" of the state. No constitutional provisions, no legislative enactments, bar women from its halls. It is, therefore, its duty and privilege to function in the education of women in whatever ways are designed to ensure to the women of the state equality of educational opportunity through the state's educational system. It cannot conceivably take any other position; it cannot for a moment be satisfied with any policy which would mean that it refused to play its part in making possible a well-rounded system of higher education through state support for women as well as for men. It cannot deny its function as the University of a democratic state, whose citizens of both sexes share equally the duties and the rights of citizenship.

Keeping the two principles stated above in mind, it is clear that the part which the University should play becomes a matter of definition, a question of fact as to what is essential to make equality of educational opportunity a reality. It is a question to be determined, that is, in the light of the facts as to what the state is doing and should do for the education of women, and which can be wisely settled on no other basis. What are the significant facts? To my mind they are these.

State universities in most sections of the country have not separated their facilities for the higher education of women from those for men. Such state universities as those of Iowa, Michigan, California—in fact, those of the middle western states generally—offer university education to women from the freshman class up through the graduate school on the same campus and under the same instructors as for men, and have done so from their foundation. In North Carolina the development has been somewhat different. With the

full assent and active support of the citizenship of the state, the institution for women at Greensboro, originated as the Normal College, is broadening into the North Carolina College for Women. I trust that no one will think me presumptuous for saying anything in this connection about another institution than the one I have the privilege to serve; it is essential if the situation is to be clarified. The North Carolina College for Women, then, with the thoughtful citizenship of both sexes in the state behind it, began some years ago its development into a state-supported institution of collegiate grade and scope, and has been recognized as a standard college by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This matter of policy in the higher education of women is, I believe, settled in the minds of the state, and to it, as the state has defined it, the University should, and does, cordially assent.

Now this means certain things. It means, first, that the University cannot, and should not, attempt to do what Iowa, and Michigan, and California, and their neighbors have done; adopt a policy which enrolls hundreds and thousands of women in elementary classes on the same campus with men. In none of the states which have done this does there exist a separate state institution for women playing a part in the state's educational system comparable to that played by the North Carolina College for Women. The point should be emphasized, because I do not think that it is fully understood. State-supported normal schools for women exist all over the country; separated state colleges for women are rare. The most fully developed example outside of North Carolina is probably the State College for Women of Florida, which is located at Tallahassee, while the State University (to which I believe women are not admitted at all) is at Gainesville.

In the light, then, of our local situation, I am convinced that a policy of absolutely free and unrestricted co-education at the University of North Carolina would not be wise. It would involve on a large scale a duplication of resources and of expenditure for large elementary classes; such an unnecessary duplication as should have no place in a well-conceived state system of higher education.

Let us consider next the other extreme, that of graduate and professional instruction. Such instruction has been built up through years of effort at Chapel Hill. It is expensive, it is work of University, as distinguished from collegiate, type. The state demands such work of its University. It is one of the functions for the performance of which it exists. I do not believe that I am saying anything to which the friends of North Carolina College for Women would not assent in stating frankly my opinion that, save for the fields into which women largely enter, the logical place for graduate and professional work for both women and men is at the University of North Carolina. This is at once the simplest and most economical solution; the simplest in that strong schools already functioning exist at Chapel Hill; the most economical in that the duplication of specialists, books and apparatus would be a terribly costly business. Is it not clear, then, that the graduate and professional schools of the University should, as a wise measure of state policy, always be open to women as well as to men? I, personally, am absolutely convinced that it is.

So far, then, a logical policy would seem to point to the exclusion of women from elementary work at the University, and their admission to graduate and professional work. But there is still another point. What of their admission to advanced undergraduate courses? The answer to this question is, I think, clear. It is inevitable that, as soon as we get beyond the elementary courses of freshman and sophomore grades, which are fairly well standardized in all good colleges, institutions will vary in the range and scope of the advanced courses which they develop in this or that department, and that students of varying

KNOW NORTH CAROLINA

A South Carolina Verdict

Another South Carolina newspaper, The Hartsville Messenger, pays high tribute to the North Carolina spirit of hustle and forward-looking progress. Taking the observations of Editor Ball, of The Columbia State as a basis, the Hartsville paper goes on to show the South Carolinians how it is done in North Carolina:

