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CHAPTER I, INTRODUCTION

Histories of the Land Grant Act of 1862, more popularly known as the Morrill Act, generally fall into one of two categories—histories of the land-grant idea and histories about land-grant institutions. The former are general histories of the movement, usually viewed from a national perspective, which seek to identify, explain, and to some degree analyze those social, political, and economic forces instrumental in shaping this evolutionary, if not revolutionary, idea in American higher education. "Jacksonian Democracy", "Social consciousness", "utilitarianism", and "industrial classes" are seemingly ubiquitous concepts linked to this movement and consequently scrutinized in this approach.

That the products of this movement were inextricably tied to these concepts, there can be no doubt. But the establishment of each land-grant institution was a singularly unique event, affected by a number of local and statewide pressures, none ever quite the same as the next. Edward D. Eddy in his Colleges For Our Land and Time has tried to classify these institutions rather arbitrarily according to the "type" of recipient assigned the Morrill funds. But mere classification does not begin to detail all of the complexities involved in the ultimate disbursement of the funds in each state.
One would think that these local and statewide pressures would be fully treated in the histories of each land-grant institution. Indeed, the call has been unmistakably clear. Earle D. Ross, noted land-grant historian, after decrying the conventional histories of those colleges as being too provincial and antiquarian concludes

. . . that if the histories of our land-grant colleges and universities are allowed to reflect the conditioning social and institutional trends which have so largely shaped and actuated their careers, along with the variant tendencies of the particular institution, they may not only help to clarify current educational issues but as well make definite and substantial contributions to the social and intellectual history of the nation.  

But many institutional land-grant histories, products of chroniclers or devoted alumni, fall woefully short of Ross' exhortation. Rarely is the interplay of these forces at the state and local levels critically analyzed, especially those which preceded the establishment of the institution. Indeed, the social, political, and economic forces which sought to shape the initial utility of the Morrill funds in each state are given, at best, a cursory glance. They are, in fact, prefatory to the rest of the "real" history of the institution, and consequently in need of greater analysis.

In most states, a series of commonly identified events preceded the actual legislative statute establishing each land-grant institution. The initial phase consisted of the formal acceptance of the provisions of the Morrill Act by the state legislature. The Civil War and its deliterious effects precluded many of the
states from rushing in to accept the grant with its attendant responsibilities. In fact, the "states in rebellion" were expressly denied the right to its benefits until after the War. Not until 1870 would the great majority of states agree to establish state-sponsored teaching of the agriculture and mechanic arts.6

After acceptance, each state concentrated on the sale of public lands (land scrip when public lands within the state were exhausted), the proceeds of which would be used to finance the new institution(s). A formula, based on the census of 1860, apportioned to each state a quantity of public land equal to thirty thousand acres for each senator and representative in the congress of the United States. At a recommended minimum level of $1.25 per acre, the total of all the monies derived would then be invested in stocks of the United States, or some other safe stocks, so as not to yield less than five percent interest. This sum would constitute a perpetual fund, the capital of which was to remain forever undiminished. In addition, each state was responsible for all expenses incurred in the administration and sale of the public lands or scrip. For many states, this second phase was both protracted and difficult, indeed, one of a number of impediments which delayed final legislative action on the entire matter.7

A third phase, and the one characterized by Eddy as the most controversial and bitter, centered on the awarding of the grant to a worthy recipient(s). At least part of the confusion lay in the multiple interpretations afforded Section Four of the Federal
statute which outlined in rather broad terms how the monies derived from the grant should be apportioned namely:

... To the endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be without excluding the scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in such manner as the legislators of the state may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.8

This broad, if not vague, language coupled with the pervasive financial desperation of a majority of colleges guaranteed a spirited, sometimes vicious, competition for the funds.

Pressures on the state legislatures were exerted from at least four directions. First, the private institutions, many ill-equipped and poorly managed but with a solid liberal studies curriculum, believed they should be the logical recipients. Many existing state institutions thought their claims to be justified; adding the new courses to their scientific and classical curricula, they argued, would promote efficiency of management and effectively advance the progress of these sometimes forgotten educational wards of the state. A third group, generally the friends of agriculture and skeptical of the new-found practical interests of the traditionally literary schools, sought to establish new and separate colleges devoted primarily to the interests of the industrial classes. And finally, there were those who sought a more equitable solution to the problem by proposing a division of the fund between these major pressure groups--a
compromise offering hope to most, if not all, of the competing factions. Legislative concurrence during this most difficult phase eventually culminated in the passage of enabling legislation establishing the proposed college(s).

Ohio was not spared of the seemingly ubiquitous clamor. In fact, the multiplicity and multifarious nature of the colleges within its borders, a sometimes splintered but powerful agricul-
tural community, and a somewhat cautious, sometimes bewildered, legislature all provided a fascinating setting for a classic battle which raged over the better part of a decade.9 The complexity of the struggle, now historically obscure, is certainly worthy of further investigation.

The central focus of this monograph, then, is to identify, narrate, amplify, and analyze those political forces in Ohio involved in the controversy over the disbursement of the Morrill funds in Ohio between the years 1862 (the year the national act became law) and 1870 (the year the Cannon bill was enacted estab-
lishing the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical Arts College).10

Specifically, the answers to the following questions are sought: Who were the primary participants in the competition for the Morrill funds in Ohio? What historical antecedents—ideolog-
cal, moral, pedagogical, and political—did each proffer, either implicitly or explicitly, in order to bolster their respective claims? What visible strategies to procure the monies are identi-
fiable and traceable? Who were the leading exponents in each
faction? As arbiters between the competing interests, what were the views and subsequent actions taken by state government officials--governors, legislators, and other administrators--during the fray? And finally, how and when was the controversy resolved, and which factors seemed to have been paramount in determining the final outcome?

Finding the answers to these and other related questions are, of course, the results of a state-wide library investigation. The bulk of materials utilized in this study were: the minutes and reports of the boards of trustees, presidents, and faculties of older Ohio colleges; newspapers, both metropolitan and agricultural; journals of both houses of the Ohio General Assembly; Ohio executive documents; annual reports of the Ohio State Board of Agriculture; and, the public and private correspondence, diaries, and other miscellaneous documents of selected state officials. Given the kinds of questions raised and the resources necessary to adequately answer them, this monograph is at once a fact-finding and synthesizing research project.

This project, then, attempts to give the fullest understanding of the dynamics of the fray in Ohio. It begins with an overview of higher education in the state during the first half of the nineteenth century, primarily focusing on the traditional elements of the status quo, as well as the eventual infiltration of progressive ideas. The role of government as a catalyst and arbiter during the years of advocacy and struggle is then scrutinized.
Next, the competing factions, with particular emphasis on their rationales and attendant strategies, are both identified and analyzed. And finally, given all of the available data, an attempt will be made to identify and analyze those factors primarily responsible for the protracted and vexatious nature of the fray.
NOTES, CHAPTER I

1 The acknowledged exemplary works of this broader, conceptual approach are Earle D. Ross, *Democracy's College: The Land Grant Movement in the Formative Stage* (Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State College Press, 1942) and Edward Danforth Eddy, *Colleges For Our Land and Time: The Land Grant Idea in American Education* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1957). Though both share in common the ubiquitous concepts influencing the movement, there are qualitative differences. Ross' history focuses on the development of the land-grant idea in its formative stage down to approximately 1890, and, consequently, is a more careful work on the impulse and implantation of the idea throughout the nation. Eddy's contribution, on the other hand, is a more comprehensive work focusing most of its attention on the evolution of the idea down through the first half of the twentieth century. Although Eddy does begin with the initial stages of the movement prior to 1870, his description of them serves primarily to lend perspective to what the land-grant college will become contemporarily.


2 Eddy's pattern of organization and affiliation is related to the assignment of the Morrill funds in each state and, according to the author, generally followed three schemes: (1) assigning the funds to a private or church-related college, (2) assigning the funds to a state university, and (3) assigning the funds to establish a new and separate institution. Not only is Eddy's scheme arbitrary, it is possibly misleading. For example, Ohio's land grant institution (now The Ohio State University) is listed in the second category when, in point of fact, it could have just as correctly been listed in the third category since it was established as a new and separate state institution. The pre-existing state universities (Ohio and Miami), though active participants in the fray did not receive one dime for their efforts.

Eddy's scheme may be reviewed on pp. 49-50 in *Colleges For Our Land and Time*. 

8

4This is not to imply that the authors of the land-grant idea or institutions were unaware of the social, political, and economic forces at the state and local levels; only that those prior to the establishment of each institution are implied, or, at best, described. The details of the mix, in most states, are unhappily left to the reader's imagination. And although such an ambitious endeavor was more than likely beyond their scholarly purview, the fact remains a gap does exist, the void must be filled.

5The complete text of the Morrill Act of 1862 is reproduced in its entirety in Appendix A on pages 385-387 of this monograph. Borrowed from George P. Sanger, ed., The Statutes at Large, Treaties and Proclamations of the United States of America (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1863), 12: 503-05.


6Eddy identifies three states (Iowa, Vermont, and Connecticut) accepting the terms of the grant in 1862; fourteen in 1863; three (including Ohio) in 1864; one in 1865; six in 1866; four in 1867; three in 1868; one in 1869; and two in 1870. Statistics borrowed from Eddy, Colleges For Our Land and Time, pp. 47-8.

7In regards to this phase, the results were mixed. Many states, including Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota, California, and especially New York sold their designated portion of lands (scrip) for well above the $1.25 per acre level. Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Ohio, on the other hand, missed the opportunity and settled for an amount far below the recommended minimum figure. Clearly, not all land-grant colleges were created equal.

For an excellent national overview of the problems surrounding the sale of the land scrip, see Ross, Democracy's College, pp. 77-85.

8Sanger, The Statutes at Large, p. 504.

9Regarding the number and variety of colleges in Ohio, Donald G. Tewksbury cites it as having more permanent colleges (23) within its borders prior to the Civil War than any other state in the Union. He also points to the two state universitites within its jurisdiction, unique in this category.

CHAPTER II, OHIO HIGHER EDUCATION DURING
THE ANTEBELLUM ERA

In his manuscript entitled _A History of Ohio, Natural and
Civil_ , Caleb Atwater, Ohio's first historian, simultaneously des-
cribines and criticizes the predominant state of affairs in Ohio
higher education prior to the Civil War. He writes: "... too many
of our literary institutions, seem to be so many elements of
sectarian views, in religious matters. This is not as it should
be."

Denying the charges proffered by the Eastern clergy of a
paucity of ministers in the West, Atwater scoffingly remarks:

According to our population we have two ministers here,
of some sort, to where they [the East] have one. The
people of the East need not mourn our destitute state, as
to our preaching... There is scarcely a day in the
year but there is some preaching of some sort, in every
town of any size in the State. We by no means, say that
we have too much preaching, but we do say that there is
not want of it in Ohio.

Written in 1838, Atwater's admonition was a clear signal that Ohio
had entered the "Denominational Era" of college founding in Ameri-
can higher education.

Atwater's remonstrance, notwithstanding, a steady migration of
settlers moving westward during the decade of the 1840's exacer-
bated the problem of ministerial supply and demand. Ohio's
checkered religiosity was but a microcosm of the country as a
whole. Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Catholics, Disciples of Christ, Lutherans, Unitarians, Baptists, and others all settled within its borders. All would need, most would demand, an ample supply of trained clergymen to minister to their spiritual needs.

The problem, growing more and more acute with every passing year, was the main topic of discussion before the Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West (S.P.C.T.E.W.) in 1848. Most of the members agreed with the Reverend Charles White's contention that:

Western colleges are hereafter to be the chief sources of a Western ministry. The ministers, sent from the East to the West, are not one twenty-fifth of the numbers which are immediately needed . . . . We at the West shall never be completely supplied from the Eastern Churches. Western colleges as sources of supply, are wholly indispensable.3

Arguments for the establishment of new colleges in the West were, indeed, convincing. First, the prospect of sending western youth to Eastern colleges was prohibitive because of distance, expense, and risk. Secondly, the social and economic benefits currently and reciprocally enjoyed by existing colleges and their respective communities would, undoubtedly, be multiplied throughout the state with the creation of these new institutions. Finally, and perhaps the most convincing argument of all, was the necessity of training her sons for the ministry on native soil. The advantages of educating their sons at home were, perhaps, best summarized, at the 1854 meeting of the S.P.C.T.E.W.:
Those who are trained on the spot, other things being equal, are best adapted to the country, and most likely to be useful. They grow up in sympathy with the people, know their circumstances, and can appreciate their difficulties; are familiar with their modes of thought, and feeling, and action, and can throw their influence through numerous channels which would be closed to those who were trained elsewhere.\footnote{4}

Beneath the surface of this seemingly innocuous rationale, however, lay the seeds of insidious self-interest. Proselytizing Christian ethics, for many Protestant denominations, would become but a shroud for furthering sectarian aggrandizement and aggression. Many colleges would become bastions of denominational imperialism, ever replenishing "soldiers of Christ" to wage yet another battle, to win yet another foothold, on the new frontier.

Innocuous or insidious designs, notwithstanding, four decades of unbridled denominationalism had a pronounced effect on higher education in Ohio. By 1860, the Methodists, with by far the largest patronage in the state, had established three permanent colleges within its borders—namely, Ohio Wesleyan University (1842), Baldwin University (1845), and Mount Union College (1858). Congregationalists and Presbyterians, either acting unilaterally or under the Plan of Union, did equally as well during the ante-bellum period.\footnote{5} Acting together in 1826, they established the Western Reserve University at Hudson, later removed to Cleveland. Eight years later, the Oberlin Collegiate Institution was founded under the auspices of the Congregational Church. And, in 1835, the Congregationalists also established Marietta College in the southeast quadrant of the state.
Other denominational interests also dotted the landscape of Ohio higher education. Catholicism spawned two colleges during the period: St. Xavier's College in Cincinnati and St. Joseph's College, also in Hamilton County. Laying the foundations for future Baptist concerns in the state, the Granville Literary and Theological College, later renamed Denison University, was instituted in 1852. The welfare of the Lutheran Church in Ohio was secured by the founding of Wittenberg College (1845) at Springfield and later, at Columbus, the Capital University (1850). Similarly, the principles of faith of Episcopalians, United Brethrens, Swedenborgians, German Reformeds, and Disciples of Christ were furthered at Kenyon (1826), Otterbein (1849), Urbana (1850), Heidelberg (1851), and both Western Reserve Eclectic Institute (1850) and Antioch (1852) respectively. Indeed, the majority of these colleges constituted the backbone of Ohio higher education to, and well beyond, the years of the Great Rebellion.\(^6\)

In many ways, the history of Kenyon College typifies the vicissitudes of a majority of these denominational colleges in Ohio.\(^7\) As was so often the case, the story of Kenyon begins with the dreams and efforts of a singular individual. Philander Chase, in his role as Bishop of the newly organized Episcopate of Ohio, sought to ameliorate the problems of the dearth of clergymen in the state by establishing a theological seminary within its borders. As its founder and first president, Chase would shoulder
the burden of a plethora of problems associated with its establish- 
ishment and early history.

Securing an initial endowment for the school headed the list of 
prerequisites. Chase determined early (July 1823) to secure the 
monies from the Church in England, and accordingly, made plans to 
personally visit and solicit the funds in Britain. Though suc-
cessful in gaining support for his mission from the Ohio Diocesan 
Convention, Chase faced some rather stiff opposition from a few 
influential members of the American Protestant Episcopal Church. 
They argued that the newly established General Theological 
Seminary in New York would produce more than enough trained minis-
ters for the country. Moreover, the Bishop of New York would 
precede Chase to England and carry out his prior threat to impugn 
both the character of the man and creditability of his mission. 
In order to convince his potential British benefactors of both his 
honesty and sincerity, Bishop Chase offered them his "Deed of 
Donation" which, among other things, promised to tender much of 
his personal property (farm and library) to the proposed school in 
exchange for their support. Impressed by the Bishop's foresight 
and unselfishness, English church officials gave him their 
blessings and ultimately the sum of $10,000---enough for a begin-
ning.

The first order of business upon Chase's return to Ohio was 
the fashioning of a constitution (charter) for the proposed sem-
inary. Enlisting the talents of an associate, the two men forged
the historical instrument which bore many of the provisions set forth in the Bishop's "Deed of Donation". It incorporated five principal articles. The first titled the school "The Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ohio". Its singular purpose would be to educate ministers of the gospel for the Church. No initial consideration was given to establishing a college or offering secular coursework. Article Two of the proposed charter affirmed the Chase plantation as the site of the new seminary, unless otherwise changed by the Diocesan Convention at some future date. The third article vested the direction and management of the institution in a nine member board of trustees which included the Bishop of the Ohio Episcopate. The vistorial powers of members of the National Protestant Episcopal Church outlined in Article Four alleviated any fear of a potential Church schism. And the last article declared the Bishop of Ohio, or his duly appointed substitute, president of the seminary. By the end of 1824, the document had gained the approval of both the Diocesan Convention and Ohio General Assembly. Even so, many volatile issues inherent in the language of the document sparked a number of controversies which significantly altered the original design of the proposed institution.

The permanent location of the institution represented the first of several departures from the original scheme. Prompted by personal, practical, and political reasons, Chase called for and eventually persuaded the Diocesan Convention to relocate the new
institution to another site. News of the decision spread quickly. No less than a half dozen thriving communities enthusiastically submitted generous offers in order to secure its location. But Chase, like many other college founders of his day, declined to fix the site at or near centers of dense population arguing that they bred corruption and, as such, would hardly suffice as a proper environment for the education of "men of morals". Instead, the Bishop opted for the countryside with adequate safeguards against corruption, as well as a solitary and pristine environment conducive to both studious and healthy living.

But exactly where should the new institution be placed?

