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Town-gown relations define political and social taglines in today’s communities. The multifaceted dynamics of such a relationship involving two entities with (oftentimes) differing priorities and loyalties cannot be understood nor investigated in isolation and in the exclusivity of economics. One area that provides definition to the relationship between a town and an educational institution located within it involves the students at the school as well as policies governing the living affairs of the students. Of consideration in this paper is the history of campus housing policies as seen through the textured relationship between Duke University and the Durham, North Carolina community.

The history of Duke University can not be completely recounted without the mention of the different residential policies in place for the students at different periods of time and how such policies are reflected on the town and gown relations of the two communities mentioned earlier. Since the history of the university runs through all the way from the 1890’s, when the school was structuring its visions, strategies and goals, there are enough periods for consideration. This investigation will cover periods from the 1874-1970. A first period of consideration would be the 1874 to 1930, which were the formative years of the college and its cause in the education of women. The second time period, 1930-1970 is coincident with the existence of the Woman’s College at the university. Such time periods are helpful in establishing concrete trends and comparing the different patterns of accommodation as they are reflected off town and gown relations.
In 1874, the then president of Trinity College, President Braxton Craven, admitted the first women at the old Trinity campus in Rudolph county, North Carolina. The female students admitted, the Giles sisters, were taught in the evenings by the president until their senior year when they were allowed to enroll in the college classes with men. Four years after, in 1878, the Giles sisters would be the first women to receive degrees at the college. The graduation of the sisters from Trinity College was a major breakthrough for expanding the role of women at the school and in North Carolina. However, very few women attended the college until it relocated to Durham.1 Because the Giles sisters were not officially admitted to the college, there were no residential provisions. It seemed most natural that their (the sisters) primary concern at that time was getting some kind of formal education. Town and gown relations then would not be comprehensive for that period because of the location (Rudolph county) although there were negotiations going on then by the town of Durham for relocation.

In the decade after the graduation of the Giles sisters, enrollment of women at Trinity College was still meager and as private students. In 1892, the Trinity Board of Trustees had taken their first official action regarding the education of women at the institution: “it was moved that women graduates be admitted to instruction in the College, but not to residency on the grounds”. So the women who were now accepted to Trinity College, although limited in number, were not allowed to have residency on campus, as accommodation provisions were not made for the female students for that decade. They

---

1 “Women at Trinity” Circa 1914. p. 3-4
were simply placed under the same jurisdiction as the day students. The women who were admitted had to find residency off campus living with family while receiving official instructions on campus\(^2\). A major breakthrough in the education of women came in 1896 with the decision to move Trinity to Durham. Washington Duke, a Durham native offered a $100,000 endowment to the college, provided that:

> Such changes in the laws, rules and regulations governing the college shall be made by those having the authority to do so, before the close of 1897, as will open its doors to women, placing them in the future of an equal footing with men, enabling them to enjoy all the rights, privileges and advantages of the college now enjoyed or to be hereafter enjoyed by men; otherwise, this offer shall be null and void\(^3\)

Following Duke’s provisional offer, Trinity took significant steps to increase the enrollment of women at the College. In the same year, women were again in the graduating class\(^4\). The four women graduates of 1896 class worked under the same conditions as the men, attending the same classes. In addition to this increased interest in the education of women, the endowment enabled the erection of a new, exclusive residential house for the women, the Mary Duke building in 1897. The building,


\(^3\) Washington Duke to J.C Kilgo, December 5, 1896, Few Correspondence, Duke University Archives.

consisting of 11 dormitory rooms, furnished a location of “most desirable surroundings” and was “adopted to the health and comfort” of young women.\(^5\)

