

THE INTENT AND FULFILLMENT OF THE MORRILL ACT OF 1862:  
A REVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF AUBURN UNIVERSITY  
AND THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Except where reference is made to the work of others, the work described in this thesis is my own or was done in collaboration with my advisory committee. This thesis does not include proprietary or classified information.

---

Kathryn Lindsay Anderson Wade

Certificate of Approval:

---

David C. Carter  
Professor  
History

---

Robert J. Jakeman, Chair  
Professor  
History

---

Kenneth W. Noe  
Professor  
History

---

Gale A. Buchanan  
Retired Dean and Director  
College of Agricultural and  
Environmental Sciences, UGA

---

Stephen L. McFarland  
Acting Dean  
Graduate School

THE INTENT AND FULFILLMENT OF THE MORRILL ACT OF 1862:  
A REVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF AUBURN UNIVERSITY  
AND THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Kathryn Lindsay Anderson Wade

A Thesis

Submitted to

the Graduate Faculty of

Auburn University

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the

Degree of

Master of Arts

Auburn, Alabama  
December 16, 2005

THE INTENT AND FULFILLMENT OF THE MORRILL ACT OF 1862:  
A REVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF AUBURN UNIVERSITY  
AND THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Kathryn Lindsay Anderson Wade

Permission is granted to Auburn University to make copies of this thesis at its discretion, upon request of individuals or institutions and at their expense. The author reserves all publication rights.

---

Signature of Author

---

Date of Graduation

## VITA

Kathryn Lindsay Anderson Wade, daughter of Walter Edward and Kathryn (Arnold) Wade, was born January 9, 1982, in Atlanta, Georgia. She graduated from Sherwood Christian Academy in Albany, Georgia as Salutatorian in 2000. She attended Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama and graduated *summa cum laude* with a Bachelor of Arts degree in History in August 2003. She entered Graduate School, Auburn University, in August 2003.

THESIS ABSTRACT

THE INTENT AND FULFILLMENT OF THE MORRILL ACT OF 1862:  
A REVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF AUBURN UNIVERSITY  
AND THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Kathryn Lindsay Anderson Wade

Master of Arts, December 16, 2005  
(B.A., Samford University, 2003)

128 Typed Pages

Directed by Robert J. Jakeman

What was the intent of Morrill Act, and what does it mean to be a land grant university? The principal purpose of the Morrill Act, as relevant to the twenty-first century land grant institutions, was to increase the economic prosperity of each individual state and therefore the world status of the United States. In 1862, in order to accomplish this feat, the land grant institution was to provide an affordable and accessible education that catered to the to the laboring classes, the majority of which pursued agricultural and mechanical pursuits.

The overall purpose of the land grant institution has not changed. Its mission is still to provide an affordable and accessible education that is adapted to meet the needs of

the lower and middle classes, the “laboring classes.” There is an abundance of institutions that serve the upper class, with stringent admission requirements, expensive tuitions, and professional degrees. In providing an education for the laboring classes, the land grant institution should offer degrees and majors not offered by professional colleges. By providing an education adapted to the needs of the laboring classes, the land grant institution will impart an education that produces constructive and involved citizens with representation and opportunities equal to the upper classes of the country.

Two examples of land grant institutions are Auburn University in Auburn, Alabama and the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia. While the dates of their establishment, their methods of governance, and their acceptance of the Morrill Act’s funding are vastly different, they are both proud of their land grant heritage and status. How did they meet the purpose of the Morrill Act in 1862, and how are they meeting it in the twenty-first century? An in depth look at the defining periods of each of these universities will lend insight into and improve our understanding of the history and the present status of land grant institutions.

Style manual or journal used: The Chicago Manual of Style, 15<sup>th</sup> Edition

Computer software used: Microsoft Word 2003

## CONTENTS

List of Tables .....	ix
Introduction .....	1
Chapter	
1. Historical Background and Related Literature .....	4
2. The Morrill Act: Not in Letter but in Spirit .....	31
3. Auburn: Alabama Land Grant University .....	62
4. University of Georgia: Georgia's "Little Yale" .....	86
Conclusion .....	110
Bibliography .....	113



## TABLES

Table	Page
1. 1858 House of Representatives Votes .....	6
2. 1858 Senate Votes .....	6
3. 1862 House of Representatives Votes .....	8
4. 1862 Senate Votes .....	8
5. Proponents of the Morrill Act and Their Visions .....	59
6. Vocation of Graduates of the A & M College of Alabama .....	68
7. Alabama Polytechnic Institute Enrollment .....	75
8. Changes in Division and Course Enrollment .....	78
9. New Student Data for First Time Freshmen .....	82
10. Counties Contributing to Auburn University .....	83
11. Occupation of University of Georgia A & M Graduates .....	100
12. High School GPA's for Entering Freshmen .....	103
13. Average SAT Scores for Entering Freshmen .....	104
14. Freshmen Applicants by Admissions Status .....	104
15. Enrollment by College and School .....	105
16. Counties Contributing to the University of Georgia .....	106
17. 2002 County Comparisons .....	107

## INTRODUCTION

What does it mean to be a land grant university? According to some land grant university presidents today, the mission consists of three components—teaching, research, and extension—as defined by the Morrill Act of 1862, the Hatch Act of 1887, and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. University of Georgia President Michael Adams, for example, maintained in 2000 that the land grant institution’s greatest legacy was producing “students whose own lives reflect and perpetuate the ideals of our three-part mission of teaching, research, and service.”<sup>1</sup> Likewise, William Walker, a recent president of Auburn University, expressed hope in January 2004 that his resignation would “mark the beginning to a new day at Auburn and that all members of the Auburn Family will put aside their differences and work together to refocus Auburn on its true land grant mission of instruction, outreach and research.”<sup>2</sup>

While all land grant universities claim the three-part mission, each institution places emphasis on a different component. President Charles Lee of Mississippi State University believed that “while research and service are important elements of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael Adams, “State of the University Address,” 12 January 2000, <http://www.uga.edu/presofc/pdfs/speeches/SoUGA2000.pdf> (accessed 28 July 2005).

<sup>2</sup> Associated Press, “Auburn President Resigns,” *Albany Herald* (Georgia), 17 January 2004, 12B.

university's mission, learning is its heart and soul.”<sup>3</sup> Similarly, Auburn University Board of Trustees member Robert Lowder identified teaching as “the fundamental mission of the land grant colleges.” The purpose of the land grant institution, Lowder added, was to “offer high quality, affordable education,” provide “essential teaching in the sciences and agriculture,” and serve “as an institution where all of Alabama’s citizens have an opportunity to obtain necessary skills to be productive citizens.”<sup>4</sup>

What is the purpose of the land grant institution? Is the land grant mission teaching, research, and outreach? Or simply teaching? Is there more to the three-part mission? According to Charles C. Muscoplat, Vice President and Dean of the University of Minnesota College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences, “historical context is essential” to understanding the “definition or original legislative intent” of land grant institutions.<sup>5</sup> This thesis will study the historical context of the Morrill Act of 1862, the act that created the land grant institution. While subsequent acts have added to the land grant institution’s responsibility, the original purpose as intended by the proponents of the Morrill Act is not obsolete. What is the mission of the land grant institution, as defined by the proponents of the Morrill Act? How does the Morrill Act apply to the purpose of the land grant institution of the twenty-first century, and how has it been applied over the years?

---

<sup>3</sup> Charles Lee, “Comments by Dr. Charles Lee on Being Appointed President,” Mississippi State University, c2001, <http://www.msstate.edu/president/acceptance.html> (accessed 28 July 2005).

<sup>4</sup> Robert Lowder, “A Response to *The Chronicle of Higher Education* article: “An Explosive Football Scandal Raises a Tough Question: Who Runs Auburn?” *The Auburn Plainsman Online*, 1 June 2000, [http://www.auburn.edu/student\\_info/plainsman/archives/060100/060100flowder.html](http://www.auburn.edu/student_info/plainsman/archives/060100/060100flowder.html) (accessed 28 July 2005).

<sup>5</sup> Charles C. Muscoplat, “The Land Grant University: Mission Accomplished or Mission Impossible?” 8 July 2004, <http://www.coafes.umn.edu/printview/03964837-9716-44a2-a384-deacfd8791d.html> (accessed 25 July 2005).

Through the research of original documents and papers this thesis will present the intentions of the major proponents of the First Morrill Act to show the primary reasons for its creation and passage. The concern for an affordable education for the industrial classes, the need for an industrial education in addition to the existing professional and liberal arts education, and the desire to provide an education for the uneducated converged with the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862.

This thesis will address how each of these factors played a role in the creation of the First Morrill Act by examining the Congressional debates and the proposals of the leaders in the movement for a new form of education. A clear presentation of the intentions of the Morrill Act's proponents will enable land grant institutions of the twenty-first century to reevaluate their purpose and enable them to understand their heritage and status. Are the driving forces behind the creation of the Morrill Act in 1862 present in 2005?

This thesis will focus specifically on the University of Georgia and Auburn University as examples of how two land grant institutions interpreted the Morrill Act. While Auburn University began as a land grant college, the University of Georgia was established prior to the Morrill Act as a liberal arts college. The University of Georgia was in operation for more than a decade before becoming a land grant college. Auburn University worked to fulfill the land grant mission from its establishment, while the University of Georgia struggled with combining the mission of the land grant college with the mission of its elite liberal arts college. This thesis will show if and how Auburn and the University of Georgia fulfilled the intentions of the Morrill Act proponents and will reveal the status of the land grant college of the twenty-first century.

CHAPTER 1  
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND  
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In the early and mid-nineteenth century, the majority of Americans lived in rural areas, on farms and in small towns along the East coast. Life focused on the strong agricultural economy. There were few high schools, and no laws concerning compulsory school attendance. Only the sons of the wealthy attended college, traveling to England or remaining in America where they received professional training in medicine, theology, or law, or a broader liberal arts education.<sup>1</sup>

The idea of federal support for higher education was not a new idea. At the Constitutional Convention of 1787, Charles Pinckney and James Madison recommended the establishment of a federal university. In a message to Congress in 1790, George Washington urged the public to take interest in supporting science and literature in universities. In 1806 Thomas Jefferson advocated scientific farming, military training within colleges, free choice of curriculum, and public education at a higher level for those with exceptional talents and virtues, and he even suggested using grants of land as a method for endowing a national university. In a report to Congress in 1841, Alden

---

<sup>1</sup> Edward Danforth Eddy, Jr., *Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land-Grant Idea in American Education* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956), 1; Gerald L. Gutek, *A History of the Western Educational Experience* (New York: Random House, 1972), 374.

Partridge, the president of Norwich University in Vermont suggested that the public lands of the United States be used to support agricultural colleges. Despite ongoing agitation for agricultural education in newspapers and agricultural societies, it would not be until the 1860s, in the midst of the Civil War, that a bill for federally supported education for agriculture and mechanics would pass.<sup>2</sup>

In 1857, Justin Smith Morrill, a Republican representative from Strafford, Vermont, introduced a bill that proposed to establish in every state a college of agriculture and mechanic arts that would be accessible to all classes. Taken in the context of the time, agriculture included not only farming but also the sale, shipment, and use of farm products. Mechanic arts, or mechanics, referred to various industrial enterprises such as machine development, equipment construction, architecture, building construction, and transportation system design and maintenance.<sup>3</sup> The terms “mechanic arts, and mechanics” as used in the context of the mid-1800s are similar to what the twenty-first century terms the various fields of engineering and architecture.

The bill proposed to grant each state 20,000 acres of public land for each senator and representative in Congress, and 60,000 acres of public land for the territories. In the words of the bill, “the leading object” of the colleges to be founded by the land grants would be “to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe,

---

<sup>2</sup> Eddy, *Colleges for our Land and Time*, 7; Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), 250; Arnold Tilden, *The Legislation of the Civil War Period Considered as a Basis of the Agricultural Revolution in the United States* (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1937), 70-72.

<sup>3</sup> Joseph Bailey Edmond, *The Magnificent Charter: The Origin and Role of the Morrill Land-Grant Colleges and Universities* (Hicksville, N.Y.: Exposition Press, 1978), 17.

in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.”<sup>4</sup>

Most of the opposition to the 1857 bill came from southern Democrats, who considered it unconstitutional. They also viewed it as a bill that would strengthen the laboring classes of the North, and saw no reason to spend federal money educating the farmers of the South. Although it passed in 1858 by a small margin of 105 to 100 in the House of Representatives and in 1859 by 25 to 22 in the Senate, President James Buchanan ultimately vetoed it in 1859.<sup>5</sup>

Table 1. 1858 House of Representatives Votes

<b>Votes by Party</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Votes by Region</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Democrat	90	18	South	49	5
Republican	4	62	Midwest	25	26
American	5	6	West	1	1
Whig	1	18	East	25	73

Source: Congress, House of Representatives, Agricultural Colleges, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess, *Congressional Globe*, (22 April 1858): 1742.

Notes: South—States that seceded from the Union: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia; Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Wisconsin; West: California, Oregon; East: Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont

Table 2. 1858 Senate Votes

<b>Votes by Party</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Votes by Region</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Democrat	21	5	South	15	1
Republican	0	14	Midwest	6	6
American	1	4	West	0	2
Whig	0	1	East	1	16
Opposition	0	1			

Source: Congress, Senate, Agricultural Colleges, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess, *Congressional Globe* (7 February 1859): 857.

<sup>4</sup> *Morrill Act of 1862, Statutes at Large of the United States of America* 12 (1863): 503-505; Eddy, *Colleges for our Land and Time*, 33.

<sup>5</sup> Congress, House of Representatives, Agricultural Colleges, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess, *Congressional Globe*, (22 April 1858): 1742; Congress, Senate, Agricultural Colleges, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess, *Congressional Globe* (7 February 1859): 857.

The year 1862 found Abraham Lincoln in the White House, the nation divided and at war, and the North continuing to industrialize. Republicans were concerned that slavery would spread to the land in the West, but in the past had found little success in passing bills. In 1862, however, with the majority of Democrats relocated to the Confederate Congress, Congress could pass bills long opposed by southerners. Within the span of a few months in 1862, Congress passed the Homestead Act, the Morrill Land Grant Act, the Emigrant Aid Act, two transcontinental railroad acts, and approved the creation of the Department of Agriculture.<sup>6</sup>

In an effort to fill the West with free labor, Republicans favored both the Homestead Act and the Morrill Land Grant Act. The Homestead Act, signed into law on May 20, 1862, encouraged settlement of the West by small farmers. The act granted applicants 160 acres of public land for residing on the land and improving it for a period not less than five years. By dividing the land into small parcels, the Homestead Act discouraged the spread of slavery into the West. The passage of the Morrill Act, less than two months later, provided small farmers accepting the provisions of the Homestead Act with the ability to live and farm on their own.

The Morrill Land Grant Act,<sup>7</sup> presented in 1862 for the second time by Justin Morrill, passed July 2, 1862, by a vote of 90 to 25 in the House of Representatives and 32 to 7 in the Senate. In 1857 opposition to Morrill's bill came mainly from the South, but

---

<sup>6</sup> Paul W. Gates, *Agriculture and the Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), 263.

<sup>7</sup> The 1862 Morrill Act is considered the First Morrill Act. A subsequent act passed into law in 1890 is considered the Second Morrill Act. 1890 was a bleak time for African Americans. In the years leading up to the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision Jim Crow became legally entrenched and disfranchisement occurred in states across the South. In addition, the turn of the century marked a period of increased lynching and other acts of violence against blacks. The Second Morrill Act extended the First Morrill Act to establish agricultural and mechanical colleges for African Americans. Examples of land grant colleges created under the Second Morrill Act are Fort Valley State in Georgia and Alabama A & M.



in 1862 the majority of the opposition came from the Midwest. The act allotted each state 30,000 acres of public land for each senator and representative in Congress, omitted the allotment to the territories, and excluded states that were not in the Union. In response to the recognition of the country's need for soldiers, the 1862 also act called for the inclusion of military training along with agriculture and mechanic arts.<sup>8</sup>

Table 3. 1862 House of Representatives Votes

<b>Votes by Party</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Votes by Region</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Democrat	8	14	South	0	6
Republican	16	57	Midwest	21	18
Union	1	19	West	0	0
			East	4	66

Source: Congress, House of Representatives, Agricultural Colleges—Again, 37<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (17 June 1862): 2770.

Table 4. 1862 Senate Votes

<b>Votes by Party</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Votes by Region</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Democrat	1	5	South	0	2
Republican	5	23	Midwest	6	8
Union	1	4	West	0	4
			East	1	17

Source: Congress, Senate, Lands to Agricultural Colleges, 37<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (10 June 1862): 2634.

For the states in which public lands were not available, the Secretary of the Interior issued land scrip<sup>9</sup> to equal the amount of deficient acres. The state could then sell the land or scrip and use the proceeds to establish an endowment fund for a college—

<sup>8</sup> An act passed in 1866 allowed former Confederate states to take advantage of the Morrill Act once they were readmitted to the Union. Eddy, *Colleges for our Land and Time*, 33.

<sup>9</sup> When a state did not have public lands available to sell, the government issued scrip for land in the West. The state could then sell the scrip and receive the money for the land grant college.

hence the name “land grant” college. The act required states to use the endowment income for operation of the college, not for buildings.<sup>10</sup>

In the years immediately following the Morrill Act’s passage, the new institutions struggled to find their purpose as land grant colleges and universities. The act was broad; it did not specify exactly what subjects related to agriculture and the mechanic arts were to be taught, or how the institutions should teach them. A curriculum for agricultural and mechanical colleges was virtually nonexistent, as were experienced professors. New and existing institutions that accepted funds from the Morrill Act began calling themselves “land grant colleges,” but their interpretations of the act and the significance they ascribed to their status as a land grant institution varied widely. Some focused on agricultural education, some concentrated on technical education, and some directed their attention to scientific experimentation and research. Still others accepted the funding but focused on liberal arts rather than agriculture and the mechanic arts.<sup>11</sup>

In 1887, a bill passed Congress that furthered the scientific and agricultural responsibility of the land grant institution. The Hatch Act granted money for the establishment of agricultural experiment stations for research in connection with the land grant colleges across the nation. The mission of the agricultural experiment stations established in conjunction with the land grant institutions was to “aid in acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture, and to promote scientific investigation and experiment respecting the principles and applications of agricultural science.”<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Eddy, *Colleges for our Land and Time*, 33-34.

<sup>11</sup> Rudolph, *American College and University*, 253-259.

<sup>12</sup> *Hatch Act of 1887, U.S. Statutes at Large* 25 (1887): 440-441.

The experiment stations funded by the Hatch Act conducted original research and experiments according to the “varying conditions and needs of the[ir] respective States or Territories.” Topics of research and experimentation included plant and animal physiology and diseases, crop rotation, fertilizers, and the analysis of soils and water. Experiment stations were directed to perform “experiments bearing directly on the agricultural industry of the United States.”<sup>13</sup>

Like agricultural colleges, experiment stations at first faced a public skeptical of scientific agriculture. However, the research of the experiment stations proved successful and farmers across the country noted their accomplishments. The experiment stations circulated bulletins and information regarding their findings, and farmers began to value their contributions to the agricultural economy. While the Hatch Act did not alter the mission of the land grant institution, it attached the additional responsibility of experimentation and research.

In 1914, the Smith-Lever Act added yet another responsibility for land grant institutions. The Smith-Lever Act furthered the agricultural aspect of the mission of the land grant college by appropriating money for the establishment of an agricultural extension service in connection with the land grant colleges. The extension service, working in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture and the land grant institutions, would be responsible for “diffusing among the people . . . useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture, home economics, and rural energy.”<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> *Hatch Act of 1887*, 440-441.

<sup>14</sup> *Smith-Lever Act of 1914, U.S. Statutes at Large* 38 (1914): 372.

With the passage of the Smith-Lever Act the land grant triad of teaching, research, and extension was completed. However, the additional responsibilities of research and extension did not alter the original mission of the land grant university as created by the Morrill Act of 1862. While the Morrill Act featured broad language, the proponents of the act were very specific in what they desired from land grant institutions.

Land grant institutions are proud of their heritage and status, but outside of teaching, research, and extension few understand what it means to be a land grant institution. What were the primary reasons for the creation of the land grant colleges? Are the primary reasons still relevant today? The literature available on the Morrill Act does not go to the heart of the question—what were the advocates of the Morrill Act trying to accomplish? What does it mean to be a land grant institution, and what is its purpose?

Although historians have shown some interest in the Morrill Act of 1862 in recent years, the majority of literature comes from 1962, the hundred year anniversary of its passage. Most of the information and analyses of the act otherwise are confined to a few chapters within broader histories of the Civil War, education, or agriculture. The majority of the literature focuses on the controversy surrounding the authorship of the act, with some attention to the politics behind its passage. Little attention is given to the act's reception, the intent of the promoters of the act, or the act's implications. None of the literature discusses the purpose of the land grant institution as intended by the promoters of the Morrill Act.

The importance of the Morrill Act nonetheless is widely recognized, making the lack of scholarship surprising. For example, historian Frederick Rudolph observed that

the “institution that did probably the most to change the outlook of the American people toward college-going was the land-grant college,” created by the Morrill Federal Land Grant Act of 1862.<sup>15</sup> The eminent historians Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Commager called the act “the most important piece of agricultural legislation in American history.”<sup>16</sup> In 1962, on the centennial anniversary of the act, Harvard professor W. K. Jordan said the Morrill Act of 1862 “was responsible for the democratization of education and for the establishment of a healthy diversity in our whole structure of higher education.”<sup>17</sup> An 1888 circular produced by the United States Bureau of Education claimed that next to the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, the Morrill Act of 1862 was the most important educational legislation in America.<sup>18</sup> Yet despite its obvious importance to agriculture and education, the act has received little attention in recent decades.

Several consistent themes appear in the academic literature surrounding the Morrill Act. Nearly all studies include a discussion of the act’s author and speculate whether Justin Morrill deserves all the credit he receives. Other themes concern opposition to the act, its principle objectives, and the politics surrounding its passage. The concern over responsibility for authorship of the act, which figures prominently in almost every publication, seems minor compared to considerations of the act’s purposes.

Almost all of the recent literature cites the works of Edmund J. James, Isaac Kandel, William Belmont Parker, Earle D. Ross, and Edward Danforth Eddy, Jr., who wrote between 1910 and 1957. James, president of the University of Illinois, published

---

<sup>15</sup> Rudolph, *American College and University*, 247.

<sup>16</sup> Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1930), 2:196.

<sup>17</sup> *After 100 Years: A Report by the State of Vermont Morrill Land-Grant Centennial Committee* (Montpelier: 1962), 13.

<sup>18</sup> Frank W. Blackmar, *The History of Federal and State Aid to Higher Education in the United States*, US Bureau of Education Circular of Information # 1 (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1890).

*The Origin of the Land Grant Act of 1862* in 1910. His book sparked the debate regarding the Morrill Act's authorship, and James's conclusions have since been discussed in most of the literature on the Morrill Act. James argued "that Jonathan B. Turner, at one time professor in Illinois College at Jacksonville, Illinois, was the real father of the so-called Morrill Act of July 2, 1862, and that he deserves the credit of having been the first to formulate clearly and definitely the plan."<sup>19</sup> While James recognizes that the act can probably not be attributed to any one man, he maintains that Turner convinced the Illinois legislature to support the use of land grants for an industrial education, making the state the first to take such a step. James concludes that through pamphlets and letters Turner reached prominent people with his idea. When Morrill proposed the bill to the United States Congress for the first time in 1857 and again in 1862 the language of the bill belonged to Turner, not Morrill.<sup>20</sup>

The idea of agricultural and mechanical education clearly did not originate with Morrill or Turner. The idea was in the works as far back as 1790, and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 included the use of land grants for education. James moreover bases

---

<sup>19</sup> Jonathan Turner's plan was called the Illinois Plan and advocated the establishment of an industrial university. The term "industrial" refers to the members of the working class, largely made up at the time of agriculturalists and mechanics, as defined in paragraph two of Chapter 1. Edmund J. James, *The Origin of the Land Grant Act of 1862: (The so-called Morrill Act) and Some Account of its Author Jonathan B. Turner* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1910), 7. Despite the fact that this book was published in 1910, it is still a topic of discussion in recent scholarship. James's argument is the only one referred to in later studies.