The Bishop quickly answered this and a host of related questions by opting for an 8,000 acre tract of land near the center of the state. The school at this spot was located only a short distance from Mount Vernon. Regular stagecoach runs linked the neighboring village to Columbus, Cleveland and Cincinnati. Moreover, the proposed sites of the National Road and Ohio Canal would be but thirty-five miles away thereby insuring easy accessibility for all of the school's Ohio patrons. Isolated, yet centrally located and accessible. Ideal!

But the question of adequate finances in order to secure its purchase presented a formidable problem. The British donors had specifically designated the use of its contribution ($10,000) for endowments, scholarships and equipment, fully expecting their American counterparts to fund the purchase of the land and
buildings. Nevertheless, Chase was determined to secure this location and quickly, if not precipitously, struck a bargain with its owner. Though the Convention eventually approved the provisions of the sale, it made clear its unwillingness to expend any diocesan funds for the new acquisition. Chase was left to his own devices.

And he was equal to the task. Still sensing an air of animosity from many influential members of the national church hierarchy, he, once again, turned to his supporters in England. By this time the Bishop was highly regarded by his British colleagues, and anything he had to say on the subject always drew an attentive ear. And what he was saying this time was, indeed, unique. Chase theorized that half of his prospective acquisition could eventually be resold at an amount equal to, if not greater than, the original purchase price, and would thereby effectively leave the English endowment intact. (This was eventually achieved as the 4,000 acres of the North Section fetched $4,500 more than the initial purchase price.) The British, impressed by Chase's speculative savvy, agreed to temporarily release part of the original endowment in order that the sale of the college lands be consummated.

Meanwhile, the school flourished at its temporary location on the Chase estate. Although the school opened with but a handful of students in 1824, its enrollment rose to fifty by 1828. Low tuition costs, inexpensive living expenditures, the prospect of a
new location, and the addition of a new collegiate (and preparatory) department accounted for its thriving condition. To be sure, the latter marks yet another deviation from the original charter of the institution.

Why the expansion? Two reasons. First, the Bishop, much to his dismay, quickly discerned the lack of preparatory skills of his first students at Worthington. He argued that sound grammar school and collegiate training must precede any rigorous theological training. Only by strengthening the former could the latter be effectively achieved. Indeed, no more than two students pursued a theological course at any one time during the first few years at the Worthington site. A second reason centered on the more practical effects of the great wave of egalitarianism currently sweeping the West, and with it a concomitant desire of the masses for more education at all levels. Deficiencies in many areas, especially in the number and quality of common school teachers, plagued the entire region. Could not the new institution assist in filling the void and thereby fulfill a great civic responsibility? Indeed, the desire and necessity for a liberal education crossed both professional and class lines.

Bishop Chase affirmed and defended these propositions and related actions during a speech delivered to the 1826 Diocesan Convention:

Much of the field of art and science, is open alike to the physician, civilian, and the divine. What one studies the other must not neglect. The knowledge of the
languages, philosophy, and Belles letters, is necessary to all, and in the attainment of this, the ability and number of the professors and teachers, the quality and extent of the libraries and the use and value of an astronomical and philosophical apparatus may be greatly enlarged, for the benefit of each, by a junction of the funds of both. It was therefore to promote, and not to impede the original design of our institution, that I have endeavored to annex a college of general science to our Seminary, and to open our doors to students designed eventually for all the learned professions. 9

Chase's decision to establish 'Kenyon College' angered a few members of the Convention; most, however, supported, even applauded, this latest move by the Bishop.

The mission of the school broadened and a suitable location secured, there remained the task of procuring the necessary funds for the construction of the new buildings at Gambier. Having exhausted his efforts and good-will across the Atlantic, the Bishop was compelled to limit his fund-raising efforts to this country—primarily in the East. All manners of solicitation, both public and private, would be enlisted, though some met with more success than others.

Chase first sought the aid of the American Episcopal Church during the 1826 meeting of the General Convention of Bishops in Philadelphia. His passionate plea, however, evoked little sympathy from the Convention as a whole. Nevertheless, a few members agreed to assist Chase in a massive fund-raising effort throughout New England. After months of toilsome labor, the Bishop successfully attained his predetermined goal of $10,000 and promptly returned home. Soon after his arrival, however, it became evident
that his apparently successful venture in the East fell woefully short of the funds necessary to complete the main edifice, chapel, and other buildings at the new location.

This time the ever resourceful Bishop turned to the Congress of the United States for public assistance. Citing the precedents of both the Ohio and Miami universities, Chase determined to request one township of land (i.e., 20,000 acres) from the government, the proceeds of which would be used for the buildings and long-range support of the schools at Gambier. Not leaving anything to chance, the wily Bishop orchestrated a dual strategy enlisting the support of both the State General Assembly and congressional contingency from Ohio.

In an address delivered to the Ohio General Assembly on 27 November 1827, Bishop Chase commended that body for having made provisions for the establishment of public schools throughout the state. But he quickly noted that the universitites at Athens and Oxford were scarcely producing one-tenth the number of teachers to adequately staff them. With fewer numbers trickling in from the East and with a potential army of instructors currently residing in the state, Chase proposed that we:

... educate these teachers ourselves. Let us draw from our own soil the moral seed, by which the Western country is to be supplied with the fruits of learning... The best, yea, the only estimable School Teachers, are those who come to their employment with minds uninflated with the vanities which riches seldom fail to inspire. They are taken from the middle and more industrious walks of life... Place the means of educating your School Teachers within the reach of these, and the
benefit of rearing up Teachers in abundance, to fill your schools, will soon be apparent. Kenyon College, now commended to your patronage to this end is worthy of your regard.10

Moved by the Bishop's stirring and commonsensical appeal, the Assembly passed a formal resolution approving of his application to Congress for a donation of a tract of land for the support of Kenyon College, and called upon the congressional delegation from Ohio to use whatever means at their disposal to promote the measure.11

Phase one of his strategy completed, Chase rushed to Washington, D.C. arriving in February 1828. Strategy sessions with his brother, Senator Dudley Chase (Vermont), and Ohio Senators Harrison and Ruggles proved fruitful as they were able to maneuver the Kenyon College bill through the upper chamber. Unfortunately, members of the House did not share in their counterparts' enthusiasm, and the measure died for lack of interest. Chase returned to Ohio with nothing to show for his effort; the anticipated Autumn move to Gambier was now clearly in jeopardy.

The Bishop, now desperate, resorted to beggardedly tactics. Contacting virtually everyone he knew--students and parishioners (past and present), friends, relatives, and acquaintances--Chase entreated all to send a minimum of one dollar to aid the college in its present crisis. This last-ditch effort fortunately garnered enough funds to complete the main edifice, and assured that the move to Gambier would proceed as scheduled.
Incessant financial problems, notwithstanding, other internal problems also plagued the college during its early years. Chief among them was the increasing animosity engendered between the Bishop and members of the college faculty over the locus of decision-making power. Chase, as founder, chief financial agent and president of the institution, naturally presumed the principle of centrality, contending that his should be the final word on all issues affecting the college. The faculty, on the other hand, proffered the principle of collegiality, arguing that academic decision-making should be a shared process involving all members of the instructional staff. The Board of Trustees, increasingly wary of the strained relations between the two factions, intervened and eventually sided with the faculty in this dispute. The Bishop promptly took his case to the Diocesan Convention. Unable to convince this 'higher authority' of the rightness of his position, he resigned his post in 1831 leaving a legacy of birth and survival for the developing institution.

The administrations of Presidents McIlvaine, Bronson, Smith and Andrews during the years 1832-1861 primarily concerned themselves with the continuing financial exigencies of the institution. Coping with this matter required both sacrifice and diligent effort on the part of all associated with the college community. Tuition charges were raised in order to offset current operating expenses. And when this contingency failed, members of the Board exercised the strictest economy on its faculty members.
Paltry salaries paid at irregular intervals prompted President Bronson to remark: "The labor of men at Gambier whose wages have been kept back . . . will cry to heaven for vengeance upon those who have oppressed the hireling and kept back his wages.\textsuperscript{12}\n
Additional sources of income, some indiscreet and some prudent, provided critical relief for the struggling college during its formative years. The sale of scholarship scrip proved to be one of its more reprehensible strategies of fund-raising. The device, prevalent among the majority of Western colleges, took a number of forms. At Kenyon, the nominal sum of $36 purchased a first-class scholarship and entitled its owner or his designee to two years of free tuition. At the other end of the scale, however, a fee of $200 entitled the owner to a fourth-class or perpetual scholarship!\textsuperscript{13} To be sure, these stop-gap measure, especially the latter category, produced a number of deliterious consequences particularly damaging to the overall development of a number of colleges.

Fortunately, Kenyon claimed yet another source of income which most of its collegiate counterparts could not. Kenyon's South Section of land (the remaining 4,000 acres), traditionally viewed as "holy ground" and thereby virtually untouchable, eventually, some would say, providentially, proved to be its salvation. Its revenues ultimately served to liquidate its accumulated debts, repair its dilapidated buildings, and offer reasonable accomodations and wages to its faculty. Consequently, Kenyon stood as one
of only a few financially stable colleges just prior to the Civil War.

Student life during the three decades following the institution's relocation to Gambier was not unlike many of her sister institutions throughout the state. The common bond shared by seminarian and collegian alike was religion. Compulsory attendance at morning and evening prayer services during the week, as well as two lengthy Church meetings on Sunday, comprised the core of their religious activities. Moreover, a number of students willingly, if not enthusiastically, participated in the inspirational revivals prevalent throughout the nation in the 1830's. The instillation of faith was, indeed, a paramount goal of the nineteenth century college.

The cynosure of his daily routine, however, centered on his academical or theological studies. Kenyon, like the majority of colleges throughout the land, was decidedly influenced by the Yale Report of 1828. The Report, written in response to the threat of the new practical studies currently coming into vogue, staunchly defended the classical thrust of the college curriculum in its now famous maxim: "The two great points to be gained in intellectual culture, are the discipline and the furniture of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge." Consequently, the study of the Greek and Latin languages, pure mathematics, ancient literature, mental and moral philosophy, the
physical sciences, rhetoric and English literature, and their related methodologies of daily recitations and periodic written and oral examinations, remained as the principal products and processes of collegiate study in the United States through the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century.

The education of the nineteenth century college student at Kenyon, or for that matter at any other college throughout the land, was not restricted to the formal classroom setting. Indeed, the extracurriculum provided an additional learning environment, one more relaxed and, assuredly, geared to the students' interests and desires. The most common of these were the literary societies where disputations, debates, and other literary exercises on topics of current interest, no doubt, served as a welcome diversion from the drudgery and drill of the regular classroom; the Greek-letter fraternity movement (replacing the literary societies) which provided a leisurely respite from the trials and tribulations of college life; athletic clubs which provided a physical release from the pressures of academia; and, student newspapers where students could voice their opinions on topics of current interest.

The successful fusion of curriculum and extracurriculum produced a core of studied and urbane men at Kenyon, prompting one of its 1862 graduates to reminisce:

The only thing of importance was the College which existed for us and we for the College. We were learning to study, we were gaining a knowledge of men, and a sense
of personality deepened within us, till we were filled with boundless enthusiasm. As I reflect on all that it was to us, I say again, there could not have been a better home for young men than was Gambier. . . .\(^{15}\)

The serenity and daily regimen of college life for many ended when the shelling at Fort Sumter began. Kenyon, like so many other colleges in the state, responded unselfishly to the call for manpower. Many students eagerly enlisted in their respective armies; others, not bound for the front, returned home to bereaved families in order to replace fathers and brothers lost in battle. The Mason-Dixon line, that invisible line of demarcation between North and South, visibly transformed former brothers into bitter enemies. The mass exodus of students had a deliterious, if not devastating, effect on a number of colleges throughout the state. Figures at Kenyon, for example, reveal that only sixty-eight students were enrolled by the end of the war, or one-half the number listed on its rolls for the year 1860-61.\(^{16}\) The Great Rebellion did, indeed, take its toll on all fronts.

A brief description of Kenyon College from her origins to the end of the Civil War in many ways exemplifies the conditions found in the majority of collegiate institutions throughout Ohio. The indefatigable efforts of their progenitors, as well as their administrative and professorial heirs, the question of a suitable location, the initial and persistently vexatious problem of adequate financing, the developing structure and process of university governance, the theoretical and practical emphasis on
religion, the continued dominance of the classical curriculum and its concomitant methodologies, and the implantation and elevation of the extracurriculum, indeed, portend a homogeneous system of higher education.

But the homogeneity was never pure. For of different origins, though not necessarily of influence and structure, were the two universities located at Athens and Oxford. Antedating the era of denominational college founding in the West, the Ohio and Miami Universities owed their very existence to both the national and state governments. Although exhibiting many characteristics (e.g., religious orientation, classical curriculum, etc.), which made them almost indistinguishable from their denominational counterparts, their social-legal-political origins insured a historical development unique in the state's sphere of higher education.

Their origination stemmed from the mutual interest and action of government and business to aid in the settlement of the West shortly after the Revolutionary War. Efforts to lure great numbers of people across the Alleghenies commenced with the passage of the federal Land Ordinance of 1785. Though offering a number of popular enticements, the high cost of land effectively dashed any hopes for a quick settlement of the territory. By stipulating a minimum purchase of at least one section of land (i.e., 640 acres at a $1.00 per acre), wealthy speculators and large land companies quickly consumed a fair portion of the available tracts.
To be sure, the cost of one section or even the grossly inflated prices of many sub-parcels was far beyond the means of most individual pioneers. Thus, shortsightedness on the part of both legislator and land speculator temporarily impeded the settlement of the West.

The spring of 1787, however, produced one of the most enterprising and visionary land companies ever chartered in this country—namely, The Ohio Company of Associates. Two of its chief organizers were Dr. Manasseh Cutler, a brilliant student and practitioner of law and theology and General Rufus Putnam, a veteran of both the French and Indian and Revolutionary Wars. Profiteering, notwithstanding, they, along with a number of their Massachusetts associates, benevolently held that much of the new western territory should be parcelled into smaller, more saleable, units for the benefit of both the country's veterans and any other hearty souls who were willing to endure the rugged, but free-spirited, life of the frontier.

Dr. Cutler, appointed by the Ohio Company to be its chief spokesman and lobbyist, confidently set out for New York to explain the propriety of his corporation's new strategy, and to subsequently bid on a rather large acquisition of western land. Cutler, a masterful politician, pressed for, and received favorable action on the matter. Moreover, his thorough and incisive presentation precipitated a full spirited debate on other aspects
of the Western question which ultimately resulted in the passage of yet another statute--The Land Ordinance of 1787.

The architects of this latest federal ordinance addressed a number of regional issues heretofore unresolved. The inadequacy of the current educational system certainly ranked as one of the more important ones and, consequently, underwent intense scrutinization. Although its earlier counterpart had provided for education at the lower levels, nothing had been said, or done, about higher education. Both a statement of support and a policy of action were necessary in order to attract men of substance and ability to the region. The 1787 Ordinance provided the former ingredient in a general, but now familiar, statement of support: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." The second element of this two-pronged strategy was undertaken when the Ohio Company, in its contract with the government, agreed to locate two townships, or 46,080 acres of land, at the center of the first 1,500,000 acre tract, and the proceeds generated from the sale or rent from these lands would specifically be used to support the establishment of a university. The successful implementation of this policy now rested in the hands of company officials.\(^\text{17}\)

The implementation phase closely paralleled the settlement strategy of the company's master plan. As early as the spring of 1789, or less than a year after the establishment of the company's
first settlement at Marietta, Putnam and his associates applied to Congress for a university charter. But Congress was slow to act. Regardless, company officials forged ahead with its own plans and formed a committee which was responsible for surveying the plots in the college townships. This survey was postponed, however, with the outbreak of the Indian wars in 1790. The Hocking Valley would be unsafe for settlement until after the signing of the Treaty of Green Ville in 1795.

The end of territorial hostilities brought with it another wave of emigrants from the East. And, once again, the Ohio Company urged the committee formed in 1790 to complete its appointed duty since neither the territorial administration (i.e., the governor and three judges) nor the Congress was willing to coordinate the settlement of the university lands with representatives of the company. Corporate officials obviously desired to populate them with substantial men and their families. This was accomplished when approximately twenty New England born and bred families settled on these tracts during the spring of 1797.

The year 1799 also proved to be a propitious one for university supporters. Five thousand free male inhabitants of voting age now inhabited the region and, according to the Ordinance of 1787, a territorial legislature could now be established. Surely, this new democratic body would be more responsive to the pleas of its constituents, especially with respect to the formation of a university—_their_ university.
It was. In the same year of its establishment, the new legislative body approved an act authorizing Rufus Putnam and others

. . .to lay off, in the most suitable place within the townships aforesaid Athens and Alexander, a town plat, which shall contain a square for the college; also, lots suitable for house lots and gardens, for a president, professors, tutors, etc., bordering on, or encircled by spacious commons, and such a number of town lots adjoining the said common and out lots, as they think will be for the advantage of the University.18

Its location now secured, the task of organizing the new institution fell squarely on the combined shoulders of Putnam and Cutler. The General envisioned a great university. And why not. The university townships were the best in the entire acquisition, and would eventually yield over $5,500 in annual income.19 Cutler concurred, and at the behest of the General, agreed to devise a charter for the new institution. After studying the charters of a number of public colleges in both America and Europe, Cutler fashioned an instrument on an even broader, more liberal basis, than the objects of his study. He then sent the prototype to Putnam in 1800, who, in turn, forwarded it to the territorial legislature for its consideration.