Considering the condition attached to the admission, one would observe that women at that time were not considered worthy of equal education with men. It was a common and natural practice nationally and indeed as with most countries for women to receive a special kind of informal education in housekeeping, nursing and farming. The kind of education they received was intended to prepare them adequately by inculcating proper mannerism, good housekeeping skills, and training as housewives. So when the college decided to admit them to the institution, it was a welcome idea for women at that time to receive the same formal education that men received. It was a rare privilege for the women in Durham as nearest college for women during that period the Greensboro Female College, had just opened its doors to women. Thus in the 1890’s, Trinity College was a pacesetter for women’s educational role. It was one of the very few institutions in the south by 1897 that offered a co-educational program.\(^6\)

Such news as education for women to be brought to Durham was met with excitement by the town of Durham. It meant education for the natives of Durham and was even more welcoming considering the rarity of such provisions in the south. Although there were very few students that graduated during the period, the town of Durham was to be the home for future students. However, very little interaction between co-eds and townsfolk occurred, as enrollment at the college was sparse afterwards. The housing condition attached to the admission of women would have served to prepare future

\(^5\) Trinity College Catalogue, 1897-1898, p. 22, Duke University Archives.

students for more interaction with the town had it been that there were enough students enrolled. Reasons for the sparseness in enrollment were not immediately apparent. During the close of the decade, when enrollment increased, the availability of on campus housing enabled a wider geographical distribution of women to develop at Trinity as one third of the total enrollment were from other cities in North Carolina, and even from a few other cities. Such a development would begin to define town and gown as contrasted to earlier arrangements where almost all the students were Durham natives and there was not much separation between a “Trinity female student” and the same “Durham native”.

The first decade in the 20th century at Trinity College appeared to have a slight shift with regards to the education of women and thus their accommodations. Washington Duke’s provisional condition that the College had adopted which altered its policy was removed in 1903. Duke wanted the College to exercise full control and judgment in its policies. At that time, there was a trend in the south towards co-ordination—a way to combine the ideals of womanhood with intellectual strength. Trinity College decided to pursue the realization of a co-ordinate college with President Kilgo leading the way. The pursuit of a co-ordinate college by the institution continued, crossing into the next decade. While the issue was pursued by solicitation of funds both from the people of Durham and the Duke family, the accommodation in place for women, that is the Mary Duke building was still in place. However, more students started attending the college. By the end of the decade, nearly 50 women were enrolled at Trinity. The co-ordinate college was still in conception stage and had not materialized at the end

---

of the period. Much of the perception of women and the roles of the accommodation were still reminiscent of the previous decade as there was no major change in the housing policy at that time.

In 1910, when President Few took over as president of the College, he had his own ideas quite different from President Kilgo. Although the ambitions of a co-ordinate college were still alive, Few was not as passionate about the idea as his predecessor. The whole co-ordinate idea led to the conscription of the only female accommodation on campus, the Mary Duke building for men’s use while nursing a grand idea for accommodations for women in their soon to be built college. After the conscription, the women at the College had no single building to be called their own and were left without any accommodation. However, Few also suggested that the only feasible plan to provide accommodation for women was to use Currin House as a boarding establishment. Despite this, the number of female students continued to increase. By the end of 1910, Few’s first year as president, nearly forty, or two-thirds of the women in attendance, called Durham home.

One would think that during this period, the cause of women and their rightful place in education would have firmly rooted itself in the society. On the contrary, some individuals representing the College, did not see the importance of regarding the foundation of women’s education at that time. Few elaborated on the College’s relegation of the educational cause of women to the backdrop in a statement to the Board of Trustees:
I do not consider that the education of women will probably ever be a primary obligation of Trinity College. Our main business is the education of men….\textsuperscript{8}

Such statements, decades after there was a move towards the acceptance that women were equally capably and deserving of good formal education as men, did not reflect any progressive improvement in the way the college pursued the advancement of women at the institution. Women were still not regarded as people whose education should be of primary importance but a distant secondary relevance.