<sup>20</sup> James bases his argument of similar language on one sentence in which Morrill's bill says, "to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life," and Turner's bill says, "for the more liberal and practical education of our industrial classes and their teachers in their various pursuits." James finds evidence that Morrill was selected by Turner and other friends to introduce the bill since he was from a state that had not yet benefited from federal land grants. In an effort to aid Morrill in the introduction of the bill, Turner and his associates forwarded all of their documents and papers to Morrill to aid the bill's passage. James, *Origin of the Land Grant Act*, 26-27, 32.

his thesis on scanty evidence—similar sentences, a letter from Morrill to Turner (consisting of only four sentences), and documents that Turner allegedly sent to Morrill.<sup>21</sup>

Ross and Eddy, the authors of the most comprehensive studies of the Morrill Act, use a variety of unpublished primary sources as well as Isaac Leon Kandel's *Federal Aid for Vocational Education: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*.<sup>22</sup> Kandel's report was written before the public could easily access the Congressional debates. Therefore, Kandel seeks to detail the Congressional discussions that led to the passage of the act to show the original intentions of Congress, the passage of the bill into law, and the absence of any educational program. This bulletin was published in 1917, and it has been referenced in almost every book referring to the Morrill Act of 1862.

The first biography of Morrill, written by William Belmont Parker in 1924, is an exhaustive study of Morrill's childhood, political career, and accomplishments. Parker reproduces many of Morrill's personal papers and memoirs in an effort to show the important role Morrill played in the creation of land grant colleges. He discusses the claims to authorship of the act, and while he acknowledges that Morrill did not invent or discover the idea of agricultural schools, he does not give the credit to Turner. He attributes James's claims that Turner was responsible for the act to institutional and personal pride, an attempt "to transfer the credit for the paternity of the land-grant

---

<sup>21</sup> James alleges that Turner and his coworkers forwarded all of their documents and papers to Morrill and asked him to present the bill. Other than a letter from Morrill to Turner in 1861, Morrill's papers in the Library of Congress do not contain any reference to Turner or his plan. The 1861 letter from Morrill to Turner appears to be a response to a letter Turner wrote Morrill inquiring about status of the land grant bill.

<sup>22</sup> Isaac Leon Kandel, *Federal Aid for Vocational Education: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, Bulletin Number 10 (Boston: Merrymount Press, 1917).

colleges from the East to the West, from Vermont to Illinois, from Morrill to Turner.”<sup>23</sup> Parker concludes that “enthusiastic and energetic as he was, Professor Turner was only one voice in the chorus of advocates.”<sup>24</sup> He also rejects the idea that Morrill “built better than he knew” or that he “knew very little of education,” or that his only wish was “to do something for the farmer.”<sup>25</sup> He denies implications that the act “amounted to little more than a casual bit of legislation framed to meet a political contingency.”<sup>26</sup>

One of the most frequently cited histories of the land grant act is *Democracy’s College: The Land Grant Movement in the Formative Stage* written by Earle D. Ross and published in 1942. Ross calls Morrill’s bill “a generalized synthesis” of all previous proposals and recognizes that many people were involved in the large movement for the promotion of agricultural education.<sup>27</sup> He analyzes the sectional opposition to Morrill’s unsuccessful 1857 bill (between the North and South) and the successful 1862 bill (between the East and West).

Ross also provides the best analysis of the act’s authorship and the best counterargument to James’s thesis that Turner, not Morrill, was the originator of the land grant movement. In a brief discussion of the Morrill-Turner controversy, Ross dismisses James’s thesis for its lack of documentary support and evidence. Ross does, however, refer to Turner as “the most voluble if not effective of the propagandists,” and also

---

<sup>23</sup> William Belmont Parker, *The Life and Public Services of Justin Smith Morrill* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1924), 278.

<sup>24</sup> In 1874, Morrill recorded the role he played in the development and passage of the Morrill Act. He claimed to have first formed the idea of land grants for colleges in 1856, but was unable to say where he obtained the idea. *Ibid.*, 262, 280.

<sup>25</sup> Henry S. Pritchett, Introduction to *Federal Aid for Vocational Education*, quoted in Parker, *Justin Smith Morrill*, 260.

<sup>26</sup> Implications made by Henry S. Pritchett in the introduction to Isaac Kandel’s *Federal Aid for Vocational Education*. Parker, *Justin Smith Morrill*, 260.

<sup>27</sup> Earle D. Ross, *Democracy’s College: The Land-Grant Movement in the Formative Stage* (Ames: Iowa State College Press, 1942), 46.



mentions the People's College, Amos Brown, and Alden Partridge as important participants in the educational movement. Ross concludes the discussion with the observation that many people influenced and contributed to the Morrill Act, so no one person can claim full credit for it.<sup>28</sup>

In discussing the opposition to Morrill's 1857 bill, Ross focuses on the South. He concluded that southerners opposed the bill on constitutional grounds, maintaining that grants by the federal government "would be an invasion of the domestic rights of the states."<sup>29</sup> Advocates of the bill did not adequately present the need for technical education; instead they reiterated the complaints of class neglect and discrimination in higher education. Opponents of the bill stated that agricultural and industrial institutions were not needed, and even if they were, the proposed grants would not be enough to establish and maintain them.

In 1957 Edward Danforth Eddy, Jr., the Vice-President and Provost of the University of New Hampshire, published another comprehensive study of the land grant movement. *Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land Grant Idea in American Education* soon joined Ross's *Democracy's College* as one of the most frequently cited studies on the Morrill Act. Eddy devotes attention not only to the Morrill Act of 1862, but also to the steps that brought it to its completed phase. In contrast to previous studies, he includes a detailed history and description of the Turner plan, showing that it was an important precursor to the Morrill Act. Eddy's analyses of Jonathan Turner, the Turner plan, Justin Morrill, and the Morrill Act of 1862 comprise the most comprehensive discussion of the act. Eddy concludes that the Morrill Act was a synthesis of the most

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 37.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 57.

widely circulated previous proposals. Although he omits any reference to Norwich University president Alden Partridge's 1841 proposal to use revenue from public land to support agricultural colleges, he does mention Amos Brown of the People's College of New York and Senator Benjamin Wade as major promoters of the act.

Like Ross, Eddy focused on the division in Congress over support of the bill. During the 1858 debates support for the bill divided between North and South over the issue of state's rights. In 1862, with the majority of southerners in the Confederate Congress, support for the bill divided between the East and the West. According to Eddy, the western states, still left with large areas of public land, feared that the eastern states would place valuable land in the hands of speculators. Thus western states considered Morrill's proposed bill unfair and unlimited. Despite the disagreement, the bill passed 32 to 7 in the Senate and 90 to 25 in the House, with 21 of the opposing votes from western states.

In addition to the important older works that are frequently cited in recent literature, there are also three works written prior to the centennial of the act that contain valuable information. Although none of these studies discuss the purpose of the land grant institution, Frederick Mumford does discuss Morrill's vision for the land grant colleges and William Sawyer details the movement for agricultural education. Arnold Tilden's 1937 study analyzes the economics surrounding the act and attempts to explain the opposition in Congress.

Tilden's *The Legislation of the Civil War Period Considered as a Basis of the Agricultural Revolution in the United States* describes the Morrill Act "not so much as a result of a studied policy of the Congress as in a spirit of generosity and one of

unwillingness to worry over details.”<sup>30</sup> Tilden surveys the economic causes and results of the Homestead Act, the Immigration Act of 1864, federal railroad legislation, the Morrill Act, the Department of Agriculture Act, and the Hatch Act. He recognizes that the majority of the academic studies covering the Civil War and Reconstruction era minimize the economic aspects and instead focus on “the more spectacular political and military history of the period.” In covering the Morrill Act, Tilden attempts to explain the voting record of Congress. He concludes that the industrial East supported the Morrill Act, Homestead Act, and transcontinental railroad acts in order to receive in turn support from the West for their own sectional legislation. In order to present a united front to the South, the East and West buried sectionalism and individual objections and voted “for the good of the party.”<sup>31</sup> Despite Tilden’s attempts to turn the focus of his study away from political history, he gives little attention to the economic causes of the Morrill Act.

In 1940 Frederick Mumford of the University of Missouri published *The Land Grant College Movement*. Associated with colleges of agriculture for fifty years as a student, instructor, dean, and director, Mumford sought to discuss the philosophy of the colleges of agriculture and their influence on the “social, intellectual and economic life of rural people and the public generally.” Although not a historian, Mumford offers insight into the Morrill Act of 1862 from the perspective of an agricultural educator.<sup>32</sup>

Using the Congressional debates, Mumford reconstructs Morrill’s vision for land grant colleges. Mumford calls Morrill’s vision for land grant institutions “somewhat

---

<sup>30</sup> Tilden, *Legislation of the Civil War*, 70. Tilden was the first to point out the importance of Partridge and Morrill’s close proximity to Norwich University.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Frederick B. Mumford, *The Land Grant College Movement* (Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri, 1940), 16.

optimistic, if not romantic.” Morrill expected that agricultural colleges would require manual labor in addition to the study of agricultural “theory” so that students’ muscles “would not become soft in summer or torpid in winter.” According to Mumford, Morrill believed that agricultural colleges should offer something to every landowner, add to scientific education, help those settling on homesteads, increase the dividends of railroads, erase pauperism, and beautify the American landscape.<sup>33</sup>

In 1948, William E. Sawyer, a graduate student at Boston University, wrote his dissertation on the Morrill Act. “The Evolution of the Morrill Act of 1862” attempts to establish the background of the Morrill Act. Sawyer argues that “there was a general public apathy for agricultural education—nay, even toward all education; that successful efforts to get aid for agricultural schools were primarily political and economic; and that even though some great leaders strove for agricultural education, most efforts failed because of general lack of interest in schools for farmers.” Local farm societies, agricultural courses offered at some colleges, scientific demonstrations, educational land grants, and public leaders all paved the way for farm schools. Sawyer concludes that Justin Morrill ultimately accomplished with his act what many had been seeking for years.<sup>34</sup>

The centennial anniversary of the Morrill Act’s passage prompted a renewed interest in the act. While a substantial amount of literature emerged in 1962, the majority of it is celebratory and not useful for an analysis of the purpose of the Morrill Act. The most prominent example of a celebratory work is Allan Nevin’s *The Origins of the Land-*

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> William E. Sawyer, “The Evolution of the Morrill Act of 1862” (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1948), 2.

*Grant Colleges and State Universities*.<sup>35</sup> Only twenty-eight pages long, it provides a brief account of the Morrill Act that focuses on the movement for an agricultural education, opposition to the Morrill Act, Justin Morrill, authorship of the act, and the act's results. Nevin's brief book provides an overview of the Morrill Act for those unfamiliar with it and is therefore listed on many of the suggested readings lists of Morrill Act literature.

Also published in 1962, Frederick Rudolph's *The American College and University* synthesized the secondary literature in an effort to provide a thorough history of American higher education. His volume attempts to answer the question, "how and why and with what consequences have the American colleges and universities developed as they have?" In discussing land grant colleges, he draws largely from Ross and Eddy rather than primary sources. Despite the fact that his book is frequently listed on bibliographies of the Morrill Act of 1862 and land grant colleges, he does not provide any new analysis.<sup>36</sup>

Three years later, Paul W. Gates published *Agriculture and the Civil War* as the first new analysis of the Morrill Act since William Sawyer's 1948 dissertation. Gates examines the contributions of the Dix and Bennett bills to the origins and enactment of the Morrill Act, topics not previously examined by historians. The Dix bill, championed by Dorothea Dix in 1854, proposed to use endowments from federal land grants to support the establishment of state institutions for the mentally ill. According to Gates, Morrill incorporated the funding plan of the Dix bill into his legislation. The Bennett bill

---

<sup>35</sup> Allan Nevins, *The Origins of the Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities: A Brief Account of the Morrill Act of 1862 and Its Results* (Washington, D.C.: Civil War Centennial Commission, 1962).

<sup>36</sup> Rudolph, *American College and University*, preface.

was considered simultaneously with the Dix bill. It proposed giving Western states modest subsidies of land for railroad construction and giving older states land for each representative and senator they had in Congress. According to Gates, discussion of the Dix and Bennett bills in Congress added to the desire of the East to share in the public lands and contributed to support for the Morrill Act.<sup>37</sup>

In assigning responsibility for the Morrill Act, Gates acknowledges the contributions of numerous individuals, including Turner. Although he does not give Morrill full credit for the act, he does say that the assistance of many men caused Morrill to “see the political possibilities in the drive.” Like scholars who preceded him, Gates concludes that the Morrill Act was the synthesis of past ideas and proposals.<sup>38</sup>

Between 1965 and 1995 only one study looked at the movement for land grant institutions. David Madsen, in a chapter of G. Lester Anderson’s *Land-Grant Universities and Their Continuing Challenge*, discusses the driving forces behind the movement for agricultural education. He notes that widespread belief in the dignity and worth of the working man, increased interest in scientific studies, and the call for practical education for the laboring classes led to the movement for agricultural colleges. Although he describes Turner as the leading advocate for agricultural education, Madsen credits Morrill with ultimate responsibility for shepherding the act through Congress: “whatever debt Morrill may have to others for the details of his plan, he was the

---

<sup>37</sup> Paul W. Gates, *Agriculture and the Civil War*, ed. Allan Nevins (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), 253-354.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 259.

acknowledged parliamentary master who engineered its passage, and for that achievement he has acquired a kind of immortality.”<sup>39</sup>

Disappearing from literature after 1976, the Morrill Act would not reemerge until John R. Campbell’s *Reclaiming a Lost Heritage* in 1995. Between 1995 and 1999 several articles and essays discussed the Morrill Act, and two books and one dissertation attempted to offer new analysis. While Campbell does not focus exclusively on the Morrill Act, he does provide some insight into the contributions of both Turner and Morrill.<sup>40</sup> Campbell includes reproductions of several newspaper articles and speeches referring to Turner’s Illinois Plan for an industrial university. Not surprisingly, as an Illinois resident and educator, Campbell gives credit for the authorship of the land grant act to Turner, not Morrill. He devotes almost his entire coverage of the Morrill Act to Turner’s contributions, while only mentioning Morrill as the sponsor of the act.

The most recent study linking the Morrill Act and economics since Arnold Tilden in 1937 is Scott Key’s 1995 dissertation, “The Origins of American Land Grant Universities: An Historical Policy Study.” Key recognizes that “contemporary problems” have caused land grant institutions to reexamine their basic mission. However, in their reexamination, “policymakers tend to overlook historical factors in their deliberations.”<sup>41</sup> Key argues that “economics was the chief motivation behind the establishment of American land-grant universities.” The Morrill Act’s educational significance was not appreciated at the time of its passage. Instead, it was seen as an important federal

---

<sup>39</sup> David Madsen, “The Land-Grant University: Myth and Reality,” in *Land-Grant Universities and their Continuing Challenge*, ed. G. Lester Anderson (n.p.: Michigan State University Press, 1976), 30.

<sup>40</sup> John R. Campbell, *Reclaiming a Lost Heritage: Land-Grant and Other Higher Education Initiatives for the Twenty-first Century* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1995).

<sup>41</sup> Key, “Origins of the American Land Grant University,” (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Chicago, 1995), 1.

economic policy. In an era of public debt lawmakers resorted to the disposal of public lands as a source of revenue. Congress debated the best method for income—the disposal of public lands through sales, leading to direct revenue, or the disposal of public lands through settlement, leading to indirect revenue through consumption and tariffs. Initially Congress disposed of the public lands through direct sales beginning with the Ordinance of 1784. This method, however, contributed little to the country’s income.<sup>42</sup>

The transition to indirect revenue appeared in the early 1800s under the presidency of James Monroe in the form of appropriations of public lands for internal improvements. Subsequently, settlement and national development began to replace the focus on revenue. The construction of roads, canals, and railroads improved the value of the land and encouraged settlement. Settlement, in turn, increased sales and revenue. While many Congressmen still viewed the public lands as a source of direct revenue, public land policy was changing by the 1840s. Pressure grew for a homestead act that would grant acreage to settlers who lived on and improved the public land. Congress could “reduce the price of land and thereby increase sales and revenue,” or could “give away land in order to increase consumption and indirectly increase revenue.”<sup>43</sup>

It was in the midst of these debates over public lands as a source of direct or indirect revenue that Morrill introduced the idea of land grant colleges. Key points out that the debate in Congress over the Morrill Act focused on economics—the disposal of the public lands—not education. Indeed, Morrill’s principal argument before Congress concerned the use of the “donations of the public lands to promote national prosperity

---

<sup>42</sup> The following article by Key is based on his 1995 dissertation. Scott Key, “Economics or Education: The Establishment of American Land-Grant Universities,” *Journal of Higher Education* 67 (March-April 1996): 196-220, 196, 198, 199.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 209-210.



and increased government revenue.” The establishment of agricultural colleges would “increase agricultural production, which would increase consumption and, in turn, increase government revenue.” Therefore, Key argues, while the Morrill Act may have the trappings of an educational act, its real purpose was to promote economic development.<sup>44</sup> While Key provides an excellent analysis of economic origins of the Morrill Act, he does “not attempt to resolve the question of what the mission (or emphasis) of the land grant university should entail.”<sup>45</sup>

Also written in 1996, a dissertation by Lee Stewart Duemer provides new analyses, extensive research, and excellent citations. “The Origins of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862: A Convergence of War and the Threat of War, Agricultural Influence, Modernization, and the American University Movement,” examines the social forces leading to the Morrill Act of 1862. Duemer argues that the origins of the act reach back to the American Revolution. The awareness and need for military education, the demand for agricultural education, modernization and the advancement of industry leading to an awareness of class distinctions, and the American university movement for the inclusion of science “converged to create a piece of legislation that responded to all of them, with the exception of an American university, to which the act was a partial response.”<sup>46</sup>

Whereas most scholars view the Morrill Act to have been an outgrowth of the Civil War or agriculture, Duemer shows the act to be more complex and longer in developing. In

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 212, 216.

<sup>45</sup> Key, “Origins of American Land Grant Universities,” 12-13.

<sup>46</sup> Lee Stewart Duemer, “The Origins of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862: A Convergence of War and the Threat of War, Agricultural Influence, Modernization, and the American University Movement” (Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1996), 1.

addition to contributing new analyses, Duemer shows how society and society's needs shaped education.

In *The Magnificent Charter: The Origin and Role of the Morrill Land-Grant Colleges and Universities*, Joseph Edmond details the role that land grant institutions have played in the development of the United States. While Edmond focuses mainly on the years following the passage of the Morrill Act, and gives no attention to the bill's passage, he provides an excellent analysis and interpretation of the land grant act's educational features. He begins with the passage of the act in 1862, the key leaders in the movement for agricultural education, and then moves on to the consequences of the act. He defines each of the terms of the act (such as agriculture and mechanic arts) in the context of the period. In addition, rather than focusing on Morrill, he provides brief biographies of the leaders in the movement. He recognizes the contributions of Simon DeWitt,<sup>47</sup> Alden Partridge, Thomas G. Clemson,<sup>48</sup> Jonathan Turner, and Justin Morrill. He does not mention Amos Brown or the People's College Association.

Most recent publications on the Morrill Act return to the question of responsibility for the Morrill Act. The entire *History of Higher Education Annual* for 1998 is devoted to the "The Land-Grant Act and American Higher Education: Context and Consequences." The first two articles look at the contributions Alden Partridge and

---

<sup>47</sup> Simon DeWitt presented a paper before the New York legislature in 1819 entitled, "A Consideration of the Necessity of Establishing an Agricultural College and Having More of the Children of the Wealthy Educated for the Profession of Farming." He also advocated the establishment of a school that supplemented teaching with experimentation. Edmond, *Magnificent Charter*, 19.

<sup>48</sup> Thomas G. Clemson was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in 1807 and promoted scientific agriculture for the majority of his life. He assisted in the establishment of the Maryland Agricultural College, supported the passage of the Morrill Act, and wrote for numerous farm magazines. He is best known for his role in the establishment of Clemson University. He and his wife, Anna Marie Calhoun, willed 814 acres to the state of South Carolina for the establishment of Clemson Agricultural College, now Clemson University.

Freeman G. Cary made to the land grant college movement, while the remainder of the journal focuses on the years leading up to and following the Morrill Act.

In “Alden Partridge’s Proposal for a National System of Education: A Model for the Morrill Land-Grant Act,” Gary Thomas Lord explores the connections between Partridge’s educational proposals and Morrill’s land grant act. Partridge, from Morrill’s native state of Vermont, presented the first plan for land grant colleges to Congress in 1841. According to Lord, Morrill incorporated Partridge’s proposal for a perpetual endowment and his plan for land distribution into the land grant act of 1862. Lord maintains that although Morrill “never acknowledged Partridge’s influence, the close correspondence in their thinking is remarkable and in all probability was not accidental.”<sup>49</sup> He points out the similarity between Partridge’s 1841 proposal and the Morrill Act, Morrill’s proximity to Norwich University, and Morrill’s friendship with Jedediah Harris, an avid supporter and trustee of Norwich University. Lord concludes that although Morrill claims sole credit for the authorship of the act, the Morrill Act “bears striking resemblance” to Partridge’s 1841 proposal to Congress.<sup>50</sup>

In “Leading and Losing in the Agricultural Education Movement: Freeman G. Cary and Farmers’ College, 1846-1884,” Julianna Chaszar describes the rise and fall of the Farmers’ College and the involvement of Freeman Cary. Cary grew up in College Hill, Ohio. After graduating from Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, he established Pleasant Hill Academy to serve the local population of farmers and mechanics. In 1845, he transformed the academy into a college with the mission of bringing higher education

---

<sup>49</sup> Gary Thomas Lord, “Alden Partridge’s Proposal for a National System of Education: A Model for the Morrill Land-Grant Act,” *History of Higher Education Annual* 18 (1998): 11-24, 11.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

to the classes not served by traditional colleges, with the option of gaining a practical education.<sup>51</sup> Like Morrill, Cary believed that agricultural education was critical to the prosperity of the nation. When Morrill presented his bill first in 1857 and then again in 1862, Cary promoted the bill in Ohio and Washington. Farmers' College was "one of the few antebellum efforts to provide practical, college-level education for the industrial classes, and the first concrete attempt to fashion an agricultural college."<sup>52</sup>

Daniel W. Lang's "Amos Brown and the Educational Meaning of the American Agricultural College Act" focuses on the overlooked but important contributions of Amos Brown, president of the People's College of Havana, New York. Lang argues that the land grant university movement was not continuous or premeditated, but proceeded in "fits and starts."<sup>53</sup> When the Morrill Act was introduced in Congress, "there was no broad consensus" on the philosophy of higher education.<sup>54</sup> The act said more about how a movement should "be financed than about the educational direction that the movement should take."<sup>55</sup> The concept of an agricultural and mechanical college was not well-defined. Amos Brown, representing the People's College,<sup>56</sup> lobbied in Washington for the Morrill Act and is one of the few men whom Morrill credits with aiding in the passage of the act. In addition, Lang details the roots of the movement for a mechanical

---

<sup>51</sup> Julianna Chaszar, "Leading and Losing in the Agricultural Education Movement: Freeman G. Cary and Farmers' College, 1846-1884," *History of Higher Education Annual* 18 (1998): 25-46, 27.