The final Act approved by the assembly on 9 January 1802 bore a striking resemblance to Cutler's original scheme. The Preamble reiterated the importance of a liberal education for its youth and acknowledged its indebtedness to the federal government for providing the resources (i.e., two townships) to fulfill that obligation. The main provisions of the Act: titled the institution the 'American Western University'; set the number of trustees
between eleven and seventeen; empowered said board to elect a
president, professors and other officers of the institution, to
fix salaries, to make rules and regulations, and to manage the
university lands as they saw fit; and authorized the faculty to
prescribe a suitable curriculum, to hold quarterly examinations,
and to enforce student rules and regulations.⁰

But another, more significant, event would effectively nullify
the original charter. The attention of the majority of residents
in the area had recently turned to the prospect of Ohio entering
the Union. It did so in 1803. Consequently, the Ohio Company,
led, once again, by Rufus Putnam, applied for yet another univer-
sity charter, this time under existing Ohio laws.

The new charter was issued on 18 February 1804, but with
several very important emendations. First, the name of the insti-
tution was changed and would henceforth be known as the 'Ohio
University'. Secondly, the composition of the board of trustees
was altered and would now include the Governor of Ohio as an ex-
officio member. And finally, specific provisions regarding the
disposition of the college lands were included. In the first
place, the tracts were to be laid off in units of not more than
240 nor less than 80 acres, concurrently appraised in their origi-
nal and unimproved state. The occupants could then lease the land
for ninety-nine years at the annual rate of six percent of the
original appraisal, but with the added provision that if the Board
so desired it could revaluate the land at the end of thirty-five,
sixty, ninety, and each twenty years thereafter. The Board was also empowered to collect a supplemental tax on the lands should circumstances warrant it. Thus, Ohio and the West had officially established its first university.

Somewhat paralleling the developments in Athens was a similar venture taken by John Cleves Symmes and his associates. As soon as the success of the Ohio Company's proposal seemed imminent, Symmes, a New Jersey judge and chief spokesman for his group, quickly petitioned Congress for a choice tract of land located along the Ohio River in what would later become the southwestern quadrant of the state. That he took his lead from the Massachusetts-based company cannot be disputed as evidenced in the body of his petition of 1787 in which he implored Congress

... to direct a contract ... in all respects similar in form and matter to the said grant made to Messrs. Sargent and Cutler, differing only in quantity and place where, and instead of two townships for the use of a University, that only one be assigned for the benefit of an academy.

The scope of the proposed institution would later be broadened to include collegiate studies.

Newspaper articles and advertisements promoting the Symmes Purchase brought an untold number of inquiries from around the nation. The judge, perhaps overwhelmed by the response, hastily began to sell the tracts before Congress had officially approved the sale. This precipitous action, coupled with his eventual inability to meet the payments on the 2,000,000 acre acquisition,
prompted a number of congressmen to question the intent and veracity of the judge. Symmes promptly sought to annul the first contract while concurrently submitting yet another application to purchase a new, but smaller (i.e., 1,000,000 acres) tract of land. A few influential friends in Congress assisted Symmes in carrying out his difficult maneuver, and for the moment, at least, the judge was spared from any further embarrassment.

But approval of the new contract delayed the location of the proposed college township. By reducing the size of the acquisition to 1,000,000 acres, this latest agreement now fell under guidelines heretofore prescribed in yet another land ordinance passed subsequent to the one in 1787. One of its provisions stipulated that only those purchases which equalled or exceeded that of the original Ohio Company procurement (i.e., 1,500,000 acres) would be eligible for a college township. Symmes' second contract seemingly eliminated any possibility of a prospective college for the region, and the subject remained a moot point from 1788 to 1792.

The college lands question surfaced again when Symmes petitioned the Washington administration to consider an application for a college township. But by the time the new contract had been approved, the original college township, being the choicest tract of land in the acquisition, was already sold. Moreover, by 1794, it had also been determined that there was not one entire township
available to sustain a college, and once again, the matter seemed
destined to fail.

In 1800, both the territorial legislature and governor, being
inundated with demands for restitution by a number of settlers
within the purchase, pressured Symmes and his associates to some-
how make good on their original proposition to provide a college
township for their constituents. Symmes humbly, but forthrightly,
presented his case before the Congress in January 1802. His
explanation and defense proved to be effective as Congress took no
specific action against him, but a satisfactory solution to the
problem of locating a college tract would have to wait awhile
longer.

It came during the Autumn 1802 when the first Constitutional
Convention of Ohio petitioned Congress to allow the future state
legislature to resolve the controversy over the college lands.
After carefully considering the matter, Congress simultaneously
relieved Symmes of his obligation and placed the responsibility of
securing a suitable location squarely on the shoulders of the new
state legislature. The congressional act of 3 March 1803 specif-
ically dictated that the Ohio General Assembly must provide:

\[\ldots\text{one complete township, in the state of Ohio,}\]
\[\ldots\text{and District of Cincinnati, or so much of any one com-}\]
\[\ldots\text{plete township, within the same as may then remain}\]
\[\ldots\text{unsold, together with as many adjoining sections as shall}\]
\[\ldots\text{have been sold in the said township, so as to make in the}\]
\[\ldots\text{whole thirty-six sections, to be located under the direc-}\]
\[\ldots\text{tion of the legislature of the said state}\ldots\]
\[\ldots\text{and the}\]
\[\ldots\text{same is hereby vested in the legislature of the State of}\]
\[\ldots\text{Ohio, for the purpose of establishing an academy, in lieu}\]
\[\ldots\text{of the township already granted for the same purpose.}\ldots\]
Moreover, if no township (as prescribed above) could be located in the original tract within five years, the state of Ohio was obligated to locate one in another part of the district.

The Ohio General Assembly's response to the federal mandate was a piece of adjunct legislation entitled "An Act to Provide for the Locating of a College Township in the District of Cincinnati". A three-man search committee, appointed by the legislature, appropriately recommended a township outside the Symmes Purchase and at the site where the college would eventually be built. The Joint Committee on Public Lands tabled the recommendation for the required five-year period, and, thus, the new college township became the irrevocable possession of the State of Ohio.

Compliance with state and federal statutes completed, the Ohio General Assembly was now free to pass an enabling act. It did so on 17 February 1809, and was titled "An Act to Establish the Miami University". The charter of Ohio's newest college essentially mirrored that of its southeastern Ohio counterpart, thereby insuring a future of mutual concern and, many times, cooperation by the two state universities.

By the time of the Civil War, then, Ohio, with its two state universities and plethora of denominational colleges, could, indeed, claim a sphere of higher education unique in the nation. Their independent origins and avowed loyalties, for the most part, insulated them one from the other. To be sure, the injection of any controversial, statewide issue would clearly generate a number
of problems for both antagonists and arbiter alike. The passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 stirred up just such a controversy. The prospect of gaining even a share of the munificent grant brought out the best and worst of the collegiate rivals. Their individual rationales and strategies, are, indeed, important to a fuller understanding of the fray, and a subject which will be thoroughly examined in a subsequent chapter.

But the controversy over the disbursement of the Morrill funds in Ohio, or, for that matter, in any other state, implied more than just a grab-bag mentality on the part of a number of factions. Indeed, passage of the land-grant legislation marked yet another, if not final, assault on the traditional elements of classicism, sectarianism, and elitism in American higher education—an assault that began nearly a century before, and one which sought to implement a more rigorous, independent, and open academic environment (i.e., the establishment of the contemporary American university).

Attempts to invigorate the placid, if not stable, environment of the American college began with both the individual and collegial efforts of a number of early nineteenth century reformers. George Ticknor's zealous efforts to reform Harvard during the 1820's perhaps best exemplifies their crusading spirit. He was extremely critical of the present system, especially its lack of scholarly orientation. No college escaped condemnation, not even
his own. In characteristic fashion he exoriated the Harvard
community exclaiming that:

... one thing is certain, a change must take place. The
discipline of college must be made more exact, and
the instruction more thorough. All now is too much in
the nature of a show, and abounds too much in false
pretences... It is seen that we are neither an Uni-
versity—which we call ourselves—nor a respectable high
school—which we ought to be... We must therefore
change, or public confidence, which is already hesita-
ting, will entirely desert us.27

The specter of disengagement between town and gown, whether
real or apparent, roused the indefatigable Ticknor to attempt a
number of reforms at Harvard. Influenced by his four-year long
academic sojourn in Europe, especially his twenty months of con-
centrated study at the University of Gottingen, Ticknor's
proposals called for: the implementation of a policy of lehrfre-
heit (i.e., the German word for academic freedom) for members of
the faculty, more precise and better organized lectures, a first-
class library, departmentalization, and an elective system of
studies. These radical revisions, however, alienated a majority
of the Harvard academic community, and, except for continued
refinements within his own department, Ticknor's reform efforts
were quickly aborted.

His efforts, nonetheless, attracted nationwide attention and
profoundly influenced many of his academic contemporaries, in-
cluding Thomas Jefferson at the University of Virginia, James
Marsh at the University of Vermont, Philip Lindsley at the Univer-
sity of Nashville, and Jacob Abbot at Amherst. The mutual exchange
of ideas engendered by this small consortium of early reformers, undoubtedly, kept alive this spirit of scholarly reform for succeeding generations of academic crusaders.

The 1850's did produce an impressive crop of distinguished reformers--Henry Tappan at Michigan, Frederick A. P. Barnard at Alabama, and Francis Wayland at Brown--who continued to trumpet the call for scholarly reform. Exemplary of both the continued criticism of the system and the sweeping measures necessary to rejuvenate it, was a scholarly work authored by Tappan in 1851 entitled *University Education*. His sobering evaluation of the system struck a familiar chord:

... We have multiplied colleges so as to place them at everyone's door; we have multiplied the branches of study so as to give everyone enough to do, and to satisfy the ambition of learning, if all are to be required; we have retained the short term of four years, so that no great portion of life need be spent in study; and we have made the terms of admission quite easy enough.\(^{28}\)

And yet the rolls of most American colleges remained embarrassingly low.

Tappan's remedy for higher education's maladies was the creation of a crowning institution, a capstone, a true university. Citing the German universities as model institutions, he defined a true university as a:

... *Cyclopaedia of education*: where, in libraries, cabinets, apparatus, and professors, provision is made for studying every branch of knowledge in full, for carrying forward all scientific investigation; where study may be extended without limit, where the mind may be cultivated according to its wants, and where, in the lofty enthusiasm of growing knowledge and ripening
scholarship, the bauble of an academic diploma is forgotten. 29

Though the mainline American college of the early to mid-nineteenth century fell woefully short of the German penchant for scholarly rigor, the persistent efforts of a long line of reformers—from Ticknor to Tappan—insured its inclusion as an important element in what was to become the contemporary American university.

The search for truth, however, must operate in an unfettered environment—one free of outside distractions and encumbrances. The American college, however, had long been shackled by the chains of denominational prejudices, jealously guarded by their overseers. The Church’s response toward the new scholarship was predictable. Science, as long as it remained the handmaiden of religion, bore no threat. But when it eventually stood on its own principles and consequently threatened the Church’s very existence, it quickly fell to the swift sword of censorship.

From the Revolution to the Civil War, American reformers recognized this dilemma, and, consequently, issued a steady stream of diatribes against the excesses of Church dominion in the area of higher education. Henry Tappan, for example, in another of his works entitled the Idea of a True University (1858) restated the issue with utmost clarity. Though he favored pious men in all of the professions of life, he adamantly held that:

... the prime object of a seminary of learning is not like that of a church, to inculcate religion or perform
its services; but, to afford education. If we are content in our common schools with proper fitness to teach the required branches, and a good moral character, why demand denominational qualification in the higher institutions? And why force the church into the State University any more than into our halls of legislation or on the benches of judges.30

Thus, the continued dominance of the Church in the affairs of America's colleges only served to vitiate any attempt by reformers to implement a freer scholarship. And an independent environment was a necessary prerequisite in the establishment of a true university.

The final, and uniquely American, element in the drive towards the creation of a true university in this country was the democratization of the curriculum and concomitant efforts to recruit able students from all walks of life, especially the large industrial sector of the population (i.e., agriculturists and mechanics). Practical subjects studied by men of practical abilities had long been a goal of reformers dating back to the post-Revolutionary era. Tied to the Great Democratic Experiment of the New Republic was the growing notion that education should serve the many, not just the few. The survivability of American democracy, it was argued, depended on the ability of its citizenry to make intelligent decisions in the affairs of the state. Indeed, the Revolution did not end at Yorktown; it would be continuously waged in every schoolhouse and college throughout the land.

Attempts to break the yokes of aristocracy and classicism arose early in the history of the republic. Benjamin Rush,
founder of Dickinson College and a member of the American Philosophical Society, spoke with a clear voice on the matter in a treatise entitled Republican Education (1798). He criticized the system's lack of educational opportunities for the laboring classes, and admonished the nation "... to let your youth be instructed in all means of promoting national prosperity and independence, whether they relate to improvements in agriculture, manufactures, or inland navigation." Many branches of science, he reasoned, could serve both the yeoman of the soil and the mechanic in his shop. Chemistry, for example,

... by unfolding to us the effects of heat and mixture, enlarges our acquaintance with wonders of our nature and the mysteries of art; hence it has become, in most universities of Europe, a necessary branch of a gentleman's education. In a young country, where improvements in agriculture and manufactures are so much to be desired, the cultivation of this science which explains the principles of both of them should be considered as an object of the utmost importance.

Rush sought to implement a number of his new ideas in his classic proposal for a National University. Its comprehensive curriculum included the study of "Agriculture in all its numerous and extensive branches," as well as "the principle and practice of manufactures." Though the proposed institution was never formally established, many of its innovative principles, including and especially a more useful and practical course of studies, fired the dreams and imaginations of a number of educators for generations to come.
Isolated attempts to introduce a more practical dimension into the curriculum of the nation's colleges appeared during the latter part of the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth centuries. William R. Davie's 'Plan of Education for the University of North Carolina' (1795) included a "Professor of Chymistry and the Philosophy of Medicine, Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts".\textsuperscript{34} The Laws of Union College (1802) included a course of study in mechanical philosophy and in "Chemistry and other kindred branches of Physical Science, by showing their application to the more useful arts and trades, to the cultivation of the soil and to domestic economy".\textsuperscript{35} At Thomas Jefferson's University of Virginia (1824), the plan of studies included a School of natural philosophy which

\ldots taught the laws and properties of bodies generally including mechanics, statics, hydrostatics, hydraulics, pneumatics, acoustics, optics and astronomy, and a School of natural history which offered coursework in \ldots botany, zoology, mineralogy, chemistry, geology, and rural economy.\textsuperscript{36}

Separate institutions of practical utility also gained footholds during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. The Gardiner Lyceum in Maine (1821), the Agricultural Seminary at Derby, Connecticut (1824), the Boston Asylum and Farm School (1824), and the Rensselaer Institute at Troy, New York (1824) exemplified the kinds of public and private efforts which sought to institutionalize the theory and practice of the laboring arts.\textsuperscript{37}

Despite these inroads, proponents of conservatism soon made their views clear on the entire matter in the Yale Report of 1828:
As our course of instruction is not intended to complete an education, in theological, medical, or legal sciences; neither does it include all the minute details of mercantile, mechanical, or agricultural concerns. These can never be effectually learned except in the very circumstances in which they are to be practised. The young merchant must be trained in the counting room, the mechanic, in the workshop, the farmer, in the field.\textsuperscript{38}

Its admonition against the inclusion of the practical arts in the college curriculum, however, ran counter to its views concerning the admission of students from these vocational backgrounds.

Openly critical of the dangers of political elitism in Europe, the Report went on to say that:

\ldots in this country, where offices are accessible to all who are qualified for them, superior intellectual attainments ought not to be confined to any description of persons. Merchants, manufacturers, and farmers, as well as professional gentlemen, take their places in our public councils. A thorough education ought therefore to be extended to all these classes. It is not sufficient that they be men of sound judgment, who can decide correctly, and give a silent vote, on great national questions. Their influence upon the minds of others is needed; an influence to be produced by extent of knowledge, and the force of eloquence.\textsuperscript{39}

Thus, the Yale Report viewed practical studies in the college curriculum as aberrational, but the education of industrial man vital.

The contradiction and condescension of the Yale Report drew open criticism but from few reformers; and, overt resistance within academic circles proved to be negligible. Not surprisingly, the way to practical education reform at the higher levels emerged as a direct concomitant of a new social-political order. The election of Andrew Jackson in 1828 ushered in the 'Era of the
Common Man'. Jacksonianism manifested an important principle of American democracy heretofore existing as only a hollow slogan, namely that "all men are created equal". Aristocracy in all its forms--political, economic, and social--repelled a large segment of the American populace, especially in the West.

The American college, elitist in both character and composition, was especially excoriated. Upper-class and lower-class commons, Greek-letter fraternities, and other patrician ornaments were all adjudged enemies in the current war against privilege. Indeed, the epithet "Rich man's college" became one of many battle cries in the arsenal of the newly popularized American.

The strength and pervasiveness of the movement resulted in more than just loathsome slogans. State appropriations to colleges and universities fell to record lows during the Jacksonian transformation. Opposing institutions of privilege, especially those funded with public tax dollars, proved expedient in many state assemblies. A Virginia newspaper editorial, for example, took issue with the policy of state appropriations for the university at Charlottesville, asking:

"Cannot the annual appropriation of fifteen thousand dollars to the University be more profitably expended for the great cause of education than in instructing from one hundred to one hundred and fifty youths, all of whom have the means of finishing their course through their own resources?" 40

In 1837, then, it was not surprising to see the bulk of U. S. Treasury surplus funds being expended on more popular projects
within the states, especially the construction of new roads, the establishment of new banks, and the construction of additional common schools. The colleges, for the most part, were wholly ignored.

