

# THE VARSITY:

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF

EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY POLITICS AND EVENTS.

VOL. IV. No. 5.

Nov. 3, 1883.

Price 10 cents.

## CO-EDUCATION.

Such a dead set has been made by the advocates of co-education upon the Council of University College for refusing to admit young women to their lecture rooms conjointly with young men, that it is time to consider who is right in the matter. DR. WILSON, as the President of the Council, has had to bear the brunt of the obloquy which the opponents of any innovation have to submit to, while the advocates of the movement are eagerly pushing their idea apparently with the confidence of ultimate success. We feel bound to put on record our views on the subject—not without hesitation on some points, in view of some of the evidence adduced—but at the same time convinced of their soundness on the main issue. They may not please the most sanguine, but we cannot help that.

In the first place, both sides are united in desiring a higher education for women. Both aim at that end, and so far we agree with both. Now comes the divergence. The co-educators demand that women be allowed to mingle with the men in their class-room, attend the same lectures, pass the same examinations, compete for the same prizes. DR. WILSON says the demand is not to be granted. He says it is inexpedient—would tend to upset discipline. The co-educators rejoin—'Look at the colleges in the States where the results have been perfectly satisfactory.' If the argument rested on the question of discipline, we think the co-educators would have the best of it. For although it would add enormously to the responsibility of the management of a college, still, it could be done. But it seems to us there is a far graver difficulty, one quite apart from any matter of discipline or even morals. It is this: A University education is intended for men, and—supposing females equally entitled to it, as they are on principle—for women, not for boys and girls. Its object is to equip men and women to fight the battle of life. In the constitution of the race, men and women are essentially different. You cannot make a man feminine without weakening his mental power. You cannot make a woman masculine without destroying her greatest charm. Can a system of education be devised which shall answer for both? There is only one answer to that question. If it could, it would only be a system of compromise on both sides. The education for men must be more feminine, the education for women more masculine. Our present system is masculine, and is intended for men and suits men. The question, therefore, of Co-Education is only another phase of Women's Rights, and common sense disposes of that subject in its extreme view with much promptness.

In this aspect of the case we think DR. WILSON undoubtedly right, and we must confess we cannot see what possible answer the co-educators can have.

As for the *nec sinit esse ferus* part of their argument, women's society can be obtained elsewhere than in lecture rooms, and its softening and refining influence can be otherwise obtained.

What Co-Educators ask for is reasonable in one way. They want higher education for women. They wish that a woman should be something else than a frivolous doll—many women wish the same thing. We think it is a gross hardship on a most deserving class of the community that they should not have the opportunity. If their friends wish to help, let them join us in asking the country to establish a Woman's College. The women have as much right to it as the men have to a Men's College. But that is a very different question from putting them both into one College. What is more, we believe that women themselves would prefer their own separate Col-

lege, and were their opinion taken to-morrow we believe it would be almost unanimous against being educated in the same lecture-rooms with men. If this be so, and we challenge Co-Educators to deny that it is so, then a Women's College is only one more of the long list of claims which University College has upon the country to enable it to meet the requirements of the time. If the country is not educated up to the point of being prepared to spend money on a Woman's College, then we will go so far as to say, that we believe it would be better for the country to wait until it is educated up to the proper point, and let things go on as they are for another generation, than emasculate our system of education by trying to turn Hercules into Omphale and Omphale into Hercules. Many of our modern movements are based upon over-wrought sentimentality. We believe Co-Education to be just one of those movements, and therefore dangerous, and to be resisted. Perhaps it is the more dangerous because it appeals to some extent to chivalry, but we believe that however pretty it may be in theory, it will not stand the test of the realities of life.

## THE PROFESSORSHIP OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Our attention has been called to a supposed inconsistency in our two editorials of last week, in reference to the establishment of a Chair of Romance Languages in University College. No such inconsistency really exists. The first article favors the substitution of a Professorship of Modern Languages, by whatever name it may be called, in place of the present tutorial system, but holds that, if there be a question of lack of funds, no change should be attempted till those funds are forthcoming. The second, recognizing that there are serious financial objections, opposes the change for the present, and further sets out that there are more important, immediate wants.

All will agree that the Modern Language department here occupies a position it should not occupy. It should be on an equal footing with all other departments, and stand in no ambiguous relation in comparison with them. It should have its professor and its representation on the College Council. But that professor, such a man as is required, cannot be obtained for the salary proposed. He will occupy a position the choice for which must be most carefully made. And when made a respectable salary must be allowed. From the meagre reports we are able to obtain of the deliberations and conclusions of the Senate, it is difficult to tell what the work of the new professor is to be, and what assistance he is to have. Either his Chair is to be a substitution for the tutorships in Modern Languages, and his will be really the work of a Modern Language professor, on a surer ground, and with a recognized standing as a professor; or there is to be an addition to the whole Modern department, with additional teaching power, and of course additional expense. If the former, the name of Romance Language is a misnomer, and German would find itself in a lower position than ever. If the latter, the question of funds looms up, and puts the matter in a different light.

That changes are sadly needed in the Modern Language department, every one knows who is at all acquainted with its present unsettled condition. But they are only some of many changes equally called for, and when the consideration of those changes involves the consideration as well of additional expenditure out of our meagre income, they must be considered in comparison with one another, on the ground of desirability. Many things we have pointed out again and again as demand-