<sup>52</sup> Farmers' College only operated temporarily. In 1884 it became Belmont College, and in 1890 it was named the Ohio Military Institute. *Ibid.*, 39-40.

<sup>53</sup> Daniel W. Lang, "Amos Brown and the educational meaning of the American Agricultural College Act," *History of Education* 31, no. 2 (2002): 139-165, 139.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 139.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 139-140.

<sup>56</sup> For information on the People's College and Havana, New York, see Note 57 in Chapter 2.

education, an aspect of the Morrill Act that has largely been overlooked in favor of agricultural education.<sup>57</sup>

A second biography of Justin Morrill appeared in 1999. Coy F. Cross's study is a condensed version of Parker's biography, with little additional information or analysis. He borrows liberally from Parker's study, and the majority of his research appears to focus on Parker's book and Morrill's 1874 memoir. Cross does not present any new ideas. While Cross devotes twelve pages to the land grant college act, Parker devotes twenty-five. Although his bibliography is extensive, his analysis is narrow. In discussing Morrill's role in the act, he attributes Morrill's interest in learning and education to the lack of opportunity afforded to him. The remainder of his coverage of the land grant act consists of a detailed chronology of the political actions leading to the passage of the act, with little analysis other than the discussion of its authorship.<sup>58</sup>

The literature presented above constitutes the most widely cited works available on the Morrill Act of 1862. It is unfortunate that of an act proclaimed to be so important and essential to the democratization of American education, there are only two comprehensive histories devoted to the act itself. While these two histories, Ross's *Democracy's College* and Eddy's *Colleges for Our Land and Time*, provide excellent coverage and analysis of the Morrill Act, they are no longer current and therefore exclude new research. In addition, neither of the authors deal with the purpose of the Morrill Act as intended by the proponents. Instead, the majority of discussions about the act center on its authorship, a fact that seems trivial considering the magnitude of the act's effects.

---

<sup>57</sup> Lang, "Amos Brown," 139, 140.

<sup>58</sup> Coy F. Cross, *Justin Smith Morrill: Father of the Land-Grant Colleges* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1999).

Many of the studies rely on the works of Ross and Eddy, and synthesize the findings of others rather than providing new research or analysis.

The most recent comprehensive book that discussed the land grant movement using primary sources as references was Eddy's *Colleges for Our Land and Time*, published nearly fifty years ago. In order to gain a complete understanding and a comprehensive analysis of the Morrill Act of 1862, it is necessary that historians undertake further research of primary sources concerning the act and its far-reaching results.

There is a need for a comprehensive history that details the purpose of the land grant institution with respect to the Morrill Act. To meet the changing needs of the enterprises and the public that a land grant institution serves, it must continue to plan and adapt. Therefore, it is necessary to reexamine the concept of the land grant university.

Even in 2005, 157 years after the act's passage, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges<sup>59</sup> recognizes that "there has been much discussion since the passage of the First Morrill Act as to its true intent."<sup>60</sup> Land grant universities are no closer today to understanding the true intentions of the Morrill Act than they were over a hundred and fifty years ago. Institutions funded under the Morrill Act of 1862 proclaim themselves land grant colleges, but what exactly does it mean to be a land grant college? Did accepting funding from the Morrill Act make a college a land grant

---

<sup>59</sup> Information about the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) can be found on its website, <http://www.nasulgc.org>. In 1963, the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities merged with the National Association of State Universities to create the current association, NASULG. It is made up of 215 institutions, including 76 land grant universities, 27 public higher education systems, and 33 tribal land grant colleges.

<sup>60</sup> National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, "Development of the Land-Grant System: 1862-1994," <[http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land\\_Grant/Development.htm](http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land_Grant/Development.htm)>, accessed 25 November 2003.

institution? Does offering agriculture, mechanic arts, and military training make a college a land grant institution? Does the three-part mission of teaching, research, and outreach make a college a land grant institution? The answer to these questions cannot be found in the Morrill Act. Instead, one must look beyond the letter of the law to the debates that occurred and the men that advocated a new form of education.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE MORRILL ACT: NOT IN LETTER BUT IN SPIRIT

What does it mean to be a land grant institution, not by the letter of the law, but in intent? In order to determine the purpose of the land grant institution, one must first understand what the promoters of the Morrill Act were trying to accomplish—their intentions for the act. This chapter will examine the Congressional debates as well as the men who worked outside of Congress to promote an agricultural and mechanical education and will develop a statement of purpose relevant to all land grant institutions.

Scott Key and Isaac Kandel both conclude that the Congressional debates over the Morrill Act centered on the distribution of public lands rather than the educational aspects of the bill. According to Daniel Lang, in 1862 the “concept of a ‘land grant college’ was neither well defined nor broadly understood.” New and existing colleges “were unclear about what the legislation actually intended.”<sup>1</sup> Although studies of the Morrill Act attempt to assign responsibility to Justin Morrill, Alden Partridge, Jonathan Turner, or Amos Brown, analysis beyond the authorship of the act is typically missing. Therefore an analysis of the act’s broader context and the intentions of each of the major

---

<sup>1</sup> Daniel W. Lang, “Amos Brown and the educational meaning of the American Agricultural College Act,” *History of Education* 31, no. 2 (March 2002): 140.



proponents of agricultural and mechanical education is necessary to lend insight into the mission of the land grant college.

Despite the debates regarding authorship of the Morrill Act that appear in the extant literature, it is clear that Justin Morrill played a pivotal role. After all, he introduced the bill in Congress and argued on its behalf. What did Morrill envision as the mission of the land grant institution? Little appears in the debates and speeches in the *Congressional Globe* about the educational aspects of the act as presented initially in 1857 and again in 1862, the year it became law. Morrill's intentions for the act are vague at best; he concerned himself more with what the colleges should accomplish than how they would achieve the results.

Justin Morrill was born in Strafford, Vermont in 1810, the second in a family of ten children (only five lived to adulthood). His father, although a prosperous blacksmith, could not afford to send all of his sons to college, so he chose to send none. Morrill attended the common schools and Thetford and Randolph Academies before taking a position as a merchant's clerk in Strafford and later Portland, Maine. He returned to Strafford in 1831 and entered a partnership as a merchant with mentor and friend Jedediah Harris. In 1848, at the age of thirty-eight, Morrill sold his interest in the store and retired. He engaged in agricultural and horticultural pursuits until his election to the House of Representatives in 1854. He began his service in 1855 as a Whig and remained in the five succeeding Congresses as a Republican. In 1866 he was elected to the Senate and served from 1867 until his death in 1898.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> For further reading about the life and political career of Justin Morrill, see Coy Cross's *Justin Smith Morrill* or William Parker's *The Life and Public Services of Justin Smith Morrill*.

Whereas other writers, such as William Sawyer, believed that Morrill “knew not what he thought within twenty years after he thought it,” Edward Eddy found that Morrill believed a vigorous type of education was necessary.<sup>3</sup> According to Eddy, the source of Morrill’s support for education included concerns such as the rapid dissipation of public lands, soil deterioration and wastage, the need for useful education, the inability of some states to provide adequate educational facilities, the benefits that occurred to European countries from agricultural schools, and the Republican party’s need to gain the support of the agricultural segment.<sup>4</sup>

Morrill’s speeches and debates in Congress clearly show that Morrill was primarily concerned with the wealth and status of the nation. An increase in agricultural production in the United States, Morrill believed, would lead to increased wealth and power over Europe. The best way to increase agricultural production, Morrill argued, would be to educate the farmers, and he pointed to the success of European agricultural schools to support his claim. Of course, there were other goals of a more philanthropic nature, such as the education of the common man, but, once again, educated labor would mean smarter labor, and thus more prosperous output.

When Morrill presented his first land grant college bill in 1857, the concept of an agricultural college was not new to the U.S. Congress. For example, in 1841 Alden Partridge had petitioned Congress to appropriate money from the sale of public lands to each state, according to its representation in Congress, for the establishment of a national system of education that would include civil engineering and agriculture.<sup>5</sup> In 1853, New

---

<sup>3</sup> Sawyer, “Evolution of the Morrill Act,” 221.

<sup>4</sup> Eddy, *Colleges for our Land and Time*, 28-29.

<sup>5</sup> Tilden, *Legislation of the Civil War*, 71-72.

York Representative Caleb Lyon, an 1841 graduate of Partridge's Norwich University of Vermont, announced that at some subsequent day he would introduce a bill for the establishment of a National Agricultural College and Experimental Farm.<sup>6</sup> On March 20, 1854, Elihu Benjamin Washburne of the House of Representatives, and James Shields of the Senate, both from Illinois, presented resolutions "relative to the establishment of industrial universities for the encouragement of practical and general education among the people in the several States of the Union, to cooperate with each other and the Smithsonian Institution at Washington."<sup>7</sup> Less than two months later, Maryland Senator Thomas Pratt presented petitions from agricultural societies in Maryland and other states asking for the establishment of a national agricultural school in the District of Columbia.<sup>8</sup> Senator Jackson Morton of Florida, a member of the Committee on Agriculture, submitted a report on the petitions and the Senate unanimously agreed to print two thousand extra copies of the report to spread among the agriculturalists of the country.<sup>9</sup> Later that year, in December, John Wentworth of Illinois requested the Committee on Agriculture investigate establishing a national agricultural school in connection with the Smithsonian Institution and modeled after the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis and the United States Military Academy at West Point.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-Present, "Lyon, Caleb," <<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=L000540>> (26 July 2005); Congress, House of Representatives, Representative Lyon of New York, 33<sup>rd</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (7 December 1853): 16.

<sup>7</sup> Mary Turner Carriel, *The Life of Jonathan Baldwin Turner* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961, 138.

<sup>8</sup> Congress, Senate, Senator Pratt of Maryland, 33<sup>rd</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (10 May 1854): 1144-1146.

<sup>9</sup> Congress, Senate, Senator Morton of Florida, 33<sup>rd</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (10 May 1854): 1144-1146.

<sup>10</sup> Congress, House of Representatives, Representative Wentworth of Illinois, 33<sup>rd</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (5 December 1854): 8.

While agitation for agricultural colleges continued in newspapers and agricultural societies, the topic did not appear on the pages of the *Congressional Globe* again until December of 1857 when Morrill introduced legislation “donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts.”<sup>11</sup> On April 20, 1858, he urged his colleagues in the House of Representatives to support his bill as a measure that would provide direct encouragement to agriculture. Never before, Morrill asserted, had Congress provided direct support for agricultural endeavors. In his opinion, the prosperity and happiness of the nation depended on the division of land into small parcels, and the education of the agriculturalists. Morrill cited the statistics that showed decreasing productivity of the soil and the depreciation of the crops. These statistics, Morrill told his colleagues, were cause for great alarm:

If it be true that the common mode of cultivating the soil in all parts of our country is so defective as to make the soil poorer year by year, it is a most deplorable fact, and a fact of national concern. If we are steadily impairing the natural productiveness of the soil, it is a national waste. . . .

These facts, after all proper allowance for errors and a short crop, establish, conclusively, that in all parts of our country important elements in the soil have been exhausted; and its fertility, in spite of all improvements, is steadily sinking.<sup>12</sup>

Morrill was concerned with the deterioration of the soil because it put the United States behind the agricultural productivity of England. In order to enlarge the productive power of the country, Morrill encouraged the scientific education of farmers and mechanics. Educating farmers and mechanics would enlarge the productive power of the United States and relieve the country from debts to creditors abroad. Americans knew

---

<sup>11</sup> Congress, House of Representatives, Representative Morrill of Vermont, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (14 December 1857): 32.

<sup>12</sup> Congress, House of Representatives, Representative Morrill of Vermont, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (20 April 1858): 1692.

but little of the agricultural science of Europe, and what they knew was unsound to use because of the great differences in soil and climate. The United States, Morrill maintained, needed its own system of scientific agricultural education.<sup>13</sup>

Morrill's next argument for agricultural education centered on the United States as a world competitor.

The nation which tills the soil so as to leave it *worse* than they found it, is doomed to decay and degradation. Other nations lead us, not in the invention and handling of improved implements, but in nearly all the practical sciences which can be brought to aid the management and results of agricultural labor. We owe it to ourselves not to become a weak competitor in the most important field where we are to meet the world as rivals.<sup>14</sup>

Morrill believed that the existence of a healthy society, healthy trade, and healthy commerce depended more on the farmers and mechanics of the country than any of the other professions combined. Yet, Congress had done nothing to aid the farmers and mechanics. By aiding the farmer and mechanic with education, the farmer and mechanic would in turn contribute to the greater good of the country through increased productivity, allowing the United States to compete with England in the world's economy. In order to accomplish all of this, Morrill argued, the United States needed scientific education. The liberal education provided by colleges and universities was not practical for the farmer and mechanic, especially if the country expected them to "solve all the scientific relations of earth, water, air, and vegetable and animal life." Therefore, Morrill advocated "a careful, exact, and systematized registration of experiments—such

---

<sup>13</sup> Congress, House of Representatives, Representative Morrill of Vermont, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (20 April 1858): 1693.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

as can be made at thoroughly scientific institutions, and such as will not be made elsewhere.”<sup>15</sup>

Morrill believed that the United States could rival Europe’s agricultural productivity, and he linked their productivity directly to their agricultural schools.

All over the highest civilized parts of Europe we find the different Governments alive to the wants of agriculture. They have established ministers of instruction, model farms, experimental farms, botanical gardens, colleges, and a large number of secondary schools, with no other purpose—and they need no higher or nobler—than the improvement of the industrial resources—the farms and the farmers—of the respective countries. All these are chiefly supported by large annual expenditures of the different Governments, except so far as any may be self-supporting institutions. The effect is in the largest degree favorable to the people and to increased production. But the teachings of European professors are of little consequence to Americans, even if they could be comprehended and instantaneously adopted, as they are rarely suited to our circumstances. Can we not have something that we claim as our own?<sup>16</sup>

Finally, Morrill maintained that improving agricultural education would, in the long run, raise the value of the nation’s public lands. If agriculture became more profitable, then it would be more desirable as a vocation. More men would purchase the public lands, settle on them, and improve them through scientific cultivation. Productivity, as well as land prices, would increase, bringing greater revenue to the government.<sup>17</sup>

Our Government is also directly interested, as the holder and dealer in large tracts of land. If it be for the interest of small holders of land, it must be for the interest of a large holder. . . . If the measure shall in any degree increase the future profits of cultivators, the value of *all* land, wherever it may be, whether held in small or large quantities, will be augmented. The cotton-gin has hardly done more to raise the price of estates in the South, than would now the discovery of a remedy for the boll-worm, and other destructive insects, . . . but some resulting improvements may safely be predicated upon the labors of thirty-two or more institutions [i.e. the proposed land grant colleges] actively engaged in scientific agriculture. There can be no doubt that the benefits to be derived, will prove an ample consideration for the lands disposed

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 1694.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 1695.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 1695-1696.

of.<sup>18</sup>

Thus, while Morrill's argument consisted of three main points, they all led to the same goal. His concern over the deterioration and lack of productivity of the soil, the status of the United States as a world competitor, and the disposal of the public lands all revolved around the same concept—the wealth and status of the nation. Nothing he said suggested that his goal was for the federal government simply to provide education for the common man out of a spirit of equality or generosity. The final words to his colleagues in 1858, urging approval of his first proposal for land grant colleges, provides a concise summary of his rationale:

The persuasive arguments of precedents; the example of our worthiest rivals in Europe; the rejuvenation of worn-out lands, which bring forth taxes only; the petitions of farmers everywhere, yearning for “a more excellent way;” philanthropy, supported by our highest interests—all these considerations impel us for once to do something for agriculture worthy of its national importance.<sup>19</sup>

The 1857 bill passed by a small margin in the House and the Senate. The House, voting 105 to 100, largely divided along party and sectional lines. Southern Democrats viewed the bill as an unnecessary expansion of the national government, while northern Republicans generally favored the bill. The West and Midwest divided equally in support of the bill.<sup>20</sup>

While Morrill was arguing his points on the land grant college bill in the House of Representatives, other men were advocating the bill in the Senate—one of whom gave a completely different argument. On February 1, 1859, just weeks before Buchanan vetoed

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 1695.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 1697.

<sup>20</sup> Congress, House of Representatives, Agricultural Colleges, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess, *Congressional Globe*, (22 April 1858): 1742.

the 1857 land grant bill, Senator Benjamin Wade of Ohio moved to take up the bill H.R. No. 2, “An Act Donating Public Lands to the Several States and Territories which may Provide Colleges for the Benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts.” Wade had served with Jackson Morton in 1854 on the Committee of Agriculture that compiled the report on a national agricultural college, so the idea colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts was not new to him.<sup>21</sup>

Sen. James Harlan, a Republican from Iowa, spoke in support of the bill, arguing that the government had expended an “immense amount of money for the education of professional men” and should show equal generosity towards the classes not represented in Congress. He advocated the education of the “masses” so that they might enter Congress and represent themselves.<sup>22</sup> According to Harlan, agriculturalists had virtually no representation in Congress:

The census of 1850 shows that, at that time, there were over three millions of people in the United States engaged in agricultural pursuits. Where is their representation on this floor? *Non esi*; they are not here, only so far as they are represented by professional men. There are but very few in either branch of Congress who are the direct representatives of the laboring class of the people of this country. . . .

. . . The passage of this bill will be one step in the right direction. It will be, in effect, a declaration that Congress will no longer discriminate against the people; that the masses, on whose shoulders have been imposed the burdens, shall participate in the enjoyment of some of the advantages of Government.<sup>23</sup>

Whereas Morrill argued for the wealth of the country, Harlan argued for the representation of the common man.

---

<sup>21</sup> Congress, Senate, Senator Harlan of Iowa, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (1 February 1859): 712.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 720.



Sen. James Simmons of Rhode Island also spoke in support of the bill and used arguments similar to Morrill's. He supported efforts to educate farmers and encourage them to settle new lands: "There is no more appropriate thing, in my judgment, if you want to improve the cultivation of the lands and increase their settlement, than to educate farmers to go there and settle them."<sup>24</sup> Like Morrill, Simmons was interested in the prosperity of the country through the productivity of the farmers.

Sen. Jacob Collamer, a Republican from Justin Morrill's native state of Vermont, pointed out that the bill would create a system of agricultural education that would be regionally adaptable. Although others had previously advocated a national agricultural university, the 1857 bill proposed to establish an institution in every state and territory. Collamer maintained that a national school would be limited in that "no one system of agriculture, no one department of science or art, could possibly adapt itself to the varied condition of the various parts of this country." The great advantage of the 1857 bill was that it proposed "to give to the States themselves the means of adopting a course of agricultural education suitable to the wants and conditions of their respective communities."<sup>25</sup>

Collamer also recognized the importance of agriculture—"the great leading interest of the country." He voiced his concern that the country was becoming less productive and the land more deteriorated.<sup>26</sup> Collamer concluded his argument with the following warning:

---

<sup>24</sup> Congress, Senate, Senator Simmons of Rhode Island, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (1 February 1859): 721.

<sup>25</sup> Congress, Senate, Senator Collamer of Vermont, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (1 February 1859): 723.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

I do not desire to make any unfortunate exhibitions; but the truth is not to be disguised that it is very much feared, after all the effort which has been put forth by our agricultural societies, by our agricultural publications, by all the associations we could make—whether, in point of fact, the longer we inhabit the country, we do not make it the less productive; whether, really, in parts of the United States, the land has not deteriorated just about in proportion to the length of time the country has been inhabited; and whether we shall not go on stripping the country, and leaving a track of desolation behind. To prevent that, the great cause of agriculture demands instruction.<sup>27</sup>

In the Senate, the division over the bill was much the same as in the House of Representatives. The majority of southern Democrats voted against the bill, while northern Republicans voted for it and the West and Midwest divided equally. The supporters of the bill ultimately won by a small margin of three votes, 25 to 22, on February 7, 1859.<sup>28</sup>

President James Buchanan vetoed Morrill's 1857 bill on February 24, 1859. He considered it an unconstitutional federal infringement on state authority, and questioned the power of Congress to make donations to individual states for education. Buchanan maintained that the bill would deprive the treasury of income from the sale of the public lands and promote land speculation that would ultimately hinder settlement in the new states. Finally, Buchanan maintained that the provisions of the bill would contribute little to agriculture and the mechanic arts. He argued that the federal government would have no way of enforcing the use of the funds for the bill's intended objects, and it would only serve to create new colleges that would compete with existing colleges. Morrill responded to each of President Buchanan's objections, but on reconsideration in the

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Congress, Senate, Agricultural Colleges, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess, *Congressional Globe* (7 February 1859): 857.

House of Representatives the bill lacked enough support (105 to 96) to override the veto.<sup>29</sup>

The bill would not come before Congress again until 1862, after the majority of southern Democrats were in the Confederate Congress. The bill that Morrill introduced in 1862 was almost identical to the bill he presented in 1857. It added military training to instruction in agriculture and the mechanic arts, allocated 30,000 instead of 20,000 acres of land for each Congressman, and excluded any allotment to the territories. A final stipulation only allowed states within the Union to take advantage of the act, excluding the rebelling southern states.

Morrill's speech advocating the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 contained many of the same points made in 1858, but included more information about the educational aspects of the institutions. In a speech before Congress on June 6, 1862, Morrill spoke of his desire to make the colleges accessible to all—especially the “sons of toil”—and free of tuition. He believed that all other expenses of the students could be taken care of wholly or in part in exchange for their manual labor on the experimental farms. Neither classical studies nor military training would be entirely ignored, but agriculture would be elevated to the highest level. While Morrill clearly intended for the colleges to focus primarily on instruction in agriculture and mechanics, he wanted to leave the specific requirements up to each individual state, according to its needs:

Every State will be the judge of its own requirements, and I have no doubt each will feel sufficient interest in the subject to make a judicious disposition of the grant. . . .

. . . Certainly the opportunity of obtaining a sound education adapted to the wants of the individual will be offered at reduced rates, a love of useful labor will be promoted,

---

<sup>29</sup> Congress, House of Representatives, Speaker of the House reading the veto message of President Buchanan, 35<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe*, (26 February 1859): 1412-1414.

and thus health and usefulness cannot but be advanced among those who otherwise might waste a life in uncultured ignorance or cultivated imbecility.<sup>30</sup>

Thus, the broad mission that Morrill envisioned for the land grant colleges was to increase the wealth and world status of the United States by disseminating scientific and practical education to the agricultural and mechanical classes at an affordable cost.

Morrill's main focus was agricultural and mechanical. He wanted to provide a type of education that was not available at existing colleges.

The arguments presented in the Senate in 1862 were also much the same as those presented in 1858. Wade pointed out the bill's relationship to the Homestead Act. The Homestead Act, signed into law on May 20, 1862, encouraged settlement of the West. The act granted applicants public land for residing on it and improving it. According to Wade, men educated by the land grant colleges could immigrate West and receive homestead grants, thus increasing the demand for land. Not only would the value of western land increase as more men moved West to cultivate the land, land would be freed in the East.<sup>31</sup> Like Morrill, Simmons, and Collamer, Wade was primarily concerned with the wealth of the country.

Senator Harlan, on the other hand, repeated his argument from 1858 and scolded the lawyers in the Senate for opposing the bill:

There are few gentlemen here who are not professional lawyers. Heretofore appropriations of land have been made for State universities. The proceeds of the sales of those lands have usually gone to educate the children of professional men—men who are able to defray the expense of the education of their children away from home, in classical studies and in the learned professions. Here, for the first time I believe in the history of the Senate, a proposition is made to make an appropriation of lands for

---

<sup>30</sup> Congress, House of Representatives, Representative Morrill of Vermont, 37<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (6 June 1862): 256.