Many of them opted to adjust to the pressures of the time. A few, for example, abandoned the custom of publicly ranking students at commencement. Others accepted non-degree students in a feeble attempt to prepare teachers for the common schools. Most introduced the manual-labor system of education which sought to achieve a threefold purpose. First, it provided the system's poorer students with a means of financial support. Secondly, it allowed every student the opportunity to gain useful practical skills by way of the farm and the shop. And, finally, it afforded the students a most welcome mental and physical respite from the regimen of daily study. 41

The fact remains, however, that generally the manual-labor system failed to produce the desired results, languished, and died. And not surprisingly. Viewed by the industrial classes, it represented a feigned attempt by the elitist institutions to legitimatize the legitimate dignity of labor. Moreover, the majority of collegians viewed the entire experiment with disgust and disdain. The students at Center College (Kentucky), for example, sarcastically labeled its two farms "Do Little" and "Do Less". 42 For the most part, then, the short-lived movement harmed, rather than enhanced, the dignity of labor in the nation's colleges.
On balance, though, the Jacksonian movement did sustain, even heighten, the call for practical reform in higher education. Early in the period, the impetus for reform reflected a conscientious effort to mesh educational opportunity with egalitarian theory. President Philip Lindsley, in his 1832 baccalaureate address at the University of Nashville, stated the case succinctly arguing that he had:

... been pleading the cause of farmers and mechanics for some ten or dozen years past. Because upon them, as enlightened, judicious, independent, patriotic citizens, depend the destines of the Republic. The question is, shall they lead or be led? ... The crisis has arrived when the people must speak and act wisely and resolutely, or their ability to speak and act, with decisive efficiency, will be lost forever.43

By the 1840's, calls for practical studies, as well as practical students, in our nation's colleges increased. Indicative of this dual concern were the ideas presented by Francis Wayland, President of Brown University, in his Thoughts On The Present Collegiate System in the United States (1842):

But while this is the case, in consequence of this unintentional restriction, a very large class of our people have been deprived of all participation in the benefits of higher education. It has been almost impossible in this country, for the merchant, the mechanic, the manufactures, to educate his son, beyond the course of a common academy unless he gave him the education preparatory for a profession. ... Nothing would tend so much to the progress of wealth among us as the diffusion throughout the whole people of a knowledge of the principles of science, and the application of science to the arts. ... Why should not the highest intellectual endowment, cultivated by the best preparatory discipline be found in every mode of occupation? And if this be so why has the whole subject been so long neglected among us? Is it not time that our system should in this matter undergo a complete and radical revision?44
Wayland, the gadfly, persisted in his pointed criticism of American higher education over the years. He would settle for nothing less than sweeping reforms, and had the support of a growing number of educators. Though proponents of the classical-denominational college had, thus far, beaten back repeated assaults on its integrity, its position was clearly comprised in 1850 when Wayland issued his Report to the Brown Corporation—a classic response to the impracticability (i.e., its form and substance) of the current system of higher education. He begins with those practical considerations affecting the increased mortality rate of the nations colleges:

If it be the fact that our colleges cannot sustain themselves, but are obliged to make repeated calls upon the benevolence of the community, not because the community is poor and education inordinately expensive, but because, instead of attempting to furnish scientific and literary instruction to every class of our people, they have furnished it only to a single class, and that by far the least numerous; if they are furnishing an education for which there is no renumerative, but even at the present low prices, a decreasing demand; if they are, not by intention, but practically, excluding the vastly larger portion of the community from advantages in which they would willingly participate, and are thus accomplishing but a fraction of the good which is manifestly within their power, then it would seem that relief must be expected from a radical change of the system of collegiate instruction.45

Wayland's rationale for change was threefold. First, it was just. Every man, he argued, who has the means to pay for an education is entitled to cultivate his mind and talents to the fullest. It is, therefore, unjust to restrict the means of education to the smallest (i.e., professional) classes. Moreover, if
every man has an equal right to an education and its concomitant benefits, it follows that every man has a special right to receive the kind of education suited to his particular needs. Unfortunately, this was not now the case, and the nation suffered because of it.

A second rationale for change lay in its expediency. The progress of a nation is wholly dependent on her most precious resource—its manpower. Indeed, as the system now stood, only a fraction of the population was fully trained. Should this trend continue, Americans would remain enslaved to the ideational and practical discoveries of their European counterparts. Americans must strike out and blaze their own path. And they could, but only if their political and social institutions liberated them from the past.

And finally, change was necessary. The rapid progress of the agrarian and commercial classes during the previous thirty years had been astounding. Self-styled institutions of practical utility had already cropped up around the country. A continuance of this trend would, undoubtedly, have deliterious, if not disastrous, consequences on the current system of higher education. Adapting to the peculiar needs of the industrial classes would, thus, serve the country, its colleges, and its citizens.46

The reformational efforts of men like Wayland and his predecessors did, indeed, help to lay the theoretical foundation for the contemporary American university. But the implementation of
these ideas would prove to be even more challenging, especially in the area of providing practical education for practical men. The education of the agriculturist or mechanic rarely commenced in a classroom. In fact, it was anomalous to the present system of higher education, and repugnant to the majority of farmers. The field and shop and trial-and-error method served them adequately, or so they thought. Tradition dies hard. But change was inevitable and ultimately led the agriculturist and mechanic to the college classroom.

Ohio, a leading agricultural state during the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century moved haltingly, but inexorably, toward the goal of a permanent agricultural college for its large constituency. The transition, however, spanned nearly a half-century, and produced a number of formal educational agents, some of which were inextricably tied to the competition over the Morrill funds. Their identification and analysis are crucial to a fuller understanding of the fray, and an area to which we now turn.

Agricultural societies and fairs in the Buckeye state proved to be vitally important in the initial shaping of the farmer's attitudes and actions regarding agricultural improvement. Fashioned after the pioneer societies in the East, Ohio established its first at Youngstown in December 1818.

Less than two years later, the Cincinnati Society for the Promotion of Agricultural and Domestic Economy held what is believed to be the first
county fair in Ohio. 48 By 1833, six more counties had been estab-
lished in the state. Public enthusiasm for the local agrarian
organizations hastened the Ohio General Assembly to pass legisla-
tion allowing county commissioners to collect a maximum of fifty
dollars for their support. As a result, the number of new agri-
cultural societies more than tripled by 1840. 49 Eventually, every
county throughout the state would benefit from these instructive
organizations.

The advantages and duties of these societies were, perhaps,
best summarized in a speech given at the inauguration of the
Jefferson County Agricultural Society in 1845:

Associations of this kind are well calculated to
cause us to read, to enquire, and to adopt means of
systematic improvement. They are the means of collecting
into a common fund, the experience of good, practical
farmers, which is again to be distributed for the common
benefit of all. And yet another important advantage we
may expect from this society, will be the effect it will
have upon our minds and upon our feelings. It will
awaken among us a Spirit of emulation, and this will give
force to our moral and physical capacities; anything that
sets us to thinking, and to enquiring, will be an opera-
tion upon the mind that will certainly improve it. 50

Inextricably tied to the county agricultural societies were
the annual county fairs. Two fundamental activities dominated
these exhibitions. The awarding of premiums by members of the
county society insured a healthy competition among its consti-
tuents. This, in turn, aroused the curiosity of the entire
agricultural community. The farmer came not only to view the
prize crops of grain, but also to question the tiller of same
about his methods. He came not just to see fat livestock, but also to inquire of its husbandman. Consequently, a spirit of inquiry mushroomed, though perhaps unwittingly, in an environment refreshingly congenial and familiar.

The county agricultural societies and their annual fairs, though markedly successful in their local appeal, proved to be relatively inept in augmenting state-wide agricultural reform. County agricultural societies in the more fertile or populous regions of the state advanced more quickly than the others. And yet, every county could contribute to the agricultural development of the state if only petty sectional jealousies were abandoned and a climate of harmonious relations established. It was imperative, then, that a coordinating agency be organized to not only guide the growth of both the new and established societies, but also to disseminate their progress for the mutual benefit of all farmers throughout the state.

The Ohio State Board of Agriculture successfully performed, this, and many other functions. Agitation for its formation began early in the 1840's, primarily through the efforts of a few county societies.\(^{51}\) Petitions from over 2,500 supporters inundated the Ohio General Assembly by January 1845.\(^ {52}\) Eventually, the friends of agriculture from across the state called for a meeting to be held in Columbus on June 25th and 26th of 1845 for the purpose of forming a State Agricultural Society.\(^ {53}\)
The Agricultural Convention proved to be most auspicious, precipitating the passage of a series of legislative measures beneficial in promoting the agricultural interests of the state. The first passed on 18 February 1846 and was entitled "An Act for the Encouragement of Agriculture". It detailed the various duties and responsibilities of the county agricultural societies, and also announced the formation of the Ohio State Board of Agriculture. In regards to the latter, the statute specifically called for the election of officers, annual meetings to be held in Columbus, and the publication of an annual report focusing on the general condition of agriculture in Ohio and which was to be submitted to the Ohio General Assembly for examination. A second statute, amending the first, passed the Ohio legislature on 8 February 1847. It adjusted the number of State Board members downward to ten, as well as designating the sum of two-hundred dollars for any expenditures incurred by the Board. And finally, a related piece of legislation entitled "An Act to Create a Permanent Agricultural Fund For the State of Ohio" cleared the state assembly on 8 February 1847. This statute stipulated that the fee to regulate public shows in each county be increased to twenty dollars, and that half of the money collected be designated the 'State Agricultural Fund' with the proceeds to be used by the State Board as it best saw fit. The mechanism was now safely in place and poised for action.
An initial accomplishment of the State Board, and one mandated by the legislature, focused on evaluating the current condition of agriculture in Ohio. Questionnaires were mailed to every county, completed, and returned with the results published in its Second Annual Report. Two questions, in particular, centered on the educative posture of their respective farming communities: "Is there any agricultural society, or farmer's club, in your county?", and "Do you think the farmers of your county are making any perceptible improvements in their mode of farming, their implements of husbandry, the quality and management of their domestic animals, or in the education of their children?"²⁷

The response was both overwhelming and informative. With few exceptions, the composite response lamented the woefully deficient resources and consequent state of educational unpreparedness of the state's agricultural community. Noted here are a few of the replies:

There is probably some improvement in this county in these particulars. There is, however, a most lamentable deficiency in both. The attention of the county society will be directed to this subject, and, from present indications, we confidently expect a change for the better.²⁸ (Cuyahoga County)

Some improvements have been made of late years in modes of farming, in implements, and in cattle and hogs, especially among farmers who read and think as well as work; but too many of our farmers, so called, are of an opposite class, and do not believe "book knowledge" is of any use so long as their lands will produce corn and their boys know how to feed pork.²⁹ (Franklin County)

We think the farmers of our county are making perceptible improvements in their mode of farming, their
implements of husbandry, and the quality and management of their domestic animals.

We feel proud of the effort made in our county (confined, chiefly, to our county) to promote the cause of education amongst our farmers. The Farmer's College of Hamilton County, Ohio, is now in successful operation. [60 (Hamilton County)]

It is apparent the Society has not made progress in developing the resources of the soil, of which it is susceptible. Nothing like Agricultural Chemistry, or a Chemical Analysis of the soil having been attempted. The great body of the Agriculturists of the county appear to be opposed to "Book farming," and hold to the 'Tradition of the Fathers,' as they well might do perhaps, if the country were always to remain new, and the soil in its virgin state. [61 (Ross County)]

Indeed, the advancement of agricultural education over the next quarter century, from an inherent suspicion of 'Book farming' to the establishment of an agricultural college, would have astounded even the most optimistic respondent.

Another significant contribution of the State Board was the publication of its Annual Report, a large volume of some 500-600 pages covering a wide range of subjects relating to the current condition and prospective improvements in Ohio agriculture. An analysis of these reports from 1845-1870 reveal an eclectic approach, but toward a common goal—namely, the improvement of the farmer's mental and material prosperity. Its state-wide distribution went a long way in accomplishing that end.

The nobility of the agricultural profession prevalent throughout history represented one theme pervasively evident throughout these volumes. An address delivered before the Cuyahoga County Agricultural Society, and reprinted in the Board's Sixth Annual
Report, perhaps, best exemplified its proud tradition. The speaker asserted that if mankind is fond of things venerable on account of antiquity, than the subject of agriculture reaches back as far as history can trace the existence of men. Indeed, it could be argued that agriculture had a divine origin, the Book of Genesis confirming its claims. Moreover, the importance of the husbandman was markedly prevalent in the Egyptian, Greek, Roman, and, for that matter, all other great civilizations of the ancient world. 62

But reputations tarnish when they deny the inevitability of progress. And nobody denied that scientific progress waned in agricultural circles. The relative importance of the associated sciences for the agriculturist, then, constituted yet another important motif of these Reports. Chemistry, physiology, botany, geology, climateology and the like were all extolled for their potential contributions to the field of agriculture. The necessity for continued study in these and other related areas, it was argued, would, in fact, determine the fate of the agricultural industry.

The prescription was accurate; but, unfortunately, the patient was obstinate. Cracking the farmer's dogmatic attitude towards 'Book farming' marked yet another enthusiastic bent of the Reports, and was illustrated in a particularly stark extract from a hard hitting article printed in the Tenth Annual Report:
While a want of suitable educational facilities and advantages is sensibly felt, there are other evils in the land which retard the intellectual and physical improvement of the country and impair its productive capacity; among which is one that farmers possess in a remarkable degree, prejudice. Prejudice in favor of old ways and plans of farming--of old implements--old, standard, superannuated notions--old lunar, and equally ridiculous kindred influences--and bitter, unyielding prejudices against science as applied to their business--against the teachings of well-conducted experiments--against agricultural books and newspapers--against everything, in fine that is written or printed, and which may be included in the very odious, yet comprehensive term of 'Book Farming'. Unfortunately, we have a class among us, who imagine that all knowledge necessary for conducting farming operations is intuitive—the gift of nature. They not only disregard agricultural information, as derived from other sources, but they sneer and deride those who have wisdom enough to avail themselves of its advantages.63

The practical value of a formal agricultural education was perhaps best summed up by the State Board's long-term corresponding secretary, John H. Klippart, when he averred:

... that labor decreases in cost just in proportion as it is intelligently directed and performed. ... In order to produce the greatest amount capable of being produced on any given soil, not the greatest expenditure of physical labor is required, but the most comprehensive intelligence to direct the labor.64

The stakes were high for not only the agriculturists but the country as well. And the time was short. Exhorting his agricultural associates to take decisive action, Israel Dille, in a speech given before the Knox County Agricultural Society in September 1852 and reprinted in the Seventh Annual Report proclaimed:

The remedy is in our hands. We must provide for a greater consumption of the produce of our country at
home. We must return and yield obedience to the laws and imperative demands of nature, we must not cast away the blessings which have been so abundantly poured out upon our land, but we must husband them frugally and cherish them with gratitude to the giver of all good, give them a perpetual abiding place with us and make them a means of subsistence and comfort to unborn millions.65

Progress and trust in the future, however, implied understanding and, unfortunately, many of the articles and essays in the Reports were much too abstruse for the common dirt farmer. Furthermore, they were not interested in agricultural conjecturing; no, they were interested in increased productivity and how, if at all, the state organization might help them better achieve it. The State Board determined not to disappoint, nor desert, them on this matter.

The Annual Reports soon included more speeches, essays, and articles of functional utility. For example, the Board in its Fifth Annual Report reprinted a speech given at Columbus Ohio on "The Drill Culture of Wheat and other Cereal Grains".66 "An Essay on the Relations Which The Agricultural, Manufacturing and Mechanical Interests, Sustain to Each Other" also appeared in the same volume.67 The reader could also count on many useful tips from Mr. Klippart in his capacity as Corresponding Secretary of the State Board. Thus, the farmer fortunate and wise enough to use these volumes, undoubtedly, benefitted from the implementation of a number of the practical procedures evident throughout their pages.
On a much grander scale, the State Board was also the driving force behind the establishment and growth of the State Fair. The first was held at Cincinnati in the Autumn of 1850. Thereafter, its location rotated annually between several select cities throughout the state until 1874 when Columbus became its permanent home. The agricultural exhibitions and mechanical demonstrations went far to promote Ohio’s relative competitiveness in the fierce inter-state agricultural wars, as well as promoting a social cohesiveness among the industrial classes within its borders.

Besides guiding and coordinating the growth of the state’s county agricultural societies, besides publishing and distributing its important *Annual Reports*, and besides establishing and augmenting the growth of the Ohio State Fair, the State Board of Agriculture, as the official mouthpiece and coordinating agency of the state’s annual agricultural convention (society), also waged a long and spirited campaign for the establishment of the state’s agricultural college. The formulation of its rationale and concomitant strategies will be fully examined in a subsequent chapter.

The State Board’s attempt to disseminate the dual transference of both practical and theoretical knowledge was unfortunately limited in scope. The *Annual Reports*, though excellent in their own right, barely reached a fraction of the quarter-million farmers across the state. The annual fairs, both state and local,
also proved to be of limited value, both temporally and geographically. Thus, yet another educational agent was demanded; one with greater accessibility and frequency, but which offered the same theoretical and practical remedies of its agricultural counterparts.

The agricultural press seemed best suited to fill these requirements. Prior to the Civil War, a half-dozen agricultural newspapers surfaced in Ohio. Even so, only two, The Ohio Farmer, and the Ohio Cultivator, found widespread circulation and infectious enthusiasm among its agricultural constituents. The Ohio Farmer, first published around 1848 in Cleveland, enjoyed the longer tenure, but did not reach its maximum influence until after the demise of the Ohio Cultivator in the early 1860's. The Ohio Farmer's primary thrust was the informal training of the farmer; it was the instructor and the farmer's field, the classroom. Evaluation of both teacher and student awaited the ensuing year's crop and livestock tally sheets. Many of the state's farmers adhered to this safer, more conservative, course of action until other scientific procedures were proven to be more productive.

The Ohio Cultivator, on the other hand, sought to emphasize the theoretical, as well as the practical aspects of the field of agriculture. Not only did its influence permeate the Ohio countryside, it, along with the Prairie Farmer, have been designated the two most influential agricultural newspapers in the West.
during the 1840's and 1850's. The bi-monthly, eight-page, popularly styled journal commenced publication on 1 January 1845 at Columbus, and enjoyed a healthy circulation for over fifteen years.

