

HETSA/5-8 July 2011

Why did Keynes promote Grace I in 1921?
A Cambridge University Officer's Attitude towards Conferring Degrees on
Women

Atsushi KOMINE

20 June 2011

Provisional Version: 1.2

Section 1 Introduction

Section 2 Three Steps in the Women's Degrees Problem

2-1 Step 1: Total Failure

2-2 Step 2: Compromise Strategy

2-3 Step 3: Virtual Victory

Section 3 Why did Keynes promote Grace I?

Section 4 Concluding Remarks

4-1 Summary

4-2 Three Lessons

Section 1 Introduction

Broad studies of Keynes's economic thought gathered momentum as the 'Counter Revolution' against him has strengthened since the 1970s. For, it was necessary to research his visions located deep in his rules of process (theories) in order to take seriously the lessons regarding contemporary economic difficulties. Harrod (1982[1951]), Milo Keynes (1979[1975]), or Patinkin & Leith (1977) had already revealed Keynes's thought based on

the memories and testimony of his contemporaries. The Corrected Writings (1971-1989) further enabled deeper research on the basis of primary documents. The fruits of this research are ample; for example, Dostaler (2007), Hirai (2008) and four biographies¹. Among them, not a little research paid attention to Keynes on the side of practical man as well as theorist. Dostaler (2007: 2) regarded him as “a man of action as much as thought” and Nasu (1995: 3) argued that “the so called ‘Keynesian Revolution’ could not have happened without his wide experience as a man of affairs”. Skidelsky (2009: 56) summarized as follows:

Keynes was also extremely practical. ... His theoretical speculations issued into compact plans of action, which could be slotted into the existing institutions of government, and which could therefore be made to happen without huge convulsions in established practice ...

To sum it up, a number of researchers came to recognize that his theories and practical behaviour should be nondivisible as an entity generated from deep within his economic thought.

Nevertheless, his role as University Officer gained little publicity. Nasu (1995) referred to Keynes’s bursarship at King’s College but not to other efforts in the University of Cambridge. The above biographies always touched on this side², but did not necessarily inspire specific and advanced studies. The topic, Keynes as a Cambridge University Officer, however, is very important, especially the specific topic of women’s degrees in the early 1920s. It is said that the younger Keynes was a radical rebel against Victorian virtues, while the older Keynes became more conservative³. The former valued aesthetic contemplation, love and friendship highly, while the latter came to suit with secular values, a public sense of responsibility

¹ Skidelsky (1992[1983]), Hession (1984), Moggridge (1992) and Felix (1999).

² For example, see Harrod (1982[1951]: 304) and Moggridge (1992: 353).

³ Skidelsky (1992[1983]: 26) regards ‘the presuppositions of Cambridge civilisation’ as more serious than ‘the presuppositions of No. 6 Harvey Road’. Regarding discussions on the origin of Keynes’s thought, see Bateman & Davis (eds.) (1991).

and some types of tradition. Then, what were the transition period and area like? In this regard, the topic of women's degrees in the early 1920s is the most appropriate case. In 1920 Keynes turned 37, neither a young don nor old. The University problem involved both private matters and the public sphere. In addition, women's problem is the topic his master Marshall had once been engaged in, thus, some contrast between the two should be revealed.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 examines three steps in the women's degrees problem in 1920/21. Section 3 discusses three reasons behind Keynes's action. Section 4 draws conclusions with some lessons from this topic.

Section 2 Three Steps in the Women's Degrees Problem

This section deals with Keynes's involvement in conferring formal degrees on women in Cambridge in the early 1920s. We divide the course of events into three steps or terms. The first term is until December 1920, in which Keynes had not played a central role. The second covers November 1920 to October 1921, when he was actively involved in the matter as a Council member of the Senate. The third is the aftermath of the results of the polling day in October 1921.

2-1 Step 1: Total Failure

We firstly take up C. R. Fay (1884-1964), a close friend and colleague of Keynes's at King's College and the faculty of economics. Fay, a historian, was one of the central figures in economics courses for Tripos, and eager to reform college and university systems, as well as Keynes. Fay submitted a letter to the *Cambridge Review [CR]* in June 1918, criticizing two types of popular voices against conferring full status on women: (a) war time was not a proper time to reform; and (b) a full, not half, measure was necessary, which meant that it would take much time. Opinion (a) meant that, he argued, every inequality not directly concerned with the war

was to be perpetuated, and Opinion (b) indicated that people were degenerating from inaction to inaction, till they could not do anything positive and bold. Thus, we had to take action now⁴. Fay also expressed an opinion at a congregation of the Senate on 30 October 1919, the opinion that the admission of women teachers into full and equal membership would increase educational efficiency in history, economics and modern languages⁵. His words and action led to his appointment as a member of a Syndicate concerning the relation of women students to the University⁶.

The Syndicate, consisting of 13 members, published its final report on 7 May 1920⁷. The report was completely divided reflecting conflicting opinions in the University. The Vice-Chancellor (Peter Gilles, Emmanuel College) did not signed at all. 6 members signed Report A, whereas the remainder signed Report B.

The two were contrastive. Report A simply proposed to admit women to full membership, while there were two limitations. The University reserved effective power over the number of the women students, and over the conditions of their residence. That is to say, only a small number could be matriculated at Girton or Newnham. On the other hand, Report B developed a strong and detailed objection against Report A. The spiritual and material wealth of Cambridge was the possession of the colleges, even more than of the University. Admitting women to such colleges would destroy their traditions. The educational aspect of the question was also important. It was doubtful whether the systems of teaching and examination which were best suited for men were also most adequate for women. Indeed, each system such as men's universities, women's ones and mixed ones had their merits. However,

the educational system of the country should not be of one uniform type The

⁴ "Women's Degree", by C. R. Fay, *CR*, 6 June 1918, pp. 436-437.

⁵ "Discussion of a Report", (held on Thursday 30 October 1919). *Cambridge University Reporter [CUR]*, 11 November 1919, pp. 253-254.

⁶ "Acta", (dated on 6 December 1919), *CUR*, 9 December 1919, p. 354.

⁷ "Report of the Syndicate on the Relation of Women Students to the University", (dated on 7 May 1920), *CUR*, 11 May 1920, pp. 935-943.

mixed university ... may be a very good thing. ... And yet to have all universities in the country of this one type would diminish instead of promoting educational efficiency and would impoverish educational ideals⁸.

Therefore, the conclusion was the creation of a new University based on Girton and Newnham Colleges. The new University could share libraries and laboratories, but examinations and degrees should be separate. Report B reflected ‘men’s college supremacists’ who attached importance to intimate communities excluding outsiders and external standards.

Will Spens (1882-1952), who signed Report B, also propounded an alternative, ‘a possible federal scheme’. His intention was to satisfy both male traditions and female requests. The Senate should consist of two houses, men and women. Each house had autonomy regarding their own matters. However, there should be a joint meeting as to matters concerning both. Degrees should be given in a congregation. The problem was how to pass Graces⁹. When Graces concerned both men and women students or members, they should be submitted first to the men’s house. After they had passed with or without amendment, they would be submitted to the women’s house. When a divergence arose, a two-thirds majority in a joint congregation could decide the matter. McWilliams Tullberg (1998[1975]: 138) describes this scheme as “distinctly disadvantageous to women”. For, at that time, the proportion of male to female students was 10 to 1. Despite this criticism, Spens was evidently seeking a more effective way to compromise with both camps.

Some economists in Cambridge were eager to discuss the two Reports. In October 1920, there was held a congregation at the Senate to discuss the Reports¹⁰. *Cambridge University Report* [*CUR*] recorded 17 members

⁸ *CUR*, 11 May 1920, p. 939.

⁹ A formal motion submitted to the Senate, with the sanction of the Council. See Stubbings (1995[1991]: 57).