North Carolina, now regarded as one of the most progressive states in the Union, is constantly being held up as an object lesson to South Carolinians and South Carolina legislators as to what can be done through constructive legislation and efficient administration of government. In government, in development of its educational system, in development of its state institutions, in construction of good roads, North Carolina has perhaps gone further in a short time than any state in the Union has ever done. The North Carolina General Assembly is now in session (they have biennial sessions, by the way) and the editor of The State is spending some time in Raleigh to see "how it's done." His observations on North Carolina, and his comparisons of the two sister states, as published daily in the paper of which he is editor, are furnishing interesting reading matter, and incidentally throwing new light upon the differences of the two states. Among the things that Editor Ball finds in North Carolina is the apparent absence of the pecuniary localism and -precinct politics, and the prevalence of a high regard for the state over the narrow idea of "county rights." He finds there, in the traveling hospital idea, the co-ordination of education, health, and roads; a co-ordination that characterizes the efforts of every department or institution of North Carolina with every other department or institution. There is absence of jealousy or conflict between institutions, and apparently complete separation of state and church. In North Carolina the rich county helps develop the less fortunate county. Revenues as from motor licenses go to the state and are used by the state highway commission for state roads. Forsyth and Mecklenburg counties, two of the wealthiest, are helping build roads in Montgomery and Bladen. Even county seats do not determine the location of a state highway—North Carolina is building roads where she needs them most. But what of South Carolina? Editor Ball says:

"The nub of the matter is that if South Carolina will turn over to the highway building agency the vehicle revenues, clothe it with power to locate roads and with discretion as to their character of construction, charging it with the duty to maintain them properly whatsoever their character, we can start with a road building program without straining the state's credit, by borrowing \$20,000,000 or \$10,000,000, and obtain a first-rate state system as quickly as though we borrowed \$50,000,000. On the other hand, if we are wanting in the breadth of mind, the common sense, the honesty and faith in dealing with ourselves, to delegate the money and the power to state agency to build roads for the whole commonwealth, without puerile concession to and compromise with every village seat, without insistence that the best road run by 'my school house' or 'my farm' or through the neighborhood from which 'my votes come,' the sooner we cease our prattle about state roads and to find our joy in running around in circles within our counties and school districts, the more time we shall have to devote to other pursuits that will lead us somewhere."

In the matter of education, North Carolina is developing her schools along the same lines that she is developing her roads. She is developing schools with the state idea in mind, and not the county idea, and in these schools she is using just as many Winthrop-trained teachers, trained at South Carolina's expense, as she can entice over the line by paying them higher salaries. As North Carolina develops the process of enticing South Carolinians over the line will not stop with the teachers and as Editor Ball asks, "Where will it stop?" Summing up: North Carolina is developing a commonwealth. South Carolina can't ignore her, but can learn from her. "If North Carolinians haven't got Andy Jackson from us, they haven't quit trying," says Editor Ball. They are ahead of us on that—they have his memorial on their side of the line.—Gastonia Gazette.

types of mind and interest will find at different institutions that work which most nearly meets their needs. Local situations, matters of institutional policy, naturally lead to greater developments in advanced work at a given institution in some fields rather than others. It would seem logical, therefore, that women who find at the University as juniors and seniors advanced courses which the University has developed, and which are in line with their serious interests, should be allowed to pursue them. Any other policy would, I believe, be a contradiction in fact of the theory of equality of educational opportunity upon which our state system of higher education must be based, inasmuch as the needs of young women of widely varying types of interest must be considered if real equality of opportunity is to exist. There is in such a position no conflict of scope between the institutions at Greensboro and at Chapel Hill; rather in this respect they are to be considered as supplementing each other.

The policy I have outlined is, I believe, fully in accord with the logic of the situation. It is not original with me, but is the policy under which the University has been operating for years. Women have been, and are, welcome here under that policy. It has not, I think, been fully understood, and I have attempted to clarify it. I see no reason why it should be

changed, save as it changes in detail of itself naturally through the years, in terms of the offerings of North Carolina College for Women and of the University in this or that department. I believe it is a policy upon which the friends of both institutions can unite, as wise alike for the institutions and for the best interests of the education of women in the state.

The question of a building for women at this time is another question. It is not, and should not be considered as, a determining factor in the University's attitude toward women. Whether it can or cannot be built at this moment is a matter which must be carefully studied in the light of all the facts, and of the best interests of the University and of the state. But whether or not it is built at this moment, the provision of adequate material facilities for women at the University in accord with its fixed policy is an obligation which the University cannot, and has no desire to, escape. On the contrary, the University has no deeper satisfaction than that of proper provision for the needs of the growing commonwealth which it serves.

