THE BIOGRAPHY OF A COLLEGE

Smokers

Several times during the year smokers are given in Brainerd Hall, where the freshmen are given an opportunity to meet other men besides those whom they meet in their classes.

Most of these smokers are held for the freshman class. The Monday after the Orientation period the Brainerd Society holds an annual smoker.

Members of the faculty and student body are there to welcome you and help you to start college by getting acquainted. The songs that will be sung that evening are in this book.

Smokers are held during the football season to get the pep started for the next day. The biggest of these smokers is held on the eve of the Lehigh game. Last year nearly the whole student body attended, and everyone enjoyed himself till his throat and the speakers gave out.

Don't miss any of these smokers, as they help you get the real college spirit; they will give you that personal contact with the students and faculty which is of incalculable value in making your life at Lafayette both happy and profitable.

APPENDIX B

THE ADMISSION OF WOMEN

The following remarks were made by the president of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Ralph K. Goodall, at its June 27, 1965 meeting, when the admission of women was approved.

(Minutes of the Board of Trustees June 11, 1965, pp. 260-261)

I share with you the desire to have the matter studied objectively, the matter shared with alumni, and the matter given sound and sensible review even under difficult circumstances. I think we have now reached the point where a decision should be made.

You know that I love Lafayette. I loved the College as a student and I have loved it through the years. And during all of that time Lafayette has been a men's college. I am sentimentally attached to that feature of the College and about many other features. And I am certain that you know there is no one who can be more sentimental and more anxious to hold onto fine old traditions than the Pennsylvania Dutchman.

But during my career as a business man I have learned to put personal feelings aside and to act on the basis of facts of what I believed was best for my company. When change proved better than the old ways, we changed. And when the old ways proved better than the new, we continued as we were. So I think we must now put personal feelings aside in regard to Lafayette and reach a decision in the same way that we make decisions in business and professional life. We must act on behalf of the long-range interests of the College and respond with an answer that will allow Lafayette College to continue as one of the best colleges in the country.

As trustees, we must be concerned about a Lafayette that meets the needs of the future. It may be a surprise to you that I have thought for a number of years that Lafayette College should eventually become co-ed. I had planned to present this proposal at the proper time—the faculty action hastened my thinking.

Therefore, gentlemen, having weighed all the evidence and having considered as well the alternatives open to us I have come to the conclusion that it is important for us to approve the recommendation that women be admitted to the degree programs at Lafayette College. I have a number of reasons for feeling as I do.

1. If the objective of Lafayette College is to be excellence—both in terms of intellectual growth and personal development—then I believe the College has a moral commitment to society to strive for excellence without regard to sex. Lafayette College has always adjusted to make its educational experience suited to the society which it serves. Since the role of women in society is changing at an ever-increasing pace, it seems appropriate that we now change Lafayette to reflect the world in which we live. Those of us who are alumni look back at our years at Lafayette as a truly great experience. I would like to think my grandchildren, whether boy or girl, could enjoy that same experience. I believe a vast majority of our alumni would like to see their children go to Lafayette, whether son or daughter.

2. The records show that there is an increasing number of men who prefer not to attend an all male college. To me this means if Lafayette does not go co-ed it will have an extremely small market to draw from and eventually would experience a decline in the average quality of its students. Lafayette has gained prestige because of its academic excellence and we cannot afford to have a let-down.

3. I was also interested in Table 3 of the Alumni Poll which indicates that the majority of educators among our alumni who returned the questionnaire agree with the recommendation of our faculty. This indicates to me that the education of men and women together is commonly accepted as preferable by those whose profession is education and it indicates further our faculty resolution was not simply an attempt to copy other prestigious institutions.

This fact indicates the academic community at large support co-education.

4. I must also say that I have not really heard good educational reasons why we should remain all male. Most of the argument is based on tradition and a natural reluctance to avoid what appears to be the bandwagon. But even those who favor remaining all male cannot argue that it is educationally desirable for young men to have a period of maturation apart from women. Those of you who have children know that Lafayette should go co-ed because other schools are doing it. However, the study of the reasons for going co-ed has been enlightening.