During this period, town and gown interactions increased dramatically because of the growing number of students enrolled and also the new ambitions that were nursed by President Kilgo during his tenure. Durham Citizens reflected the support of the Co-ordinate College by their actions. Referring to the Woman’s College plan, an article in the Daily Sun (of Durham) stated that: “The social life of both institutions being separate, the obstacles confronting co-education would be overcome and the full worth of co-ordinate education secured”\textsuperscript{9}. Such support from the town of Durham showed that the relations then was a good one as again, the community had a sense of belonging in the affairs of the college. The conscription of the Mary Duke building led to the displacement of the students to town. Such displacement, afforded the students more interaction with the town. There were no reports of delinquency on the part of the students or inappropriate

\textsuperscript{8} Report of President Few to the Board of Trustees, June 1912, p. 11, Duke University Archives
\textsuperscript{9} Durham Daily Sun, Durham, NC, June 30, 1904.
behavior. However, with the increase in prominence of the College, more out of
town and state people were making Durham their new home. It is not clear as to
the extent, the differences in background were going to make in the relations even
as most of the students were from the southern states.

Right after the World War II (1925), President Few had a change in mind
and thought it important to have a co-ordinate college. He wrote to J. H Reynolds,
the president of Hendrix College and stated that, “co-ordinate education was not
hostile to co-education”. He suggested the development of a co-ordinate college
that provided a “separate but equal” series of courses\textsuperscript{10}. After many efforts from
the citizens of Durham, the College inched towards its dream of co-education. It
was during this period that the new Southgate dormitory for women was built.
The dormitory, a final answer to the accommodation situation for women could
house about 130 students. At the completion of the building, nearly 150 women
enrolled at Trinity and nearly all of them resided in the new facility. So for the
most part, almost all the women were now resident on campus.

The notion of a co-ordinate college was rekindled after the war with a renewed
interest. By that time, the need for the education of women and indeed respect for them
were being manifested. It was a national trend as part of the rethinking of the after war
mentality. As most women were left to do the jobs that men did during the war, they
created for themselves, the opportunities that proved that they were capable of doing
most of the things that were considered sacredly for men. Women were involved with the
running of plants across the nation as well as some more intellectually demanding tasks.

\textsuperscript{10} R. P Few to R. P Reynolds, August 18, 1921, Few Papers, Duke University Archives.
So after the war, they were earning their respect in more aggressive ways. The society realized that there was a profound need to educate its women thereby asserting that women could and should receive a commensurate level of education as with the men. The provision of the Southgate dormitory for women and the concerted efforts of the society showed that the cause of women had ascended the priority level list. If in the previous decade, the administration thought it misplacement of priorities to embark on a co-ordinate education cause, and to conscript the only building that was available for women, then the efforts invested in the realization of a facility that can accommodate up to 130 students must reflect a change in perception and the attachment of a greater level of significance to women.

This level of significance as mentioned above manifested itself in the involvement of the town. It showed a heightened town and gown relationship that was very congenial. As one historian put it, the dormitory became “a monument to town-gown relations”\(^{11}\) The town’s involvement in the project had been unprecedented. In an attempt to raise money, an advertisement in a local newspaper stated, “...Durham, the city that has always made generous responses to every demand for improved and increased educational opportunities for its youth at any expense, will of course, promptly and gladly seize the unusual offer to provide for its young women”\(^{12}\) The town responded by raising over $100,000 while Benjamin Duke matched the sum with another $100,000. It showed the town as trying to provide the motivating impulse for the college and bearing

the interest of the college especially, its female students and their accommodation. This period obviously was a very agreeable period for the two parties and the relations then must have been at their best.

In fall of 1930, the university established the Woman’s College, a College of Arts and Science within the university that provided for the instruction of undergraduate women\textsuperscript{13}. The arrangement, provided that the eastern campus of the university (with an addition of about twelve buildings) be dedicated to the Woman’s College, “thus offering the advantages of a separate college for women with its own distinct life and at the same time, through close association with the larger University life, preserving some of the best features of co-education\textsuperscript{14}”. So the women admitted to the college were to attend the Woman’s College with most of the teaching and living affairs on the east campus. The east campus is situated about a mile and a quarter from the west campus, which was home to Trinity College.