<sup>31</sup> Congress, Senate, Senator Wade of Ohio, 37<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess. *Congressional Globe* (11 June 1862): 2627.

the education of the children of the nation, and it meets with strenuous opposition<sup>32</sup> from a body of lawyers. If this Senate was composed of agriculturalists chiefly, they would have provided first for an agricultural college, and afterwards probably for a college in which the sons of lawyers, physicians, and other professional men could be educated.<sup>33</sup>

Harlan's concern for equality remained. If the country provided schools for the doctor and the lawyer, it should also provide schools for the farmer and mechanic. Every man, regardless of economic status, deserved equal representation from the government. Since uneducated men would probably not be elected to Congress, an education should be provided so that they would have opportunity equal to the professionally educated men.

While the mission of Simmons, Collamer, and Wade were much the same as Morrill's objective for the land grant institutions, Harlan's mission was different—he was more concerned with equal rights and representation. Judging from his remarks in the Senate, Harlan's vision for land grant institutions might be succinctly articulated as educating the laboring classes so that they might rise in status and have representation and opportunities equal to that of the professional men of the country. His goal was to provide an education for the uneducated. While the privileged could afford an education, the common people could not. Harlan wanted institutions that brought education to the common masses.

What about the other men who worked outside the halls of Congress to promote agricultural and mechanical education? What did they envision, and how did they expect

---

<sup>32</sup> According to the biographies in the "Biographical Directory of the United States Congress," <<http://bioguide.congress.gov>>, 19 of the 25 men who opposed the bill in the House of Representatives were lawyers. All 7 of the men who opposed the bill in the Senate were lawyers.

<sup>33</sup> Congress, Senate, Senator Harlan of Iowa, 37<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (10 June 1862): 2629.

the colleges to operate? Revered national leaders such as James Madison, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson had advocated either a national university or an agricultural college, but the government failed to support such ideas. At the time, they were just that—ideas. No one had perfected the concept of how the money would be provided, what subjects would be taught, what curriculum would be used, or what segment of the population would be served.

According to Earle Ross, Morrill “attribute[d] the inspiration [for land grant agricultural and mechanical colleges] to his personal experiences and cogitations.”<sup>34</sup> Ross finds Morrill’s claims that the “phraseology was wholly his own,” that he did not remember ever hearing anything about it before he introduced it in Congress, and that he did not remember receiving any assistance in framing his bill unconvincing.<sup>35</sup> Ross finds Morrill’s assertions “incredible in the view of the long and varied industrial movement, the similarity or identity of the leading features of the bill with well-known phases of that movement, and Morrill’s own recorded or reasonably implied experiences.”<sup>36</sup>

Like Ross, Arnold Tilden finds it highly improbable that Morrill came up with the idea on his own. The movement for land grant colleges, Tilden observes, had been going on for more than a decade before Morrill began to support them in 1856. According to Tilden and William Sawyer, Morrill was aware of the educational mission of Norwich University and knew its president Alden Partridge (the first person to petition Congress for land grants for education). Norwich University was located only twelve miles from Morrill’s home in Strafford, and Morrill’s mentor and business partner served as a trustee

---

<sup>34</sup> Ross, *Democracy’s College*, 49.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 50.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

of Norwich. Tilden recognizes Jonathan Turner in 1851 as the second to advocate land grants for education (he recognizes Partridge as the first), which Tilden believes culminated with the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862. Morrill was present at the meetings at which Turner's plan was discussed, and as a Congressman elected in 1855, Morrill probably heard firsthand the agitation in Congress for agricultural education.<sup>37</sup>

It is highly probable that Morrill was aware of the agitation for agricultural schools and the plans presented for them well before he began promoting agricultural education in 1856. Although Justin Morrill put it all together, the Morrill Act combined the concepts of Alden Partridge, Jonathan Turner, Justin Morrill, and The People's College Association of New York. Alden Partridge, Jonathan Turner, and The People's College Association of New York had ideas for an agricultural and mechanical education before Justin Morrill ever presented his bill to Congress. Therefore, their ideas for agricultural and mechanical education must be taken into account as well, since their visions likely played a role in Morrill's development of the act.

Partridge, the founder of Norwich University in Vermont, graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1806. He advocated what he called an "American System of Education" that would "meet the needs of American society and a constitutional republic—a nation undergoing rapid expansion and development." Partridge is best known for his promotion of military training and military schools, but he also felt the existing method of classical education "was too narrow and not really liberal enough." Partridge wanted to teach the operations of government and the important sources of national wealth—"agriculture, commerce, and manufactures." Thus,

---

<sup>37</sup> Tilden, *Legislation of the Civil War*, 70-75; Sawyer, "Evolution of the Morrill Act," 37, 113.

Partridge's American System of Education combined military science and training with a practical, scientific, and liberal education.<sup>38</sup>

Partridge founded the American Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy in 1819, and later changed its name to Norwich University. He served as the institution's president from 1834 to 1843. He believed in a liberal but practical education to prepare "students to become useful and active citizens," and therefore advocated trips outside the classroom for realistic instruction. Partridge recommended military instruction as an "appendage" to civil education. He wanted to prepare students for "useful and responsible roles as civilians, but, when necessary, they could assume duty as military officers in a civilian army." Norwich University proved successful and served as a model for other institutions founded by Partridge or his students throughout the country.<sup>39</sup> After his death in 1854, his dreams of a practical education lived on in many of his peers and students.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Lord, "Alden Partridge's Proposal," 13.

<sup>39</sup> The following information is taken from Gary Lord's article on Alden Partridge. A number of institutions were founded that followed the Partridge plan of an American System of Education. They were expected to serve as feeder schools for Norwich University, but due to fires, economic depression, and the deaths of administrators the schools did not have long life spans. Schools following the example of Norwich included The New Jersey Institution (1828), Orange, New Jersey; The Collegiate and Commercial Institute (c. 1840), New Haven, Connecticut; the Pennsylvania Literary, Scientific and Military Academy (1842), Bristol, Pennsylvania; the Pennsylvania Military Institute (1845), Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; the Wilmington Literary Scientific and Military Academy (1846), Wilmington, Delaware; the Scientific and Military Collegiate Institute (1850), Reading, Pennsylvania; the Gymnasium and Military Institute (1850), Pembroke, New Hampshire; the National Scientific and Military Academy (1853), Brandywine Springs, Delaware; the Western Literary and Scientific Institution (1829), Buffalo, New York; The Arrow Rock Military Academy (c. 1840), Arrow Rock, Missouri; the St. Louis Military Academy (1844), St. Louis, Missouri; the Mount Sterling Literary, Scientific and Military Academy (1847), Mount Sterling, Kentucky; Jefferson College (1828), Washington, Mississippi; Richland School (1829), Rice Springs, South Carolina; Three "Literary, Scientific and Military" academies in North Carolina, Fayetteville (1830), Oxford (1830), and Raleigh (1844); and the most successful, lasting until after the Civil War, was the Virginia Literary, Scientific and Military Academy (1839) in Portsmouth, Virginia.

<sup>40</sup> During the 1800s and early 1900s many noteworthy Americans matriculated at Norwich University. The following list is courtesy of Jack Hall, Archives Assistant at the Norwich University Library: Admiral George Dewey, the hero of Manila Bay; Colonel Truman B. Ransom, fell at the Battle of Chapultepec, during the Mexican War of 1845; General Grenville Mellon Dodge, one of the prime movers of the



In 1841, Representative Edmund Burke and Senator Henry Hubbard, both of New Hampshire, presented a proposal by Alden Partridge to their respective branches of Congress. Partridge's plan called for "land grants to support institutions, new or remodeled, that would offer a curriculum embracing both liberal and useful learning."<sup>41</sup> Partridge asked that Congress appropriate forty million dollars to be paid in annual installments from the proceeds of the sale of public lands for the establishment of non-partisan and non-sectarian educational institutions. According to Partridge's plan, the money from the sale of the public lands would be divided among the states according to their representation in Congress. Each state would then establish as many institutions as possible, with the course of study to include disciplines such as agriculture, civil engineering, military science and practice, architecture, political economy, government, and modern language and literature.<sup>42</sup>

Partridge's mission for the land grant institutions he proposed was to prepare students to become useful and responsible citizens by equipping them with a civil education, a practical education that prepared students for duties as an American citizen. Practical knowledge would be gained through scientific and liberal study inside and outside of the classroom on the operations of government, modern languages and history, political economy, engineering, agriculture, commerce, and manufactures. In addition

---

Transcontinental Railroad in 1868; and William Griffith Wilson, a co-founder of Alcoholics Anonymous. Lord, "Alden Partridge's Proposal," 13.

<sup>41</sup> Henry Hubbard was from Charlestown, N.H., less than forty miles from Partridge's home in Norwich. Edmund Burke was from Claremont, N.H., less than thirty miles from Norwich. It is unclear as to why Partridge's plan was not introduced in the form of a bill. Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-Present, "Hubbard, Henry," <<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=H000883>> (26 July 2005); Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-Present, "Burke, Edmund," <<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=B001088>> (26 July 2005).

<sup>42</sup> Lord, "Alden Partridge's Proposal," 15; U. S. Congress, House Report No. 69, 26<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., 1841.

military training would allow students in the event of war to assume positions in an army. Partridge focused on educating the uneducated, common or privileged, with practical instruction in agriculture and mechanic arts as well as the classical curriculum offered in many of the professional liberal arts colleges.

Justin Morrill lived about twelve miles from Norwich University and was acquainted with Alden Partridge. He was asked to serve as a trustee of Norwich in 1848, and was no doubt familiar with Partridge's educational theories and the education imparted at Norwich University. His mentor, neighbor, and business partner Jedediah Harris served as a trustee of Norwich from 1834 to 1855, and was well-acquainted with the educational goals of the University.<sup>43</sup> When Morrill introduced the land grant bill in Congress in 1857, it is reasonable to assume that he was influenced by the educational system advocated by Partridge.<sup>44</sup>

Also advocating a new system of education at the time was Jonathan Baldwin Turner of Illinois. In 1833, Turner graduated from Yale College and began teaching at Illinois College in Jacksonville, Illinois. He taught a variety of subjects, but was most

---

<sup>43</sup> Lord, "Alden Partridge's Proposal, 19.

<sup>44</sup> There is no proof that anyone influenced Morrill. His papers devote sole credit to himself. However, Gary Thomas Lord presents strong evidence that Morrill was familiar with Partridge's educational philosophy. According to Lord, Morrill could have seen the printed version of Partridge's detailed proposal to Congress. Morrill's friend and business partner, Jedediah Harris, maintained an extensive library from which he allowed Morrill to borrow freely. As a trustee of Norwich and a supporter of the Partridge plan for an American System of Education, it is likely Harris owned a copy of Partridge's proposal or a book of published congressional documents. Morrill loved to read, and may have either read Partridge's proposal or discussed it with Harris. In addition, Morrill lived in close proximity to Partridge, and four Norwich University trustees lived in Morrill's hometown. Many young men from Strafford attended Norwich. Lord also includes as evidence a letter sent to a Vermont newspaper signed "A. Blacksmith" (Morrill's father was a blacksmith) that is presumed to be from Morrill. The letter takes issue with Alden Partridge's candidacy for Congress in 1836, and calls Partridge's lectures on education a bore. Finally, in 1848 Morrill turned down an invitation to join Norwich's board of trustees. For more on Morrill and Partridge's relationship, see Lord, "Alden Partridge's Proposal."

“concerned with the advancement of education at the lower levels.”<sup>45</sup> In an 1850 speech, Turner began publicly advocating the education of what he termed the “industrial classes:”

All civilized society is, necessarily, divided into two distinct cooperative, not antagonistic, classes: a small class, whose proper business it is to teach the true principles of religion, law, medicine, science, art, and literature; and a much larger class, who are engaged in some form of labor in agriculture, commerce, and the arts. For the sake of convenience, we will designate the former the *professional*, and the latter the *industrial* class; not implying that each may not be equally industrious, the one in their intellectual, the other in their industrial pursuits.<sup>46</sup>

Turner concerned himself with the wants of the industrial classes. He believed that their desire for equal opportunity could be supplied through a new educational “system of *liberal education* for their own class, and adapted to their own pursuits; to create for them an *industrial literature*, adapted to their professional wants; . . . to elevate them, their pursuits, and their posterity. . . .”<sup>47</sup> Turner did not want to see a ruling caste formed by the professional men over the uneducated industrial classes. He pointed out that while the professional men had universities, colleges, books, libraries, teachers, and professors available for their interests and needs, the industrial classes with their agricultural and mechanical pursuits had nothing. According to Turner, existing knowledge would be powerless until properly applied, and the industrial classes did not have the means to apply it without proper education. He was not asking for special treatment, he simply wanted “the same principles of mental discipline and thorough scientific practical instruction” as the professional and military classes.<sup>48</sup> Therefore, Turner and the Industrial League of Illinois (organized in 1852 with the goal of

---

<sup>45</sup> Carriel, *Jonathan Baldwin Turner*, viii.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 69.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 110, 111, 114.

promoting the interests of the industrial classes) petitioned the Senate and House of Representatives of Illinois to present a memorial Congress, and on February 8, 1853, the General Assembly of Illinois unanimously adopted a resolution to

procure the passage of a law of Congress donating to each State in the Union an amount of public lands not less in value than *five hundred thousand dollars*, for liberal endowment of a system of industrial universities, one in each State in the Union, to cooperate with each other, and with the Smithsonian Institute at Washington, for the more liberal and practical education of our industrial classes and their teachers; a liberal and varied education adapted to the manifold want of a practical and enterprising people, and a provision for such educational facilities, being in manifest concurrence with the intimations of the popular will, it urgently demands the united efforts of our national strength.<sup>49</sup>

While Turner promoted agricultural and mechanical education, he was not advocating a university that would teach, exclusively, technical skills. He called for the teaching of “branches of learning *related* to agriculture and the mechanic arts,” not agriculture and the mechanic arts themselves. Turner, along with other men from Illinois attending a discussion on the mission and location of an agricultural college there, believed that technical skills could best be learned on model farms, in workshops, or at home, and therefore a university should not be organized entirely to teach practical arts. He did not want a workshop or potato patch, as might be developed to teach the practical arts of agriculture and mechanics; instead, he wanted a university of the highest possible grade.<sup>50</sup>

Turner traveled all over Illinois promoting education for the industrial classes. In a letter to his wife in January of 1853, Turner wrote that the railroad men of Chicago were so interested in his educational plans that they gave him a six-month railroad pass

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 116.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 161.

that would allow him to travel free.<sup>51</sup> On March 20, 1854, two members of the Illinois Congressional delegation, Sen. James Shields and Rep. Elihu Washburne, presented Congress with Turner's plan.<sup>52</sup> Newspapers across the nation, including Horace Greeley's *New York Tribune*, reported on Turner's educational plan.

Turner's plan widely appeared in newspapers. Horace Greeley advocated it, members of Congress discussed it in 1854 (Morrill entered Congress the next year), and the United States Agricultural Society meeting fully debated it in 1856. Morrill was in attendance at the meeting as his county's representative.<sup>53</sup> It is all but certain that Morrill heard of Turner's educational ideas, even if he had not met him. In a letter to Morrill on February 5, 1858, Freeman Grant Cary of College Hill, Ohio enclosed several articles favoring Morrill's land grant bill, including one by Jonathan Turner.<sup>54</sup>

Turner wanted industrial institutions that would provide a scientific, liberal and practical education to the industrial classes equal to the education given to the professional classes. His interest was in providing equal education for farmers and mechanics—what he called the industrial classes. Turner was not concerned with providing an agricultural and mechanical education as much as he was concerned with providing an education for agriculturalists and mechanics—the common man. According

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 132.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 138.

<sup>53</sup> Eddy, *Colleges for our Land and Time*, 24-27.

<sup>54</sup> In 1846, Cary opened an agricultural and mechanical institution in Ohio, and in the following years actively spoke out in favor of land grant colleges. Like many of the other advocates of the Morrill Act, the mission for his Farmers' College was "to bring higher education to classes of people not served by traditional colleges, and to give them the option of a practical education." Like Morrill, "Cary believed that agricultural education was crucial to national prosperity." He, too, called for the allocation of federal funds for agricultural and mechanical education, and when Morrill's bill entered Congress he worked in Ohio and Washington to secure congressional support. More information can be found about Freeman G. Cary in Julianna Chaszar's article "Leading and Losing in the Agricultural Education Movement: Freeman G. Cary and Farmers' College, 1846-1884," *History of Higher Education Annual* 18 (1998): 25-46; Justin Smith Morrill Papers, F. G. Cary, College Hill, to Justin Morrill, Vermont, 5 February 1858, transcript in the hand of F. G. Cary, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

to Turner, “the whole interest, business, and destiny for life of the two classes run in opposite lines; and that the same course of study should be equally well adapted to both is utterly impossible as that the same pursuits and habits should equally concern and benefit both classes.”<sup>55</sup> His idea of a land grant college was an institution that provided an education for the classes not served by the traditional professional college. Turner wanted an institution that served the laboring classes by providing a practical education for them. A literary, classical education would not help the industrial class. He believed that the industrial class needed colleges that educated them to become practical thinkers, not classical scholars, and therefore advocated what he called “industrial colleges.” While Morrill’s motives were mainly to increase the country’s wealth, Turner desired to enhance the minds of the people.

Another key figure in the movement for agricultural and mechanical education was Amos Brown. According to Daniel W. Lang, Brown gave “educational expression to the concept of what a land grant college should be.”<sup>56</sup> Brown was born on a farm in New Hampshire in 1804. He entered Dartmouth College in 1829, where he studied theology and philosophy, but avoided the sciences because he did not like them. After graduating from Dartmouth, Brown attended Andover Theological Seminary. Upon completion of his studies at Andover, Brown served as a principal and teacher for several years before taking a position as the president of the People’s College, chartered in 1853, and located in Havana, New York.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Carriel, *Jonathan Baldwin Turner*, 71-72.

<sup>56</sup> Lang, “Amos Brown,” 163.

<sup>57</sup> Havana, New York was incorporated in 1836 and 1895 its name was changed to Montour Falls. Montour Falls is located in the center of the New York Finger Lakes region, at the southern tip of Seneca Lake, and thirty minutes west of Ithaca. The following information about the People’s College is from Ray C.

The People's College Association (the founders of the People's College) grew out of a labor movement for mechanical education that began in the mid-1800s. Labor organizations began to advocate an education for mechanics following the Panic of 1837. Changes in technology and manufacturing processes also contributed to the movement for mechanical education, and organized labor and newspapers pushed for a new type of education that would serve the mechanic's needs.

Formed on July 13, 1843, in Buffalo, New York, the Mechanics' Mutual Protection "sought to diffuse a more general knowledge of the scientific principles governing mechanics and the arts," to elevate the workingman by making him more independent and proficient, to protect the mechanic "from the encroachments of wealth and power," and "above all awaken a common interest in their profession [of mechanic arts]."<sup>58</sup> In 1849, with approximately 10,000 members statewide, the Mechanics' Mutual Protection proposed to establish a college for mechanics and artisans. The proposal gained widespread support, and on August 15, 1851 seventeen members of the Mechanics' Mutual Protection met and elected prominent men from the state to form The People's College Association. Members including Horace Greeley, Martin Van Buren,

---

Brown's "Colleges that have Closed, Merged, or Changed Names," and can be found on the internet at: <[http://www.wcmo.edu/wc\\_users/homepages/staff/brownr/NewYorkCC.htm](http://www.wcmo.edu/wc_users/homepages/staff/brownr/NewYorkCC.htm)>. The People's College was incorporated in 1853, and the foundation stone laid in 1858. On May 14, 1863, the income from the Morrill Act was offered to the People's College. The trustees of the college were unable to meet the conditions for preparation and endowment set by the legislature; ultimately, the money from the Morrill Act was given to Cornell University. The People's College project was abandoned, and it became the New York Masonic Orphan Asylum. In 1873 it became a private boarding school, and was later St. John's Seminary of Atonement for high school boys. It is currently the used as the New York State Academy of Fire Science; Lang, 144.

<sup>58</sup> *Landmarks of Tompkins County, New York*, ed. John H. Selkreg, *A History of Cornell University*, by W. T. Hewitt (Syracuse: D. Mason & Company, 1894), available online at <<http://www.rootsweb.com/~nytompki/Landmarks/contents.htm>>.

William Seward, and Erastus Corning worked to raise money for the college. Two years later, the New York legislature approved a bill to charter The People's College.<sup>59</sup>

While there was a general understanding of what agricultural education entailed, the definition of mechanical education was vague at best. It could mean anything from the education of engineers and architects to the training of machine operators and tradesmen. When combined with agriculture, the mechanic arts referred to the manufacture and operation of farm machinery. Proponents of mechanical education faced the challenge of developing a practical and applicable curriculum for a new category of education.<sup>60</sup>

The People's College Association planned the college course exclusively around agriculture and mechanics. The college would not offer the classical education characteristic of existing colleges. Yet Amos Brown, the president they chose for the college, had no agricultural or mechanical knowledge. William H. Brewer, "who knew him well, said that Brown had 'less mechanical instinct than any other intelligent man' he had ever known." Brown's plan, contrary to the plans of the People's College Association, was to incorporate an agricultural course around a core curriculum of the classics. In addition, while the Association called for "easy and broad access to the school," Brown wanted "extensive and stringent admission requirements." Despite the discrepancy in agreement, Brown followed the wishes of the college's sponsors. Three out of four faculty appointments were in agriculture and the mechanic arts, and a model farm was purchased and stocked.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Lang, "Amos Brown," 146; Selkreg, *Landmarks of Tompkins County*.

<sup>60</sup> Lang, "Amos Brown," 141.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 148, 150.



In 1857, two months before Morrill introduced his land grant bill to Congress, Brown asked the trustees of People's College to approve a motion allowing him to travel to Washington to "procure the passage of a bill . . . making appropriation of a portion of the public domain for the promotion of education in the several States similar in kind to that provided for in the plan [the original plan] of The People's College."<sup>62</sup>

Morrill introduced the land grant bill before Brown could complete his proposal and travel to Washington. Upon reading about Morrill's bill in the newspaper, Brown asked for permission from the trustees to travel to Washington to lobby for its passage. According to historian Daniel Lang, once in Washington Brown promoted The People's College as well as Morrill's bill. While Morrill spoke in Congress of land grants and advancing the United States position through agricultural production, Brown passed around circulars explaining in detail the educational aspects of the bill. Morrill himself believed that Brown and the example of the People's College provided crucial support for the passage of the bill. Brown described the college envisioned by the Mechanics' Mutual Protection and the People's College Association, not his own personal vision. Because Morrill discussed little about the educational aspects of the bill, and because he made no effort to refute Brown's claims, the People's College appeared to be a model for the colleges that would be founded under the bill's provisions. According to Lang, newspapers in New York began to refer to Morrill's bill as "the People's College bill."<sup>63</sup>

Brown's educational vision is unclear. He apparently wanted government-funded education, but not one that exclusively taught agriculture and mechanics. Brown

---

<sup>62</sup> 'President Brown's Report,' 15 September 1862, MS, Bramble Family Papers, Cornell University, quoted in Lang, "Amos Brown," 151.

<sup>63</sup> Lang, "Amos Brown," 151-152.

advocated the importance of the classical curriculum, and had grand plans to “build up a Heidelberg in Chemistry, a Berlin in Philosophy, a Harvard in Natural History, a Yale in Agricultural Chemistry, a something equally brilliant in Technology.”<sup>64</sup> He desired stringent admission requirements that certainly would have kept out many of the lower classes. It would appear that Brown’s educational vision was for a competitive, rigorous educational institution very similar to the professional liberal arts colleges, with the addition of agricultural classes and government funding to enable it to serve more people.