5. The matter of increased costs is given as a reason to delay co-education or remain an all male college. Admittedly it is going to cost more money to admit women—for Model C-1960 the additional costs are $140,000 over a period of 5 years and is not a major consideration. The other models are more expensive. If the decision is to go co-ed, the administration must be charged with the responsibility of a program which would minimize the additional costs and the proposed program approved by the Board. But I also think there are some practical reasons why we must make the decision to admit women. I am frank to admit that in many ways I think we are "boxed in." What I now have to say relates to the 245th Campaign. I have asked Gary Evans, Vice President for Development, for his opinion. The following reflects his and my collective thinking.
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THE ADMISSION OF WOMEN

The following remarks were made by the president of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Ralph K. Griswold, at the June 27, 1969 meeting, when the admission of women was approved. (Minutes of the Board of Trustees June 27, 1969, pp. 238-239)

I share with you the desire to have the matter studied objectively, the matter shared with alumni, and the matter given a sound, sensible review even under difficult circumstances. I think we have now reached the point where a decision should be made.

You know that I love Lafayette. I loved the College as a student and I have loved it through the years. And during all of that time Lafayette has been a man's college. I am sentimental about that feature of the College and about many other features. And I am sure that you know there is no one who can be more sentimental and more anxious to hold onto fine old traditions than the Pennsylvania Dutchman.

But during my career as a business man I have learned to put personal feelings aside and to act on the basis of facts of what I believed was best for my company. When things proved better than the old ways, we changed. And when the old ways proved better than the new, we continued as we were.

So I think we must now put personal feelings aside in regard to Lafayette and reach a decision in the same way that we make decisions in business and professional life. We must act on behalf of the long-range interests of the College and express with an answer that will allow Lafayette College to continue as one of the best colleges in the country.

As trustees, we must be concerned about a Lafayette that meets the needs of the future. It may be a surprise to you that I have thought for a number of years that Lafayette College should eventually become coed. I had planned to present this proposal at the proper time—the faculty action hastened my thinking.

Therefore, gentlemen, having weighed all the evidence and having considered as well the alternatives open to us, I have come to the conclusion that it is important for us to approve the recommendation that women be admitted to the degree programs at Lafayette College. I have a number of reasons for feeling as I do.

1. If the objective of Lafayette College is to be excellence—both in terms of intellectual growth and personal development—then I believe the College has a moral commitment to society to strive for excellence without regard to sex. Lafayette College has always adjusted to make its educational experience suited to the society which it serves. Since the role of women in that society is changing at an ever-increasing pace, it seems appropriate that we now change Lafayette to reflect the world in which we live. Those of us who are alumni look back at our years at Lafayette as a truly great experience. I would like to think my grandchildren, whether boy or girl, could enjoy that same experience. I believe a vast majority of our alumni would like to see their children go to Lafayette, whether sons or daughters.

2. The records show that there is an increasing number of men who prefer not to attend an all male college. To me this means if Lafayette does not go coed it will have an extremely small market to draw from and eventually would experience a decline in the average quality of its students. Lafayette has gained prestige because of its academic excellence and we cannot afford to have a let-down.

3. I was also interested in Table 3 of the Alumni Poll which indicates that the majority of educators among our alumni who returned the questionnaire agree with the recommendation of our faculty. This indicates to me that the education of men and women together is commonly accepted as preferable by those whose profession is education and it indicates further our faculty resolution was not simply an attempt to copy other prestigious institutions.

4. I must also say that I have not really heard good educational reasons why we should remain all male. Most of the arguments is based on tradition and a natural reluctance to avoid what appears to be the bandwagon.

5. Another reason is that it should be desirable for young men to have a period of maturation apart from women. Those of you who have children know what I mean.

Reverting to the co-ed bandwagon, I hold no brief for those who feel Lafayette should go coed because other schools are doing it. However, the study of the reasons for going co-ed has been enlightening.