Accommodations were provided for the women on campus as four new dormitories were built especially for the women bringing the total number of residential halls on the east campus to five. The students had options of single, double rooms or suites to choose from. With the provision of accommodation on campus, all undergraduates from out of town were to reside on campus in one of the dormitories with exceptions granted to the natives and residents of Durham at that time. However, special arrangements could be made with the dean for students who were older and wished to live off campus. Judging from documentation, the policies for the men at Trinity College

\textsuperscript{13} Duke University Bulletin of Undergraduate Instruction, University Archives, 1929-1930
\textsuperscript{14} Duke University Bulletin of Undergraduate Instruction, University Archives, 1929-1930
were different as there were no mentions of off-campus housing restrictions. Rather, students (male) who were officially admitted to the University were allowed to rent rooms for a minimum of a semester from the assortment of three groups of residence houses, suggesting that off-campus living could have been an alternative.

During this period, the women began to see refinements to rules as they pertained to them. Apart from the documented restriction of off-campus living, they had more detailed requirements for their on-campus living. For example, the men were required to furnish their blankets, sheets, pillow-slips, towels and pillows without any specifications as to the kind of materials of the required items whereas the women, in addition to the standard requirements mentioned above, were obligated to bring sash curtains of a standard kind\textsuperscript{15}. These specifications proved that the women were to receive a special kind of training to become better housekeepers. They were to be concerned about the make and presentation of their rooms while the men were not to be concerned with that. It might be instructive to consider such perception as being a general trend in the American tradition during that period where women were to be trained in certain activities that helped define and prepare them as good wives. In addition to the housing issues, women also faced restrictions with boarding (dining). While it was found “desirable for male students to board in its supervised halls”, no resident woman was permitted to board anywhere else apart from the Union. With such arrangements, Women were limited to the places to could dine while the men were advised on appropriate locations but not mandated to dine at such locations. An apparent reason why

\textsuperscript{15} Duke University Bulletin of Undergraduate Instruction, University Archives, 1930-1931
they could have been placed under such restrictions was that they could not go off-campus neither could they go over to the western campus for reasons of “dinning with men”. Again, such rules showed the sex oriented restrictions that were placed on women.16

During this period, since the residents were allowed to live off-campus, they were familiar parties to the two communities. In as much as they were residents of the Durham community, they were also ambassadors of the university. They provided means of assessment for the residents of Durham as to the placement respect for the school. Since they (the students) were also residents, there were no evident tensions in the relationship as documented during that period. For instance, if the off-campus residents had ignoble conduct in town, it was difficult to place a reason for such conduct on the school because the student also resided at home, were she was groomed in homely morals. For the women who were resident on campus, the strict rules sniffed out interaction with the town. Students were only allowed to go directly to approved functions off campus but they were not allowed to stop en-route the venue of the function. Driving with men after 8.00pm and visitations to amusement parks were prohibited.17

Although there were suggestions that the relationship between the town and gown had been a pleasant one, nuances of a contrary implication began to surface. 1932, the then dean, Dean William Wannamaker was in the contention that on campus living was the best fit for undergraduates. In his report, he expressed his hopes of not witnessing the explosion of the student population to the extent that they would rent rooms in the town.