Brown supported the Morrill Act, but his motives were for the money, not the educational ideology Brown promoted. Money would have put the People’s College on its feet and secured its success. Brown’s personal mission was not the same as other land grant proponents. While his personal educational goals were nothing revolutionary, he was speaking for the Mechanics’ Mutual Protection and the People’s College Association, whose visions were more along the lines of other land grant proponents.<sup>65</sup>

In 1862 Brown presented various Congressmen with circulars describing the People’s College as a model for land grant institutions. Therefore, it is important to note the mission of the People’s College. It would prepare students to enter the workforce immediately after graduation. It would offer courses in agricultural and mechanical subjects with machine shops and a farm where students would be encouraged to work as a part of their course of instruction. Men from outside the college would be invited to

---

<sup>64</sup> William H. Brewer to Waterman T. Hewitt, 11 March 1894, Howard Papers, quoted in Lang, “Amos Brown,” 157.

<sup>65</sup> Lang, “Amos Brown,” 139-165.

attend lectures in return for working on the farm or in the shops with students, where they would impart their own first-hand knowledge of farming or a trade.<sup>66</sup>

Only Brown presented congressmen with the educational aspects of the bill. Morrill argued that the act would increase the nation's wealth through the education of the agriculturalist; Collamer, Simmons, and Wade argued in agreement with Morrill; Harlan pointed out the need for equal representation by the lower classes and education for the common man; Partridge advocated a useful scientific and military education; and Turner called for the education of the industrial classes (common man). Morrill specified that the colleges should offer "branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts," not "excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics." In addition, he asked that "the opportunity of obtaining a sound education" would be "adapted to the wants of the individual" and "offered at reduced rates."<sup>67</sup>

With the exception of Brown, none of the supporters of the act presented the educational requirements of the bill. When Brown showed up in Washington to lobby for the passage of the bill, he provided what the proponents needed—an educational prototype. Thanks to Brown and the People's College, congressmen that voted for the bill's passage, while not specifying educational requirements, certainly had an educational vision in mind. The educational mission, as presented by the People's College and viewed by congressmen as a model for land grant institutions, was to prepare students to enter a mechanical trade or take up scientific farming immediately after

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 142-143.

<sup>67</sup> Congress, House of Representatives, Representative Morrill of Vermont speaking for Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges, 37<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., *Congressional Globe* (6 June 1862): 256.

graduation by providing an education based exclusively on practical experience, manual labor, and knowledgeable instruction in the areas of mechanical and agricultural education.

With many different proponents and thus many different educational visions, the Morrill Act was signed into law in 1862. But with such a broad mission, newly founded and existing colleges accepting the act's funding were unclear on what their goals should be as land grant institutions.

In reviewing the different visions of the proponents of land grant colleges, one finds the common educational themes of agricultural, mechanical, and scientific as well as practicality, affordability, and accessibility. The following table is helpful in summarizing the contributions of each of the act's proponents.

Table 5. Proponents of the Morrill Act and Their Visions

	Alden Partridge	Jonathan Turner	The People's College Association	James Harlan	Benjamin Wade, James Simmons, Jacob Collamer	Justin Morrill
Prepare Students to Become Useful and Active Citizens	X					
Teach Scientific Agriculture	X	X	X		X	X
Teach Mechanic Arts	X	X	X			X
Teach Military Training	X					X
Teach Liberal Arts	X	X				X
Educate the Common Man		X		X		X
Equality in Education		X		X		
Universal Accessibility			X			X
Increase the Wealth and Status of the Nation					X	X
Locally Tailored and Controlled					X	X

Although Justin Morrill was the primary sponsor of the Morrill Act, many others were actively involved in promoting the bill and securing support for its passage. The mission of the Morrill Act, as relevant in 1862 and 2005, should combine the visions of all of the act's major advocates because Justin Morrill's act ultimately combined the goals of all of the earlier land grant proponents. Therefore, under the broader context of the act, and in spirit rather than letter, the leading object of the land grant institutions should be to *increase national wealth and world status* by providing an *affordable* education *accessible to all*, especially the laboring classes, so that through study focusing on *scientific agricultural and mechanical education*, but also including *classical studies* and *military training*, they might become *useful and active citizens*, rising in status and have *representation and opportunities equal* to the professional men of the country.

The principal purpose of the Morrill Act, as relevant to the twenty-first century land grant institutions, was to increase the economic prosperity of each individual state and therefore the world status of the United States. In 1862, in order to accomplish this feat, the land grant institution was to provide an affordable and accessible education that catered to the to the laboring classes, the majority of which pursued agricultural and mechanical pursuits. The overall purpose of the land grant institution has not changed. Its mission is still to provide an affordable and accessible education that is adapted to meet the needs of the lower and middle classes, the "laboring classes." There is an abundance of institutions that serve the upper class, with stringent admission requirements, expensive tuitions, and professional degrees. In providing an education for the laboring classes, the land grant institution should offer degrees and majors not offered by liberal arts and professional colleges. By providing an education adapted to the needs

of the laboring classes, the land grant institution will impart an education that produces constructive and involved citizens with representation and opportunities equal to the upper classes of the country.

Two examples of land grant institutions are Auburn University in Auburn, Alabama and the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia. While the dates of their establishment, their methods of governance, and their acceptance of the Morrill Act's funding are vastly different, they are both proud of their land grant heritage and status. How did they meet the purpose of the Morrill Act in 1862, and how are they meeting it in the twenty-first century? An in depth look at the defining periods of each of these universities will lend insight into and improve our understanding of the history and the present status of land grant institutions.

## CHAPTER 3

### AUBURN: ALABAMA LAND GRANT UNIVERSITY

Auburn University and the University of Georgia are two examples of land grant institutions. They are both located in the South and agriculture has figured large in the economies of their respective states throughout all of their histories. How have each of these universities applied the mission of the Morrill Act over the years? The University of Georgia provides the example of an existing institution that accepted the funding of the Morrill Act, while Auburn is an example of a college that was begun under the auspices of the Morrill Act. How do these universities interpret the mission of the Morrill Act in the twenty-first century?

Because the Morrill Act only applied to states in the Union, Alabama and Georgia could not take advantage of the federal funds until their return to the Union.<sup>1</sup> In 1869, Governor William Hugh Smith of Alabama took steps that allowed Alabama to receive 240,000 acres of land scrip. In 1871, Governor Robert B. Lindsay sold Alabama's scrip

---

<sup>1</sup> The 1862 Morrill Act only applied to states in the Union. A subsequent act in 1866 allowed the Confederate states to take advantage of the act upon their return to the Union. *U.S. Statutes at Large* 14 (1868): 208-209.

at ninety cents an acre for a total of \$216,000. The money was invested in eight percent bonds of the State of Alabama due in 1886.<sup>2</sup>

Florence, Tuscaloosa, Talladega, Birmingham, Elyton, and Auburn all competed to become the site of Alabama's land grant college. After much debate the legislature settled on Auburn. It offered the buildings and thirteen acres of the East Alabama Male College, a Methodist institution established in 1856, as well as seventy-five acres of land southwest of the college buildings. Two citizens also donated land for the college, bringing the total amount donated to two hundred acres. The Alabama legislature hoped that the state's new land grant institution, the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama, would help Alabamians rebuild their postwar economy by providing technical training in agriculture and mechanical arts. In accordance with the act, the curricula would also include other scientific and classical studies, and would require military instruction.<sup>3</sup>

In keeping with the Morrill Act, the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama focused on educating the lower and emerging middle classes in agriculture and mechanics. According to an annual report made by President Isaac Tichenor in 1876, 86 percent of the population of Alabama lived by agriculture.<sup>4</sup> Adding the population

---

<sup>2</sup> William Warren Rogers, "The Founding of Alabama's Land Grant College at Auburn," *The Alabama Review* XL (January 1987):14-37; Allen Kerr, *A History of the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, 1883-1983* (Auburn, 1985), 8; Board of Trustees Minutes, 30 July 1873, Special Collections & Archives, Auburn University.

<sup>3</sup> The East Alabama Male College was established by Alabama Methodists in 1856 as a Christian liberal arts school. Its bankruptcy following the Civil War led the Methodist Church to offer the school to the state for use as the land grant college. Board Minutes, 30 July 1873.

<sup>4</sup> For additional reading Isaac Tichenor, see Michael Edward Williams, "Isaac Taylor *Tichenor*: The Contributions of a Nineteenth-century Denominationalist to the Preservation and Extension of the Southern Baptist Convention" (Ph.D. Diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993). Williams's book, *Isaac Taylor Tichenor : The Creation of the Baptist New South* (University of Alabama Press, 2005), scheduled for release in late 2005.



involved in mechanical pursuits brought the percentage to at least 90 percent of the entire population. The A & M College was the only institution of higher learning in the state that provided a liberal and practical education to those two groups. The college was organized for that purpose, and its courses of study, labors of its faculty, and the whole spirit of the institution was directed to that end.<sup>5</sup>

In selecting course offerings, the Board chose from courses offered by land grant colleges in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Missouri. Each of the courses required four years of study, with the exception of agriculture. Students choosing to study in agriculture received a three year degree because of fewer requirements in language and math than the science and literary courses. The college offered five degrees—literature (Latin and Greek), science, civil engineering, surveying (this course could be completed for a certificate of proficiency, not for an actual degree), and agriculture. The degree of agriculture consisted of two semesters of language (French, Latin, or German), natural science, botany, chemistry, mathematics, political economy, surveying, and practical agriculture. Students who remained in the college one year after graduating could earn a masters degree.<sup>6</sup>

Emerging land grant institutions faced a cynical public; many people questioned the usefulness of agricultural colleges. People did not understand the importance of attending college to learn how to become a farmer. While the faculty members and the Board of Trustees recognized the importance of agricultural studies, parents were often reluctant to lose their laboring sons to higher education. In a speech before the Board,

---

<sup>5</sup> Board Minutes, 24 June 1876.

<sup>6</sup> *1875-1876 Catalogue of the State Agricultural and Mechanical College, Auburn, Lee County, Alabama* (Montgomery: J. P. Armstrong & Co., 1876), 12-13, 15.

President Tichenor emphasized the prejudice that was present in the minds of many agriculturalists against what they called “book farming” and the misconception of the scope and design of agricultural colleges which led them to undervalue, if not despise, the advantages they provided. The families of the state involved in farming could not afford to lose their sons to college, and those who could did not desire that they become agriculturalists.<sup>7</sup>

Similar to other land grant colleges, the first few years for the A & M College of Alabama were disappointing, discouraging, and financially strained. The first term of the college began in the fall of 1872. By the opening of the second session on the first of January in 1873 the college was in debt, the faculty unpaid, and the financial resources were undetermined. There were no desks or furniture, and no money to buy them. Enrollment was small—even the attendance of local students was low. President Tichenor claimed that the men of letters who usually improved college facilities had no understanding or desire for knowledge of agricultural pursuits. In short, he believed that educated men with money had no interest in aiding an agricultural college.<sup>8</sup>

President Tichenor proposed to improve enrollment by providing agricultural scholarships for one student from each county, allowing them room, board, tuition, books, and uniform for a cost of one hundred dollars—as long as they restricted their course of study to agriculture or engineering. While this would deduct from already dwindling funds, if the students on scholarship encouraged others to enroll then it would more than make up for the money given in scholarships. Alabama law already required that two boys from every county, recommended by the county school superintendent,

---

<sup>7</sup> Board Minutes, 30 July 1873.

<sup>8</sup> Board Minutes, 30 July 1873; Board Minutes, 20 March 1872; Board Minutes, 22 March 1872.

receive scholarships for free tuition at the A & M College. In addition to agricultural scholarships, and in keeping with the original religious affiliation of the East Alabama Male College, the A & M College admitted free of tuition the sons of ministers in active service and men preparing for the ministry.<sup>9</sup>

President Tichenor believed that no young man should go without education, and therefore began awarding boys whose parents could not afford the college's fees admission without tuition. By 1875 so many students were receiving tuition waivers that President Tichenor urged the Board of Trustees to grant free tuition to all students. In a report to the trustees Tichenor reported that nearly half of all of the students paid only incidental fees. He advocated abolishing tuition and levying a flat twenty-dollar fee for incidental expenses. In addition to believing that this would more equally distribute the burden of college expenses among the students, he reasoned that the Board furnished education at a cost decisively lower than the other colleges of the state and that the recognition of that fact should be circulated among the people in hopes of increasing enrollment. President Tichenor believed that the annual cost per student at the A & M College should amount to approximately two hundred dollars.<sup>10</sup>

Admission to the college was easy, but the college itself was not. The Board granted admission to any white male at least fifteen years old who passed an oral or written exam consisting of geography, grammar (including spelling), and arithmetic (algebra and geometry). Applications were sent to the president, along with testimonials

---

<sup>9</sup> This was a large feat; in 1872 there were sixty-five counties in Alabama. Providing free tuition for two students from each county meant providing free tuition for 130 students, more than the enrollment for entire college. Genealogy Inc., "County Formation Maps" (The State of Alabama, 1999) [on-line]; available from [http://www.segenealogy.com/Alabama/al\\_maps/images/al53.gif](http://www.segenealogy.com/Alabama/al_maps/images/al53.gif); Board Minutes, 30 July 1872; Board Minutes, 30 July 1873; *1875-1876 Catalogue*, 11.

<sup>10</sup> Board Minutes, 12 July 1875.

vouching for the applicant's upstanding moral character. Students would then be admitted into the class (one through four, with four being the lowest) for which they were found to be qualified.

The majority of students attending the A & M College pursued degrees related to agriculture and engineering. In 1872, of 103 students, 43 were pursuing branches related to agriculture, 39 were pursuing branches related to mechanic arts (engineering), and 21 were pursuing classical studies. In 1878, the enrollment of 279 students at the college exceeded that of all of the institutions of the state and placed the college in the front rank of the colleges in the South (the University of Georgia had an enrollment of 116 in 1878).<sup>11</sup>

Perhaps the most important factor in shaping the early years of the A & M College was the severe lack of funds. In 1873, the interest generated on the sale of the land scrip amounted to \$20,000 for the year. Student fees amounted to \$90 per paying student (\$40 instruction fee, \$5 surgeon's fee for medical attention, \$10 incidental fee, and \$35 uniform fee), and totaled approximately \$3000. Of the \$23,000 available for expenditure, Tichenor proposed that \$15,000 would go to pay the faculty, \$2000 would go to the college farm, and \$3000 would go towards incidental expenses. This would leave only \$3000, of which none (in accordance with the Morrill Act) could be spent on building repair and maintenance. By 1877, the A & M College had reached an indebtedness of \$20,000.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Board Minutes, 30 July 1873; Board Minutes, 24 June 1878; *The University of Georgia Fact Book 2000*, 42.

<sup>12</sup> Board Minutes, 30 July 1873; *1875-1876 Catalogue*, 9; Board Minutes, 23 June 1879; Board Minutes, 8 January 1877.

While the faculty of the A & M College of Alabama endured hardships in almost every area, they were able to overcome them all. Maintaining a strong devotion to education in the areas of agriculture and mechanical arts, the faculty and the Board of Trustees fulfilled the spirit of the Morrill Act of 1862. In its early years, the A & M College of Alabama strove to uphold the mission of the proponents of the Morrill Act. In an effort to *increase the wealth and status of the nation*, it provided an *affordable education, accessible to all*, especially the laboring classes, so that through the study of *scientific and practical agricultural and mechanical education*, and including *classical studies and military training*, students might become *useful and active citizens*, rising in status and having *representation and opportunities equal* to the professional men of the country.

In 1880, at the request of the Bureau of Education in Washington, the faculty reported that of more than 500 graduates since 1872, 222 were engaged in agriculture.<sup>13</sup>

Table 6. Vocations of Graduates of the A & M College of Alabama, 1872-1880

Agriculture	222
Mechanic Arts	23
Professional	71
Engineering	17
Commerce	90
Unknown	94

Source: Board of Trustees Minutes, 29 June 1880.

Despite these promising figures, the year 1880 proved to be a turning point for the college's enrollment. Figures steadily increased from 104 students during the 1875

---

<sup>13</sup> Board Minutes, 29 June 1880.

academic year to an enrollment of to 279 for 1878. The next year, enrollment began to decrease. President Tichenor credited the lower numbers to “the opportunities opening before young men and the demand for their services occasioned by the great revival of business.” He believed that many prospective applicants had chosen business pursuits rather than the agricultural and mechanical degrees offered at the state’s land grant institution. Despite President Tichenor’s optimism that enrollment would improve the next year, it would not reach its previous high of 279 until the 1890 academic year.<sup>14</sup>

Following a fire that destroyed “Old Main,” the A & M College’s main building, Samford Hall, was constructed in the center of campus in 1888. The historic building proudly proclaimed the two main departments of the University as stated in its mission from 1872. The archway above the door on one side of the main entrance announced “Agriculture,” while the other proclaimed “Mechanics.” Just as Samford Hall was once the main building on campus, the studies of agriculture and mechanics were the main focus of the institution. As funding and enrollment increased, the University erected more buildings and offered expanded courses.

Over the years, the original mission of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama evolved with the interests of each president and the changing needs of the people of the state. In a report to the Board of Trustees in 1873, President Tichenor stated that the leading design of the Morrill Act “was to benefit the Agricultural interests of the country.” Therefore, he concluded, the “leading feature of the college” should be to help the agricultural sector of Alabama. During the ten years he served as president,

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

Tichenor focused on strengthening and improving the college's Department of Agriculture.<sup>15</sup>

William Leroy Broun succeeded Tichenor as president in 1882. He served as president during the 1882 academic year and from 1884 until his death in 1902. His focus, rather than on the Department of Agriculture, was on teaching. In his June 1883 report he emphasized that the leading object of the college was “to teach, to teach those branches that relate to Agriculture and the Mechanical Arts.” He believed that the best way for the college to comply with the law would be to concentrate the educational force of the college on the few courses required by the Morrill Act so that in time “an Institute distinct for teaching Science and its application” might be built. According to Broun, “with continuous efforts to expand only in this direction, the College would ultimately become what it was designed by law to become, a Polytechnic Institute.”

While the Morrill Act did set teaching agriculture and the mechanic arts the leading objects of the land grant institutions, the main intent of the Morrill Act was accessibility and affordability. By educating the laboring classes with an applicable, affordable, and accessible education, the land grant institutions would increase the wealth and status of the nation. The applicable education in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century was agriculture and mechanic arts, the profession of the majority of the United States citizens.<sup>16</sup>

Under President Broun, the mission of the Agricultural and Mechanical College changed. By 1885, the mission statement in the A & M College Catalogue was no longer “to teach such branches of learning as related to agriculture and the mechanical arts.”

---

<sup>15</sup> Board Minutes, July 1873.

<sup>16</sup> Board Minutes, June 1883.

Instead, it provided a new interpretation of the Morrill Act and an additional title. The title page for the catalogue clearly stated “The State Agricultural and Mechanical College, Alabama Polytechnic Institute.” The addition to the name signified the expanding system of practical instruction in industrial science offered by the college. The new mission statement read, “The leading object of the college, in conformity with the act of Congress and the acts of the State Legislature, is to teach the principles and applications of science,” especially those relating to agriculture and the mechanic arts.<sup>17</sup>

Funding from the Hatch Act in 1887 furthered the goal of a science-based education. It appropriated federal funds for the establishment of an agricultural experiment station in connection with the state land grant colleges. The A & M College owned an experimental farm, but had always struggled over funding the necessary experiments. While the Hatch Act expanded the responsibility of the land grant college to include research as well as teaching, it did not alter the mission of land grant institutions.<sup>18</sup> Land grant institutions were still primarily intended to maintain affordable and accessible classes that were applicable to the laboring classes in each state. The A & M College continued to serve the laboring classes of the state, but emphasis on research slowly became the new focus.

Reflecting the change to a science based curriculum and the addition of the research component, the Alabama legislature voted in 1899 to formally change the name of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama to the Alabama Polytechnic Institute. President Broun maintained that the language of the Morrill Act was broad and

---

<sup>17</sup> *1888-1889 Catalogue*; Board Minutes, 27 August 1885.

<sup>18</sup> National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, “The Land Grant Tradition Hatch Act,” <[http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land\\_Grant/Hatch.htm](http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land_Grant/Hatch.htm)>, accessed 10 December 2004.



comprehensive, and included science and its application to the arts. He believed that while the act made prominent the fields of agriculture and the mechanic arts, it did not limit “the scope of the College thereto, as its contracted name” indicated. According to Broun, the name Agricultural and Mechanical College was not given to land grant institutions by the Morrill Act, but “originated in the accidental endorsement of a Congressional Clerk.” The Alabama Polytechnic Institute would not only teach agriculture and mechanic arts, but would enter “on a larger sphere to teach science and its application as related to the varied industrial interests of civilization.”<sup>19</sup>

In the years to come, Alabama Polytechnic Institute devoted college work “to the study of natural sciences and their application to practical education.” According to Charles Thach, president of the institute from 1902 to 1920, a students’ education was “based upon a sound and thorough education in History, Language, and Mathematics.” As president, Thach focused on technical education and applied science. Student interest in agriculture and related subjects waned during the first ten years of the twentieth century, but in 1910 enrollment began to increase with the erection of an agriculture building and a renewed concentration in farm work.<sup>20</sup>

In 1910, the college began its transition from a “technical” purpose to a scholarly one. Academic achievement took precedence, and catering to the laboring classes through accessibility was no longer the college’s primary goal. As a result of its new mission, it was finally able to eliminate a sub-freshman preparatory class for ill-prepared students. O. D. Smith, Auburn’s president in 1901, had spoken of the desire “to eliminate the sub-freshman class, and engage in strictly collegiate work.” Unfortunately, “the

---

<sup>19</sup> Board Minutes, 13 June 1897.

<sup>20</sup> Board Minutes, 3 June 1907; Board Minutes, 30 May 1910.

deficiency of good fitting schools, especially in the rural sections,” still rendered it necessary to retain the class. He went on to say that the increased interest and improvement in public education, and the rapidly increasing number of excellent high schools, gave hope that the sub-collegiate class might be discontinued in the near future.<sup>21</sup> Although the near future lasted ten years, when the A & M College began its transition from technical to scholarly in 1910 it was finally able to stop maintaining a preparatory class.

By 1913, agriculture had established itself as a science and people no longer sneered at what they had called “book farming.” Out of a total enrollment of 731, 345 students pursued agricultural degrees. The threat of the boll weevil demanded diversification and emphasis in the applied science of farming. In 1914, the Smith Lever Act established the Cooperative Extension Service, a partnership of the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the land grant institutions. The act called for practical applications of research, demonstrations of existing or improved practices and technologies in agriculture, home economics, and rural energy. County agents distributed information through demonstrations, publications, workshops, and visiting rural families.<sup>22</sup>

With the passage of the Smith Lever Act, the Alabama Polytechnic Institute now focused itself on a three-fold mission of teaching, research, and extension for “the advancement of science and arts.” While the Hatch and the Smith-Lever Acts did not change the mission of the land grant universities, many land grant institutions changed

---

<sup>21</sup> Board Minutes, May 1911; Board Minutes, 9 June 1902.

<sup>22</sup> The Smith-Lever Act does not say anything about Congress’s understanding of the mission of the land grant colleges. It says that the money from the act is to go to colleges receiving the 1862 Morrill Act funds and should be used for diffusing “useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture, home economics, and rural energy.” Board Minutes, 26 May 1913; Board Minutes, 20 May 1916; National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, “The Land-Grant Tradition Smith-Lever Act,” <[http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land\\_Grant/Smith-Lever.htm](http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land_Grant/Smith-Lever.htm)>, accessed 9 December 2004.

their missions. Providing an accessible and affordable education for the laboring classes was no longer the primary mission of Alabama's land grant college. Instead, according to President Bradford Knapp in 1931, the "three great functions of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute" were teaching, agricultural research, and agricultural and home economics extension work.<sup>23</sup>

Between 1930 and 1940 enrollment increased from 1,927 to 4,191, more than doubling despite the state of depression. As shown in Table 7, every School within the Institute saw at least a hundred percent increase in enrollment, and the Schools of Agriculture, Home Economics, Science and Literature, and Veterinary Medicine more than doubled.