Its primary objectives and subsequent format were revealed in the 'Prospectus' of its first edition:

The Ohio Cultivator will aim to impart such knowledge of the principles and practice of improved agriculture, as will enable farmers to increase the value and production of their lands, and obtain greater returns for their capital and labor. It will give descriptions of the different breeds of domestic animals, with remarks on their comparative value, their management, diseases, & c; also, of improved agricultural implements, labour saving inventions and machinery, farm buildings, fences, & c; (frequently illustrated with engravings). It will also encourage the formation and support of Agricultural Societies throughout the State, notice their proceedings, and afford a medium of communication, through which the friends of improvement may become known to each other, and publish the results of their experiments, discoveries and plans of operation.

The tabloid's other objectives included: the printing of accurate trade and commodities information, the elevation of the study of Horticulture, and, most importantly for our purposes, the provision of an effective forum for advancing the cause of agricultural education.

The latter provision would prove to be a most formidable task given the backgrounds of the paper's prospective patrons. The following appeal printed in its very first edition, though noble in its intention, nevertheless, illustrated the magnitude of the charge:
Do not imagine that because you are a plain practical farmer, and never wrote a sentence for publication in your life, that you cannot be of service in this way. If you meet with any facts or discoveries that you think it would be profitable or interesting for your brother farmers to know, you can and ought to make them known. Write in just such language as you would use in relating the matter to a practical farmer, and give yourself no trouble about how it will appear in print; we'll trim off the rough edges if necessary.

But many of their written suggestions, polished or not, still underscored procedures rooted in old superstitions, and which by now had become popular fallacies. One such misconception was the dubious practice of "moon-farming". An editorial of 15 August 1846 sought to lay the matter to rest:

The moon has given rise to an abundance of superstitious observances, and from the very earliest ages, have been supposed to exercise a great influence over the earth and men. Many of these superstitions have been exploded, while others still retain no inconsiderable hold on the public mind, and are the pregnant source of error. On no point is this more perceptible than in that of farming. That the moon can produce any perceptible influence on crops, or deserves the slightest regard in their sowing or planting, is a notion as false in philosophy as it is contrary to fact. That the waxing and waning of the moon has any influence on the growth of vegetables or their germination is a notion belonging to the same ages as astrology and witchcraft, and like these beliefs should ere this have ceased to exist.

Yet another error the paper sought to dissipate was the farmer's general antipathy towards "book farming". But rather than constantly hammering away at the farmer's personal integrity, the Ohio Cultivator sought to arouse in its readers both the curiosity and delight of such a venture:

Imagine yourself seated quietly in your domicile or office, at that still hour when all around have retired
and become 'to dull forgetfulness a prey', and not a sound is heard save the chirping of the social cricket, or the genial music of the whistling winds; to be poring over the pages of some fascinating and instructive author, finding in every sentence some new idea, some mystery explained, some hitherto unthought of principle in agriculture developed or striking character graphically portrayed; to be thus edified and enchanted, taking no note of time until the morning break upon your enjoyment, and your author is reluctantly laid upon the shelf, with heart-felt thanks that he has seduced you to forget the world and its cares, and make you somewhat wiser, perchance a better and more useful man. 76

Essays and articles on the study of agriculture and its associated sciences also filled the pages of the Ohio Cultivator. The very first edition contained an excellent article by Joseph S. Sullivant of Columbus entitled "Agriculture Is a Science As Well As An Art", and maintained:

Agriculture as an art may be defined as the knowledge of the processes necessary for the cultivation of the soil. Agriculture as a science explains to us the reasons for these processes, and from a careful study of the laws and operations of nature, give us rules whereby to successfully apply them in the practice of agriculture. And as this successful application depends upon a knowledge of these laws, who that cherishes a love for his profession will be unwilling to avail himself of the advantages that modern science has placed within his power, will he not stretch forth his hand and pluck the fruit thus offered to his grasp? I again say that agriculture is a science as well as an art, and he that would be eminent or successful in it must study it as a science. 77

In another instructive discourse, the role of the associated sciences is carefully expounded:

To estimate the simplicity of agriculture, let us look at it in its reality. Besides embracing much of almost every branch of learning, it draws extensively upon Chemistry, Mineralogy, Geology, Botany, and Meteorology. The first teaches the composition and properties
of the different soils, and species of vegetation, together with that of light and heat, air and moisture, and every material thing. The second teaches the description and classification of the extensive variety of minerals which make up the globe, and constitute the basis of the soil, while its hand-maid, Geology, teaches the manner in which they enter into the formation of the earth, the signs by which different soils may be known, and c. Botany describes to us every thing that vegetates and blooms, and meteorology directs our attention to the winds and the storms, and enables us to prognosticate the changes of the natural elements. To these may be added vegetable Physiology, which teaches the influence of light, heat, earth, and water in producing vegetation. 78

Although it could be argued that agriculture should be studied contemplatively, that it should be studied as a science, and that a number of associated sciences were germane to its study, neither the farm, county societies, Annual Reports, or agricultural press could provide all of the time, facilities, resources, and expertise necessary to advance it as a separate field of study. Only institutions of a high grade could hope to support such an ambitious endeavor, and they, in turn, would need to be supported by students who would benefit from its inclusion in the curriculum. A handful of course offerings and lectures on agricultural topics at some of the traditional colleges were reported in the agricultural press during the first half of the nineteenth century. They also published the prospectus and course of studies of the state's two foremost agricultural institutions--The Farmers' Collegiate Institute of Hamilton County (1845) and the Ohio Agricultural College at Oberlin (1854). A number of factors, however, precluded them from enjoying a thriving and enduring existence--
reasons which were brought out during the competition for the
Morrill funds, and which will be fully scrutinized in a succeeding
chapter.

The development of Ohio higher education through the first
half of the nineteenth century in many ways mirrored those of
other states throughout the country, especially in regard to the
profusion of small, denominational colleges which dominated the
system. The presence of two state universities within its
borders did, however, portend more than a modicum of incongruity,
especially in those controversial areas which impacted the affairs
of a majority of the state's colleges and universities. The move
towards a more rigorous scholarship and a freer environment within
Ohio's colleges generally reflected national trends, yielding only
negligible progress. But the move to educate members of the
industrial classes in their respective vocations fired the imagi-
nations of hundreds of reformers throughout this leading
agricultural state. Some argued its time had come; others argued
it did not go far enough. The Morrill Act would serve as a
catalyst in resolving this great social issue, but in the process
incited sharp dissonance between the great number of separate and
diverse entities within the state who were just as interested in
securing its material benefits.
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CHAPTER III, THE POLITICAL PROCESS AT WORK

The first session of the Thirty-Fifth Congress did, indeed, produce legislation of both controversy and consummation and was the cynosure of much spirited debate in both of its chambers. On 14 December 1857, Congressman Justin Smith Morrill of Vermont introduced House Bill No. 2 which specifically called for the establishment of agricultural and mechanical colleges. Its provisions, at once both specific and vague, bore the seeds of mushrooming controversy in the several states designed as its beneficiaries.

Section I of the bill capsulized the intent of the Act and also detailed the apportionment formula for each of the states. Specifically, it stated that an agricultural and mechanical arts college(s) would evolve from the proceeds of the sale of public lands apportioned in each state to equal a quantity of 20,000 acres for each senator and representative in Congress. The second section of the measure prescribed that the lands in either the States or Territories be sold for no less than $1.25 per acre, and that if not enough public lands (i.e., federal lands) were available within each state's jurisdiction, land scrip could be issued, sold, and applied to the uses and purposes prescribed in said Act.
The next provision charged the states with the responsibilities of incurring all the expenses regarding the sale, management, and superintendence of said lands. Section Four, the very heart of the measure, mandated that all monies collected from the sale be invested in stocks of the United States, individual states, or other safe stocks yielding not less than 5 percent for:

... the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific or classical studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts. ... in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.  

The fifth and final section specifically detailed the implementation of the Act within the respective States or Territories charging them with four distinct responsibilities. First, responsibility for any diminishment or loss of funds rested solely with the states, thereby insuring that the entire amount would be applied to the purposes prescribed in Section Four of the bill. Furthermore, it was designated that a sum of not more than 10 percent of the total proceeds may be used to purchase the lands on which to build the college and/or experimental farm if so approved by their respective legislative assemblies. Secondly, no portion of the monies could be used to purchase, erect, preserve, or repair any buildings of the prospective college(s). Thirdly, each state must discharge the function of said Act within five years or relinquish the monies collected back to the Federal government. And finally, each established college was duty bound to submit an
annual progress report to all of the other colleges endowed by the Act, to the Smithsonian Institution, and to the agricultural department of the Patent office, and at government expense.\textsuperscript{3}

After its introduction, Mr. Morrill promptly requested that the measure be referred to the Committee on Agriculture where it would have undoubtedly gained its approbation and been favorably reported back to the full body. But Mr. Pecher of Virginia opposed such a move arguing that the measure should rightfully be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.\textsuperscript{4} A debate ensued regarding its referral and culminated in a vote of 105-89 in favor of its assignment to the Committee on Public Lands.\textsuperscript{5}

Exactly four months later, Mr. Cobb of Alabama, the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, reported back its findings and recommended the bill not pass. Mr. Walbridge of Michigan, author of the minority report favoring its passage, quickly rose and asked that the vote in the full House be postponed until copies of the bill, as well as the majority and minority reports, could be printed which was unanimously agreed to.\textsuperscript{6}

The delay allowed the measure's sponsor time to compose and deliver a point-by-point refutation of the Committee's reasons for opposing the measure. Its chief contention centered on the bill's unconstitutionality, to which Mr. Morrill pointedly remarked:

\textquote{We exert our power and expend millions to protect and promote commerce through lighthouses, coast surveys, improvement of harbors, and through our Navy and Naval Academy. Our military "Crown Jewels" are manufactured at West Point on Government account. We make immense grants
of land to railroads to open new fields of internal trade. We secure to literary labor the protection of copyright. We encourage the growth and discipline of hardy seamen by eking out their scanty rewards through governmental bounties. We secure to ingenious mechanics high profits by our own system of patent rights. We make munificent grants to secure general education in all the new states. But all direct encouragement to agriculture has been rigidly withheld.7

The Committee's 'Majority Report' also countenanced against the impropriety of the measure, fearful that any and every meritorious object would make incessant and/or exorbitant demands on the General Government. Where would the line be drawn? To be sure, Morrill railed against such insensitivity. He first cited facts and figures in various sections of the country regarding the widespread deterioration and exhaustion of their soils. Was this not a national concern? And most certainly not an exorbitant one! Though America was in the forefront of many industrial endeavors, she ashamedly trailed Europe in the promotion and advancement of the science of husbandry. Survey the plentiful numbers of agricultural ministers, model farms, experimental farms, botanical gardens, and, most importantly, agricultural colleges and secondary schools on the European continent. Then survey the paucity of similar institutions in our country. The catalyst for any agricultural ascendency, at least for Morrill, lay in the belief that "Young Americans should have some chance to study agriculture as a profession, and be attracted to it as a learned, liberal and intellectual pursuit."8 Indeed, national pride was the issue for,
according to Morrill, "If other nations advance, though we but pause, we are outdistanced." 

Morrill also refuted the opposition's concern over the jealous, if not disastrous, competition which would befall the American system of higher education should these new collegiate institutions emerge. This, Morrill argued, represented no more than a misplaced cavil arguing that:

Our present literary colleges need have no more jealousy of agricultural colleges than a porcelain manufactory of an iron foundry. They move in separate spheres, without competition, and using no raw material that will diminish the supply of one or the other. 

There were other practical and political expediencies for supporting the legislation. Although a few states, like Michigan, had already provided for an agricultural college, most were unwilling or unable to support them. In addition, fully four-fifths of the nation's population was engaged in either agricultural or related mechanical pursuits and would, in Morrill's opinion, overwhelmingly approve this measure had they a direct voice in the matter. Congress should act swiftly and decisively.

Summing up. Morrill exhorted:

... the pervasive arguments of precedents; the examples of our worthiest rivals in Europe; the rejuvenation of the worn-out lands, which bring forth taxes only; the petition of farmers everywhere, yearning for 'a more excellent way'; philanthropy, supported by our own highest interest--all these considerations impel us for once to do something for agriculture worthy of its national importance.

The House did on 22 April 1858, passing Morrill's bill, but only by the narrow margin of 105 yeas to 100 nays.
A third of the battle won, the measure moved to the upper chamber. Here, too, the measure would undergo more delay and meticulous scrutiny. It was not until the Second Session, however, that debate on the measure reached fever pitch. Benjamin Wade, Republican from Ohio, utilizing the same arguments presented by Morrill in the House, spoke eloquently on the urgency and expediency of passing the bill. Its detractors, however, were just as determined in their opposition.

Senator Pugh, Wade's Democratic counterpart from Ohio, initially cited President Franklin Pierce's veto message of 3 May 1854 regarding the lunatic asylum bill as precedence for opposing the current measure under consideration. A staunch state's rightest, Pugh also argued that the sovereignty of the States is pre-eminently a sacred constitutional trust, and must not be abrogated by any federal intervention. The legislation, as it was now written, unnecessarily, if not dangerously, tied the hands of several states. It dictated how they should invest their money when there were perhaps safer or more profitable alternatives; it delimited the use of the funds thereby punishing the poorer states which might, in fact, need part of the proceeds to erect and maintain the collegiate building; it placed an unreasonable time restriction on its implementation, five years not being enough time for some states to establish a college, especially those hamstrung by other financial burdens; and, finally, it unjustly benefitted the rich (i.e., larger) states who could undoubtedly
afford such agricultural institutions without the benefit of the legislation.

Pugh also viewed the potentially disastrous economic consequences of the Act disdainfully. Specifically, he predicted that the vast amount of new lands promulgated by this piece of legislation would needlessly glut the market, diminishing their value, and with two deliterious effects. The value of the land being depressed, Pugh foresaw that many states would not be able to collect enough money to establish the intended schools. Consequently, only unscrupulous land speculators would benefit from the entire enterprise, and at the expense of the very people for whom the law was intended to assist. For Pugh, at least, the measure's liabilities far outweighed its assets. Thus, he would oppose the measure not so much as an anti-agriculturist, but more as an anti-Federalist.14

Inexpediency marked the cynosure of Missouri Senator Green's opposition to the proposed agricultural colleges. For over half a century America had prospered and expanded her agricultural output unrivalled by any of her European counterparts, even those which supported agricultural schools. Why tamper with success? Indeed, he argued, it would be foolish: "If such is the consequence, do we not endanger agriculture, and are we not standing as the wild visionary advocates of a system that may result in more harm than good?"15
Senator Clay gave the lengthiest speech in opposition to the measure. Although laced with the practical improprieties and problems (e.g., the foolishness of giving away lands at a time when the treasury tills needed replenishing, the monopolization of the sale of lands by greedy and unscrupulous capitalists, the pervasive disapprobation of the agricultural community, etc.) echoed by a consortium of fellow senators, his central argument, and the thread by which all who opposed the measure seem to draw strength, lie in its unconstitutionality. A classic defense of states' rights ensued. The bill, Clay argued, if passed in its present form would:

... unlimit all the limitations of the powers of Congress; will efface all the lines that define the boundaries between Federal and State's rights; confound all the separate and distinct duties of State governments, and will be a long step towards the overthrow of this truly Federal and the establishment of a really National Government.16

Other senators were more succinct in their opposition. Senator Rice, for example, simply exclaimed: "We want no fancy farmers; we want no fancy mechanics."17 Despite the lengthy delays, the oratorical displays, and incisive quips, the measure did manage to muster enough support to pass the Senate by a count of 25-22 on 7 February 1859, the two Senators from Ohio being divided at the final tally.18

Two of the three steps successfully completed, the bill now moved on to the final hurdle, the President. Indeed, this was the same man who as a congressman in 1827 voted in favor of a bill to
grant public lands for a deaf and dumb asylum in Kentucky. 19
Three decades, however, had transformed both the man and the
country. Youthful altruism spawned during an 'Age of Social
Reform' had been supplanted by a more sober individualism in an
'Age of Social Stagnancy'. The resultant metamorphosis bore
ominously for the measure's supporters. President James Buchanan
would not sign their bill.

On 26 February 1859, President Buchanan returned the Morrill
bill to the House of Representatives with his veto message. The
Act, in his view, was both inexpedient and unconstitutional. On
the first score, he warned that the measure would deprive the
Treasury of some $5,000,000. Furthermore, it was ludicrous to
believe that these new lands would fetch the prescribed minimum
standard of $1.25 per acre since bounty-land warrants of Old
Soldiers were still plentiful at eighty-five cents per acre.
This, than, was a most impropitious time for putting new lands on
the market—both for the government and for the intended object of
the bill. 20 Moreover, the sale of new land would be particularly
injurious to the new States as wealthy speculators would un-
doubtedly purchase them in large blocs and sell them at inflated
prices, thereby effectively checking population growth in many of
these new jurisdictions for years to come. 21

The President also believed that the intended objects of the
bill would injuriously interfere with existing colleges in the
states. Relatedly, the President sincerely doubted that most of
these agricultural schools could stand by themselves. Commenting on their impracticability, he states:

Under this bill, it is provided that scientific and classical studies shall not be excluded from them. Indeed, it would almost be impossible to sustain them without such a provision; for no father would incur the expense of sending a son to one of these institutions for the sole purpose of making him a scientific farmer or mechanic. 22

The constitutionality of the bill, both in its structure and potential effects, also raised serious questions in the mind of the Chief Executive. Pedantically, and in a fashion similar to a schoolmaster chastening his charges, Buchanan sought to instruct, if not indoctrinate, the bill's supporters on the merits of the strict constructionist view of the constitution stating that:

The Constitution is a grant to Congress of a few enumerated but most important powers, relating chiefly to war, peace, foreign and domestic commerce, negotiations, and other subjects which can be best or alone exercised beneficially by the common Government. All other powers are reserved to the states and to the people. For the efficient and harmonious working of both, it is necessary that their several spheres of action should be kept distinct from each other. This alone can prevent conflict and mutual injury. 23

The Morrill bill, as it was now conceived, represented a serious breach of state's rights, or, according to the President, the usurpation of power by the federal government over its originators. It clearly posed a serious threat to the practical machinations of effective and efficient government. The consequence of all this the President asserted was that:

The Federal government which makes the donation, has confessedly no constitutional power to follow it into the
States and enforce the application of the fund to the intended objects. As donors, we shall possess no control over our own gift after it shall have passed from our hands.24

The President's veto message, however, did not deter the bill's sponsor. After a forceful rebuttal, Congressman Morrill asked his colleagues to reconsider the measure in the hope of overriding the presidential veto. But the concurrence to override fell short of the necessary two-thirds majority (105 yeas - 94 nays), and, thus, the veto stood.25

Initial disappointment soon dissipated. The approaching presidential election clearly obviated their pessimism and motivated its staunchest supporters to redouble their efforts. For example, Jonathan Baldwin Turner, an early advocate of colleges for the industrial classes, sought and gained the support of the two leading presidential candidates regarding any future legislation on the subject.26 This and other related actions virtually assured the introduction of yet another land-grant college bill into the National Assembly by its legislative votaries.