¹⁰ *Cambridge Review* recorded that it was “quite an unusual spectacle” that “chairs and benches were filled with listeners”. “Senate Debate on Women’s Degree”, *CR*, 22 October 1920, p. 22.

expressing their opinion¹¹. Among them two economists supported Report A. Dr. Clapham (1873-1946), a future first Professor of Economic History in Cambridge, said that “men and women worked in perfect harmony in the mixed University”¹². Fay argued that, after admitting equal partnership, female teachers would benefit more greatly than female students from being formal members at their Special Boards¹³.

The fatal votes began at 9 a. m. on 8 December 1920. Report A was defeated by 904 votes to 712 (total 1616)¹⁴. However, resident members of the Senate were, as a whole, for equal membership (See Chart 1). The total number of active University Residents, that is to say, not only resident in Cambridge, but occupied in teaching for the University or for a College, or in some other direct University work, was 491 at that time. Out of them, 86 members abstained, 214 voted for Report A and 191 against. 27 Professors were for and 15 Professors were against¹⁵. About 59 % of the non-resident members voted against women’s formal membership. Undergraduates

	Placet	Non-Placet	Total
Total	712 (44.1%)	904 (55.9%)	1616
Teaching Residents	214 (52.8%)	191 (47.1%)	405
others	498 (41.1%)	713 (58.8%)	1211

Chart 1. Voting on Report A (December 1920)

spontaneously organized a poll amongst themselves as they were not members of the Senate. 3213 (67 % of the resident undergraduates) had voted, 884 for, and 2329 against Report A¹⁶. This figure means that male

¹¹ “Discussion of the Report of the Syndicate on the Relation of Women Students to the University”, (held on 14 and 15 October 1920), *CUR*, 28 October 1920, pp. 190-207.

¹² *CUR*, 28 October 1920, pp. 193-194.

¹³ *CUR*, 28 October 1920, pp. 201-202.

¹⁴ “Acta”, *CUR*, 10 December 1920, p. 395.

¹⁵ “Analysis of the Vote of Dec. 8, 1920”, *CR*, 18 February 1921, p. 248. “Vote of Dec. 8, 1920 -Corrigenda”, *CR*, 25 February 1921, p. 263.

¹⁶ “University Journal”, *Cambridge Chronicle [CC]*, 8 December 1920, p. 3. *CC* described the voter turnout as 69 %, but 67 % was right according to the total number of the undergraduates (4789). See “The Residents List”, *CR*, 22 October 1920, p. 23.

students were generally stronger objectors than teachers. The Union Society, a famous debating club, of which Keynes was once the President in 1905, had proposed a motion several times that welcomed the admission of women to all privileges of the University in full equality with men. In May 1920 the motion was accepted¹⁷, but in November 1920 it was rejected¹⁸. These numbers indicate that socially-aware students were likely to accept gender equality, whereas a majority of the students came to show overt hostility towards it as the voting day approached. In essence, teachers' respect for women was totally defeated by the hostility of most students and conservative graduates.

The two camps were equally defeated when it found that Report B was also rejected on 12 February 1921¹⁹. The women problem stuck in a dead end. There were only the two options for a solution: a scheme either for full membership or for creating a new Women's University. The matter was complicated and entangled, thus it was impossible to represent the majority's preference simply in those two extreme ways. Naturally another character or approach was necessary.

2-2 Step 2: Compromise Strategy

Just a month before the polling day in December 1920, half of the Council members were elected. The maximum number of members was fixed to 18 according to the Act²⁰, but usually the Chancellor did not attend meetings and the Vice-Chancellor (Giles) was at that time elected from the representatives of Heads of Colleges. So basically 16 members discussed general matters concerning the University as a whole. Neville Keynes had been a member since 1893 as Secretary, as well as Registry since 1910.

¹⁷ 365 votes in favour versus 266 against (total: 631). "The Union Society", *CR*, 21 May 1920, p. 342.

¹⁸ 337 votes in favour versus 423 against (total: 769). See McWilliams Tullberg (1998[1975]: 149).

¹⁹ 50 votes in favour versus 146 against Report B. "Acta 12 February 1921", *CUR*, 18 February 1921, p. 660.

²⁰ See Articles 6 and 9 of the Cambridge University Act (1856). The Registry of the University (ed.) (2009[1914]: 145-146).

Sir E. Rutherford, J. M. Keynes and Mr Spens, all newly elected, played a vital role in women's issues.

The central Government had decided that considerable "grants could not be made without an enquiry sufficient enough to satisfy Parliament"²¹ and established the Royal Commission on Oxford and Cambridge Universities on 14 November 1919. To inquire mainly into four aspects²², the Commission, consisting of 23 members²³, made a business trip to Cambridge in August 1920 and took evidence from numerous resident members (Evans 2010: 30). Among others, Keynes also testified to the Commission (Harrod 1982[1951]: 304).

Keynes played a vital role in dealing with women's problems from the moment of his election as Council member. According to Council minutes of 6 December 1920, the Secretary of the Royal Commission expressed a desire to receive the written views of a few representative members of the University. The Vice-Chancellor requested members to suggest the names of suitable persons to reply²⁴. The minutes did not record the names, however, it was evidently Keynes who was, among others, in charge of answering, judging from correspondence in the Keynes Papers of King's College, Cambridge:

The Royal Commission ... are anxious to supplement the memoranda ... by obtaining representative local opinion ... with regard to the government of the University. / ... the Commissioners have not yet arrived at definite conclusions²⁵.

²¹ *Royal Commission on Oxford and Cambridge Universities: Report*, Cmd 1588, London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1922, p. 7.

²² The financial resources and their administration within the University, the government of the University, and the relations of the Colleges to the University. See *Royal Commission on Oxford and Cambridge Universities: Report*, p. 5.

²³ The Chair was Asquith and the Deputy Gerald Balfour. B. Athena Clough, the Vice-Principal (later Principal) of Newnham, joined as one of the two female members.

²⁴ *Council of the Senate Minutes*, Min.I.20B (1920-1921), Manuscript Room, University Library, University of Cambridge, 6 December 1920, p. 83, Section 13.

²⁵ From C. H. Stocks (Secretary of the Royal Commission) to J. M. Keynes, 15 December 1920, UA/5/1/94, the Keynes Papers [KP], Modern Archives, King's College, University of Cambridge.

The last sentence shows that the Commission was ready to be, partly at least, persuaded by university teachers.

Keynes not only replied to the questionnaire, including 10 questions²⁶, from the Commission, but also seemed to make out a draft of the formal University reply based on his own²⁷. He exchanged views with Spens and redrafted²⁸. Keynes's reply included the following points: he was in favour of the creation of a Resident Body consisting of University teachers or officers²⁹. He was in support of the existing system of electing the Vice-Chancellor, the order of rotation of the Heads of the Colleges, because the Heads system itself had the hospitality and dignity which were required to the Vice-Chancellor³⁰. He opposed the appointment of outside representatives to supervise internal organizations such as the General Board of Studies and the Financial Board. For, external members could rarely attend meetings and were useless in practice³¹. Instead, a periodical Royal Commission should supervise the University and report *ex-post facto*³².

Keynes, who might have been irritated by conservative members in the Council such as Professor Sorley and Mr Gray³³, appealed to public sentiment in the University as well. In February 1921, he expressed his opinion in the *Cambridge Review*³⁴. This letter³⁵ revealed his basic way of

²⁶ "Universities Commission: Questions about University Government, Cambridge", UA/5/1/97-99, KP.

²⁷ [A reply to University Commission], undated [December 1920], typed with MA, by Keynes, UA/5/1/100-105, KP.

²⁸ From Will Spens to J. M. Keynes, 1 January 1921, UA/5/1/95-96, KP.

²⁹ Keynes' reply to Questions 1, 2 and 3, UA/5/1/100, KP.

³⁰ Keynes' reply to Questions 4 and 5, UA/5/1/101, KP.

³¹ Keynes' reply to Question 9, UA/5/1/104, KP.

³² Keynes' reply to Question 10, UA/5/1/105, KP.