5. The matter of increased costs is given as a reason to delay co-ed education or remain an all male college. Admittedly it is going to cost more money to admit women—the Model C-1960 the additional costs are $390,000 over a period of 8 years and is not a major consideration. The other models are more expensive. If the decision is to go co-ed, the administration must bear the additional costs and the proposed program approved by the Board. But I also think there are some practical reasons why we must make the decision to admit women. I am frank to admit that in many ways I think we are "bearded in." What I now have to say relates to the 24M Campaign. I have asked Gary Evans, Vice President for Development, for his opinion. The following reflects his and my collective thinking.
a. If we decide not to admit women at this time or defer action, it is unlikely that we can reconsider the matter for at least 5 or 6 years. You know that the "On Lafayette" campaign has already been interrupted. In fact, the faculty has blasted our campaign, through their introduction of the co-ed recommendation. But let's face it—the recommendation has been made and we must reply.

It is important that we start the campaign going again and keep it going without further interruption. This means that any decision we make now must stand until the campaign is completed. We might begin to slip educationally and academically within the next few years. But we would be unable to do anything about it until 1974 or 1975 because of the "On Lafayette" campaign. If Lafayette suffers in quality at a time when its costs are increasing and that's unsupported institutions are more and more acceptable to students and parents, the College may lose ground that will nearly be impossible to recover.

b. There is a second practical consideration with regard to the "On Lafayette" campaign. In fact, the faculty has blasted our campaign, through their introduction of the co-ed recommendation. It is important that we start the campaign going again and keep it going without further interruption. This means that any decision we make now must stand until the campaign is completed. We might begin to slip educationally and academically within the next few years. But we would be unable to do anything about it until 1974 or 1975 because of the "On Lafayette" campaign. If Lafayette suffers in quality at a time when its costs are increasing and that's unsupported institutions are more and more acceptable to students and parents, the College may lose ground that will nearly be impossible to recover.

Appendix C

MEMBERS OF THE LAFAYETTE COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES (1825 to 1985)

P - President of the college  
C - Chairman of the board  
V - Vice chairman of the board  
S - Secretary to the board  
L - Life trustee  
T - Term trustee  
A - Alumni trustee  
E - Elected to emeritus status

George Bostick 1825-41 L
John Brown 1825-35 L
Peter Arnold Brown 1825-41 L
John Carey 1825-37 L
George Huns 1825-41 L
George G. Huns 1825-37 L
Jose M. Huns 1825-41 L
Christian Jacob Hunter 1825-37 L
Peter Bier 1825-37 L
Jos Jones 1825-41 L
Jacob Kern 1825-41 L
John B. Latimore 1825-37 L
Walter C. Livingston 1825-37 L
William Long 1825-41 L
Philip Henry Malcom 1825-37 L
Anthoni McCarr 1825-37 L
Thomas McKearn 1825-37 L
Peter Sel Malcom 1825-41 L
Peter Miller 1825-37 L
Philip Newell 1825-37 L
Robert Patterson 1825-37 L
James Madison Porter 1825-37 L
John Hays Powell 1825-37 L
Andrew M. Prevost 1825-37 L
Thomas J. Rogers 1825-41 L
John Maria Scott 1825-37 L
William Snow 1825-37 L
Samuel Stephenson 1825-37 L
Joseph Kennedy Scott 1825-41 L
Benjamin Tilghman 1825-41 L
Jacob Seigler 1825-41 L
George Wister 1825-41 L
Silas E. Wirt 1825-41 L
Jacob Seigler 1825-41 L
John Swane 1825-41 L
George Wilt 1825-41 L
Hopewell Humphreys 1825-41 L
George Jenkins 1825-41 L
Solomon Allen 1825-41 L
Enoch Green 1825-41 L
John Johnson 1825-41 L
Joseph McKay 1825-41 L
James Wilkes 1825-41 L
Abraham Bickham 1825-41 L
Henry A. Bickham 1825-41 L
John L. Byrke 1825-41 L
Turla Green 1825-41 L
Henry Howson 1857-48 L
Thornton Symington 1857-48 L
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The end of the Trustees, many of its leaders and its co­
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