Not surprisingly then, Congressman Morrill gave early notice at the Second Session of the Thirty-Seventh Congress of his intent to, once again, introduce a bill calling for the creation of agricultural and mechanical arts colleges. This he did on 16 December 1861, the measure promptly being referred to the Committee on Public Lands.27 Though the Committee's complexion had been altered by the passing of two elections, six months of deliberation yielded the same results as its 1857 counterpart. On 29 May
1862, it recommended the measure not pass. Mr. Morrill, however, did not seek to submit the question to the full House since similar efforts in the Senate were meeting with greater success.

Senator Benjamin Wade introduced Senate Bill No. 298 on 2 May 1862. Two weeks later, the chairman of the Senate's Committee on Public Lands reported the bill back favorably. But approval of the full Senate was far from won. Staunch opposition arose from many of the Senators representing the newly formed states. The most outspoken of these was Senator Lane of Kansas. He, like many of his western colleagues, feared that their state's prime land would be sold to many outsiders before they could select their school lands or receive their fair share of railroad lands. Mr. Lane also countenanced against the amount of land available for purchase in each of the new states, and, as a result, called for an amendment limiting the amount of any purchase to no more than 1,000,000 acres in each jurisdiction. Senator Wilkinson of Minnesota concurred citing among other arguments that without such limitations the Morrill bill would unduly interfere with the Homestead Act recently passed by Congress.

Considerable sentiment for the amendment mounted, and in order to hasten the passage of the measure, Senator Wade agreed not to oppose this and yet another important amendment introduced by Senator Collamer of Vermont which limited acceptance of the measure by state legislatures to two years from the date of presidential approval. After these and other sundry amendments
were agreed to, the full Senate voted to pass the bill by a vote of 32-7 on 10 June 1862.\textsuperscript{34} A week later, under Morrill's guiding hand, the measure cleared the House by an overwhelming 90-25 margin.\textsuperscript{35} And as promised, President Abraham Lincoln signed the bill into law on 2 July 1862, thus ending the long struggle to secure its enactment.

The new law essentially mirrored the failed 1857 bill with but a few important changes. These included: an increase of the land formula from 20,000 to 30,000 acres for each senator and congressman, the exclusion of the 'States in Rebellion' from its benefits, the omission of the 'Territories', and the addition of military tactics into the curriculum.\textsuperscript{36} The federal government had performed its creative responsibility. It was now up to the states to successfully oversee the second phase—namely, that of implementation.

In many ways the phase of implementation would be more difficult than that of origination. This was due in large measure to the broad, if not vague, language of the law itself. Particularly vexatious was that part of Section Four which stated:

\begin{quote}
. . . the leading object [of the college] shall be without excluding other scientific or classical studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislature of the states may respectfully prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.\textsuperscript{37}
\end{quote}

Each special interest group and their lobbying agent(s) could (and did) take liberties in interpreting this section in a manner
which, not surprisingly, promoted their respective claims. Colleges and universities, both public and private, agricultural associations, the press, both public and agricultural, and individuals of varied persuasions all concocted 'acceptable' uses for the distribution of the proceeds from this munificent grant.38

And on what agency did the onerous tasks of reviewing the proposals, of contending with the seemingly unending queue of lobbyists, and of ultimately arbitrating the entire matter fall? The state legislature. Indeed, the vague language of the Act coupled with a plethora of like-sounding proposals must have rung cacophonously in both the ears and minds of many legislators. Regardless, the charge was clear and the time short.

As in many other states, Ohio's response in handling matters of agricultural importance was rooted in both its interest and experience of the past. Unfortunately, political coercion rather than cooperation provided the impetus for most legislative action. And then only rarely, especially in regards to proposals aimed at direct legislative aid to agricultural education. One such anomaly was an 1844 House Resolution and related committee report. The committee's recommendations fell wcefully, though most would agree, predictably, short of the agrarian class' high expectations. Understand their frustration.

On 2 December 1844, the resolution prayed that a:

... committee on Agriculture be instructed to inquire into the expediency of enacting a law establishing two agricultural schools, based upon scientific principles;
one to be located in the northern and the other in the southern part of the state.39

The hopes of the agrarian class soared, but alas the euphoria was short-lived as the Standing Committee on Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufactures issued its final recommendations.40

In the first five pages of the six-page report, the committee extolled the necessity and virtue of a sound practical education for the agrarian class. Its primary objective should not be to educate the farmer out of his peculiar vocation as the present collegiate institutions had done; no, its principal objective should be to elevate him so that he might prosper in his chosen station of life. The social inequities perpetrated on the industrial classes brought sharp criticism from the committee. It echoed the sentiments of Horace Greeley on the matter who piously remarked:

The division of the race into two unequal contrasted classes—the few thinkers—the many workers—has been and is the source of many and sore evils. It is the source of infinite servility, falsehood and mean compliance.41

The report further acknowledged the success of agricultural colleges in elevating the lot of masses both at home and abroad. The committee especially lauded the efforts of the agricultural colleges located in Tennessee and Massachusetts. But what of Ohio? Would the establishment of an agricultural college benefit her corporately, as well as lifting up her loyal constituents? Fortuitously, perhaps, but not with any direct aid from the legislature. Though the Committee recommended the establishment of an
agricultural school, it would not advocate the use of public funds to get the project off the ground. If not direct support, then from what source? The committee prayed it be from private enterprise, individuals of great means, and from the pockets of the thousands of farmers across the State [emphasis added]. The last straw! Agriculturists would have to mobilize and organize themselves in order to effectively prick the conscience of lethargic, if not torpid, legislators on this and all other matters of agricultural importance.

It came as no surprise, then, that governmental interests and activity markedly increased with the advent of Ohio's influential agricultural press. Direct pressure from both its editor and readers, no doubt, struck the motivational cord of many a legislator. In the very first edition of the Ohio Cultivator, for example, Editor Bateham chided the assembly for its lackadaisical, if not irresponsible, posture on agricultural matters.

The necessity and advantage of making some appropriation by the State for the promotion of agriculture, we think, at this late day, must be admitted by every enlightened citizen; especially in a State like Ohio, so entirely dependent on agriculture for its prosperity. During the great pecuniary embarrassment which of late prevailed in this country, there may have been some shadow of excuse for refusing to grant money from the treasury for such a purpose; but even then it may be doubted whether a wise economy, would not have suggested the fostering of agricultural improvement, as the surest and most speedy means of restoring prosperity. Be that as it may, there can be no real excuse at the present time for neglecting this great interest; on the contrary everything seems to demand and favor immediate action on the subject.
Specifically calling for an improvement of the laws regarding agricultural societies, as well as the creation of an Agricultural Survey of the state, Bateham masterfully concludes his editorial with a poignantly political message for both legislator and constituent:

We are happy to find a large majority of the members of both branches of the Legislature are practical farmers, and it would be a libel on their intelligence to suppose that they will not view this subject favorably. There must be an expression from their constituents however; and we advise our readers, therefore, to send in petitions for this object without delay. Let them be brief and to the point; urging the passage of such a law, during the present session.\(^{45}\)

Others were just as quick to offer politically expedient advice. In the 15 January 1845 edition, for example, William H. Taylor, the Corresponding Secretary to the Hamilton County Agricultural Society, quipped: "The farmers of the state are the largest contributors to its revenue, and there is no class of citizens who receive so little encouragement from the Legislature."\(^{46}\)

Similarly, a letter to the editor penned under the sobriquet 'Montgomery' in the 1 February 1845 edition, chided Ohio's legislators for failing to move on the creation of a State Agricultural Society:

Does that body await an application from the people to prompt them to every measure of public policy? Do they wait to be instructed by their constituents in the performance of each individual act of their duty? Surely not. We could not but regard such an excuse as an evasion of responsibility. Do the members of the Legislature not know that every Farmer in the State, who
deserves to be called such, would gladly sign such a petition if presented to him? Why then put a few individuals, for it must be done by a few, to the expense and trouble of circulating such papers all over the State? Persistent public awareness of legislative lethargy, on this issue at least, did produce a flood of over 2,500 petitions to the General Assembly, but to no avail—at least not immediately. And so once again the editor put his pen to paper blasting the legislature for their callous disregard of so pressing an issue:

After a session of nearly three months and a half the SOLONS(!) of this great State have returned to their homes. They have passed a large number of laws, some of them doubtless, intended to be of general benefit to the people, but many more, for the special good of a party, or a few partizan friends. The friends of agriculture, the greatest interest of the State, have petitioned and urged in vain for the least possible act that might have a tendency to advance the great productive interests of the State, and promote the prosperity of the whole people, without regard to party! Whole weeks have been spent in devising new modes and new articles of taxation, but they had not time to legislate on that which was directly calculated to increase the ability of the people to pay taxes, and would lessen the need of taxation by increasing the revenues of public works.

And the ultimate weapon, the mobilization of a solid voting bloc promoting the interests of the agrarian class, reverberated throughout the pages of the 15 April 1845 edition with this editorial volley:

... we believe that the farmers of Ohio, among who we must ever look for conservative power can be persuaded to look at this evil in its true light, and when they thus see it, we have faith to believe that they will apply the remedy—by refusing to countenance and elect to office, mere partizan-political demagogues, whose only recommendation is being staunch whigs or democrats, whose only aim will be to secure the continuance of themselves in office, and their party in power. Until such a reform
is effected, it is vain to look for the general advancement of agriculture or education, or any other of the great interests of the whole people. This we believe to be sober truth. Will the farmers look at it; and act upon it when they are about to select their candidates for office? 49

Weighty epithets by both editor and subscriber, no doubt, exacted the attention of many legislators. And in order to gauge, if not further influence, the educability and sagacity of the state's lawmakers, their voting record on issues of agricultural importance frequently appeared in the pages of the Cultivator.

But the paper's most efficacious and, subsequently, most effectual strategy in proselytizing the cause of agriculture centered on its persistent call for a convention of the friends of agriculture. The twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth of June 1845 marked its success in this endeavor, as hundreds met in Columbus for the purpose of creating a State Agricultural Society. And to reaffirm its steadfast commitment on this vital issue, subsequent issues of the Ohio Cultivator reported both the proceedings of the Convention and the reaction of its subscribers regarding its present and potential impact on the affairs of the agricultural community. 50 The agriculturalists' voice would be heard—and needed!

Now unmindful of either the practical or political consequences of the newly-formed agricultural coalition, Governor Bartley, in his Annual Message to the Ohio General Assembly, advised:

Agriculture being the most important branch of industry in this State, and furnishing more extensive
employment to our citizens than any other pursuit, cannot receive too much attention and encouragement from the Government. . . . It is therefore, a consideration of no ordinary import, that the attention of the people of this State should be divided with peculiar interest to the various improvements, and useful discoveries in the art of agriculture, and the fostering hand of government should not be withheld from this most extensive pursuit of our people.51

And, of course, the elevated wisdom of the Governor’s words received a most auspicious place in the pages of the agrarian press.

As previously mentioned, the 1845 Agricultural Convention in Columbus proved to be most auspicious, precipitating the passage of a number of legislative acts beneficial to the agricultural interests of the state. The first statute, entitled "An Act for the Encouragement of Agriculture" became law on 18 February 1846. Recapitulating, the Act detailed the duties and responsibilities of county agricultural societies, created the powerful State Board of Agriculture, and prescribed the submission of an annual report of the state’s agricultural progress (or lack thereof) to the Ohio General Assembly.52 One year later, tandem legislation was enacted into law on 8 February 1847. The first appropriated the sum of two hundred dollars from the Treasury for discretionary use by the Board of Agriculture.53 The second piece of legislation authorized county auditors to increase the fee for public shows to twenty dollars, with one-half of the revenue collected specifically earmarked for the establishment of a 'State Agricultural Fund'.54 Munificence or pittance? The agriculturists’ response to this overriding question would not be long in coming.
The Third Annual Report of the Ohio State Board of Agriculture (1848) used a variety of journalistic tactics to make known its views on the subject. Allen Trimble, former Governor of Ohio and the Board's first president, in his Annual Message began with a laudation of the statutes passed in 1846 and 1847 which, in his opinion, "... gave the people the evidence that their Representatives deemed it important to their individual interest and the intent of the State." Then a comparative analogy with a neighboring state ensued. New York, under the liberal patronage and supervision of its legislature, had moved to the forefront of agricultural advancement. Although Ohio could not yet claim to be her equal, Trimble asserted that its advantage would soon dissipate because "... we [Ohio] have their [emphasis added] example to aid us, and their success to cheer us, in our career of improvement." The political goad continues:

The experience of that great State [New York] in the good results which have flowed from liberal legislation upon this subject, will be a sufficient guaranty that whatever liberality may be manifested by our government, will be repaid a thousand fold, in the rapid improvement of all our great industrial pursuits, and in the equally rapid increase of the wealth and power of the State.

And if the message still proved to be muddled, Trimble reminded the legislators that two-thirds of the State's population was agriculturist and that:

A wise government will not long hesitate to communicate to such an interest that most active impulse, and by every means within its power, stimulate the industry, and increase the intelligence of so large and important a class of its citizens.
Thus, at least as far as the State Board was concerned, the recently enacted legislation could only be classified as a proper first step. Clearly, more, much more, legislative assistance was necessary in order to satiate the natural and just desires of the agrarian class in Ohio.

One clear and persistent aim of both the State Board and Ohio Cultivator centered on more legislative aid to promote advanced agricultural education in the State, though the years between the advent of the State Board and the introduction of Morrill's first bill produced only three serious attempts at fulfilling this ambition. The first, the Farmers' College of Hamilton County, was chartered by the legislature on 23 February 1846. Founded by Freeman Grant Cary, the articles of incorporation stated that the objects of the association "... shall be to direct and cultivate the minds of the students in a thorough and scientific course of studies, particularly adapted to agricultural pursuits."59 But it was not until seven years after its founding that the trustees determined to specifically raise $100,000 in order to establish an agricultural department at the college. Cary, the college's president, resigned that office in order to solicit contributions and eventually direct the new Farm Department. By the mid-1850's it had gained some notoriety by publishing the nation's first collegiate agricultural periodical entitled The Cincinnatus (1856). Despite its seeming popularity, the college's revenues did not keep pace with its expenditures. Financial exigencies
approached the critical stage by the outbreak of the Civil War. Though founded as a private corporation, it, nevertheless, sought public assistance from both the national and state authorities, including the funds derived by Morrill's agricultural college bill. Thwarted in its bid to procure any type of legislative assistance, the institution eventually languished and died. In 1884, the institution became Belmont College and six years later the Ohio Military Institute. 60

Another attempt barely reached the conceptualization stage. Senate Bill No. 135, introduced during the First Session of the Fiftieth Ohio General Assembly in 1852, called for "granting lands for agricultural education, to the trustees of Heidelberg College." 61 In a six-page report of the Select Committee to which the bill had been referred, it not only expostulated on the general necessity for establishing a thorough agricultural education in northwestern Ohio, it also detailed a plan of agricultural studies for a 'Farmer's Course'. In pressing for legislative concurrence on the bill, the committee's report earnestly asked: "Shall not the State of Ohio set the world so good an example of educating the sons of its agriculturists in a manner worthy of their heritage and duty?" 62 Evidently not, as the measure failed to be engrossed after its third reading by a wide 7-18 margin. 63 Again, legislative support for the promotion of an agricultural college proved wanting.
But why? Many agricultural leaders believed much of the reason for the legislative inertia centered on the farmer's unwillingness to pursue an aggressive policy of agrarian politics. E. D. Mansfield, in an address delivered at the Highland County Fair, vents his frustration on this most vexatious problem:

Although in the art of agriculture, as in other things, most improvement comes from the efforts and enterprise of individuals, yet there are some things which can only be accomplished by the people, in a joint or public capacity. And let me say, that farmers have never asked enough. Having more power than any other class of community, they have acted the least. They have acted as if they thought modesty was as much a virtue for farmers, as it is for women. Lawyers, Doctors, Merchants, Manufacturers, and Bankers, have had laws passed for their special benefit, but I know of none for farmers, save the proceeds of public shows, given to the agriculture funds. 64

Agrarian diffidence, notwithstanding, yet another trial emerged in September 1854 when a prospectus entitled "Ohio Agricultural College, Oberlin, Lorain County, Ohio" appeared. Its primary objective sought ". . . to place within the reach of Farmers, both old and young, the means of acquiring a thorough and practical acquaintance with all those branches of Science which have a direct relation to Agriculture." 65 Organized and coordinated by Norton S. Townshend, the "college" was, in fact, a series of privately funded lectures given during the winter months, first, at Oberlin College and, then, at Cleveland for two years. Though enthusiastically endorsed by the Ohio Cultivator and prominent agriculturalists across the state, sparse attendance (i.e., no more than forty students at any one session) plagued the
program from the start. Consequently, Townshend petitioned the legislature for a grant of some $6,000. The petition resulted in the introduction of Senate Bill No. 219. "To Promote Agricultural Education in Ohio." After clearing the Committee of the Whole without amendment, it was then submitted to the Committee on Universities and Colleges for further consideration. On 19 February 1857, the committee issued its final report and found that:

... the appropriation proposed did not come within our constitutional obligations which apply only to that kind of instruction which is necessary and beneficial, equally, to all classes and callings. The instruction imparted in common schools is useful in all conditions, while that being supported by the bill under considera-
tion, is limited in its benefits, to a particular, though larger class of people. If an appropriation be made for one institution of the kind named, justice and equality will demand like appropriations for other similar instit-
tutions. ... The committee, therefore, recommend that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Thus thwarted thrice.