---

16 Duke University Bulletin of Undergraduate Instruction, University Archives, 1932-1933
17 Social Regulations for Women, Duke University Archives
He also encouraged social living on campus, citing that if “proper” types of social interaction were not offered on campus, then students would search out presumably, more dangerous social engagements elsewhere\(^{18}\). Such statements expressing concern for the safety of the students implied that the Durham community was not a safe place for the students. The safety issue was not peculiar to the area but it was a national issue at that time as crime rate, especially homicide, steadily during that period\(^ {19}\). It was then a key decision for the college, which had assured parents of their children’s welfare, to ensure the safety of its students despite rising crime rates. While that was a germane decision, it also marked an informal separation of the two parties by emphasizing their distinctiveness and immediate concerns. Although there were perpetrators of crimes living in the city, most of the residents felt that they were also being associated with the crimes, a perception they felt prompted the administrators of the college to make such statements as issued by the Dean. Still, the relationship between the two communities had not developed any strong tone because of the limited interaction between the students and the community due to the restrictions. In the same year (1932), the Duke University Chronicle, the university’s student operated news paper, read, “Historical Relations of Duke and Durham Cited: Through forty years of locations in Durham, Duke and the City have operated as inseparable Communities Contributing Much to the other. Four years later, a flattering article appeared on the Durham Sun on February 29, 1936 entitled “A


Salute to Duke University for Making Durham a Finer City” 20. These publications by both parties further qualify the assertion that the relationship had been a pleasant one.

The 1940’s show a similar trend in the policies and regulations regarding to housing with just a few adjustments. As with the earlier decade, all undergraduate students who were not residents of Durham were still required to stay on campus. As for the women, the number of residential dormitories increased from the previous decade, going from five to eight buildings. This suggests that the university might have found success in the housing policy, prompting them to increase the number of housing facilities. This however, may well be as a result of the increase in enrollment at the university at that point in time generally. As President Hollis Edens reported, by the late 1940’s, the resources at the university were meant to serve a population of about 3500 students but about 5000 students matriculated. The increase in the enrollment numbers might have necessitated the building of new dormitories. Students who were twenty-one years of age, were, with special permission from the Dean allowed to stay off campus 21.

The requirements and rules governing on campus accommodation were still the same. Women were still obligated to bring with them certain items of a specified standard. One thing that stands out, as a major difference in the status of women on campus is the fact that their male counterparts were to receive housekeeping benefits from maids hired by the university. The maids were to prepare the rooms daily except for Sundays with the service beginning promptly at 8.00 am and ending at 1.00 pm. This preferential service was not available to the women as the absence documentation for such a

20 Durham Sun, February 29, 1936. “A Salute to Duke University for Making Durham a Finer City”
21 Duke University Bulletin of Undergraduate Instruction, University Archives, 1945-1946
provision suggests. The boarding restriction was still in place for the women as with the earlier decade where they were restricted to dinning at specified locations while the men were advised on the “most logical” location for dining.

Because of World War II, the town and gown relations at that time were quieted. Both communities were more concerned with the larger issue of war as Americans and had very little conscious considerations for the relations. Instead, they naturally engaged in endeavors to help with the war like providing shelter and training grounds for the military. When the war ended, since most of the regulations about housing remained the same, not much was affected by the policies. Instead, there were general efforts to rebuild the communities, both the university and the town as was with the nation at that time.

During the 1950’s, the accommodation policies in place in the 1940’s were still in effect. Number of dormitories for women in the Woman’s College remained same at eight. The Duke Bulletin for Undergraduate Instruction mentions that for instructional purposes, an additional college was established in the previous decade. The College of Engineering admitted only men as one can deduce from the bulletin by statements such as “students of Trinity College and the College of Engineering live in the same dormitories, belong to the same fraternities…”\(^\text{22}\). The status of women barely changed from the previous decade. Only noticeable changes were firstly, that while all other underclassmen in the different colleges, i.e. Trinity College and College of Engineering were allowed to have automobiles with the exception of freshmen, students at the Woman’s College were not allowed to own cars except they were seniors. Again this disparity in policies

\(^{22}\)Duke University Bulletin of Undergraduate Instruction, University Archives, 1951-1952
reinforces the notion that women were incapable of independence and appropriate decorum in the town. So by placing the restriction, the administrations intentions could have been to limit the amount of movement the women had to town and discourage any ensuing interaction that might result from such visits thereby ‘protecting’ the underclassmen who were presumably not matured enough to make good decisions.