Between 1931 and 1935, Alabama ranked seventh among the thirteen southern states in gross farm income, but by 1945 had dropped to tenth. The net income per farm for Alabama from 1940 to 1945 was less than all of the thirteen southern states. The Governor of Alabama, Jim Folsom, blamed the Agricultural Extension Service. According to an article in the *Montgomery Advertiser*, the welfare of the Alabama farmers had "been neglected by the men chiefly responsible for that welfare"—the Extension Service.

Despite the agricultural rank of the state, and the discontent with the Extension Service, enrollment in the School of Agriculture increased from 6.4 percent of the total enrollment in 1930 to 11.0 percent of the total enrollment in 1950. However, other schools saw increase as well. The School of Education increased from 21.4 percent to 24.8 percent, and the School of Science and Literature grew from 15.9 percent to 20.2

---

<sup>23</sup> Bradford Knapp, "Report of the President of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute to the Board of Trustees," Board of Minutes, 18 May 1931.

percent. Also notable was the decrease in the percentage of the total enrollment of the School of Engineering, from 35.0 percent in 1930 to 20.6 percent in 1950.

Table 7. Alabama Polytechnic Institute Enrollment, 1930, 1940, 1950

School	1930	% of Total Enrollment	1940	% of Total Enrollment	1950	% of Total Enrollment
Agriculture	124	6.4	444	12.4	937	11.0
Architecture and Allied Arts	138	7.2	162	3.9	770	9.1
Chemistry and Pharmacy	180	9.3	300	7.2	629	7.4
Education	474	21.4	853	20.4	2108	24.8
Engineering	675	35.0	1183	28.2	1747	20.6
Science and Literature	307	15.9	674	16.1	1713	20.2
Home Economics	47	2.4	255	6.1	315	3.7
Veterinary Medicine	43	2.2	245	5.8	266	3.1
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>1926</b>		<b>4191</b>		<b>8485</b>	

Source: *Alabama Polytechnic Institute Bulletin*, 1930, 1940.

In 1952, Trustee Ed Roberts called attention to the growing sense that the college was placing more stress on the liberal arts rather than the sciences and professional schools. In response to Roberts's assertion, President Ralph B. Draughon (1948-1965) pointed to the decline in the agricultural population over the years, which translated into decreasing enrollment in agriculture at Alabama Polytechnic Institute. The Board discussed the issue, and suggested that the college's emphasis should focus more on agriculture and less on education.<sup>24</sup> House of Representatives member Walter Givhan agreed that the Alabama Polytechnic Institute should change its direction. In a letter to the Board of Trustees he expressed the desire to increase Alabama's agricultural production. "Most of us believe that the best way to make Alabama progressive and to

<sup>24</sup> Ralph Draughon served as acting president for fourteen months before becoming the president of the college in 1948. Board Minutes, 7 November 1952.

have additional tax money is to expand our research and education in agriculture, wrote Givhan. By increasing agricultural research and education, Givhan believed that the agricultural income of the state could “be increased by hundreds of millions of dollars over a period of years.”<sup>25</sup>

By 1960, under the leadership of President Draughon, the transition begun in 1910 from a technical purpose to a scholarly purpose was completed. To reflect this change in purpose, the Board of Trustees decided that the name “Auburn—Alabama Land Grant University” would be a better description of the institution and its mission of teaching, research, and extension. The Alabama legislature agreed and in January of 1960 Auburn University became the official name of the college.<sup>26</sup>

In 1876, 86 percent of Alabama’s population lived by agriculture. By 1964 only 45 percent of Alabama’s population lived in rural areas and only 7.5 percent were engaged in full-time farming. In 1964, 75 percent of Auburn’s students enrolled in the schools of education, engineering, and science and literature, with the remaining 25 percent spread between agriculture, pharmacy, chemistry, architecture and the arts, home economics, and veterinary medicine.<sup>27</sup>

The greatest change in the percentage of students enrolled in the School of Agriculture came in the ten years between 1950 and 1960. Forty-five Alabama counties lost population as the state’s rural population decreased 14 percent and the farm population decreased by 60 percent. Students pursuing degrees in the School of

---

<sup>25</sup> Board Minutes, 30 October 1953.

<sup>26</sup> Board Minutes, 13 June 1949; Board Minutes 1 June 1959; *Birmingham News*, 4 October 1964; Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, “Degrees Awarded by College/School by Level and Gender, 2003-2004,” Auburn University, <[http://www.panda.auburn.edu/reports/degrees/degrees\\_awarded\\_by\\_College\\_major\\_0304.pdf](http://www.panda.auburn.edu/reports/degrees/degrees_awarded_by_College_major_0304.pdf)>, accessed 5 December 2004.

<sup>27</sup> Board Minutes, June 24, 1876; Mickey Logue, “Auburn Sees Many Changes as Student Load Grows Heavier,” *Birmingham News*, 5 October 1964, 8.

Agriculture amounted to 11.6 percent of the total enrollment in 1950, but only 6.8 percent in 1960. Table 8 shows the changing interests of the students, with the bold numbers denoting schools and majors that decreased in enrollment between 1950 and 1961. Most notable is the decrease of interest in agriculture, agricultural engineering, and agricultural education, and the increase of interest in forestry, pre-law, and physics.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> *The Alabama Polytechnic Institute Bulletin, 1950-1951*, (Auburn, Alabama: Alabama Polytechnic Institute, 1951), Auburn University Libraries, Ralph Brown Draughon Library, Department of Special Collections & University Archives; *The Alabama Polytechnic Institute Bulletin, 1960-1961*; Mickey Logue, "Auburn Sees Bigger Role for Ag School," *Birmingham News*, 11 October, 1964, B1.

Table 8. Changes in Division and Course Enrollment, 1950-1960

	1950	1960	% change
School of Agriculture	937	775	<b>17.3</b>
Agriculture	574	288	<b>49.8</b>
Agricultural Administration	54	49	<b>9.3</b>
Agricultural Engineering	97	53	<b>45.4</b>
Fish Culture	16	--	--
Forestry	137	252	45.6
Game Management	15	--	--
Ornamental Horticulture	44	30	<b>31.8</b>
Biological Sciences	--	103	--
School of Education	2108	3156	33.2
Agricultural Education	447	239	<b>46.5</b>
Education	1583	2689	41.1
Home Economics Education	78	115	32.2
School of Home Economics	315	286	<b>9.2</b>
Home Economics	310	286	<b>7.7</b>
Nursing Science	5	0	<b>100.0</b>
School of Science and Literature	1713	2477	30.8
Accounting	7	--	--
Business Administration	918	1256	26.9
Pre-Dentistry	67	72	6.9
Pre-Law	44	86	48.8
Pre-Medicine	98	105	6.7
Physics	18	96	81.3
Pre-Veterinary Medicine	96	88	<b>8.3</b>
Science and Literature	368	522	29.5
Secretarial Training	97	144	32.6
Mathematics	--	108	--
School of Architecture and Arts	770	758	<b>1.6</b>
School of Chemistry	308	397	22.4
School of Engineering	1747	3024	42.2
School of Pharmacy	321	273	<b>15.0</b>
School of Veterinary Medicine	266	243	<b>8.6</b>

Source: *The Alabama Polytechnic Institute Bulletin*, 1950, 1960.

Enrollment figures for the fall of 2003 showed 4.49 percent of the student population majoring in programs in the College of Agriculture. This number is misleading, as several majors that originated in the Department of Agriculture have since moved to other colleges and schools within the university. The agricultural classes listed

in the catalogues and bulletins prior to 2003 included botany, food science, forestry, biosystems engineering, marine biology, microbiology, rural sociology, wildlife science, and zoology. The enrollment for the College of Agriculture decreased from 6.8 percent in 1960 to 4.49 percent in 2003. However, adding the enrollment in the majors removed from the College of Agriculture since 1960 to the enrollment in the College of Agriculture in 2003 increases the number of students enrolled in traditionally agricultural classes to 7.84 percent. Therefore, the increase in enrollment occurred in the percentage of agricultural students outside of the College of Agriculture (those engaged in botany, food science, marine biology, microbiology, rural sociology, wildlife science, and zoology). Due to the fragmentation of the College of Agriculture over the years, the above increase in the percentage of agricultural students is not credited to the College of Agriculture in the 2003 enrollment statistics.<sup>29</sup>

In 2003, 22.05 percent of Auburn's student population was enrolled in the College of Liberal Arts, 18.75 in the College of Business, 15.77 in the College of Engineering, 10.45 in the College of Sciences and Mathematics, and 9.79 in the College of Education. The enrollment for the College of Agriculture only accounted for 4.49 percent of the student body (or 7.84 percent if including the original courses of study), a vast change from the 1894 high of 54.98 percent.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> The School of Pharmacy and the School of Veterinary Medicine also originated in the School of Agriculture but were moved from the School of Agriculture prior to 1950 and are therefore not included in these figures. *Auburn University Bulletin, 2004-2005*, (Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, June 2004); *Auburn University Bulletin, 1960-1961*, Auburn University Libraries, Ralph Brown Draughton Library, Department of Special Collections & University Archives; *Auburn University Bulletin 1980-1981*, Auburn University Libraries, Ralph Brown Draughton Library, Department of Special Collections & University Archives.

<sup>30</sup> Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, "Enrollment by College/School All Students, Fall Terms 1993-2004," Auburn University, <<http://www.panda.auburn.edu/reports/enrollment/ebcuagsf.asp>>, accessed 5 December 2004; Board Minutes, June 1897.



The number of people engaged in farming in the state of Alabama has decreased over the years, perhaps contributing to the decline in enrollment in the College of Agriculture. In addition, admission standards have become more rigorous and the cost of tuition has risen since the school's beginning. The rural population of the state, with less income and fewer adequate high schools, is no longer the targeted audience of the University. In 2004, more than twenty-five percent of children living in rural areas of Alabama were poor. According to the Population Reference Bureau, 19.4 percent of children in urban areas of Alabama lived in poverty, whereas 26.2 percent of children in rural areas of Alabama were below poverty level.<sup>31</sup>

The cost of attending the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama in 1876 was roughly fifteen dollars of school fees, thirty-five dollars for a military uniform, and between twelve and fifteen dollars a month for room and board. A student could attend the college for less than \$200 a year (equivalent to \$3,224 in 2000). By 1922, the cost of attending the institution for one year reached roughly \$382 for non-residents (equivalent to \$3,925 in 2000) and \$346 (equivalent to \$3,555 in 2000) for residents; by 1964 it cost \$973 for non-residents (equivalent to \$5,402 in 2000) and \$703 for residents (equivalent to \$3,903 in 2000); and by 2000 it reached at the least \$4,908 for residents and \$11,356 for non-residents, excluding meals and parking permits.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> William P. O'Hare and Kenneth M. Johnson, "Child Poverty in Rural America," *Reports on America* 4, no. 1 (Washington, D.C: Population Reference Bureau, March 2004), 9-10.

<sup>32</sup> The calculation of constant dollars is taken from the *Handbook of Labor Statistics U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (Estimate) 1800-2005* on the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis website, <<http://minneapolisfed.org/research/data/us/calc/hist1800.cfm>>, accessed 10 July 2005. The Consumer Price Index is only an estimate for the year 2005. During the 1876-1877 school year the costs were as follows: \$10 incidental fee, \$5 surgeon fee, \$35 uniform fee, and \$12-\$15 for room and board. In 1920 the costs for two semesters was: free tuition for residents, \$36 for non-residents, \$25 for incidental, surgeon, and library fees, \$25-\$35 a month for room and board, \$10 for graduation, and \$11 for a student activities fee. The cost for three quarters in 1960 was: free tuition for residents, \$270 for non-

Between 1997 and 2002, median annual tuition and required fees rose by 36 percent at public four-year colleges and universities in Alabama, as compared to the 29.7 percent median of the other Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states. Tuition and fees at public four-year colleges in Alabama equaled 34.5 percent of the median annual income for families in the lowest fifth of incomes. In 2001, 68 percent of first-time freshmen enrolled in Alabama's public four-year colleges received some form of financial aid and 41 percent took out loans.<sup>33</sup>

In 1962, Auburn began requiring applicants to take either the American College Test (ACT) or the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) for admission and placement purposes. The next year, Auburn began requiring satisfactory high school grades in college preparatory classes. Prior to 1962, the institution based admission on letters of good standing and a basic university entrance exam covering geography, grammar, and arithmetic. As a result of the heightened admission standards, Auburn reported fewer dropouts and greater staying power for freshmen in 1964. Director of Admissions E. J. Brumfield reported in 1964 that the new admission standards kept the bottom twenty percent of Alabama's high school students from attending Auburn. While the use of selectivity in admissions does not appear to be in keeping with the land grant tradition of education for the masses, limited faculty and facilities resulting in the inability to

---

residents, \$495 for room and board, \$10 for graduation, \$25.50 in student activities fees, and \$172.50 in college fees. The cost for attending two semesters in 2000 was as follows: \$3050 tuition for residents, \$9150 for non-residents, \$1590 for room (meals not included), \$194 for graduation for residents, \$542 for graduation for non-residents, \$44 Transit fee, and \$30 Student Government Association fee. *1876-1877 Catalogue; 1920-1921 Catalogue; Bulletin, 1960-1961; Bulletin, 2000-2001.*

<sup>33</sup> The sixteen Southern Regional Education Board states are Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Delaware, and Maryland; Southern Regional Educational Board, "Alabama Featured Facts," June 2003, <<http://www.sreb.org/main/EdData/FactBook/2003StateReports/Alabama.pdf>>, accessed 3 December 2004; Southern Regional Educational Board, "Challenge to Lead: Alabama," 2004, <[http://www.sreb.org/main/Goals/Publications/Color\\_PDF/AL-color.pdf](http://www.sreb.org/main/Goals/Publications/Color_PDF/AL-color.pdf)>, accessed 3 December 2004.

accommodate the immense number of applicants have forced Auburn to apply higher admission standards than in previous years. In addition, the faculty agreed in 1964 that there was no point in admitting students whose high school grades and aptitude test scores indicated they would be failures.<sup>34</sup>

Table 9. New Student Data for First-Time Freshmen in 2003

Number of Freshman Applicants	12,439
Number of Freshman Applicants Accepted	9,653
% Accepted	77.6
Number of Freshman Applicants Enrolled	3,706
% Accepted Enrolled	38.4
Average ACT of Enrolled	24.4
Average GPA of Enrolled	3.51
Average SAT of Enrolled	1125

Source: *Auburn Bulletin*, 2003.

While the admission standards and tuition costs changed, the source of incoming freshmen hardly varied in the last sixty years. In 2000 the top ten counties contributing to Auburn’s enrollment were (in order of contribution from highest to lowest): Jefferson, Lee, Montgomery, Madison, Mobile, Shelby, Baldwin, Houston, Morgan, and Calhoun. The highest contributors were, in general, the most populated counties.<sup>35</sup> Looking at the county contributions compared to the country population shows a different picture. The counties contributing the most students per 1,000 people were generally in the southeastern corner of the state, making them closer to Auburn, while the counties

<sup>34</sup> Mickey Logue, “Harder to Get into and Harder to Get Out of Auburn,” *Birmingham News*, 14 October 1964, A8.

<sup>35</sup> *Bulletins*, 1940-2001.

contributing the least number of students per 1,000 people were generally located within 150 miles of Tuscaloosa and the University of Alabama.<sup>36</sup>

Table 10. Counties Contributing to Auburn University

	Contributing the Most Students Per 1,000 People	County Description			
		% Rural or Urban	% Below Poverty Level	Median Household Income	Location
1.	Lee	67% Urban	21.8-26.9	\$29,667-35,241	East Central
2.	St. Clair	87% Rural	6.3-12.3	\$35,962-44,704	North Central
3.	Tallapoosa	75% Rural	13.0-16.6	\$29,667-35,241	East Central
4.	Coffee	56% Rural	13.0-16.6	\$29,667-35,241	Southeast
5.	Montgomery	88% Urban	17.0-23.3	\$35,962-44,704	South Central
6.	Henry	100% Rural	17.0-21.3	\$29,667-35,241	Southeast
7.	Chambers	50% Urban	17.0-21.3	\$29,667-35,241	East Central
8.	Houston	65% Urban	13.0-16.6	\$29,667-35,241	Southeast
9.	Monroe	78% Rural	17.0-21.3	\$24,749-29,093	Southwest
10.	Covington	72% Rural	17.0-21.3	\$24,749-29,093	South Central

	Contributing the Least Students Per 1,000 People	County Description			
		% Rural or Urban	% Below Poverty Level	Median Household Income	Location
1.	Greene	100% Rural	31.1-39.9	\$16,646-23,370	West Central
2.	Pickens	100% Rural	21.8-26.9	\$24,749-29,093	West Central
3.	Lawrence	93% Rural	13.0-16.6	\$29,667-35,241	Northwest
4.	Shelby	64% Urban	6.3-12.3	\$55,440-55,440	Central
5.	Hale	85% Rural	21.8-26.9	\$24,749-29,093	West Central
6.	Lamar	100% Rural	13.0-16.6	\$24,749-29,093	North Central
7.	Winston	84% Rural	17.0-21.3	\$24,749-29,093	Northwest
8.	Bibb	81% Rural	17.0-21.3	\$29,667-35,241	Central
9.	Tuscaloosa	71% Urban	17.0-21.3	\$29,667-35,241	West Central
10.	Fayette	79% Rural	17.0-21.3	\$24,749-29,093	West Central

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, Auburn University; Center for Business and Economic Research, "2000 Census of Population for Alabama," The University of Alabama College of Commerce, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 10 December 2004, <<http://cber.cba.ua.edu/edata/census2000.html>> (10 December 2004); U.S. Census Bureau, Summary File 3, Matrix P53, Matrix P87, Census 2000 <<http://factfinder.census.gov>>.

<sup>36</sup> Center for Business and Economic Research, "2000 Census of Population for Alabama," The University of Alabama College of Commerce, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 10 December 2004, <<http://cber.cba.ua.edu/edata/census2000.html>>, accessed 10 December 2004.

Is the Morrill Act outdated? A self study of Auburn University in the 1960s reported that the “fundamental changes in the economy and society of Alabama demand the constant reassessment of the services which Auburn University renders to the state, not only in the instructional program but equally important in the extension and research activities.” In 1998, there were fewer than 38,000 farms in Alabama, but agriculture remained a significant contributor to the state’s economy. Less than 2 percent of Alabamians engaged in farming, yet agriculture contributed an excess of \$4 billion annually to Gross State Product (GSP), or 3.7 percent, through the sale of farm and forestry products. In 2003, Alabama had 45,000 farms and contributed 2.98 percent to GSP, while Georgia had 49,300 farms and contributed only 1.9 percent to GSP. On the other hand, Alabama agriculture contributed .17 percent to the GSP of the Southeast, while Georgia agriculture contributed .25 percent to the GSP of the Southeast.<sup>37</sup>

The primary goal of the Morrill Act was not agriculture or mechanic arts, but was to increase the wealth and status of the nation by providing an affordable, accessible, and applicable education for the laboring classes. At the time, the main occupations of the laboring classes were industrial—agriculture and mechanic arts. While the land grant university is directed by the Morrill Act to teach “branches of learning related to agriculture and mechanic arts,” as well as liberal arts and military training, it is also adaptable to a changing society. Educating the common man, imparting a practical and scientific education, providing universal accessibility and low tuition, and providing an

---

<sup>37</sup> Bureau of Economic Analysis, the U.S. Department of Commerce, “Regional Economic Accounts,” <<http://www.bea.gov/bea/regional/gsp/action.cfm>>, accessed 16 July 2005. “Auburn Sees Many Changes;” Noel A.D. Thompson, John Dunkelberger, Lavaughn Johnson, and Glenn Howze, “Future Farming: Study Chronicles Changes in Alabama Farms Now and Into the Next Century,” *Highlights of Agricultural Research* 45, (Auburn, Alabama: Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, Fall 1998) <<http://www.ag.auburn.edu/aaes/communications/highlightsonline/fall98/futurefarming.html>>, accessed 11 December 2004.

education equal to that at any professional college is a large part of the mission of the land grant institution.

The primary goal of the Morrill Act was not teaching, research, or extension. It was not focused on academic achievement or liberal arts, but rather sought to educate the laboring classes by providing an affordable, accessible, and an applicable education.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA: GEORGIA'S "LITTLE YALE"

The history of the University of Georgia is vastly different from that of Auburn University. While Auburn embraced its land grant status from its founding in 1872, the University of Georgia began many years earlier as a small liberal arts school. Auburn's origins as a land grant college made it much easier for it to maintain the land grant purpose. University of Georgia, on the other hand, embraced different principles from those put forth in the Morrill Act.

The charter for the state university was signed in the Georgia legislature on January 25, 1785, and the university officially opened its doors in 1801. The university offered a classical education that followed both the European model and that of Yale, the alma mater of the majority of the university's proponents, "and was thus geared to the education of the gentry and not the common man."<sup>1</sup> While the land grant institution's mission was to offer an education not provided by traditional liberal arts colleges—an education for the "laboring classes," the University of Georgia was begun with liberal arts and privileged classes in mind.

---

<sup>1</sup> Max H. Bass, *The UGA Coastal Plain Experiment Station. . . The First 75 Years* (Tifton, Ga.: Lang Printing Co., 1993), 6.

In an effort to make the University of Georgia into a “little Yale,” the university maintained stringent admission requirements. For admission to the freshman class, a candidate had to be at least fourteen years old, and demonstrate a knowledge of Caesar, Cicero’s Orations, Virgil, John and Acts in the Greek Testament, Graeca Minora or Greek Reader, Latin and Greek Prosody, English grammar, geography, geometry, arithmetic, and algebra (equations of the first and second degree, binomial theorem, extraction of roots, ratio, progression). In addition, candidates were required to be knowledgeable of Sallust’s Jugurthine War, six books of Xenophon’s Anabasis, and two books of Homer’s Iliad. Clearly, the admission requirements catered to the upper classes, and did not accommodate the rural, lower classes.<sup>2</sup>

In 1854 William Terrell, a physician from Hancock County, recognized the necessity for an education that applied to the laboring classes of Georgia. In an effort to meet the needs of the farmers of the state, he donated \$20,000 for the endowment of a professorship of agriculture. The university hired Daniel Lee of New York to fill the position, and agriculture entered the only school on campus, Franklin College of Arts and Sciences. Lee offered lectures on agriculture until the Civil War began in 1861. As a Northerner in the South during the war, Lee was suspected of having divided loyalties. In 1863, he left the University and moved to Tennessee. The university closed until 1866.<sup>3</sup>

In the midst of the war, Congress passed the Morrill Act. Georgia, like Alabama, could not take advantage of the act until it returned to the Union. In 1872, Georgia sold

---

<sup>2</sup> *Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Georgia, 1855-1856*, 11.

<sup>3</sup> Stephen J. Karina, *The University of Georgia College of Agriculture: An Administrative History, 1785-1985* (n.p., c. 1985), 22.



its land grant of 270,000 acres for ninety cents an acre, receiving a total of \$242,202. The state had less than a year to find a location and open the new institution. The University of Georgia and an agricultural college in Dahlonega, North Georgia College, competed for the land grant funds. The North Georgia College was newly established, and had not yet begun to function, while the University of Georgia had been operating for more than a half a century. When the Board of Trustees of the University of Georgia asked that the land grant college be located in Athens under the University of Georgia, the governor was happy to comply.<sup>4</sup> The land grant funds were diverted to the University of Georgia, but debate in the legislature continued. Ultimately, the legislature divided the land grant funds and in the fall of 1872 began appropriating \$2000 annually to North Georgia College.<sup>5</sup>

William LeRoy Broun, later the president of Auburn University, served as the first president of the University of Georgia Agricultural and Mechanical College. The A & M College was under the control of the Board of Trustees of the University of Georgia, and the president was under the direction of the chancellor. The college offered classes in agriculture, horticulture, analytic and agricultural chemistry, mineralogy, economic geology, natural history, physiology, industrial mechanics and drawing, physical geography, meteorology, English, and military tactics. In addition, the Civil Engineering School of the University of Georgia was moved to the new A & M College.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Bass, *The UGA Coastal Plain Experiment Station*, 8.