³³ A motion by them was rejected in January 1921, the motion that only Girton and Newnham should be on a basis of a new University. *Council of the Senate Minutes*, Min.I.20B (1920-1921), 17 January 1921, p. 84, Section 5.

³⁴ This weekly magazine, including club activities, poems, book reviews and letters to the Editor, started in 1879 and ended in 1998. The purpose was to give a representation of the life and thought of the University.

thinking on women's problems.

Quite apart from the right to vote in the Senate, it is, in the opinion of most male teachers in the University, a grievance that a woman, however, well qualified, should be debarred on the sole ground of sex, from eligibility for University prizes and studentships and from University lectureships, Readerships and Professorships, *which are the reward and encouragement of sound learning*. It is also a grievance, for the men teachers in the University as well as for the women, that we should be debarred from electing our women colleagues on Boards of Studies, *however useful* we may deem the assistance of particular individuals to be.

Keynes first emphasized two practical grievances: unequal opportunities which discouraged women from studying hard, and closed job appointments which diminished educational efficiency.

The following point, Keynes then continued, was that it was “disgraceful” and an “injustice” that the name of a Girton female lecturer (Mrs Wooton) was advertized not in the main body of the lecture list, but in a tiny footnote to a title entered under the name of a male lecturer (Hubert Henderson). This meant that female lecturers were not admitted as formal staff. Keynes described the Master of St. John's (R. F. Scott) as “obviously untruthful”³⁶, for the Master pretended to be in a middle position and concealed the above problems. He also pointed out that an “action by the Commission would be improper interference from outside on a domestic matter” and if a House of Residents could not by itself accomplish much-needed reforms, the Royal Commission would go further to intervene on a larger scale³⁷.

In February and March 1921, there were larger movements at the

³⁵ “Correspondence: Women's Degrees”, *CR*, 42, 21 February 1921, pp. 273-274, Emphasis added.

³⁶ Keynes cut these aggressive expressions off the draft. From J. M. Keynes to the Editor of the *Cambridge Review*, 21 February 1921, UA/5/2/2-4, KP.

³⁷ A local newspaper recorded that “Mr. J. M. Keynes breathes out fire and threatenings of short and quick shrift from the Royal Commission”. “University Journal”, *Cambridge Chronicle [CC]*, 2 March 1921, page 5.

Council towards normality in the University. It was resolved that “the Vice-Chancellor was requested to take steps to ascertain whether a compromise between the different parties was possible on the question of Women’s Degrees”. After conferring with some members of the Council, the Vice-Chancellor decided to invite the signatories of a proposed paper to the Council. 12 members including Keynes, Spens, Clapham and Rutherford³⁸, unanimously resolved the following points in the paper: (1) women students shall be matriculated at women’s colleges with a distinct disciplinary body. (2) They shall be eligible for all degrees except membership of the Senate. (3) The number of resident women in *statu pupillari* shall be within 500. (4) A Professor elected from the body of Women Graduates shall not be *ex officio* Head of the Department. (5) Women shall be eligible for all Scholarships and Prizes, and for all Professorships, Readerships, Lectureships, etc. and for memberships of Boards and Syndicates³⁹. As we shall discuss later, these points are along the same lines as Keynes’s claims.

It was Keynes who seized the initiative when the above paper was discussed at the Council on 7 March 1921. Keynes first moved, Professor Rutherford seconding⁴⁰, that “the Council appoint a Committee to draft a Report to the Senate containing Graces for carrying out the proposals of this Report”. Professor Sorley immediately moved as an amendment, Mr Gray seconding, that a Syndicate should be organized to discuss the memorials already circulating for and against the women’s degree problem. Sorley and Gray desired to follow the normal procedures of forming Graces, because they thought that the Council members, a majority of whom were for compromising, desired to bring solutions by themselves. The amendment was rejected by 11 votes to 3 (1 not voting) and the

³⁸ The other members were Peter Giles (Vice-Chancellor), H. G. Comber, E. C. Pearce (the next Vice-Chancellor), Walter Durnford, H. F. Stewart, H. A. Holland, H. Hamshaw Thomas and T. Knox-Show.

³⁹ “Women’s Degree Committee: 1 March 1921”, *Council of the Senate Minutes*, Min.I.20B (1920-1921), annexed, 7 March 1921, between p. 91 and p. 92.

⁴⁰ A motion should be followed by one seconding at the Council. How to decide was a relative majority system.

original motion was agreed by 13 votes (2 not voting). As a result, Keynes, Spens, Innes and Sir W. Dunford were appointed members of the first Committee to draft a report and Sorley and Gray of the second Committee⁴¹.

A series of memorials were published one after another. On 8 March 1921, two memorials were disclosed in public: the first was oriented in the same direction as the above report with 12 signatories. 113 members, including C. W. Guillebaud, a nephew of Alfred Marshall, signed this memorial; the second claimed that “the University ought to remain a University for men’s education directed by men” and only diploma of titular degrees would be given to suitable women. R. F. Scott headed the list of 102 signatories⁴². Further, Knox-Show, a member of the Council, announced he would publish a memorandum to agree with a compromise plan⁴³. 187 signed this memorandum. Out of 187⁴⁴, 115 voted placet on Report A in December 1920, 50 voted non-placet, and 22 did not vote⁴⁵. That is to say, regardless of the previous voting action, a wide range of members was deeply concerned with finding a solution. Women’s colleges, responding to this movement, welcomed to the proposal to confer titular degrees and vowed that they “would not take steps to appeal to the Commission”⁴⁶.

On 25 April, two reports, prepared by the two Committees appointed on 7 March, were laid before the Council, and after some amendments, it was resolved that the Registry was requested to prepare a combined Report

⁴¹ *Council of the Senate Minutes*, Min.I.20B (1920-1921), 7 March 1921, p. 91, Section 7.

⁴² “Memorials to the Council of the Senate on the Relation of Women-Students to the University”, (dated on 7 March), *CUR*, 8 March 1921, pp. 710-712.

⁴³ See also *Council of the Senate Minutes*, Min.I.20B (1920-1921), 2 May 1921, p. 94, Section 10.

⁴⁴ The figure of McWilliams Tullberg (1998[1975]: 158), 177, is a mistake.

⁴⁵ “Memorial to the Council of the Senate on the Relation of Women Students to the University”, (dated on 28 April), *CUR*, 3 May 1921, pp. 902-903.

⁴⁶ “The Women’s Question”, by K. Jex-Blake (Mistress of Girton College) and B. A. Clough (Principal of Newnham College), (dated on 4 May 1921), *CR*, 6 May 1921, p. 351.

including an introduction and concrete Statutes, and that the Report should be published on 3 May, discussed on 12 May, and voted upon on 16 June⁴⁷.

The two proposals were called Grace I and Grace II⁴⁸. The former, ‘the compromise’, consisted of three elements⁴⁹: the number of women students was limited to five hundred (a Grace would change the condition); all privileges except membership of the Senate were conferred on women students and teachers, however this condition was also subject to existing special rights of particular Colleges; the discipline of men and women students was kept entirely separate. Grace I took a step towards realizing gender equality in the fields of study and research, while giving sufficient consideration to the traditional concerns held by protectors of (men’s only) colleges system. This idea, they said, “undoubtedly contain[ed] the most acceptable suggestions since Report A was voted down”⁵⁰. Grace II simply proposed titular degrees for women.

The process of making two Graces was extremely unusual in three points. First, the Council formed its own committee to consider two ideas, not appointing a Syndicate to report. This special treatment was necessary for the Council to take the initiative in reversing the result of the big issue settled just a half year ago. Second, two ideas were not separately signed, but combined into a Report consisting of two parts with the same signatories of 14 Council members⁵¹. This format was also necessary to dramatize the united effort by the Council to reach a solution. Third, the method of voting was irregular. Votes on the two proposals should have been taken at the same time, but in the event of Grace I being carried, Grace II would be withdrawn⁵². This procedure invited harsh attacks⁵³, but

⁴⁷ *Council of the Senate Minutes*, Min.I.20B (1920-1921), 25 April 1921, p. 93, Section 10.