As cited in the Woman’s college handbook\textsuperscript{23}, there were a lot of restrictions placed on the women even as very few women were approved for off campus living as discussed above. For example, the women who lived on campus as late as 1952 could only attend approved off campus activities such as dances. ‘Approved’ meant that they had to be posted. The university did not concern itself with activities around town and there could have been a lot of activities around town that would have provided positive experiences for the students and even better forums for interaction with the community in a quest to develop better relationships. When they were permitted to go out of town, they were only permitted on the grounds that they were escorted. These restrictions did not end at activities such as dances; even the places the students could visit were spelled out. For instance, the students were not allowed to visit certain parts of the hotel, or better put, they were only allowed to visit one or two parts of a hotel like the coffee shop. Amidst these rules and regulations lay the true intention of the university -- to help preserve the supposedly good morals and character of the students (who were ostensibly from good homes) and to know the source of character acquisition should a student start misbehaving. These intentions were praise worthy considering that it is a university with

\textsuperscript{23} Duke University Bulletin of Undergraduate Instruction, University Archives, 1952-1953
strong religious ties and high value on morals and character of an individual. However, they failed to factor certain considerations. One of those considerations is that for any institution, in a town with very little contributions to the industrial developments of the town as seen in researchers working with town industries, the students almost mean more than the faculty to the town. When people think about the school, apart from the structures, they think about the students. So any kind of perception the town would nurse about university, has to come because of the students. If the university had recognized that the issue of tensinal relationships between it and the town was inevitable, then it would have made considerations for that in its policies.

Because the university admitted way more students than it normally admitted, due to national issues with World War II, the university became very lax about it’s admission selectivity. With a less academically elite student body, most students got into trouble socializing during the early 1950’s. The some of the women who were now allowed to have automobiles now had the opportunities to attend parties off campus hosted by fraternities. In 1951, locals accused fraternities of being too loud too late. Such parties presumably were with the women at the Woman’s College who were sanctioned for such engagements. Moreover, the Town Girls Club also organized some of the parties that displeased the locals because of the high noise level at night. The Town Girls Club was an organization formed by a certain group of women who were permitted to live off campus\textsuperscript{24}. It was formed with the aim of making sure that the women who resided off campus were still an integral part of the campus community by ensuring involvements in

\textsuperscript{24} Woman’s College bulletin (1936-1937), Duke University Archives
social activities, mentoring of the lower class students and sports. This institution, formally formed between 1932 and 1937 went out of existence later on in the late 50’s\textsuperscript{25}.

The period between 1960 and 1970 was a period with a lot of defining events for the women at the Woman’s College. In the Duke University General Catalogue of 1962-1964, the catalogue states, “As the undergraduate colleges of the University are resident institutions, all students are required to live in the residence halls”. Exceptions to this rule were to be approved by the college’s respective deans. This policy remained till summer of 1968 when upperclassmen at the Woman’s College started pushing for off-campus living for seniors. The administration started looking into the case and consulted with several other colleges like the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Antioch College and Cornell as documented in a correspondence between an officer in charge and Provost Cole\textsuperscript{26}. A committee was set up and considered the pros and cons of such an arrangement. The pros included the point that it would launch the students gradually into the real world and make for adjustments before they have to be let alone. One of the disadvantages cited was that it would cost the University adequate control over the conduct of the students off campus. After much deliberation, the request was granted but was not effected till a year later.

As for the status of women during that period, much in resonance with the national wave of student activism, the women began to see more clearly than before, the disparities in the policies concerning them and those concerning the men at Trinity College. They began to voice their displeasure with the ‘restrictive’ rules they had as

\textsuperscript{25} Woman’s College bulletin (1959-1960), Duke University Archives
\textsuperscript{26} Letter from M. Margaret Ball to Provost Cole, November 25, 1968. Duke University Archives.
contrasted with the more liberal rules at Trinity College. In a letter from Jane Philpott, the acting Dean at the time to Provost Marcus, Philpott pointed out that “a number of students in The Woman’s College are restive about the parietal restraints that are applied to undergraduate women but not to undergraduate men. The students who are vocal about these restraints are particularly vocal about (a) the requirement that they must live on campus, and (b) their restriction to the board plan.” Such complaints brought to the fore, issues (as discussed above) which in their subtlety, had demoted women and endorsed the independence of men in the Trinity College. The women no longer considered it just to abide by rules that made them appear inferior to the men.