Strained relations between the State Board and the legislature periodically surfaced over less substantive issues. In the early 1850's for example, a few legislators sought to abolish the Board with this action resulting in the disruption of that agency's publication of its Annual Report. The battle ended with the full legislature voting to extend [emphasis added] the Board the permanent use of two large rooms in the north-east wing of the newly-planned State House, as well as the immediate publication of the Annual Reports for both [emphasis added] 1852 and 1854.
Agitation of this sort surfaced again when the General Assembly failed to print the Annual Report of 1855. And, once again, the State Board readied to do battle. A memorial signed not only by its members, but by every delegate attending the 1856 Agricultural Convention angrily, if not threateningly, denounced the action:

Representing as we do, all the farming interests of Ohio, which includes more than one half of the population, and which pays more than two-thirds of the taxes of the State, we claim the right to protest against this inexcusable neglect of duty, and to demand that those who have been guilty of so great a dereliction, should receive the censure of your body. 70

To be sure, swift and decisive public condemnation would follow any more affrontive actions by the legislature.

Ohio's newest agricultural gazette, and the one which would carry the burden of agricultural hegemony through the years of the Morrill controversy, also contributed its views on the leading agricultural issues of the period. The Ohio Farmer, in an editorial dated 14 February 1857, chided its own constituency regarding its failure to rally around Townshend's agricultural bill, and advised that: "... every farmer who takes our paper, bestir himself, and see that his representative is awake, and right on this matter." 71

Despite the admonition towards its own, the newspaper left little doubt where it stood regarding any direct confrontation between the legislature and the State Board of Agriculture. It was outraged when the legislature reneged on an earlier promise and assigned the State Board its rooms in a less than auspicious
location in the new State Capitol. Thomas Brown, the editor and proprietor of *The Ohio Farmer*, spoke out forcefully:

It is a disgrace to our Legislature to stick away in the dark and untenable regions of the Capitol, the Agricultural Rooms. We wonder why they were not assigned rooms in the cellar; there is a great deal of rooms there, and then, too, there would be a propriety in putting the interests of the sort as near the ground as possible. . . . A grand idea to cram the first interest of the State and the people, into the waste places of 'their own house' as our worthy Governor felicitously names it. . . . What do locating committees think of the farming interests of the State? Is it a fat goose to be plucked; and when denuded, to be shut up in a dark bin of a room, so that when the next crop of feathers has grown, she may be easily caught and plucked again? Yes, that is it, farmers you are the fat goose—you are, if you allow yourself thus to be elbowed out of your own house. . . . Where are our farmer Senators and Representatives? What are they doing while their interests are put into the dark? They too, are asleep and are they, like their constituency, waiting to be plucked. 72

Thus, in the dozen years preceding the introduction of Morrill's first bill, apathy, if not open hostility, generally marked the attitude of a majority of state legislators on most agricultural issues. Even so, the agricultural community, blessed with a few influential leaders and buttressed by the sheer weight of political numbers, laid the groundwork for its own development. Indeed, the agricultural press spear-headed the call for an annual agricultural convention and concomitant State Board. Corporately, though not always consensually, these influential agencies pressed into law those concerns they deemed vital to the nurturing, if not flourishing, condition of the agrarian class. This was especially true regarding the issue of an agricultural college, and, subsequently, proved to be a most telling factor during the debate over
the Morrill funds. Though both the corporate and individual strategies of the agricultural community, as well as other rivals for the funds, will be examined fully in subsequent chapters, it now behooves us to focus specifically on the state's response to these competing elements between the years 1857 - 1870.

The first extensive description of 'Mr. Morrill's Bill' pressed into the minds of Ohioans with the 2 January 1858 printing of The Ohio Farmer, gaining favorable editorial comment. ⁷³ Numbered amongst its distinctive readership was the Honorable Salmon P. Chase, Governor of Ohio. Not unmindful of its content and certainly not heedless of the State Board's messianism regarding all agricultural improvements for the state, Chase simultaneously broaches both subjects in his Annual Message to the Fifty-Third General Assembly:

The State Board of Agriculture has performed a service of great value in stimulating and promoting agricultural improvement and its annual reports add largely to our store of agricultural knowledge. But this Board cannot do all that should be done or must be done, if we wish to retain our present agricultural position. I respectfully suggest to your consideration that expediency of establishing an agricultural Institution for the instruction of the rising generation in those branches of knowledge which pertain especially to the theory and practice of farming. It is thought by persons qualified to judge that such an institution could be so organized and administered that it would almost; if not altogether, sustain itself. No one can doubt that any cost of which it could be the occasion, would be repaid to the State a thousand fold in benefits. ⁷⁴

The governor's plea, however, again fell on deaf ears.

Official governmental interpolation at the state level during the interim extending from Buchanan's veto to Lincoln's signature
abated considerably. In fact, the only official pronouncement came, once again, from the Governor's office. William Dennison, in his Annual Report to the legislature, reminded that body of agriculture's dominant role in the state's economy. There was no doubt, at least in the mind of the Governor, that the creation of both an experimental farm and agricultural school would confer numerous advantages upon the state. He consequently recommended to the legislature favorable consideration on these subjects. But again the legislature refused to take independent action on the matter.

The affixture of Lincoln's signature to the 'Agriculture and Mechanical Arts College' bill exacted but a few droplets of ink in the Ohio press, both public and private. Both were dominated by the events of the Civil War. An exception to this rather conspicuous absence appeared in the 28 June 1862 edition of The Ohio Farmer where in anticipation of the President's signature the bill was printed in full. However, no comment, either favorable or unfavorable, framed the editorial column of that newspaper, or any other for that matter, for at least a month following the bill's enactment.

In spite of its relative obscurity in the press, it did not escape the attention of one prominent Ohioan, Governor David Tod, who quickly called for a special meeting with key members of the State Board to exchange views on the national legislation. A position letter was quickly penned and passed on to the Governor
in which the Board recommended that the provisions of the grant be accepted.77

Whatever the tenor of the meeting, it soon became clear that not all those in positions of responsibility shared the Board's view on this matter. R. W. Taylor, Auditor of State, in his Annual Report to the legislature, warned of the potentially disastrous consequences of accepting the grant. He specifically criticized those provisions of the act which placed the responsibility and expense of selling the land, managing the fund, and erecting the college buildings squarely on the shoulders of an already overburdened public. State government also bore no mean responsibility. Though designated as only a trustee of the fund, it, unlike other trusteeships, would be held accountable for the absolute safety of all investments, the due payment of interest, and the replacement of funds lost regardless of contingency. Moreover, given the costs necessary to support a first-rate college, now conservatively estimated at $100,000, Taylor predicted a substantial tax increase for the citizens of Ohio should such an enterprise be approved.

Though much of the auditor's concern centered on the potential fiscal damage to the state, he also questioned the propriety of establishing a college whose main thrust would concentrate on the agricultural and mechanical arts. The experience of the country clearly showed the folly of establishing purely agricultural and mechanical arts colleges, the majority of which have either
perished or reverted back to the usual courses of a scientific or classical nature. Critical of the incongruity of teaching agricultural and mechanical arts, classical and scientific studies, and military tactics all under one roof, Taylor dubbed the entire matter visionary. 78

Despite the chilling remarks of the auditor's December 1862 Report, representatives to the Agricultural Convention in January 1863 did not agree and found its appropriation the cynosure of its discussion. An extended, though unwittingly premature, discussion on how best to utilize the funds (i.e., for one or many colleges), as well as the prospective nature of the institution(s), resulted in the passage of the following resolution:

Resolved: That the Ohio State Board of Agriculture be and are hereby, requested to memorialize the General Assembly in favor of accepting the grant of lands by Congress, for the establishment of Agricultural Colleges, and, also, in behalf of the speedy and appropriate organization of such an institution. 79

The original resolution was later amended to read "one or more, as may be thought most advantageous." 80

During this same session the State Board appointed Norton S. Townshend and Thomas C. Jones a committee charged with the responsibility of drawing up a memorial consistent with the resolution approved by the Convention. They did so, and subsequently laid a copy of the document on the desk of every member of the Ohio General Assembly. 81

The action of the State Board serendipitously or strategically coincided with the Governor's Annual Message to the Ohio
General Assembly in January 1863. In it, Governor Tod, though eminently satisfied with the accomplishments of the state militia's current officers in the field, called to the legislature's attention the propriety of giving state aid for the creation and support of a school for instruction in military science. In this connection, he directed their attention to the Act of April 2d [sic] which in addition to promoting the teaching of military tactics also promoted the study of the agricultural and mechanical arts. After a short discourse on the main provisions and benefits of the Act, the Governor, in a rather obvious allusion to the earlier remarks of the state auditor, assured the legislature of the harmonious relationship among the disciplines of agriculture, mechanic arts, and military tactics, though in time of war it would be difficult to determine which would be most important. Tod also argued that the proceeds from the sale of the land scrip would provide sufficient funds for the establishment of a college. Although it would be impossible to fix an exact sum needed for the whole enterprise, he thought the sum of $60,000 would be ample. In his concluding remarks, the state's chief executive deemed the matter of vital importance to the state, and having met with the State Board of Agriculture and gaining their hearty concurrence, commended the entire matter to their deliberate consideration.

Deliberateness on the part of the legislature, however, meant considerable delay, even though most political observers across
the state predicted quick legislative acceptance of the national grant. This assumption even transcended her borders as evidenced in a letter dated 28 February 1863 from William T. Steiger to Governor Tod. In seeking the post of Ohio's land scrip agent at the nation's capital, Steiger wrote:

Looking to the agricultural and mechanical interests of the State of Ohio, I presume her Legislature will promptly accept the munificent grant (amounting to about 630,000 acres) as required by the act of Congress which limits the terms of acceptance to two years.\(^3\)

Despite the best suppositional assurances, the Second Session of the Fifty-Fifth Ohio General Assembly did not produce the desired legislation. But it was not for lack of proposals. Two measures were introduced into the House. The Honorable Asher Cook introduced the first, House Bill No. 274, on 22 January 1863. This measure sought to take and claim the benefits of the Morrill Act in order to create an Agricultural Bureau.\(^4\) After a second reading and a recommendation for its passage with sundry amendments from a select committee of which Mr. Cook was chairman, the bill than moved on to the Committee of the Whole where it appears to have died for lack of interest.\(^5\)

A memorial dated 3 March 1863 from the trustees and stockholders of Farmers' College proposed to donate their college to the state, and undoubtedly set the stage for the introduction of House Bill No. 368. This measure, authored by Representative Peter Zinn of Cincinnati, urged the legislature to accept the donation of Farmer's College in order to fulfill the conditions of
the act of Congress passed July 2, 1862. But like the Cook legislation, this bill languished and died in committee.

In the upper chamber, Senator Sprague presented the following resolution on 28 January 1863:

Resolved, That the earnest attention of the committee on Agriculture is hereby directed to the grant of lands by an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, donating certain lands to the States for agricultural and mechanical purposes, and that the said committee is hereby requested to determine at an early day of the session, whether, in their opinion, this General Assembly ought or ought not accept the said grant, and report by bill or otherwise.87

Two weeks after the reading of the resolution, Senator Jason McVeigh offered Senate Bill No. 201, 'Accepting the donation of lands to the State of Ohio for the endowment of Agricultural Colleges', for consideration in that body.88 A week later McVeigh's bill gained the approbation of the Madison County Agricultural Society and a second reading. Even so, its subsequent assignment to the Committee of the Whole ended any hope for approval.89

Senate Bill No. 214, conceived by Peter Hitchcock of the Committee on Agriculture, perhaps offered the best hope of an early acceptance of the federal grant.90 The 24 February 1863 edition of The Cleveland Leader provides us with the best, if not only, overview of early legislation aimed at both accepting the grant, as well as providing an organizational framework for establishing a college. The first section of the bill, in full compliance with the federal statute, instructed the Secretary of
State to inform the proper federal authorities of Ohio's willingness to accept the provisions of the Act.

The second component of the Hitchcock bill focused on the organizational framework of the college. It first called for the creation of a Board of Commissioners to consist of the President of the State Board of Agriculture and two other Board members, the latter to be appointed by the governor and confirmed by the Senate. The Board's initial duties would center on securing suitable grounds and building for the institution, either by purchase or donation. It also prescribed that the State Fund Commissioners be entrusted with both the administration and sale of the land scrip. And finally, the measure recommended that the institution, once established, be governed by a board of trustees consisting of the President of the State Board of Agriculture, three members of the Board selected by its annual convention, and two other individuals to be named by the governor.

The final section of the bill outlined the admissions policy and curriculum of the new college(s). Enrollment would be limited to those students who were recommended by the officers of their respective county agricultural society, or county commissioners where no such society existed. All applicants were restricted to between the ages of 16-25, and were expected to be proficient in reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, and geography. Two hours of manual labor per day would be mandatory. Details of the curricular arrangement were sketchy, the newspaper account saying only
that it would be prescribed and embrace all areas of study except languages.\textsuperscript{91}

After spending considerable time in both the committees of the Whole and Agriculture, the latter, after the addition of several amendments, recommended the Hitchcock measure pass. The stage set, the bill engrossed and read for a third time, the question was raised "Shall the bill pass?". But before a full Senate vote was taken, Senator Henkle rose and requested the measure be indefinitely postponed which was agreed to by a wide margin of 23-6. The bill was never revived.\textsuperscript{92} Consequently, this legislative session ended without any concrete action being taken on the federal statute.

The year 1864 produced many heuristic influences which eventually led to the passage of a measure accepting the provisions of the Morrill Act for the State of Ohio. The first, Governor Tod's Annual Message to the General Assembly, assured its members of the state's sound financial footing, thus allaying many of the fears brought on by the state auditor's Report. Therefore, he saw no reason to change his views on the matter and, once again, reiterated his support for the State Board's position on the 'Agricultural College Question'.\textsuperscript{93}

In another section of the capital city, the annual Agricultural Convention also focused its attention on the agricultural college issue. A sense of urgency permeated the proceedings. Mr. Darwin E. Gardner of Toledo, Lucas County, offered the following
resolution to the Convention at-large:

Resolved, That the State of Ohio ought to accept the grant of land for the establishment of agricultural colleges as soon as possible.94

The resolution and ensuing discussion revealed a dramatic change of strategy from that of the previous year. Any discussion regarding the proper distribution of the funds would have to wait; legislative acceptance of the measure was now the paramount concern. The horse had to come before the cart. And with this understanding, the Gardner Resolution was unanimously approved by the Convention.95

The Regular Session of the Fifty-Sixth General Assembly commenced on 4 January 1864. Within three days of the opening proceedings the Honorable Columbus Delano introduced House Bill No. 4, 'To Accept an Act of Congress Approved July 2, 1862.'96 Less then two weeks after its introduction, the measure gained the overwhelming approval of the House by a vote of 73-3.97 Two weeks of feverish activity in the upper chamber produced a similar response, the bill passing by a count of 23 yeas to 5 nays. On February 9, the measure was enacted into law.98 The Morrill Act had gained yet another beneficiary.

The swiftness by which the Delano measure cleared both houses came as a surprise to but few observers. Forces intent on plucking the fruits of the legislation were already devising their respective strategies. By the end of the legislative session of 1864, petitions and memorials from the trustees of four Ohio
colleges--namely, Farmers' College at College Hill, Ohio University at Athens, Miami University at Oxford, and Mount Union in Stark county--sought the attention and special consideration of the State's lawmakers.

Initially, at least, the trustees of Farmers' College gained the upper hand. Samuel F. Cary and other citizens of Hamilton County, acting as a committee on behalf of the stockholders and directors of the college, urged the Senate to accept the donation of said institution for the purposes outlined in the Morrill Act. This, in turn, produced two distinct legislative measures designed to promote the singular interest of the Hamilton County College.

The first, Senate Joint Resolution No. 30, directed the committees on Agriculture of both houses to visit Farmer's College. After some political maneuvering, a joint committee consisting of members from both the Senate Agricultural Committee and House Committee on Colleges and Universities visited College Hill and afterwards made the following recommendation to the entire General Assembly:

... the trustees and stockholders of Farmers' College be requested to leave open their proposal now before the General Assembly, in order that future action may be had upon this subject with due regard to the highest and best interest of the whole State.