⁴⁸ “Report of the Council of the Senate on Degrees for Women Students” (dated on 2 May 1921), *CUR*, 3 May 1921, pp. 907-911 and 3 October 1921, pp. 46-50.

⁴⁹ See Leedham-Green (1996: 192), McWilliams Tullberg (1998[1975]: 158) and Sutherland (2006: 176-177). See also “Women’s Degree”, *CC*, 12 October 1921, page 5.

⁵⁰ “The Women’s Question”, *CR*, 29 April 1921, p. .

⁵¹ Sorley and Gray rejected to sign.

⁵² “Report of the Council of the Senate on Degrees for Women Students” (dated on 2 May 1921), *CUR*, 3 May 1921, p. 907.

the Council overcame the opposition⁵⁴ because they seemed to avoid a situation where Grace II was preferable to Grace I even if both received a majority vote.

Keynes took a firm stand on approving of Grace I in the discussion at a congregation at the Senate⁵⁵. He began his words by blaming “the gallant die-hards from Clare” for speaking “lightly of the evil results of external interference”. He analyzed that most people against Report A had been afraid that either (i) men would lose final authority over men’s education, or (ii) University facilities would be overcrowded by increased numbers of women. Grace I, the compromise, should meet these objections. The important thing, Keynes winded up, was that the University itself should settle the women problem⁵⁶.

The polling day was postponed from 16 June to 20 October⁵⁷, due to possible transportation troubles caused by coal miner and related strikes⁵⁸. The Council had to give extra consideration that even non-resident members could easily vote by coming Cambridge. By accident, this postponement gave both camps time to contemplate.

During this period, Keynes exchanged most important letters with Spens in September 1921. Spens was very worried about the situation, stating that “if the University did not accept a compromise which the women accepted, there would almost certainly be interference by

⁵³ A letter from W. L. Mallison (Chairman, Master of Clare College) *et al.* to Vice-Chancellor (dated on 13 May 1921), *Council of the Senate Minutes*, Min.I.20B (1920-1921), annexed, 16 March 1921, between p. 96 and p. 97.

⁵⁴ *Council of the Senate Minutes*, Min.I.20B (1920-1921), 16 March 1921, p. 96, Section 6.

⁵⁵ Apart from Keynes, Spens, Fay and Clapham remarked. “Discussion of the Report” (dated on 12 May 1921), by Mr Spens, Mr Fay and Dr Clapham, *CUR*, 24 May 1921, p. 1031, p. 1035 and p. 1036.

⁵⁶ “Discussion of the Report” (dated on 12 May 1921), by J. M. Keynes, *CUR*, 24 May 1921, p. 1038.

⁵⁷ *Council of the Senate Minutes*, Min.I.20B (1920-1921), 4 June 1921, p. 99, Section 8.

⁵⁸ See McWilliams Tullberg (1998[1975]: 160). Once in May 1897 special trains ran between Kings-Cross London and Cambridge for non-resident members of the Senate. “To the Editor of *The Times*”, *The Times*, 21 May 1897, p. 14.

Parliament”. It was desirable that influential graduates such as Austen Chamberlain should say something.

Unfortunately I do not know Chamberlain personally, ... I cannot approach him myself. ... but I fancy you will know him pretty well, and if so and if you at all agree with my view of the situation, I think much the best plan might be for you to make or take some chance of discussing the whole situation with him and making some such suggestions as the above⁵⁹.

Keynes, on his holidays in Charleston, replied quickly. This confidential letter reveals his basic way of thinking. He began his letter with the words, “Your letter of the 2nd September is very interesting, though I hope you are unduly pessimistic. I believe we shall win without much doubt, if only we can get out supporters to vote”. He continued:

However, last night I happened to be staying with Asquith and discussed the situation with him. He was horrified to learn that there was any doubt as to a successful issue of the October Vote. He told me that the Commission will not be reporting before the end of the year; that is to say, *sometime after the Vote*. If, he said, the Non-Placets were to win, that would certainly make a profound difference to their report. He was also very decidedly of the opinion that the Non-Placets would not obtain the faintest degree of Parliamentary support; but the report of the Commission would necessarily bring the issue into the political arena; and that in that event the opponents of the women could not possibly hope for success.

Of course *this was confidential*. But I do not think there would be any harm in your letting it get round privately to the opposition that the Commission will not be reporting until after the Vote; ... They will therefore be doing a great injury to the University...

... our right tactic will be to circulate a fly early in October bringing right out

⁵⁹ From Will Spens to J. M. Keynes, 2 September 1921, UA/5/2/5-7, KP.

into the open the threat of external interference. We could point out that in that event the compromise would fall to the ground, and in all the general turmoil which would follow *the interests of the University* would certainly suffer. ... Even if the threat of interference enrages the opposition I do not think that this matters. Our business is not so much to attend to them as to attend to our own supporters⁶⁰.

This letter reveals three elements. First, Keynes's ultimate end was not constraints related to old colleges or preposterous conventions, but University interests associated with research and advanced education. Second, his concrete measures were practical: the tactics were to stimulate moderate members to take action, by suggesting the threat of external interference. Third, he was optimistic about the consequences in the near future.

His suggestions in the letter were possible thanks to his deep interchange with the inner-circle of government. Chamberlain, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, placed his trust in Keynes, stating that "in my absence he will be received on the same footing as I should be if I were present"⁶¹. Keynes, on the other hand, was close to the Whigs rather than the Tories. From the autumn of 1915, Keynes became friendly with the Asquiths and the McKennas among other elite circles. He recalled as follows: Asquith's "temperament was naturally conservative. ... he was the perfect Wig for carrying into execution those Radical projects ... which were well judged" (Keynes 1972 vol. 10: 38-39). Asquith had refused to hear demands from suffragists (Strachey 1928: 315). However, at last in August 1916 he gave up his opposition against women's right to vote after crediting women's direct and indirect achievements during the War (ibid.: 354). Keynes might favour this pragmatic temperament⁶². The honeymoon

⁶⁰ From J. M. Keynes to Will Spens, 8 September 1921, emphasis added, UA/5/2/8-9, KP.

⁶¹ Keynes (1971 vol. 16: 415) and Dostaler (2007: 143).

⁶² Nevertheless, the honeymoon period ended in 1926 when the General Strike arose. Keynes for the first time approved of Lloyd George, who was positive about the Strike, and criticized Asquith, who blamed union leaders for illegal actions. Keynes could never meet Asquith again, who was furious about Keynes's article, although his

with high-ranking statesmen enabled him to access confidential information, which in turn formed his confidence to persuade other people.

The members' poll was held on Thursday 20 October 1921. It had been difficult to forecast which camps were predominant⁶³, with numerous fly-sheets for and against flying about. Just when St. Mary (University Church) bells rang at half past 8 a. m., it turned out that Grace I failed by 694 to 908 (total 1602) and Grace II succeeded by 1011 to 369 (total 1380)⁶⁴. Keynes's effort to pass Grace I seemed to have come to nothing, and just barely obtained titular degrees.

2-3 Step 3: Virtual Victory

Does the fact that Grace I was denied in 1921 indicate that Keynes was defeated in the long run? The answer is negative — quite the opposite.

The Report of the Royal Commission published in March 1922 was as Keynes predicted based on Asquith's secret information. The good news was that the Report did not adopt a hostile attitude towards the University. In fact, it recommended the same contents as Grace I although it was sometimes more conservative than Grace I. The Report said as follows: It was financially necessary to support women students, thus a grant of £4,000 a year would continue for ten years. The most serious practical grievance of women at Cambridge was that the teachers, however qualified, were not eligible for posts or offices in the University, and were excluded from teaching organizations. Trials to reform this were rejected due to the non-residents' voting. On the other hand, Cambridge should remain predominantly a 'men's University', that is to say, the offices of Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Proctor should not be open to women. Besides, a

obituary reconciled him with Mrs. Asquith (Dostaler 2007: 114).