<sup>5</sup> Karina, *University of Georgia College of Agriculture*, 43-45.

<sup>6</sup> Broun served only three years before resigning in 1875. Broun did not get along with Chancellor Tucker, who came into office in 1874. Broun, as the president of the A & M College, believed in the mission of the land grant college. He believed that agriculture could and should be taught. Tucker disagreed. He did not believe in the teaching of agriculture. Thomas Reed, "History of the University of Georgia," c1949, Thomas Reed Papers, The University of Georgia Libraries Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Online, <http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/reed>, 3308.

In addition to teaching agriculture, the Morrill Act required the college to teach branches of learning related to mechanic arts, which the University of Georgia interpreted to mean wood and iron working. The university, known as “little Yale on the Oconee,” did not want to offer such common subjects, so it appropriated \$8,000 annually to Atlanta University to teach mechanical and woodworking courses. In this way, it maintained its land grant status and continued to receive land grant funding.<sup>7</sup>

Although the University of Georgia enjoyed land grant status, it did not necessarily fulfill the land grant mission in its first few years as a land grant college. The university interpreted the act to mean that it was responsible for two things—teaching agriculture and mechanic arts. Henry H. Tucker, Chancellor of the University of Georgia in 1875, was “a decided classicist,” and “did not believe that practical agriculture could be successfully taught.” He “saw no future for the new college so far as that feature of its work was concerned.”<sup>8</sup> Many students entered the new agricultural college, but by 1876 attendance began to wane. Students remained in college only a short time before returning home. At the commencement for the class of 1876, only 32 out of a beginning class of 187 students graduated. The majority of the students who left were those enrolled in the A & M College.<sup>9</sup>

During the next school year attendance for the University dropped from 203 to 161.<sup>10</sup> The A & M College experienced the greatest loss. In speaking to the trustees about the agricultural department, Chancellor Tucker directed his attention to the unreasonable expectations of the public:

---

<sup>7</sup> Bass, *The UGA Coastal Plain Experiment Station*, 5, 8.

<sup>8</sup> Reed Papers, “University of Georgia,” 987.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 1007.

<sup>10</sup> *The University of Georgia Fact Book 2001*, 42.

This department has disappointed public expectations, and the reason of this is that the public expectations have been unreasonable. It seems to have been imagined that an unlettered youth, if sent here, could be so instructed that in a couple of years he would not only learn all about practical agriculture but that he would become thoroughly versed in all the sciences that bear on that branch of industry. . . . Unless a student has had enough general literary culture to be able to use books to an advantage, to reason intelligently, to gather ideas speedily from the printed page, it is in vain to expect him to make rapid progress in the severer branches of knowledge or in any branch.<sup>11</sup>

Tucker believed that practical agriculture could best be learned on the farm, not in the classroom. He felt that most of the students admitted to the agricultural department were ill-equipped to learn anything if they had not had previous schooling. Common academies in the students' home towns could have taught the students just as well, if not better, Tucker reasoned, without the expense of board and travel. For this reason, Tucker believed the agricultural department had lost the confidence of the public and thus had become unpopular.

Tucker suggested two remedies for improving the agricultural department and public confidence in the institution. First, he suggested raising the admission standards to weed out unqualified students. Second, he recommended educating the public. Tucker believed the public would have to learn that agriculture was not different than any other profession—it would take just as long to educate a man for agriculture as it would to educate him for any other profession.<sup>12</sup> However, by maintaining the high admission standards that Tucker advocated, the University of Georgia failed to meet one of the purposes of the Morrill Act—accessibility to all classes.

---

<sup>11</sup> Reed Papers, "University of Georgia," 1010-1011.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

Tucker believed that the state college was “wholly unadapted to the wants of ordinary school boys.” Instead, he encouraged the college to obtain patronage from the more educated classes. According to Tucker,

. . . no shorthand method has been discovered by which a lad, wholly untaught, can be manipulated into an educated and scientific man in the course of two or three years. . . . A certain amount of personal culture is necessary to fit a man for anything. Special education can be begun only when a reasonable amount of general education has been completed.<sup>13</sup>

With heightened admission requirements and classes that catered to the privileged classes, the attendance for the University had decreased. On the other hand, enrollment at the North Georgia Agricultural and Mechanical College in Dahlonega had risen to three hundred. Tucker pointed out that the North Georgia College was cheaper and gave a more elementary education than the University of Georgia and was thus better suited for farmers:

Many persons in their poverty have abandoned the idea of giving their sons such superior advantages as can be had at Athens, and send them to a cheaper place. . . . A large number of the students there are of such a class, that if we had them here we should be obliged to organize them into grammar school classes, just as done here in the second year of the State College, which is the only year (in the sense of large numbers) it ever prospered. The tide has simply turned and the flood that came here during that single year now flows appropriately to Dahlonega.<sup>14</sup>

Tucker compared the University of Georgia to other colleges, pointing out that its attendance by “real college students” was equal to that of other well-known colleges. The University of Virginia had an enrollment of 363, but only 120 “might be called real college students.” The University of Mississippi had only 143 out of 471 students of “real college grade,” and Vanderbilt only 129 out of 405. Although the enrollment at the University of Georgia was low, Tucker believed it consisted of quality students. High

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 1033.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 1036.

enrollment of low grade students was neither desired nor sought after by Chancellor Tucker or the University of Georgia.<sup>15</sup>

According to Tucker, the term “agricultural college” also misled the public, since practical agriculture could not be taught. In addition, Tucker believed the study of scientific agriculture would be far too complicated for the average farm boy and a waste of money for the University:

the sciences which underlie the subject of agriculture are altogether too deep and too broad and too high for the capacity of boys at school. All that such boys can do is to learn the beginnings of knowledge and those are exactly the same for all classes of people, whether farmers, lawyers, doctors, merchants, mechanics, manufacturers, or anything else. To call a school of this kind agricultural is simply to use a catchword to take the popular ear and to furnish a pretext for the use of funds intended for other purposes.<sup>16</sup>

Tucker had no desire to meet the underlying intent of the Morrill Act; he wanted the funds. He did not want to extend an invitation to the laboring classes by making the college affordable or accessible. If the upper classes wanted to send their sons to an agricultural school, that would be fine, but he did not care to have the lower classes sending their poorly educated boys to his university. While he attempted to comply with the letter of the law by offering agricultural classes, everything he did went against the spirit of the Morrill Act. The whole purpose of the act was to increase the wealth of nation by providing an education that catered to the laboring classes—the classes that were not served by existing liberal arts colleges.

After the passage of the Morrill Act and the establishment of the Agricultural and Mechanical College as part of the University of Georgia, the terms of admission to the A & M College were different than admission requirements to the liberal arts college

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 1037.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 1041.

(Franklin College) of the University. In 1880, the Catalogue stated that admission to the A & M College required that a candidate be “not less than sixteen years of age, and have a fair knowledge of Arithmetic, English, and Geography.” Students admitted to the A & M College were not allowed to pursue a classical course for the degree of Bachelor of Arts. Instead, they could choose between agriculture, engineering, applied chemistry, or a partial course. While free tuition would be available for the same number of students as members of the Georgia General Assembly, the costs were hardly defrayed. Students with free tuition had to pay approximately \$200 per year, while students without scholarships paid \$240. The cost of attending the A & M College was only slightly lower than the yearly \$275 required for attending Franklin College.<sup>17</sup>

The passage of the Hatch Act in 1887 and the location of the Georgia experiment station opened discussion of the University’s commitment to its land grant purpose. Only a small number of students entered the department each year—“it seemed impossible to arouse much interest among the young men of the state so far as pursuing the study of agriculture was concerned.” “Faced with the prospect of lavishing more Federal money on the virtually nonexistent college of agriculture,” Trustee Benjamin C. Yancey requested that a special committee compile a report on whether or not the University of Georgia had fulfilled the land grant mission.<sup>18</sup> While ensuing the report concluded that the University did teach agriculture, it did not address the discrepancy between the land grant income and the agricultural expenditures.

The report did, however, temporarily relieve investigations and the legislature located the experiment station in Athens until a permanent location could be established.

---

<sup>17</sup> *Catalogue, 1880*, 31, 32, 48.

<sup>18</sup> Karina, *University of Georgia College of Agriculture*, 65.

With the announcement of the location of the station in Athens, populist farmers across the state voiced their disapproval. The protest of the farmers was successful, and in 1889 the Board of Directors of the experiment station, appointed by the governor, voted to permanently locate the station in Griffin.

While the farmers had won the fight of the location of the experiment station, they were not impressed with the University's direction of the agricultural college. There was a general belief that the Morrill Act funds were not being "used in a way to gain the most satisfactory results." Indeed, some members of the Board of Trustees publicly stated that it was impossible to teach agriculture. The farmers of the state disagreed, and claimed that the funds of the A & M College had "been diverted to make Franklin College a free literary institution."<sup>19</sup>

The farmers of the state were correct. The A & M College was, according to Turner, "a pretext for the use of funds intended for other purposes."<sup>20</sup> The "other purposes" that Tucker referred to were the operation of the University of Georgia's liberal arts classes and the salaries of its teachers. The funding from the Morrill Act accounted for \$27,000 of the University's total income of \$40,000 in 1891. The Farmer's Alliance of the state called for the agricultural college's "immediate reorganization, so that it may . . . be operated in the interests of the industrial classes of the state, for whose benefit the fund was granted." The farmers agreed that the object of the colleges, as set out in the Morrill Act, was "to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes." In order to accomplish this feat, the farmers believed the A & M

---

<sup>19</sup> Vertical File, "Georgia. University. Land Grant Colleges." The University of Georgia Libraries Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library.

<sup>20</sup> Reed Papers, "University of Georgia," 1041.

College needed to be removed from the University of Georgia's control and located with the experiment station in Georgia under the direction of Robert J. Redding.<sup>21</sup>

Attempts by the Farmer's Alliance to move the A & M College to Griffin were unsuccessful. By the 1904 academic year the only difference between admission to Franklin College and admission to the A & M College were the foreign languages. While Franklin College required Latin and Greek, the A & M College did not require Greek and would drop the Latin requirement if the student did not pursue the study of Latin in the college. Those who did not study Latin would instead be required to study Greek upon entrance to the freshman class. The remaining admission requirements consisted of mathematics (including the Metric System, algebra to quadratic equations, and three books of geometry), English grammar ("the ability to parse and to analyze the English sentence, and to define grammatical terms"), ancient history, and writing ("the ability to write clear, idiomatic English, correct in spelling, punctuation, and paragraphing" on a subject assigned from Stevenson's "Treasure Island," Longfellow's "Evangeline," Eliot's "Silas Marner," Scott's "Ivanhoe," Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar," or Cooper's "Last of the Mohicans").<sup>22</sup>

In 1905, amidst arguments between the Board of Trustees and the farmers of Georgia, university benefactor George Foster Peabody organized and financed a trip to visit the Wisconsin's land grant institution, the University of Wisconsin. Peabody was concerned about the success of the A & M College and wanted to give University proponents the chance to observe a flourishing land grant college. Like the University of

---

<sup>21</sup> Reed Papers, "University of Georgia," 3312; Karina, 84, 69; Vertical File, "Georgia. University. Land Grant Colleges." The University of Georgia Libraries Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library.

<sup>22</sup> *Catalogue, 1904-1905*, 14-15.



Georgia, the State College of Agriculture in Wisconsin was combined with the state university. However, the University of Wisconsin's agricultural college was considered successful, while University of Georgia's agricultural college was not. A group of forty faculty and staff members, newspapermen, and politicians made the trip to Wisconsin.<sup>23</sup>

After the group returned to Georgia, the state legislature passed the Connor Act in hope that additional money would allow the university to fulfill the land grant mission. In an effort to "strengthen the university as a whole, . . . foster the individual interests of the state," and "aid in overall development," the act appropriated \$100,000 to the University of Georgia to construct and equip an agricultural college building. In addition, the act removed the A & M College's control from the University of Georgia trustees and called for the appointment by the governor of a separate board of eleven trustees for the management of what it termed the agriculture and farm technology school. A dean was elected by the A & M College's Board of Trustees to serve as the head of the new college. In essence, it was a college within a university, operating on the same campus but with a separate board of trustees and dean, who was president of the A & M College.<sup>24</sup>

Prior to the passage of the Connor Act in 1906, the majority of students pursued classical and professional training. The class of 1880 had "furnished twelve lawyers, four college professors, three teachers, three manufacturers, two legislators, two railroad men, two judges, two insurance men, two civil engineers, two authors, and one each, minister, real estate dealer, farmer, college president, journalist, physician, merchant, publisher, and druggist." For the 1898 academic year, no one majored in agriculture, and

---

<sup>23</sup> Reed Papers, "University of Georgia," 3312.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 3317, 3320.

only nine students attended the winter short course. In 1900, 93 students enrolled in the agricultural school, but “so few were actually in the agricultural program that only two classes in agriculture were taught.”<sup>25</sup> Between 1907 and 1932, with the aid of Soule and the Board of Trustees (consisting mainly of Georgia farmers), and separated from the University of Georgia, the A & M College flourished. Enrollment increased from 67 in 1908 to 1,155 in 1932.<sup>26</sup>

The passage of the Connor Act marked the end of an era for the A & M College. Operation under the University of Georgia’s governance between 1872 and 1905 had been filled with controversy and conflict. The loss of the experiment station in its removal to Griffin, the appropriation of funding to North Georgia and Atlanta Colleges, the failure to erect an agricultural building, and the refusal to maintain accessibility and applicability all marked the University’s unsuccessful beginning as a land grant institution. To maintain land grant status and funding, the teaching of agriculture was the only aspect of the Morrill Act that the University reluctantly fulfilled.

The years spent fighting for funding and agricultural instruction came to a close as men with an interest in the success of the A & M College took over. The Connor Act required that the A & M Board of Trustees members had agricultural experience, thus ensuring that the governance of the institution had a vested interest in the farmers of the state. The Connor Act gave the A & M College the freedom to select a dean and faculty, resulting in an entirely new agricultural college.

---

<sup>25</sup> Reed Papers, “University of Georgia,” 1143; Karina, *The University of Georgia College of Agriculture*, 96.

<sup>26</sup> “Georgia University College of Agriculture. . . Annual Report 1931-1932: Report of the President, State College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts, To the Honorable Board of Trustees of the University of Georgia and the Georgia State College of Agriculture,” The University of Georgia Libraries Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, 1.

The Connor Act provided for a reorganization of the College of Agriculture and the establishment of departments of agronomy and animal husbandry. Subsequently, departments of horticulture and farm mechanics were established; the department of farm mechanics would later become the department of agricultural engineering. The worn-out farm was taken care of, and new implements were obtained.

In 1907, the new Board of Trustees of the A & M College selected Andrew McNairn Soule for the position of President of the State College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts. Soule was born in Canada, but came from a position as dean at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Under Soule's direction, the A & M College raised the entrance requirements to an even higher level, making the college accessible to an even smaller segment of the population. According to the 1915 Catalogue,

The raising of the entrance requirements and the constant improvement of the course of study have led to the general appreciation of the institution by educators and leaders of public thought, both within and without the state. The wisdom of the Board in insisting upon the recognition of scholarship and the attainment of high standards has thus been fully justified.<sup>27</sup>

By the 1919 school year, the A & M College required entering freshmen to be at least sixteen years old, have three credits of English, two credits of history, two and a half credits of mathematics, two credits of foreign language, and four and a half credits of an elective, for a total of fourteen credits. In addition, credits were only accepted from accredited schools, and students had to take an entrance exam in either June or

---

<sup>27</sup> *Catalogue, 1915-1916, 2.*

September. While students could attend the A & M College free of tuition, the remaining costs added to approximately \$263.25 per year (equivalent to \$2621.32 in 2000).<sup>28</sup>

Free tuition made the college affordable, but the strict admission requirements hardly made it accessible. The students of the state came from diverse backgrounds and many had not received proper preparation to meet the A & M College's admission's standards. In the 1920s, in an effort to increase enrollment, the A & M College, in partnership with the Cooperative Extension Service established under the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, instated a "Go to College Movement." County extension agents encouraged prospective students to save their earnings from 4-H for college tuition. In addition, the A & M College established a standardized placement test for entering freshmen.<sup>29</sup>

A list of the occupations of A & M alumni graduating between 1902 and 1931 showed that while only 9.59 percent farmed exclusively, approximately 30 percent were engaged in farming in addition to their other pursuits, making the total in farming almost 40 percent.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> *Catalogue, 1919-1920*, 28, 113, 117; *Handbook of Labor Statistics U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (Estimate) 1800-2005* on the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis website, <<http://minneapolisfed.org/research/data/us/calc/hist1800.cfm>>, accessed 10 July 2005.

<sup>29</sup> Karina, *University of Georgia College of Agriculture*, 149.

<sup>30</sup> *Catalogue, 1931-1932*, 8.

Table 11. Occupations of University of Georgia A & M Graduates (1902-1931)

Occupations	Living Graduates	Percent of Living Graduates
Extension	178	19.18
Teachers	279	30.09
Business Related to Agriculture or Home Economics	85	9.15
Business not Related to Agriculture or Home Economics	62	6.68
Farmers	89	9.59
Research	20	2.16
Foresters	21	2.26
Veterinarians	46	4.95
Graduate Students	29	3.12
Homemakers	49	5.28
Other lines	70	7.54
Total	928	

Source: *Alabama Polytechnic Institute Catalogue*, 1931-1932.

The admission requirements and fees for the A & M College were not much different from the fees of the University of Georgia. While President Soule understood the importance of providing an education for the laboring classes, he refused to lower admission standards or tuition. According to a report by Soule in the 1922 Catalogue,

Our problem is not one of interesting men and women in the type of training we represent, but rather in securing endowments which will enable them to participate in the courses we are offering. It is an unusual day when one or more letters are not received from some properly prepared and wholly worthy Georgia boy or girl asking for aid to defray a part of their collegiate expenses. . . . They come from the rural districts, and a large per cent of them, after receiving their degrees, will return thereto. . . .

. . . Not long since, a gentleman stated to me that “The three needs of Georgia were better roads, rural schools, and churches.” I am sold one hundred per cent on this platform.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>31</sup> *Catalogue, 1922-1923*, 2.

Rather than lowering the A & M College's standards or costs, Soule sought to secure endowments and better rural schools.

Between 1907 and 1932 the Georgia State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts operated as its own college on the University of Georgia campus in Athens. It received the Morrill funding and, with the exception of accessibility, it worked to fulfill its interpretation of the land grant mission. It provided only degrees related to agriculture and the mechanic arts; it did not allow students to pursue a liberal arts education. The Morrill Act did not limit students to an agricultural or mechanical degree, but the Georgia A & M College did.

In 1931, Governor Richard B. Russell, Jr. pushed through legislation that reorganized both the state government and the college system. The new system consolidated higher education under a Board of Regents and replaced all of the independent boards of trustees. A Chancellor was the chief executive officer of the Board of Regents, and each of the college and university chancellors of the state were reduced to the title of president. The Experiment Station and the Extension director were both directed to answer to the Board of Regents instead of the A & M College.<sup>32</sup>

The Board of Regents forced the A & M College back under the control of the University of Georgia. Andrew Soule, reduced to the status of dean, resigned. With the exception of agricultural engineering, the remaining engineering classes moved to Georgia Tech in Atlanta. The university adopted the quarter system and assigned a core curriculum for all degrees. An applicable education was no longer considered as important as a well-rounded education that included liberal arts classes.

---

<sup>32</sup> Karina, *University of Georgia College of Agriculture*, 181.

Between 1872 and 1931, the A & M College operated under its interpretation of the Morrill Act. The passage of the Hatch Act in 1887 and the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 did little to alter its mission. Until 1931, the A & M College, Experiment Station, and Extension Service operated separately with their individual missions as proclaimed in their respective legislation. The reorganization under the Board of Regents, however, united the three institutions and by the end of World War II the new mission of the A & M College centered on teaching, research, and extension, rather than affordability, accessibility, and applicability.<sup>33</sup>

In 1950, the Director of the Experiment Stations<sup>34</sup> and the Director of Agricultural Extension were both placed under the supervision of the College of Agriculture. Amidst the reorganization, the agriculturalists of the state continued to protest the University of Georgia's handing of the A & M College. An attempt to remove the A & M College from the control of the University of Georgia once again failed, and the Board of Regents renewed its stronghold on the college.<sup>35</sup>

Under the Board of Regent's the University of Georgia emerged as a modern, politically controlled university. The focus of the College of Agriculture turned to research and extension as their respective institutions were introduced into the college's structure. Between 1950 and 1960 the enrollment in the College of Agriculture decreased and the number engaged in farming nationwide declined. The enrollment of the "baby-boomers," however, in the 1960s brought an increase to the number in the College of

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 181-187.

<sup>34</sup> Two experiment stations were established after the station was placed in Griffin in 1889. The Coastal Plain Experiment Station in Tifton was established in 1918, and the College Experiment Station in Athens was established in 1950. For more information on the experiment stations, see Max H. Bass's *The UGA Coastal Plain Experiment Station...The First 75 Years* (Tifton, Ga.: Lang Printing Co.: 1993).

<sup>35</sup> Karina, *University of Georgia College of Agriculture*, 211.

Agriculture. Enrollment maintained a steady number until 1978, when it slowly began to decline, dropping 30 percent by 1984. As enrollment declined, focus on research and extension replaced the emphasis on teaching and affordability, accessibility, and applicability.<sup>36</sup>

The influx of the baby boomers in the 1960s forced the University to limit the number of students it accepted.<sup>37</sup> The mission of the Morrill Act, accessibility, affordability, and applicability was all but abandoned as tuition rose and admission requirements became stricter.

In 1993 Georgia began the HOPE Scholarship program,<sup>38</sup> allowing state residents with a high school grade point average of 3.0 or higher to attend all Georgia institutions free of tuition (as long as they maintained at least a 3.0). While this allowed students of lesser means to afford the University, the admission requirements kept many out. In 2004, the average GPA of entering freshmen was 3.71, with an average SAT of 1233. Ninety-nine percent of in-state freshmen received the HOPE Scholarship.

Table 12. High School GPA's for Entering Freshmen, 2001

Grade Point Average	Number	%
3.90 and over	1,068	26.0
3.50-3.89	1,758	42.8
3.00-3.49	1,129	27.5
2.50-2.99	120	2.9
2.00-2.49	19	0.5
Below 2.0	6	0.1
<b>Total Entering Freshmen</b>	<b>4,108</b>	

Source: *The University of Georgia Fact Book*, 2001.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 271.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 240.

<sup>38</sup> HOPE—“Helping Outstanding Pupils Educationally” is Georgia’s scholarship program. It rewards students with financial assistance at eligible Georgia public and private colleges and universities, and public technical colleges. More information about the HOPE program can be found on the internet at <http://www.gsfc.org/HOPE/Index.cfm>.



Table 13. Average SAT Scores for Entering Freshmen, 1972-2004

Year	UGA Mean	Nat'l Mean	State Mean
1972	1019	937	834
1980	1026	890	814
1990	1045	900	844
2000	1202	1019	974
2004	1233	1026	987

Source: *The University of Georgia Fact Book*, 2001-2004.