As more women were allowed to live off-campus, the new found liberty coupled with the already deteriorating conduct of men off campus, complicated the town and gown relations. As reported above, there had been cases of misconduct as the men that resided off-campus blared music during their fraternity parties and disturbed the residents of the neighborhoods where the parties were held at odd hours. When the women who were approved for off-campus living hired apartments in town, it gave room for more parties and disturbances as they oftentimes collaborated with the men to hold parties. There was more interaction with the people of Durham as the students ate and shopped in the town. People started perceiving the students as “snobbish”, “rich and spoilt” presumably because of their (the female students) carriage and demeanor around town. It should also be noted that by this time, the community of Durham was not an economically buoyant one and Duke University was beginning to draw to itself, an elite status, attracting more out of state students, so the disparities in economics and

backgrounds may have contributed to the perceptions. The decade would formally usher in an era of tensional town and gown relations.

After 1970, the relationship between town and gown would be a checkered one with a deteriorating tone. The increase in the student population, the widening of the economic gap between the institution and the town of Durham would serve to further worsen the relationship between the two parties. There have been conscious efforts by the school administration to ameliorate the relationship by conceptualizing ventures that will help reach out to the community, provide certain amenities as well as offer employment opportunities to the residents. The students facing the same realization started contributing to the community by offering community service. Services that students offer include mentorship and tutoring in high schools.

In conclusion, one can draw from this very rich history of the College relating to housing policies as seen reflected in town and gown relations a myriad of deductions. Firstly, during this time period, because the College was new to the town and efforts to advance the college were collaborative between the college and the town, the town and gown relations then were good. The housing accommodation in the first period was rarely provided for the women enabling the women to live off-campus. Although they had more interaction with the town, their numbers were not enough to alter any kind of relationship. Furthermore, the fact that they were mostly Durham natives made the town feel a high level of involvement and connection to the college, which contributed positively to the relations then.

The second period was remarkably different in terms of the accommodations, the status of women and town and gown relations. During this period, the battle of co-
ordination had been won. Because of the dedication of the facilities on the east campus to the women during the Woman’s College days, there were enough housing units to take care of all the accommodation needs at least during the early years of the College. While the accommodations were adequate for a housing, the status of women suffered, as they were perceived as being inferior to the men. When women were allowed to live off campus in greater numbers, the town and gown relations, which had started to deteriorate, did not make the move to town by the women a welcoming one as pertained to town-gown relations.

Overall, one can not overemphasize the contributions that national shifts in the status of women and of human rights in general to the outcomes of the housing provisions and the town interactions. With proponents of the equality of women and men working hard over the decades, the results gradually manifested. The push for the relevance of the education of women to the society strengthened and housing was a consequence of the push. So, while the demeanor of women would initially be shy, reserved and very accepting of things thrown their way, their disposition in the 20th century would be assertive and confident, demanding what they deemed best for them. While this is by all means a good direction to move their cause, some would, because of youthful exuberance, do things like excessive partying, disrespect to the town among other things that might have done the town relations no good. The housing policy has not changed much from immediate past decades as with now, where only seniors are allowed to live off-campus, but the explosion in population makes it difficult to have a tenacious control over the conduct of students in town. Moreover, the deterioration in relations is not peculiar to Duke University as most universities have that as a respectable issue of
concern, to bridge the chasm between the town and the college. Hopefully, the efforts that are being dispensed now, will unite town and gown someday, as bringing it to the glorious days of the past.