⁶³ "No one seems to be very confident how the vote will go. If the non-residents abstain from voting Scheme I. is almost certain to be carried". "Women's Degree", *CC*, 12 October 1921, page 5.

⁶⁴ "Acta" by John Neville Keynes (Registrar), *CUR*, 25 October 1921, p. 171. See the following: "No Women Members at Cambridge: Grace I. Defeated", *The Times*, 21 October 1921; "University Journal: Grace I. and II.", *CC*, 26 October 1921, page 3; McWilliams Tullberg (1998[1975]: 165), Leedham-Green (1996: 192).

limited number of women undergraduates (500) should matriculate at Girton or Newnham, and some of them should live with their parents. Evidently the Report accepted all the elements of Grace I and did not accuse resident members of rejecting Grace I because non-residents were regarded as responsible for it. In addition, the Report took conservative teachers (some College fellows) into account when recommending some preservation of men's power.

The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act was enacted on 31 July 1923. Clause I of the Act provided that the University of Cambridge Commissioners (11 members) should be established. Clause 6 provided that the Commissioners should make statutes for the University in accordance with the Report of the Royal Commission (1922), after careful thought of the admission of poorer students. In the Act, there were no words regarding female students and teachers, however the Report was enough as a guide.

In advance of the legislation, the economics group had embarked on reform respecting female problems. Since 1903, when the Economics Tripos was launched, the group had organized the Special Board for Economics and Politics, in a similar manner to other groups. There several elected members dealt with practical business such as schemes of courses of study, examinations and studentships. The chairman and the secretary were elected from among its members every year. The secretary recorded minutes autographically. The chairman approved the previous minutes by signing next time. After entered checking the minutes, it found that the first day at which a woman entranced was 8 December 1920. By a curious coincidence, that was the same day as the polling for Report A. "It was decided to invite Miss [sic, Mrs] Wootton⁶⁵ to deliver the causes of [..., *unreadable*] on the Economic Functions of Government in place of Mr Henderson, and actualise the lectures in any way that might be possible"⁶⁶.

⁶⁵ Barbar Wootton (1897-1988) married in 1917, but her husband died during World War I. She studied economics at Griton.

⁶⁶ *Minutes of the Special Board for Economics and Politics*, Min.v.115 (1911-1923), Manuscript Room, University Library, University of Cambridge, 100th Meeting, 8 December 1920, p. 129, Section 1.

On 25 May 1923, the Conference of Lecturers started, and approved the scheme for an Economics Department Fund and the lecture list for 1923/24. Before that, there had been a Degree Committee that consisted of economists only, to discuss economics matters, unlike the Special Board including scholars in law or politics, to discuss general matters.

Three years later, the formal faculty system was launched. The first meeting of the Faculty of Economics and Politics was held in the Marshall Library at 2:30 p. m. on Tuesday 26 October 1926. A woman teacher, Miss Tappan, for the first time attended the meeting⁶⁷. A month later, the Faculty Board for Economics and Politics, consisting of 8 male members⁶⁸, was formally organized. The minutes then said “Miss Tappan was coopted [as] an Additional Member of the Board”⁶⁹. She was nominated examiner for the qualifying examination as well as male teachers such as Lavington and Dobb. On 15 November 1927, it was agreed that “women ought to have equal eligibility with men as conditions for the Adam Smith Prize and other University Prizes”⁷⁰. The Prize was a triennial essay prize of £60, founded by Marshall in 1891. The application was open to women in line with Keynes’s claim in the 1921 *Cambridge Review*. In short, the economics group restructured its organization and rules to formally accept women students and teachers.

New Statutes was published in January 1926, assented to by the King in May, and actualized in October. The pillars of reform were roughly three points: first, the governing body was no longer the Senate including non-residents, but a House of Residents only (Evans 2010: 30). Residents directly connected with the University could control themselves, except for elections of Chancellor and burgesses for Parliament. Second, the University was re-organized to ensure higher education and advanced

⁶⁷ *Minutes of the Special Board for Economics and Politics*, Min.v.116 (1923-1929), Faculty Meeting, 26 October 1926, p. 82.

⁶⁸ Butler, Guillebaud, Yule, Clapham, Shove, Lavington, Keynes, and Alston.

⁶⁹ *Minutes of the Special Board for Economics and Politics*, Min.v.116 (1923-1929), 1st Faculty Board, 16 November 1926, p. 86, Section 3.

⁷⁰ *Minutes of the Special Board for Economics and Politics*, Min.v.116 (1923-1929), 7th Faculty Board, 15 November 1927, p. 116, Section 7.

research. In particular, middle-units (faculties and laboratories) between colleges and the University were established and self-governed to some degree. Third, the position of women was drastically improved⁷¹. Women could hold teaching offices. 183 University Lecturers were appointed by the new Statutes and among them, 11 were women⁷² for the first time.

In other words, the actual process of reform came into line with defeated Grace I, while including Grace II. Consequently, after “1926 the distinctions between titular and full membership of the university became very slight” (Bradbrook 1969: 70). The economics group anticipated this trend and at the head realized numerous reforms including the improvement of women’s status. Clapham, Fay, Robertson, and Guillebaud were instruments of change. However, the core of the reform movement was Keynes himself.

It took more than 20 years until gender equality became true at last. As of September 1946, 2 women were Professors, 20 were University Lecturers, and 2 were Heads of Department (McWilliams Tullberg 1998[1975]: 180). A Syndicate to examine women’s problems, appointed in January 1947, published its report in June. The report recommended the full membership of women on the same terms as men. The Grace was put to the vote on 6 December 1947. This time everything went well. Finally the Proctor pronounced the word ‘Placet’. The caps were lifted and replaced again. This was the very moment when the full membership was admitted after long struggles.

Section 3 Why did Keynes promote Grace I?

Why did Keynes promote Grace I in 1921? We set up three types of reasons: a premise of his action, a central reason, and a profound element below the surface.

⁷¹ See Statute B Chapter IV-1, Statute D Chapter VII-8 and Statute E Chapter I-8. The Registry of the University (ed.) (1928: 15, 41, 58-59).

⁷² *The Historical Register of the University of Cambridge Supplement, 1921-30*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge, p. 7.

The first reason, which presupposed everything, is Keynes's philosophy about women. Around him, there existed progressive pioneering elder women and promising female students. Mary Paley Marshall (1850-1944) and Florence Ada Keynes (1861-1958) were pioneers who studied economics in Cambridge. Mary, one of the first five girls to enter Newnham College, read moral sciences (including economics) (Marshall 1950: 14) and obtained a first class at the Tripos. She became the first woman lecturer on economics in Cambridge and published *the Economics of Industry* (1889)⁷³ with her husband. However, her potentiality did not point to economics *per se* afterwards but was forced to transform itself into assistance and help. She inspired numerous girls, including Florence and Eglantyne Jebb (1876-1928). Mary was in charge of developing the Marshall Library of Economics, the library where students could borrow books for lectures on economics. Keynes gave a high tribute to Mary in her biography while implicitly criticizing her husband, Alfred. "Marshall", he wrote, "came increasingly to the conclusion that there was nothing useful to be made of women's intellects" (Keynes 1972 vol. 10: 241). Alfred's father was a tough old character and his victim was his wife. "Heredity is mighty, and Alfred Marshall did not altogether escape the influence of the parental mould" (ibid.: 162). We could here interpret that Keynes did not at all accept his master's philosophy about women.

His mother Florence also matriculated at Newnham and studied for the Higher Local Examination. When she and her husband Neville moved to Harvey Road, there were still many of the old traditions of the University but progressive elements at the same time. Admission of women to the University was one of them. Numerous female students and elderly graduates were fascinated with the Charity Organization Society started in London. Florence served as Secretary of the COS Cambridge for many years. She also served as chair of the public service and magistrates committee of the National Council of Women for 11 years, and as President during 1930/31. She became the first woman Town Councillor in

⁷³ Keynes described it as "an extremely good book" (Keynes 1972 vol. 10: 239).