Table 14. Freshmen Applicants by Admission Status, Fall Terms 1970-2004

Year	Applied	Accepted	% of Applied Accepted	Enrolled	% of Applied Enrolled	% of Accepted Enrolled
1970	5,600	4,291	77	2,486	44	58
1980	6,716	4,597	68	2,439	36	53
1990	9,561	7,513	78	3,087	32	41
2000	12,869	7,932	62	3,966	31	50
2004	13,267	8,197	62	4,531	34	55

Source: *The University of Georgia Fact Book*, 2001-2004.

While the average freshman entering the University of Georgia in 2004 had an SAT score of 1233 and a GPA of 3.71, the average student in the state of Georgia scored only 987 on the SAT. Students from rural areas live in higher rates of poverty, have parents with traditionally lower incomes, and receive an education generally considered inferior to the education provided in urban areas. Thus, as the majority of students that choose to enter agricultural pursuits are from rural areas, and fewer rural students are attending the University of Georgia, the College of Agriculture and the Environmental Sciences has decreased in size.

Table 15. 2004 Enrollment by College and School, Fall Terms, Undergraduate and Graduate

<b>College/School</b>	<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>% of Total Enrollment</b>
Agricultural & Environmental Sciences	1,645	4.92
Arts & Sciences	16,269	48.70
Business	2,341	7.01
Education	4,903	14.68
Environment & Design	626	1.87
Family & Consumer Sciences	1,706	5.11
Forest Resources	377	1.13
Journalism	972	2.91
Law	704	2.11
Pharmacy	580	1.74
Public & International Affairs	1,411	4.22
Social Work	357	1.07
Veterinary Medicine	484	1.45
Biomedical & Health Sciences Institute	19	0.06
Total Enrollment	33,405	

Source: *The University of Georgia Fact Book*, 2004.

According to the Morrill Act, the leading object of the institutions should be to teach branches of learning related to agriculture and the mechanic arts. While it does mention that liberal arts should not be excluded, it does not say liberal arts should be the main focus. More than half of the students at the University of Georgia are engaged in liberal rather than practical pursuits. The purpose of the Morrill Act was to give the industrial classes an education so that they might increase in status and thereby increase the nation's wealth. Table 16 shows the Georgia counties contributing the most and the least students to the University of Georgia.

Table 16. Counties Contributing to the University of Georgia

	Contributing the Least Students Per 1,000 People	County Description			
		% Rural or Urban	% Below Poverty Level	Median Household Income	Location
1.	Echols	100% Rural	24.8-31.3	\$21,448-28,539	South Central
2.	Quitman	59% Rural	19.6-24.5	\$21,448-28,539	Southwest
3.	Taylor	100% Rural	24.8-31.3	\$21,448-28,539	West Central
4.	Long	89% Rural	15.0-19.5	\$28,656-33,899	Southeast
5.	Atkinson	100% Rural	19.6-24.5	\$21,448-28,539	South Central
6.	Heard	100% Rural	10.5-14.8	\$28,656-33,899	Northwest
7.	Cook	59% Rural	19.6-24.5	\$21,448-28,539	South Central
8.	Murray	72% Rural	10.5-14.8	\$34,453-41,387	Northwest
9.	Haralson	83% Rural	15.0-19.5	\$28,656-33,899	Northwest
10.	Tattnall	78% Rural	19.6-24.5	\$28,656-33,899	Southeast

	Contributing the Most Students Per 1,000 People	County Description			
		Percent Rural or Urban	Percent Below Poverty Level	Median Household Income	Location
1.	Oconee	51% Rural	2.6-10.2%	\$55,211-71,227	Northeast
2.	Clarke	91% Urban	24.8-31.3%	\$21,448-28,539	Northeast, Site of the University of Georgia
3.	Madison	96% Rural	10.5-14.8%	\$34,453-41,387	Northeast
4.	Fayette	78% Rural	2.6-10.2%	\$55,211-71,227	Northwest
5.	Oglethorpe	99.9% Rural	10.5-14.8%	\$34,453-41,387	Northeast
6.	Gwinnett	97% Urban	2.6-10.2%	\$55,211-71,227	North Central
7.	Columbia	74% Urban	2.6-10.2%	\$55,211-71,227	Northeast
8.	Rockdale	85% Urban	2.6-10.2%	\$42,697-53,599	North Central
9.	Wilkes	69% Rural	15.0-19.5%	\$21,448-28,539	Northeast
10.	Jackson	88% Rural	10.5-14.8%	\$34,453-41,387	Northeast

Source: *The University of Georgia Fact Book*, 2000; U.S. Census Bureau, Summary File 1, P2, Census 2000, <<http://factfinder.census.gov>>; U.S. Census Bureau, Summary File 3, Matrix P53, Matrix P87, Census 2000 <<http://factfinder.census.gov>>.

In general, the top contributors to the University of Georgia, and to the A & M College when it operated independently, were the counties surrounding the University—all top contributors were within 120 miles of Clarke County. In addition, while 4 were urban and 6 were rural, only 1 of the rural counties had a poverty level below 15 percent.

It would appear that location and median household income were the main determinants for the counties contributing the most students per 1000 people. On the other hand, the counties contributing the least number of students per 1000 people were rural. Of the counties contributing the least, only one had an income above \$33,900. The main determinants for the counties contributing the least students per 1000 people were income and poverty level. A comparison of the 2002 county enrollment distribution with a 2002 county poverty list shows the following:

Table 17. 2002 Country Comparisons

	Highest % Poverty Level	Number of Students Contributed to UGA	% of UGA Enrollment
1.	Wheeler	5	.02
2.	Chattahoochee	11	.04
3.	Calhoun	6	.02
4.	Wilcox	16	.06
5.	Clay	5	.02
6.	Hancock	10	.04
7.	Macon	25	.09
8.	Tattnall	14	.05
9.	Randolph	14	.05
10.	Early	27	.10

  

	Lowest % Poverty Level	Number of Students Contributed to UGA	% of UGA Enrollment
1.	Fayette	663	2.46
2.	Forsythe	308	1.14
3.	Cherokee	476	1.77
4.	Columbia	576	2.14
5.	Henry	259	.96
6.	Paulding	73	.27
7.	Oconee	546	2.03
8.	Gwinnett	3976	14.77
9.	Coweta	201	.75
10.	Harris	64	.24

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, "Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates," <<http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/saipe/saipe.cgi>> (17 July 2005); *The University of Georgia Fact Book*, 2002.

Under the leadership of President Michael Adams, the University of Georgia has continued to raise its admission standards. Since Adams became president in 1997, the average GPA of entering freshmen has risen from 3.51 to 3.71. According to Adams, the quality of the students “brings out the best in our faculty and demands that we improve our curriculum and teaching so that the good students who come here will leave here even better. . . . The short answer to those who ask for lower standards at the University of Georgia is ‘No.’”<sup>39</sup>

The University of Georgia began with a mission to impart a classical education, educate the privileged, and become a respected, elite public university. In this mission, it has succeeded over the years. *U.S. News and World Report* ranks the University of Georgia among the top twenty public “Best Colleges,” and in 2004 students won the Rhodes, Marshall, Truman, and Goldwater honors, “a feat accomplished only at 3 other schools—Harvard, Yale, and Brown.” Is the University of Georgia among the top schools because of exemplary teaching or stringent admission policies? It is making the brightest students brighter—could it do the same with average students?<sup>40</sup>

When Michael Adams gave his first State of the University Address in 1998, he reported overhearing a conversation at a local Chinese restaurant and recounted it in his speech. The story, and Adams comments on it, are as follows:

I overheard a parent say to one of his four children, “That’s the new president at UGA.” The 10-year-old responded, “I’m going to UGA.” A friend with him said, “Yeah, it’s really tough to get in there. You better study really hard.” The other child responded, “Don’t worry I’m smart, I can do it.”

---

<sup>39</sup> Michael Adams, “State of the University Address,” 11 January 2001, <http://www.uga.edu/presofc/pdfs/speeches/SoUGA2001.pdf> (accessed 28 July 2005).

<sup>40</sup> Michael Adams, The University of Georgia Office of the President, “Welcome,” 7 June 2005 <http://www.uga.edu/presofc/> (accessed 9 June 2005).

The fact that we are setting that kind of standard is especially important to me.”<sup>41</sup>

What is the value of having a strict admissions policy? How does this idea fulfill the Morrill Act? As a land grant institution, the University of Georgia should seek to *increase the wealth and status of the nation* by providing an *affordable* education, *accessible to all*, especially the laboring classes, so that through the study of *scientific and practical agricultural and mechanical education*, and including *classical studies* and *military training*, students might become *useful and active citizens*, rising in status and having *representation and opportunities equal* to the professional men of the country. Just as President Adams said the university is not much different in the twentieth century, it is not much different in the twenty-first century as it continues to focus on liberal arts for the privileged sector.

---

<sup>41</sup> Michael Adams, “State of the University Address,” 7 January 1998  
<http://www.uga.edu/presofc/pdfs/speeches/SoUGA1998.pdf> (accessed 9 June 2005).

## CONCLUSION

The passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 revolutionized higher education. The wording of the act was broad, but the intent of the proponents was specific. Ultimately, the act combined the visions of Alden Partridge, Jonathan Turner, the People's College Association, and Justin Morrill in an effort to provide an applicable, affordable, and accessible education for the laboring classes. The land grant universities created under the Morrill Act were to be "People's Universities." The act set agriculture and mechanics as the leading objects of the institutions because they were the professions of the laboring classes. Educating the laboring classes would not only boost economic prosperity and increase world status, but would also enable the laboring classes to represent themselves.

The Hatch Act in 1887 and the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 added to the responsibilities of the land grant institutions, but did not replace their mission of affordability, accessibility, and applicability for the laboring classes. The acts called for research and outreach, specifically in the areas of agriculture, to boost the economies of the state and help the laboring classes. In the twenty-first century, most land grant institutions have replaced the original mission of the land grant college, as envisioned by the proponents of the Morrill Act, with a three-fold mission of teaching, research, and outreach. In addition, the laboring classes have been left behind in favor of academic

rank. As the land grant universities drift more and more toward an elitist approach in their recruitment and admission's policies, what institution will serve the laboring classes? Other state schools? Community colleges?

According to New Mexico State University President Michael V. Martin, land grant institutions need to remember their mission. Any university can take an A high school student and turn out an A college graduate, but it is more challenging and more important to turn a C high school student into a B+ graduate, and an active contributor to the state's economy.<sup>1</sup> While universities claim they are forced to be selective in admissions because of the number of applicants that apply, many departments within universities are less than filled to capacity. In an effort to meet the intent of the Morrill Act, land grant institutions should change their admission policies to meet the needs of the people.

In 2005 the Georgia Farm Bureau donated \$100,000 to the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences of the University of Georgia to endow the Georgia Farm Bureau Land Grant University Lecture Series. Income from the endowment will support an annual lecture on or near the July 2 signing anniversary of the 1862 Morrill Act. According to Wayne Dollar, Georgia Farm Bureau president, "it is important we not lose sight of the purpose of our land grant universities and the concept and premise on which they were built."<sup>2</sup> The concept of the land grant institution—affordability, accessibility, and applicability—is just as necessary and applicable in the twenty-first century as it was at its creation in 1862. If land grant institutions fail to

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael V. Martin, "A Drift Toward Elitism by the 'People's Universities,'" *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 51 (25 February 2005), B26.

<sup>2</sup> UGA Office of Public Affairs, "Georgia Farm Bureau Endows Lectures," *Columns*, 24 January 2005, <http://www.uga.edu/columns/050124/digest.html> (accessed 11 August 2005).



accomplish their original mission, then other colleges and universities must adapt the land grant concept in order to serve the laboring classes of the state.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary

- Adams, Michael F. "State of the University Address." 7 January 1998. <http://www.uga.edu/presofc/pdfs/speeches/SoUGA1998.pdf> (accessed 9 June 2005).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "State of the University Address." 12 January 2000. <http://www.uga.edu/presofc/pdfs/speeches/SoUGA2000.pdf> (accessed 28 July 2005).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "State of the University Address." 11 January 2001. <http://www.uga.edu/presofc/pdfs/speeches/SoUGA2001.pdf> (accessed 28 July 2005).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Welcome." The University of Georgia Office of the President. 7 June 2005. <http://www.uga.edu/presofc/> (accessed 9 June 2005).
- After 100 Years: A Report by the State of Vermont Morrill Land-Grant Centennial Committee.* Montpelier: 1962.
- Alabama Polytechnic Institute Catalogue.* 1900-1959. Auburn, Alabama: Alabama Polytechnic Institute. Auburn University Libraries, Ralph Brown Draughon Library, Department of Special Collections & University Archives.
- Albany Herald* (Georgia). 17 January 2004.
- Auburn University. Board of Trustees Minutes. 1873-1960. Special Collections & Archives, Auburn University.
- Auburn University Bulletin.* 1960-2005. Auburn University Libraries, Ralph Brown Draughon Library, Department of Special Collections & University Archives.
- Auburn University Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. "Degrees Awarded by College/School by Level and Gender, 2003-2004." [http://www.panda.auburn.edu/reports/degrees/degrees\\_awarded\\_by\\_College\\_major\\_0304.pdf](http://www.panda.auburn.edu/reports/degrees/degrees_awarded_by_College_major_0304.pdf) (accessed 5 December 2004).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Enrollment by College/School All Students, Fall Terms 1993-2004." <http://www.panda.auburn.edu/reports/enrollment/ebcuagsf.asp> (accessed 5 December 2004).

*Birmingham News*. October 1964.

Brewer, William H. to Waterman T. Hewitt. 11 March 1894. Howard Papers. Quoted in Daniel W. Lang, "Amos Brown and the Educational Meaning of the American Agricultural College Act." *History of Education* 31 (2002): 139-165.

Brown, Amos. "President Brown's Report." 15 September 1862. MS, Bramble Family Papers. Cornell University. Quoted in Daniel W. Lang, "Amos Brown and the Educational Meaning of the American Agricultural College Act." *History of Education* 31 (2002): 139-165.

Bureau of Economic Analysis. U.S. Department of Commerce. "Regional Economic Accounts." <http://www.bea.gov/bea/regional/gsp/action.cfm> (accessed 16 July 2005).

*Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Georgia, 1855-1931*. Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, The University of Georgia Libraries.

*Catalogue of the State Agricultural and Mechanical College, Auburn, Lee County, Alabama, 1876-1890*. Special Collections and Archives, Auburn University Library.

Center for Business and Economic Research. "2000 Census of Population for Alabama." Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The University of Alabama College of Commerce, 10 December 2004. <http://cber.cba.ua.edu/edata/census2000.html> (accessed 10 December 2004).

"Georgia. University. Land Grant Colleges." Vertical File. Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, The University of Georgia Libraries.

"Georgia University College of Agriculture Annual Report 1931-1932: Report of the President, State College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts, To the Honorable Board of Trustees of the University of Georgia and the Georgia State College of Agriculture." Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, The University of Georgia Libraries.

*Handbook of Labor Statistics U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (Estimate) 1800-2005*. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis. <http://minneapolisfed.org/research/data/us/calc/hist1800.cfm> (accessed 10 July 2005).

*Hatch Act of 1887. U.S. Statutes at Large* 25 (1887): 440-441.

Lee, Charles. "Comments by Dr. Charles Lee on Being Appointed President." Mississippi State University. c2001. <http://www.msstate.edu/president/acceptance.html> (accessed 28 July 2005).

- Lowder, Robert. "A Response to *The Chronicle of Higher Education* article: "An Explosive Football Scandal Raises a Tough Question: Who Runs Auburn?" *The Auburn Plainsman Online*. 1 June 2000. [http://www.auburn.edu/student\\_info/plainsman/archives/060100/060100flowder.html](http://www.auburn.edu/student_info/plainsman/archives/060100/060100flowder.html) (accessed 28 July 2005).
- Morrill Act of 1862. Statutes at Large of the United States of America* 12 (1863): 503-505.
- Morrill, Justin Smith. Papers. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
- Muscoplat, Charles C. "The Land Grant University: Mission Accomplished or Mission Impossible?" 8 July 2004. <http://www.coafes.umn.edu/printview/03964837-9716-44a2-a384-deacfd8791d.html> (accessed 25 July 2005).
- Reed, Thomas. "History of the University of Georgia." c1949. Thomas Reed Papers. Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, The University of Georgia Libraries. <http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/reed> (accessed 28 July 2005).
- Smith-Lever Act of 1914. U.S. Statutes at Large* 38 (1914): 372.
- United States Statutes at Large*. Vol. 14.
- University of Georgia Fact Book*, 1970-2004.
- U.S. Census Bureau. "Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates." 1999-2000. <http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/saipa/saipa.cgi> (accessed 17 July 2005).
- \_\_\_\_\_. Summary File 1, P2. Census 2000. <http://factfinder.census.gov> (accessed 28 July 2005).
- \_\_\_\_\_. Summary File 3, Matrix P53, Matrix P87. Census 2000 <http://factfinder.census.gov> (accessed 27 July 2005).
- U.S. Congress. *Congressional Globe*. 46 vols. Washington, D.C., 1834-73.
- U. S. Congress. House. *Report No. 69*. 26<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., 1841.

## Secondary

Bass, Max H. *The UGA Coastal Plain Experiment Station. . . The First 75 Years*. Tifton, Ga.: Lang Printing Co., 1993.

“Biographical Directory of the United States Congress.” <http://bioguide.congress.gov>.

Blackmar, Frank W. *The History of Federal and State Aid to Higher Education in the United States*. US Bureau of Education Circular of Information # 1. Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1890.

Brown, Ray C. “Colleges that have Closed, Merged, or Changed Names.” [http://www.wcmo.edu/wc\\_users/homepages/staff/brownr/NewYorkCC.htm](http://www.wcmo.edu/wc_users/homepages/staff/brownr/NewYorkCC.htm) (accessed 6 July 2005).

Campbell, John R. *Reclaiming a Lost Heritage: Land-Grant and Other Higher Education Initiatives for the Twenty-first Century*. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1995.

Carriel, Mary Turner. *The Life of Jonathan Baldwin Turner*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961.

Chaszar, Julianna. “Leading and Losing in the Agricultural Education Movement: Freeman G. Cary and Farmers’ College, 1846-1884.” *History of Higher Education Annual* 18 (1998): 25-46.

Cross, Coy F. *Justin Smith Morrill: Father of the Land-Grant Colleges*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1999.

Duemer, Lee Stewart. “The Origins of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862: A Convergence of War and the Threat of War, Agricultural Influence, Modernization, and the American University Movement.” Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1996.

Eddy, Jr., Edward Danforth. *Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land-Grant Idea in American Education*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956.

Edmond, Joseph Bailey. *The Magnificent Charter: The Origin and Role of the Morrill Land-Grant Colleges and Universities*. Hicksville, N.Y.: Exposition Press, 1978.

Frost, Dan R. *Thinking Confederates: Academia and the Idea of Progress in the New South*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000.

Gates, Paul W. *Agriculture and the Civil War*. New York: Alfred A, Knopf, 1965.

Georgia Student Finance Commission. “Georgia’s Hope Scholarship Program.” <http://www.gsfc.org/HOPE/Index.cfm> (accessed 28 July 2005).

- Gutek, Gerald L. *A History of the Western Educational Experience*. New York: Random House, 1972.
- Hewitt, W. T. "A History of Cornell University" In *Landmarks of Tompkins County, New York*, edited by John H. Selkreg. Syracuse: D. Mason & Company, 1894.  
<http://www.rootsweb.com/~nytompki/Landmarks/contents.htm> (6 July 2005).
- James, Edmund J. *The Origin of the Land Grant Act of 1862: (The so-called Morrill Act) and Some Account of its Author Jonathan B. Turner*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1910.
- Kandel, Isaac Leon. *Federal Aid for Vocational Education: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. Bulletin No. 10. Boston: Merrymount Press, 1917.
- Karina, Stephen J. *The University of Georgia College of Agriculture: An Administrative History, 1785-1985*. Athens, Ga.: n.p., c1987.
- Kerr, Norwood Allen. *A History of the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, 1883-1983*. Auburn, Ala.: Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, Auburn University, c1985.
- Key, Scott. "Economics or Education: The Establishment of American Land-Grant Universities." *Journal of Higher Education* 67 (March-April 1996): 196-220.
- Lang, Daniel W. "Amos Brown and the Educational Meaning of the American Agricultural College Act." *History of Education* 31 (2002): 139-165.
- Lord, Gary Thomas. "Alden Partridge's Proposal for a National System of Education: A Model for the Morrill Land-Grant Act." *History of Higher Education Annual* 18 (1998): 11-24.
- Madsen, David. "The Land-Grant University: Myth and Reality." In *Land-Grant Universities and their Continuing Challenge*, edited by G. Lester Anderson, 23-48. Ann Arbor: Michigan State University Press, 1976.
- Martin, Michael V. "A Drift Toward Elitism by the 'People's Universities.'" *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 51 (25 February 2005): B26.
- Morison, Samuel Eliot, and Henry Steele Commager. *The Growth of the American Republic*. Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press, 1930.
- Mumford, Frederick B. *The Land Grant College Movement*. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri, 1940.

- National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, "Development of the Land-Grant System:1862-1994." [http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land\\_Grant/Development.htm](http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land_Grant/Development.htm) (accessed 25 November 2003).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Land Grant Tradition Hatch Act." [http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land\\_Grant/Hatch.htm](http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land_Grant/Hatch.htm) (accessed 10 December 2004).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Land-Grant Tradition Smith-Lever Act." [http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land\\_Grant/Smith-Lever.htm](http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land_Grant/Smith-Lever.htm) (accessed 9 December 2004).
- Nevins, Allan. *The Origins of the Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities: A Brief Account of the Morrill Act of 1862 and Its Results*. Washington, D.C.: Civil War Centennial Commission, 1962.
- O'Hare, William P., and Kenneth M. Johnson. "Child Poverty in Rural America," *Reports on America* 4. Washington, D.C: Population Reference Bureau, March 2004.
- Parker, William Belmont. *The Life and Public Services of Justin Smith Morrill*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1924.
- Pritchett, Henry S. Introduction to *Federal Aid for Vocational Education: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, Bulletin No. 10, by Isaac Leon Kandel. Boston: Merrymount Press, 1917.
- Rogers, William Warren. "The Founding of Alabama's Land Grant College at Auburn," *The Alabama Review* 40 (January 1987): 14-37.
- Ross, Earl D. *Democracy's College: The Land-Grant Movement in the Formative Stage*. Ames: Iowa State College Press, 1942).
- Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Sawyer, William E. "The Evolution of the Morrill Act of 1862." Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1948.
- Southern Regional Educational Board. "Alabama Featured Facts." June 2003. <http://www.sreb.org/main/EdData/FactBook/2003StateReports/Alabama.pdf> (accessed 3 December 2004).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Challenge to Lead: Alabama." 2004. [http://www.sreb.org/main/Goals/Publications/Color\\_PDF/AL-color.pdf](http://www.sreb.org/main/Goals/Publications/Color_PDF/AL-color.pdf) (accessed 3 December 2004).

Thompson, Noel A.D., John Dunkelberger, Lavaughn Johnson, and Glenn Howze.  
“Future Farming: Study Chronicles Changes in Alabama Farms Now and Into the  
Next Century.” *Highlights of Agricultural Research* (Auburn, Alabama: Alabama  
Agricultural Experiment Station) 45 (Fall 1998). [http://www.ag.auburn.edu/  
aaes/communications/highlightsonline/fall98/futurefarming.html](http://www.ag.auburn.edu/aaes/communications/highlightsonline/fall98/futurefarming.html) (accessed 11  
December 2004).

Tilden, Arnold. *The Legislation of the Civil War Period Considered as a Basis of the  
Agricultural Revolution in the United States*. Los Angeles: University of Southern  
California Press, 1937.

UGA Office of Public Affairs. “Georgia Farm Bureau Endows Lectures.” *Columns*. 24  
January 2005. <http://www.uga.edu/columns/050124/digest.html> (accessed 11  
August 2005).