But this is apart from my main point. What I have tried to say, as clearly as I know how, is that the University believes in equality of educational opportunity for both sexes, and in its duty to see to it that it does its part to help make that principle a reality.

OUR CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES

(Frank C. Vilbrandt, Professor of Industrial Chemistry, Department of Chemistry, University of North Carolina.)

Has it ever occurred to you how closely chemistry is brought home to you in everyday life? Do you realize what an important part it is playing in the development of the state? Excluding such industries as furniture, foundries, tobacco, metallurgy, and water purification wherein chemistry plays an important part and in which industries many chemists are employed, there exist 290 other chemical plants of more or less importance in the state.

Compared with some of the more important industries in the state such as cotton knitting and cotton mills, the chemical industries yield greater production values in proportion to capital invested and laborers employed than any other class. The cotton mills and knitting mills numbering approximately 625 in all have an invested capital of over \$231,150,000, employing over 90,000 people and yielding \$320,000,000 of products. The twenty-three tobacco plants constituting the industrial side of tobacco, employing 9,300 people, have a capital investment of \$130,440,000 and yield \$225,000,000 worth of products. The chemical industries, of which there

are 290 plants, have a capital investment of but \$117,500,000 employing but 10,650 people and yielding \$201,500,000 worth of products. These figures do not include proprietary drugs and medicines which belong rightly to the field of pharmacy, but which the layman attributes to chemistry. Statistics show these chemical industries are almost on a par with our great tobacco industry, in which we lead the world.

It is evident, therefore, that the state is as much of a chemical industrial state as it is a cotton or tobacco state. Chemical industries rank third, following only cotton and tobacco. If the industry were to include all those allied branches in which chemistry plays a part, such as metallurgy, water purification, furniture manufacture, and foundries, it would dwarf all others. Its interests are many and varied, as should be, taking care of the wants and comforts of the people not only in this state or country but also in foreign lands.

To watch, safeguard, control, and operate this giant, men trained in the fundamentals of chemistry and chemical engineering are economically essential.

Data for Aluminum Company of America, Badin, N. C., not available and therefore not included in Chemical Industrial Data.

Rank of Industries

Arranged to show (1) the capital invested, (2) yearly production, (3) number of plants, and (4) number of employees. The total number of plants is 6,346, with a capital investment of over 953 million dollars, of which 117 million are invested in chemical industries alone. The latter industry ranks as third in the industries of the state.

Data secured and compiled by the Industrial Chemical Division of the Chemistry Department, University of North Carolina.

Financial Comparisons

Industries	Plants	Employees	Capital Invested	Yearly Output Val.
Cotton Mills	450	73,600	\$200,000,000	\$235,000,000
Tobacco Industry	23	9,300	130,440,000	225,000,000
Chemical Plants	290	10,650	117,500,000	201,500,000
Knitting Mills	175	16,500	31,150,000	33,270,000
Furniture Factories	124	14,000	16,000,000	40,000,000
Woolen Mills	9	951	1,800,000	3,500,000
Silk Mills	3	874	2,000,000	1,800,000
Cordage Mills	2	42	55,000	300,000
All others	5,270	60,000	455,000,000	47,250,000

Rating of Chemical Industries in North Carolina

Arranged by the different chemical industries to show (1) capital invested, (2) value of plants, (3) number of plants, and (4) yearly production value. From the data is excluded that of the Aluminum Company of America because it is not available. The great fertilizer industry with the Virginia-Carolina Chemical Company's large holdings easily surpasses the others. Second stands the enormous cotton seed oil industry, which is to be expected, but even with our enormous forest reserves we can give but last place to our forest products chemical industry.

Industry	Plants	Capital Invested	Value of plants Estimated	Value Annual Production
Fertilizers	42	\$79,750,000	\$39,700,000	\$31,920,000
Cottonseed Oil Products	56	12,000,000	28,000,000	133,600,000
Leather	11	3,300,000	6,500,000	10,650,000
Paper and Pulp	3	6,850,000	4,200,000	6,500,000
Ice	55	2,750,000	2,000,000	2,600,000
Gas and By-Products	10	2,500,000	500,000	1,500,000
Rubber Fabrics	3	2,200,000	2,000,000	4,000,000
Ceramics	103	2,000,000	1,500,000	7,000,000
Dyeing and Mercerizing Cotton	3	900,000	2,000,000	570,000
Turpentine and Rosin	10	50,000	70,000	110,000