Cambridge in 1914 and Mayor during 1932/33. She was a symbol of the new age embodying the spirit of social reformers.

Keynes was also fortunate to have excellent female students or colleagues. We have six examples here. First, he served as an Elector to the J. E. Cairness Scholarship of Girton College during 1909 to 1915 at least, and taught a number of able female students. He wrote a letter for a job search, stating that “I am fairly well acquainted with Miss M. Nicholson’s work in Economics ... and *I have no hesitation in recommending Miss Nicholson in the above terms*”⁷⁴. Second, he regarded Dorothy Jebb⁷⁵ (1881-1963), Eglantyne’s sister, as “amongst the very ablest of the economic students who have taken the Economics Tripos” (Skidelsky 1992[1983]: 212). Third, Keynes must have supported to Lynda Grier’s (1880-1967) promotion to lecturer in economics at Newnham. She was inspired by Mary Marshall and took Part II of the Economics Tripos. In 1915 Katherine Stephen, the Principal, consulted with Keynes as to the promotion of Grier. Taking other correspondence⁷⁶ into account, his answer must have been positive.

Fourth, he recommended Miss H  l  ne Reynard (1875-1947) for a post in economic affairs. From “the work she has done for the *Economic Journal*”, Keynes wrote, “I should judge her well suited for the post of Lecturer in Economic and Business Affairs at King’s College for Women”⁷⁷. Fifth, Keynes assumed an ambivalent attitude to Marjorie Tappan Holland (1895-1977), the first member of the Faculty of Economics argued in 2-3. On the one hand, he “was grateful for her help over” intimate knowledge of the American banking systems⁷⁸ (Patinkin and Leith 1977: 27). On the other

⁷⁴ From Keynes [no signature] to unknown, 1 June 1912, emphasis added, UA/14/1/51, KP.

⁷⁵ Dorothy and Miss Elkin worked for the Board of Trade under Layton during WWI, who was temporarily hired by Government.

⁷⁶ The “men should be sent to Miss Grier’s lectures at Newnham, which are, I hear, quite good and cover the same ground as Fay’s. I am in communication with Miss Grier about it”. From Keynes to Pigou, 9 January 1915, UA/5/1/32, KP.

⁷⁷ From Keynes to unknown, 25 May 1922, UA/14/1/101, KP.

⁷⁸ This testimony was Austin Robinson.

hand, “Keynes seems to have regarded her credentials as pedestrian and in 1932 voted against her reappointment to a university lectureship” (Aslambeigui & Oakes 2009: 31)⁷⁹. These episodes indicate that he was meritocratic irrespective of age and sex. Sixth, he praised Joan Robinson’s paper as “excellent – most beautiful and lucid” (Marucuzo & Rosselli eds. 2005: 174-175). In 1931 the Faculty Board permitted her to give eight lectures based on her draft on imperfect competition. She had also been discussing his *Treatise on Money* and gave him beneficial comments on it. All the examples show that Keynes escaped the extreme prejudice that women were good only at examinations and had little originality in advanced research. In other words, he was, unlike his master Marshall⁸⁰, convinced that women had no intellectual difficulties in reading and developing economics.

The second reason is that Keynes, as a person of affairs, attempted to eliminate unreasonable conventions. His criteria were clear: to allocate money and human resources efficiently within the limit of the University fund; to establish a just reward structure based on teachers’ effort in order to attract talented researchers; to clarify the process of personnel affairs; and to self-control the inner organization of teaching and research to some degree and at the same time to be controlled by other outside organizations to another degree.

For Keynes, who confessed that Cambridge was “pretty inefficient” (Fay 1979[1975]: 38) just in the year (1902) of his matriculation, Cambridge in the 1910s became itself to him “more and more as a sort of machine, like the India Office”, nonetheless he shall “inevitably go on and on improving it” (Skidelsky 1992[1983]: 270). From 1908 onwards, he had been engaged in drafting reform plans and discussing them with other reformers. In 1911/12 he belonged to the Reforms Committee to discuss the governance of the

⁷⁹ Tappan was fellow (1924-1963) and Vice-Mistress (1940-1941) at Girton. *Girton College Resister* says that she kept lectureship in economics at the University from 1923 to 1963. Therefore, Keynes’s vote against her must have been dismissed.

⁸⁰ Groenewegen (1995: 526) describes him as the feminist *manqué*. It means that Marshall could not escape from “unscientific prejudice” when supporting “for the sexual division of labour” (ibid.: 525).

University and “the relating of the University to women students”⁸¹, the finance, and the organization of teaching and research. His stance was to widen the University Common Fund in proportion to Colleges’ contributions in teaching to the University and to the movements of the business cycle. That is to say, he intended to create a new system of taxing colleges progressively and redistributing the money to necessary units⁸². Teachers’ stipends should, according to Keynes in 1920, “be fixed by the Faculty on elastic principles”, not “through a centralised authority on inelastic principles”⁸³. Incentive was another importance. To exclude scholarships and teaching offices was against “the reward and encouragement of sound learning”⁸⁴. His 1925 correspondence summarized his points:

I am very strongly opposed to any fixed scheme of the stipend ... I should like to keep the division of the Faculty Funds between these members as fluid as possible. I am opposed to the variation of stipends depending merely on seniority. ... If a man has not been promoted to the first grade by the time he is 36 to 40 years of age, it is much better that there should be some slight pecuniary pressure on him to seek a job elsewhere⁸⁵.

In short, Keynes required the optimum use of financial and human resources within limited funds. It was very logical for him to include able women in these human resources because he had escaped the prejudice regarding women’s abilities.

Keynes also attempted to reconcile economic efficiency with public

⁸¹ “Reforms Committee, Private for Members Only”, MA, signed by R. K. J. P., 11 March 1911, UA/13/1, KP.

⁸² “Proposed Scheme of College Contributions to the Common University Fund”, April 1911, by J. M. K., UA/13/32-42, typed, KP.

⁸³ From Keynes to the Master [Giles?], 13 November 1920, UA/5/1/89-91, KP.

⁸⁴ From J. M. Keynes to the Editor of the *Cambridge Review*, 21 February 1921, UA/5/2/2-4, KP.

⁸⁵ From Keynes to the Master (Gonville & Caius), “Faculties Finance”, 13 March 1925, UA/5/2/42-54, typed, KP.

sentiments such as 'justice' or 'fairness'. When he referred to women's problems or University reforms, he frequently added the following words: women lecturers were permanently excluded in the lecture list and debarred from the emoluments. It was "disgraceful" and they should "remove these injustices"⁸⁶. A new General Board of Studies should coordinate the proper apportionment of teachers between different subjects. The Council should nominate the members of the Board because it was "the fairest and most practical"⁸⁷. This indicates that the Council members, having broad wisdom, could handle expeditious processing.

Keynes was always a University reformer. In the process of its modernization, it was absolutely necessary to admit women to full membership, including not only titular degrees but also full access to studentships, scholarships, prizes, teaching offices, and members of the Boards. His intention was to abolish absurd conventions in the University, which followed the development of economics and consequently led to gender equality.

The third reason is located deep in his specific action. It took root in his basic way of economic thought: to solve the women's problem required the embodiment of a middle unit way, his idealistic autonomous organization to coordinate tradition and enterprise, freedom and control. The problem was more than merely gender equality, rather autonomy in the University. To abolish absurd conventions did not necessarily mean to deny the merits of traditions. In fact Keynes proposed "a return towards medieval conceptions of separate autonomies"⁸⁸. In the case of the women's degrees matter, he first felt the need to keep the University away from any interventions such as the Royal Commission and non-residents.

⁸⁶ From J. M. Keynes to the Editor of the *Cambridge Review*, 21 February 1921, UA/5/2/2-4, KP.

⁸⁷ "Organization of Teaching and Research in the University and Colleges", 25 October 1912, by J. M. K., UA/13/121-122, KP. Keynes also questioned "whether we should begin to limit the freedom of those [laissez-faire] forces by reference to what is 'fair' and 'reasonable' having regard to all the circumstances". See "Am I a Liberal?", 1 August 1925, Keynes (1972 vol. 9: 303).

⁸⁸ "The End of Laissez-faire", 1926, Keynes (1972 vol. 9: 289).

Nonetheless, he at the same time appealed his plight to outsiders and persuaded insiders to accept a compromise plan, the plan seemingly better than a strong intervention.

Keynes attempted to establish the renewal of ‘separate autonomies’ with new measures and with flexible ideas. First, the measures should be to reorganize a new middle unit (faculty and laboratory) to advance sciences (including economics). Teaching and research staff, regardless whether fellow at any College or not, should be appointed by a Faculty and fulfill their responsibilities for curriculum. The Faculty was mostly self-governed, but should be supervised (so as to point to public aims) by other autonomous organizations such as the General Board of Studies, the Financial Board, or the Council of the Senate. Second, the flexible ideas were to calculate costs and benefits within limited financial and human resources, while considering the balance with fairness and desirability depending on the situation.

Keynes in the middle of the 1920s left messages placing a high value on University autonomy. “The Universities are another example of the semi-independent institutions divested of private interest which I have in mind”⁸⁹. He continued to discuss:

the ideal size for the unit of control and organization lies somewhere between the individual and the modern State. ... progress lies in the growth and the recognition of semi-autonomous bodies ...

It is easy to give examples ... of separate autonomies ... the universities, the Bank of England, the Port of London Authority, even perhaps the railway companies⁹⁰.

the real problems of the next ten years is ... a deliberate and persevering attempt to discover how to run the best enterprises which are already public concerns efficiently and to the public advantage. ...

⁸⁹ From Keynes to the Editor of *The Times*, 25 March 1925, Keynes (1981 vol. 19: 348).

⁹⁰ “The End of Laissez-faire”, 1926, Keynes (1972 vol. 9: 288-289).

the running of these public services ... by boards whose members, chosen solely for their business capacity, were adequately remunerated. ... in that way the advantages of public ownership and responsibility would be combined ...⁹¹.

Keynes gave a few examples as to public concerns: the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the Charity Commissioners, building societies, co-operative societies and the colleges, school and the universities. He always pointed out that colleges and universities, the best example of self-government, should be efficiently managed for the sake of public purposes.

The profound reason Keynes promoted Grace I was his desire to embody an idealistic autonomy in the University. It was not a direct movement for realizing gender equality *per se*, although that was realized as a result.

Section 4 Concluding Remarks

This section deals with a short summary as a conclusion and three lessons from this topic.

4-1 Summary

The reasons why Keynes promoted Grace I, a compromise proposal that was, however, oriented towards gender equality are divided into three types. First of all, he had escaped the prejudice that women were merely better at routine work and should sustain somebody else. Pioneering models, his master's wife and his mother, and promising female students enabled him to escape from the old-fashioned attitude. This was the premise of his action. Next, Keynes aimed at the optimum use of financial and human resources to encourage the development of modern subjects including economics. For that purpose, it was absolutely necessary both to abolish absurd conventions in colleges and the University, and to actively

⁹¹ *The Manchester Guardian*, 1 August 1927, Keynes (1981 vol. 19: 696).

promote women lecturers. Lastly, he attempted to actualize in the University his idealistic organization, a semi-autonomous body. His action embodies two mixed visions: his fairness in fighting to protect minority rights⁹², and his economic viewpoints to consider pecuniary incentives and budgetary constraints. Thus the case of women's degrees could be a similar figure to Keynes's whole vision of economic management in a free society. His engagement in women's issues was, therefore, not directly or originally related to radical feminism *per se*, but led to gender equality as a result.

4-2 Three Lessons

We can take three lessons from the battles for and against Grace I.

First, gender and education is a persistent issue. Report B, as well as Marshall, asserted that "there is a question concerning the intellectual aptitudes of men and women ... The women are better at routine work but less original"⁹³. This was an extreme opinion, but less extremely, some teachers claimed that each gender had a suitable education system such as separate accommodation, classrooms and degrees. We have to study this matter with help from empirical approach.

Second, what universities are for has been a substantive question. This question can be divided into three: first, who governs a university and how? Are the main providers of autonomy those inside the university (in that case teachers only, staff including officers, or all members including students)? Or is it necessary for third parties to supervise or intervene in the universities? Second, how and to what extent should public subsidies be introduced into the universities? Does the universities' financial basis depend exclusively on tuition and fees, public aid from the national treasury, or voluntary donations? Third, what is a university's social responsibility? Some universities have a long history and others not. We have to ponder a new mission of universities for not monks or elites but just people. These issues remain open questions and will be discussed

⁹² Dostaler (2007: 23) appreciates "Keynes's struggle for women's equality, for the right to contraception and abortion, for the recognition of homosexuality".

⁹³ *CUR*, 4 October 1920, p. 64.

repeatedly.

Third, Keynes's economic thought is itself relevant and suggestive. From 1908 onwards, and in the early 1920s in particular, Keynes, also a man of practice, had been engaged in reforming the University, sometimes gradually and at other times drastically, with his excellent practical sense (drafting and planning), persuasive ability (eloquence and beautiful style of writing) and intelligence sources (human network). His remedies for women's degrees include multiple visions into, not only university reform or gender free movements, but also autonomous control in a free society to realize economic efficiency, social justice and individual liberty⁹⁴ at the same time.

Bibliography

(A) Primary literature including archival documents

CUR: Cambridge University Reporter, Cambridge: University of Cambridge

CR: The Cambridge Review: A Journal of University Life and Thought

CC: Cambridge Chronicle, Microfilm.P.94, Macroform Reading Room, University Library, University of Cambridge

Council of the Senate Minutes, Min.I.20B (1920-1921), Manuscript Room, University Library, University of Cambridge

Minutes of the Special Board for Economics and Politics, Min.v.114 (1903-1911), Min.v.115 (1911-1923), Min.v.116 (1923-1929), Manuscript Room, University Library, University of Cambridge

KP: the Keynes Papers, Modern Archives, King's College, University of Cambridge

UA/5 ... General Correspondence on Academic Matters, 1909-1946

UA/13 ... Papers concerning the Reforms Committee of Cambridge University, 1911-12

UA/14 ... Testimonials, Reports on Fellowship Dissertations and University Theses, 1909-46

A letter from J. M. Keynes to Duncan Grant, 16 February 1909 and 20 October 1909.

Add. 57930, British Library Manuscript Collections, London

⁹⁴ See "Liberalism and Labour", 1926, Keynes (1972 vol. 9: 311).

Royal Commission on Oxford and Cambridge Universities: Report, Cmd 1588, London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1922.

(B) Secondary literature

Anderson, R. D. 1995 [1992]. *Universities and Elites in Britain since 1800*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ashby, E. 1958. *Technology and the Academics: An Essay on Universities and the Scientific Revolution*, London and New York: Macmillan.

Ashby, E. 1971. *Any Person, Any Study: An Essay on Higher Education in the United States*, New York: McGraw- Hill.

Aslanbeigui, N. and G. Oakes 2009. *The Provocative Joan Robinson: The Making of a Cambridge Economist*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Bartley, P. 1998. *Votes for Women 1860-1928*, London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Bateman, B. W. and J. B. Davis eds. 1991. *Keynes and Philosophy: Essays on the Origin of Keynes's Thought*, Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.

Bennet, D. 1990. *Emily Davies and the Liberation of Women 1830-1921*, London: Andre Deutsch Ltd.

Bradbrook, M. C. 1969. *'That Infidel Place': A Short History of Girton College 1869-1969*, London: Chatto and Windus.

Cambridge University Student Union [CUSU] (ed.) 1997. *Nasty Forward Minxes: A History of Women at Cambridge University 1897-1997*, Cambridge: CUSU Women's Campaign, in Rare Book Room, Cambridge University Library [Cam. b. 997. 74].

Clarke, P. 2009. *Keynes: The Twentieth Century's Most Influential Economist*, London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

Deacon, R. 1985. *The Cambridge Apostles: A History of Cambridge University Elite Intellectual Secret Society*, London: R. Royce.

Deane, P. 2001. *The Life and Times of J. Neville Keynes: A Beacon in the Tempest*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Deane, P. 2004. "Keynes, (John) Neville", in Matthew and Harrison (eds.) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 31, 498-499.

Dostaler, G. 2007. *Keynes and his Battles*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Dyhouse, C. 1995. *No Distinction of Sex?: Women in British Universities, 1870-1939*,

- London: UCL Press.
- Evans, G. R. 2010. *The University of Cambridge: A New History*, London: I. B. Tauris.
- Fay, C. R. 1979 [1975]. "The Undergraduate", in M. Keynes (ed.): 36-38.
- Fawcett, M. G. 1924. *What I Remember*, London: T. Fisher Unwin Ltd.
- Felix, D. 1999. *Keynes: A Critical Life*, Westport, Connecticut and London: Greenwood Press.
- Gardner, A. 1921. *A Short History of Newnham College*, Cambridge, Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes.
- Groenewegen, P. 1995. *A Soaring Eagle: Alfred Marshall 1842-1924*, Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Groenewegen, P. (ed.) 1996. *Official Papers of Alfred Marshall: A Supplement*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Economic Society.
- Harrod. R. 1982[1951]. *The Life of John Maynard Keynes*, London: W.W. Norton & Company (First Published by London: Macmillan).
- Hession, C. H. 1984. *John Maynard Keynes: A Personal Biography of the Man Who Revolutionized Capitalism and the Way We Live*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Hill, P. 1995. *The Early Cambridge Women Students: The Sociological, Demographic and Sexual Contexts and the Women's Subsequent Careers*, printed as manuscript, in Rare Book Room, Cambridge University Library [Cam. b. 995. 7].
- Hirai, T. 2008. *Keynes's Theoretical Development: From the Tract to the General Theory*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Humphreys, R. 1995. *Sin, Organized Charity and the Poor Law in Victorian England*, Hampshire and London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Howarth, J. and M. Curthoys 1987. "The Political Economy of Women's Higher Education in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Britain", *Historical Research* (University of London), 60(141), February 1987, 208-231.
- Kagan, J. 2009. *The Three Cultures: Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and the Humanities in the 21st Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keynes, F. A. 1950. *Gathering Up the Threads: A Study in Family Biography*, Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons Ltd.
- Keynes, J. M. 1972. (vol. 9). *Essays in Persuasion, The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes*, London: Macmillan and Cambridge University Press for the

- Royal Economic Society.
- Keynes, J. M. 1972. (vol. 10). *Essays in Biography, The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes*, London: Macmillan and Cambridge University Press for the Royal Economic Society.
- Keynes, J. M. 1981. (vol. 19). *Activities 1922-1929: The Return to Gold and Industrial Policy*.
- Keynes, M. (ed.) 1979 [1975]. *Essays on John Maynard Keynes*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leader, D. R. 1988. *A History of the University of Cambridge*, vol. 1, the University to 1954, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leedham-Green, E. 1996. *A Concise History of the University of Cambridge*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maclure, J. S. (ed.) *Educational Documents: England and Wales, 1816 to the Present Day*, London: Routledge.
- Mahood, L. 2009. *Feminism and Voluntary Action: Eglantyne Jebb and Save the Children, 1876-1928*, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marcuzzo, M. C. and A. Rosselli (eds.) 2005. *Economists in Cambridge: A Study through their Correspondence, 1907-1946*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Marshall, M. P. 1947. *What I Remember*, with an Introduction by G. M. Trevelyan, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McWilliams Tullberg, R. 1993. "Marshall's Final Lecture, 21 May 1908", *History of Political Economy*, 25(4), 605-616.
- McWilliams Tullberg, R. 1998 [1975]. *Women at Cambridge*, revised edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McWilliams Tullberg, R. 2004. "Grier, (Mary) Lynda Dorothea", in Matthew and Harrison (eds.) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 23, 905-906.
- McWilliams Tullberg, R. 2006. "Women's Education", in Raffaelli, Becattini and Dardi (eds.) *The Elgar Companion to Alfred Marshall*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Moggridge, D. 1992. *Maynard Keynes: An Economist's Biography*, London: Routledge.
- Mulley, C. 2009. *The Woman Who Saved the Children: A Biography of Eglantyne Jebb Founder of the SAVE THE CHILDREN*, Oxford: A Oneworld Book.
- Nasu M. 1995. *Keynes, Man of Practice: The background in the Making of Keynesian Economics*, Tokyo: Chuko-Shinsho (in Japanese).

- Patinkin, D and J. C. Leith (eds.) 1977. *Keynes, Cambridge, and the General Theory*, London: Macmillan.
- Pedley, R. 1977. *Towards the Comprehensive University*, London: Macmillan.
- Power E. 1997 [1975]. *Medieval Women*, forward by Maxine Berg, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Purvis, J. 1991. *A History of Women's Education in England*, Milton Keynes; UK: Open University Press.
- The Registry of the University (ed.) 1928. *Statues of the University of Cambridge and Passages from Acts of Parliament Relating to the University*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The Registry of the University (ed.) 2009 [1914]. *Statues of the University of Cambridge with the Interpretations of the Chancellor and Some Acts of Parliament Relating to the University*, digitally reprinted, edited by John Neville Keynes, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, H. M. 1983. "J. M. Keynes and Cambridge in the 1920s", *South African Journal of Economics*, 51(3), September 1983, 280-185.
- Sanderson, M. 1999. *Education and Economic Decline in Britain, 1870 to the 1990s*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, B. 1965. *Education and the Labour Movement, 1870-1920*, (*Studies in the History of Education*, Vol. 2), London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Simon, B. 1974. *The Politics of the Educational Reform, 1920-1940*, (*Studies in the History of Education*, Vol. 3), London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Skidelsky, R. 1992[1983]. *John Maynard Keynes, Hopes Betrayed 1883-1920*, paperback edition, London: Macmillan.
- Skidelsky, R. 1996. *Keynes*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Skidelsky, R. 1997. "Keynes's Concluding Notes", in G. C. Harcourt and P. A. Riach (eds.) *A 'Second Edition' of the General Theory*, volumes 1, London: Routledge.
- Skidelsky, R. 2009. *Keynes: The Return of the Master*, London: Allen Lane.
- Strachey, R. 1928. *The Cause: A Short History of the Woman's Movement in Great Britain*, London: G. Bell & Sons Limited.
- Stubblings, F. 1995 [1991]. *Bedders, Bulldogs and Bedells: A Cambridge Glossary*, revised and enlarged version, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sutherland, G. 2006. *Faith, Duty and Power of Mind: The Cloughs and their Circle*

- 1820-1960, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, M. S. 1989. *Joan Robinson and the Americans*, New York and London: E. E. Sharpe, Inc.
- The Registry of the University (ed.) 1928. *Statutes of the University of Cambridge and Passages from Acts of Parliament relating to the University*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The Registry of the University (ed.) 2009 [1914]. *Statutes of the University of Cambridge with the Interpretations of the Chancellor and Some Acts of Parliament relating to the University*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The University of Cambridge 1932. *The Historical Register of the University of Cambridge Supplement, 1921-30*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The University of Cambridge 2009. *Statutes and Ordinances of the University of Cambridge*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vicinus, M. 1985. *Independent Women: Work and Community for Single Women 1850-1920*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Whitaker, J. K. (ed.) 1996. *The Correspondence of Alfred Marshall Economist*, vol. 3: *Towards the Close, 1903-1924*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.