A lack of consensus among the committee members, no doubt, promoted this favorable yet noncommittal response. Some members believed that agriculture proper could receive no permanent benefit from a specialized education, others were of the opinion that
agricultural departments connected to existing colleges would best promote the true spirit, intent, and letter of the national legislation, while still others believed that the state's interests would best be served by the creation of at least three exclusive agricultural colleges throughout the state. 102

The other, more formal, measure regarding the candidacy of Farmers' College was introduced into the Senate on 5 February 1864. Senate Bill No. 57, "To enable the State of Ohio to accept the donation of Farmers' College of Hamilton County, as tendered by the trustees and stockholders of said College, for the uses and purposes contemplated in the act of Congress of the United States, approved July 2, 1862," enjoyed a protracted life in the upper chamber. Though spanning two legislative sessions, it, too, died in committee, the impact of the joint house visitation-report, undoubtedly, sounding its death knell. 103 Thus, even though acceptance of the grant was assured, its particular application would have to undergo even more meticulous scrutiny.

The year 1864 not only marked the state's formal acceptance of the national statute, it also signaled the entry of yet another willing participant in the political fray—namely, the public press. It performed three vitally important functions. First, it provided its readership, both public servant and constituent alike, with important factual data (e.g., legislative summaries, community propositions, executive messages, etc.), which, over the long run, pieced together those components necessary to
an integrated, whole understanding of the complicated political puzzle. Providing a forum for debate over the various issues of the industrial college question proved to be yet another valuable function of the daily gazettes. And finally, the editorial columns of these publications displayed an enthusiastic fervor usually reserved for more partisan issues, and, as a result, both stimulated and influenced the thought of their patrons on this most vexatious issue.

The March 1864 editorials in both The Ohio State Journal and Cincinnati Gazette, for example, exchanged charges and countercharges over the efficacy of establishing agricultural colleges and experimental farms in Ohio. The first volley, fired by the Gazette, impugned the usefulness of such institutions remarking that: "Agricultural College farms are a joke wherever they have been tried." The editor of the Journal countered with impressive facts and figures regarding the tremendous gains of the German agricultural industry between 1800-1854, which, in his view, was directly attributable to the flourishing condition of the country's sixty-five college farms. He concludes:

What inveterate jokers these Prussians must be,—a little bit, just a little of that kind of joking would not hurt Ohio, where the product per acre is decreasing rather than increasing, and in all the Prussian official reports we have failed to find the farmers there requiring an outside fund to keep them running.

A week later, the Journal-Gazette debate over the practical value of an experimental farm attached to an agricultural college
filled the better part of their editorial columns. To the renewed charges of the impracticality of such a farm, the Journal re-
torted:

Farming, in its length and breath [sic], is an art in which there is as much improvement as in any other art under the sun; and we shall never attain to a complete knowledge of it as a science until we know all the functions and processes which every part of the animal and vegetable bodies perform in their respective econo-
mies. We know that the soil of Ohio can produce 52 bushels of good wheat per acre, but the average in the State is 14 only; it can produce 500 bushels of potatoes per acre, but the average is less than 100; it can pro-
duce 180 bushels of corn, but the average is less than 40; and so on as to other crops. In our humble judgment an experimental farm, where a strict account of the details of every crop is recorded, will reveal the source of our present comparatively scanty crops. . . . We are full persuaded that an Agricultural College without an experimental farm, is like a locomotive with one driving wheel, the missing wheel may per se not amount to much, but the remainder is entirely worthless without it--the two must go together if an practical result is to be obtained.107

Other influential parties also began to ruminate over the possibilities brought about by the acceptance of the federal endowment. Of particular note was the State's School Commis-
sioner, E. E. White. His much heralded essay on the topic first appeared in his Annual Report for 1864.108 The problem of imple-
mentation, at least according to White, centered on two fundamental questions: 1. What is the object Congress designed to secure by this munificent grant? 2. What course of study and instruction will best secure the object? For the Commissioner, at least, the answer to the first question was clearly delimited in
the fourth section of the Morrill Act, the key words being capitalized and/or italicized. Thus, all monies derived from the sale of lands should be inviolably appropriated:

... to the endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college, where the LEADING OBJECT shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, 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, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life. 109

For too long, the Commissioner argued, the agricultural and mechanical arts professions have had to endure a relatively inferior status. Equal station with law, medicine, theology, teaching, trade, and the military could only be attained after the development of a field of specialized knowledge and an official organ of dissemination. Extensive research in a properly funded and administrated college and attached experimental farm, as well as a specialized training program for teachers in the common schools would, undoubtedly, produce the desired results. 110

The answer to the second question regarding the relative position of liberal, scientific, and practical studies within the college proved to be particularly vexatious. Wide and divergent views expectantly arose over this issue because of the great educational question which underscored it. A first view purported the primacy of the present liberal arts curriculum at the overwhelming majority of collegiate institutions and, thus, advocated the superaddition of agricultural and mechanic arts courses onto
the existing curriculum. Another view held that the course of
instruction should be exclusively professional, the addition of a
literary department serving only as a 'useless ornament' necessary
to comply with the provisions of the federal statute. A third and
even more restrictive notion viewed the farmer and artisan as mere
'operatives' and promoted only those rudiments (i.e., facts) of
practical education which could be applied to their respective
pursuits.

Commissioner White's views on this subject did not clearly
fall into any one of these categories, arguing that the scheme of
instruction should be sufficiently wide and extensive to fill the
full measure of a liberal as well as a professional education.\textsuperscript{111}

And though the statute implied that the former should be subor-
dinated to the latter, sound educational theory purported that a
broad-based education must precede any further specialization.

With this view in mind, then, the Commissioner penned a classic
defense of the value of liberal studies for any profession:

All experience teaches that in the successful ac-
quision of those facts which have the greatest value in
practical life, disciplined powers and developed strength
are a pre-requisite. Every successful teacher will
concur in this statement that the shortest road to a
practical knowledge of applied science is through a
mastery of the principles and laws of pure science. . . .
Hence it is that the discipline acquired in the thorough
mastery of a study which has little apparent value in
practical life, may be of the very greatest utility as a
means of reaching those facts that are practically use-
ful. Development thus becomes the gate way to practical
knowledge. No principle in education is better settled
than this.\textsuperscript{112}
But the value of liberal studies, White argued, went beyond the disciplining of the mind and subsequent discovery of useful knowledge in one's profession. It was also instrumental, if not crucial, to the development of the greatest function of education--namely to teach man how to live:

Man does not live by bread alone. The farmer and the mechanic must also be a member of society, a citizen, a MAN. Upon him as well as upon other men, rests the responsibilities of life. The mightiest social and civil questions of earth's history demand solution at his hands. He may be called to the highest councils of the State or of the nation--and well would it be for the country if he were oftener thus called. To this duty he should bring the same breadth of culture and comprehension as his compeers from the so-called learned professions. He should stand an honor to industry as well as her stong and able defender. The first step in all right education is to develope manhood--to educate man as man and not as an instrument--and any scheme of education for the industrial classes which ignores this great fact, which places a man's occupation above himself, will fail--in the future as in the past.113

The Commissioner then moves on to briefly recapitulate the several options currently under review regarding the proper distribution of the funds. The first sought to establish a separate and independent institution which would include the study of all the higher branches of scientific and classical studies, a school of military tactics, departments of agriculture, commerce and the mechanic arts, and a large experimental farm. A second plan simply proposed to divide the grant between the two state universities, Ohio and Miami, organizing in each an agricultural and
mechanical department. A third proposition called for the estab-
lishment of several agricultural and mechanical departments in a
number of colleges throughout the state. 114

Without discussing the relative merits of any of these, White
proposes what he believes to be an effective compromise. Specifi-
cally the Commissioner recommended that one-half of the fund be
set apart for the endowment of a specialized, professional school.
Its primary functions would include: instruction in the applied
sciences, experimental and scientific investigation on an experi-
mental farm, and the presentation of public lectures on a variety
of agricultural and mechanical topics. The other half of the fund
would be divided between three well-endowed colleges in different
sections of the state—two to organize departments of applied
science and the third a normal department. Preparatory skills in
both the liberal and practical studies would dominate the curri-
culums in each of these industrial departments. 115

Commissioner White cites four distinct advantages of his plan
over the others. First, it avoids the fatal error of class educa-
tion which he cites as the primary reason for the miserable, if
not short-lived, existence of the nation's agricultural schools.
Secondly, the course of instruction in agricultural and mechanical
arts at the central, professional school would, indeed, be its
leading object and, thus, fulfill all statutory requirements. A
Miami or Ohio University, for example, would find it difficult, if
not impossible, to subordinate the liberal to the more specialized
studies, and, thus, would fail to comply with the Act's chief provision. A third advantage centered on the potentially healthy competition derived from the three branch departments, and entrance exam being required for admission to the central college. And finally, the plan could be put into operation immediately. The establishment of branch departments in existing colleges would not only afford prompt instruction, it would also allow sufficient time for both the sale of the land scrip and subsequent establishment of the professional school.

The success of the Commissioner's plan, however, presumed that the sale of the land scrip would yield no less than one dollar per acre or an aggregate sum of approximately $630,000 (i.e., 21 Senators and Representatives x 30,000 acres x $1 per acre), and, thus, invested at six percent an annual income of slightly more than $37,000. To be sure, the Commissioner, as well as a number of other interested parties, was shocked at the actual amount eventually procured by the sale.

E. E. White's Report to the legislature, no doubt, profoundly influenced those who sought a clearer understanding of the nature and scope of the whole complicated state of affairs. Indeed, his analysis was the most comprehensive to date and actually marked the incipient stage of a prolonged debate over the most effective way to distribute the proceeds of the munificent grant. And it, undoubtedly, fired the imaginations of many college trustees who otherwise might not have given the grant a second thought.
Other views on the proper disposition of the agricultural college funds surfaced during the first few months of 1865. Governor John Brough, in his Annual Message threw his weight behind the idea of a single, practical institution of higher learning. Though commending the Commissioner of Common Schools for providing both a clear and forceful presentation of the issue at hand, the governor differed with Mr. White's conclusion that the fund should be divided. On the contrary, division would tend only to incapacitate whereas consolidation would validate the true spirit, letter, and intent of the national legislation. At the same time, Brough did not think that consolidation automatically required the building up of a grand state university. The governor warned that such action could only result in an institution

. . . whose professorships shall tempt the greatest scientific minds of the country--whose contribution to the grandeur of the State shall compensate for its utter want of utility--whose education shall illustrate and expand the abstruse theories of science, attainable by the few, but a sealed book to the many--whose lectures and publications however appreciable by the highly educated mind will be totally unintelligible to the honest tiller of the soil, who desires to learn, in the simplest and most practicable manner, how two blades of grass can be made to grow where only one was produced before.\textsuperscript{117}

Brough's conclusions regarding the primary object of the act rested squarely on its language and concomitant application, namely that the fund

. . . shall be inviolably appropriated to the endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college, where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanic arts.\textsuperscript{118}
Thus, the primary purpose of the enactment, at least in the mind of the governor, was to institute a new and distinct species of education, one not heretofore favored either by federal or state aid, and, one committed solely to the advancement of the agricultural and mechanical interests of the state.

The governor's view underscored his belief in the principle:

... that all wealth comes from the earth, and the labor and mechanism requisite to produce it; and that whatever facilitates and increases the production adds alike to individual and national wealth and greatness.119

Its application could only lead to the following conclusions concerning the primary object of the statute. First, the instruction is intended to be sui generis--of its own kind; and, thus, should not be subordinated to other scientific and classical studies. Secondly, and inextricably tied to the first view, is the notion that plain and practical instruction will best permeate the ranks of the greatest number of industrial men. Thirdly, valued practical instruction will cement the farmer and mechanic to his profession, whereas a general (i.e., an exclusively scientific or liberal) education would, undoubtedly, educate him out of it, and to the detriment of the individual, the state, and the nation. Assuredly, if fathers in the agrarian community did desire a liberal education for their sons, avenues were already open to them through a plethora of existing public and private institutions. None, however, existed for his own special interests, and this is what is clearly needed. Finally, only the
creation and organization of a new and separate institution could
faithfully and completely fulfill the paramount purpose of the
statute, namely, to teach such branches of learning as are related
to agriculture and the mechanic arts. Merely attaching a profes-
sorship to an existing institution would, in effect, subordinate
it to general education, and short of a radical change in the
existing institutions' charters, de facto subordination would be
assured. Moreover, if existing institutions desired the federal
largess primarily because of insufficient endowments, then other,
more legitimate, means of funding by the state should be pursued.120

The governor's concluding remarks reiterated the importance of
prudent action by the legislature:

The object of the appropriation, as I understand it, is a
good one, and may be made a means of largely increasing
the prosperity of the State. Too much should not be
attempted with it in the beginning. Its application
should be made gradually, affording opportunity for ex-
perience to demonstrate and correct any errors in the
working of it. If applied to a separate institution, as
I think it should be, I respectfully suggest that its
management be entrusted to men of intelligence and in-
tegrity practically associated with the interests it is
designed to benefit.121

In the same month, the Agricultural Convention also focused
attention on the governor's Report. After considerable discussion
by a number of delegates concerning the consolidation or division
of the land-grant funds, the membership-at-large voted overwhelm-
ingly in favor of the former. The one-institution policy hereupon
became the official one of both the Convention and the State Board
of Agriculture, and was strictly adhered to by both for the duration of the fray.\footnote{122}

The governor's Annual Report and State Board resolution was not the only food for legislative thought during the year 1865. A number of thought-provoking articles and essays appeared in the pages of the public press. The \textit{Ohio State Journal}, not surprisingly, offered the most comprehensive and incisive coverage of the agricultural college debate. Sample part of the year's fare.

In a spirited dialogue of letters, two gentlemen who signed themselves 'Agricola' and 'Kay' heightened the debate over the division-consolidation issue. 'Agricola' proposed the attachment of agricultural colleges to six existing first-rate collegiate institutions throughout the State. His plan, like the school commissioner's, assumed that the proceeds from the sale of the land scrip would yield no less than one dollar per acre, or an aggregate sum of just over \$600,000. His rationale centered on three principal arguments. First, the entire fund would be exhausted if one new institution were created and, clearly, tuition alone would not be able to sustain it. Secondly, connection with existing literary colleges would save the cost of establishing and maintaining requisite foundational studies since many of them already flourished in these institutions. And finally, the judicious and equitable distribution of the funds to existing colleges across the state would, unquestionably, allow a greater number of
farmers and mechanics to attend. Summing up, then, 'Agricola' concludes;

By this plan—distribution—the fund will be managed with the best economy, with equal security, and with much the greatest efficiency, and the interests of our youth and of agriculture, as well as of the Colleges of our State, will best be subserved.¹²³

'Kay's' retort bristled with indignation. The sum of $90,000 (one-tenth of the funds being earmarked for land and/or a college farm) invested at 5 percent interest would only yield $4,500, hardly enough to support a full contingent of six professors. Indeed, the paltry salary of $750 represented a little more than half the pay of a lieutenant in the infantry service.¹²⁴

Furthermore, attaching an agricultural college to an existing institution, 'Kay' argued, was not only impractical but theoretically, if not legally, impossible. No existing college, in Ohio anyway, could make the agricultural and mechanical arts its "leading object" without radically altering its charter. He viewed all existing colleges as corporate bodies possessing certain franchises which they, themselves, cannot yield or transfer without violating the law. Thus, the proposals of Farmer's College, the two state institutions at Athens and Oxford, and, for that matter, any other existing collegiate institution in the state must be considered null and void. This was especially true of Ohio and Miami universities since, in his view, only Congress, the original donor, could legitimately transfer or sell their lands. The institutions, themselves, were powerless to do so.
'Kay' also viewed the congressional grant as one with franchises. Consequently, not even the state could divide or transfer the monies generated by the sale of the land scrip. The grant to the state is a trust, not an absolute gift. The state is not sovereign in this matter and, thus, no division of the fund is possible without the direct authority of Congress.

Early in the debate The Ohio State Journal, itself, took no side on the question. In fact, an editorial penned in its first February edition actively promoted the idea of even more debate quoting the ancient, if not trite adage "haste makes waste" as suitable advice in regards to the whole affair. And during the interim, the editor argued, the State would do well to profit from the experiences of those states (Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Michigan, Illinois, and Iowa) which had already completed the task of organizing industrial colleges under the congressional grant.

Within one month, however, the Journal, sensing the possibility of the establishment of a new college in the capital city, reversed its position. After printing yet another anti-division letter from a 'Member of the State Board', the paper, in its editorial column, described the article as:

... a dispassionate and sensible article on the proper disposal of the munificent grant of Congress. The candid and argumentative manner in which he presents his views, and his logical deduction from the philosophy of the grant, will commend the article to favorable consideration of readers generally, and especially the members of the legislature, who are called upon to take action on this important measure.
Amid the clamor of the wide and divergent views espoused by the school commissioner, governor, and press regarding the proper distribution of the funds, the Ohio General Assembly did manage to pass a bill which not only provided for the sale of the land scrip, but also led to its first attempt at selecting a worthy recipient(s). On 30 January 1865, Mr. Columbus Delano introduced a measure (House Bill No. 294), 'To provide for the sale of land scrip, and to purchase land for a site and experimental farm for an agricultural college.'

Perhaps the best, if not only, extant summary of the measure was printed in the 18 February 1865 edition of The Ohio Farmer, and is herein examined. Sections one thru five directed the auditor, treasurer, and secretary of state, that is, Land Scrip Commissioners, to advertise the sale of the land scrip. Each proposition received was to be no less than 160 nor more than 640 acres per individual. All proposals were to be forwarded to either the Commissioners in Columbus or to their local county auditor or treasurer, the latter being reimbursed for their services on a sliding percentage scale. The next four sections of the bill provided for the disposition of the funds collected. Specifically, they could be paid into the state treasury to be appropriated and used by the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund for payment of the public debt. The sum of $50,000, however, was to be reserved and appropriated for the purchase of an experimental farm. The total amount collected, less 10 percent for the farm,
would be designated the 'Agricultural Fund' upon which the state was irrevocably pledged to pay 6 percent interest for the endowment and support of at least one college for the teaching of the agricultural and mechanical arts. Should it become necessary, the legislature would be empowered to borrow $100,000 from the 'Agricultural Fund' for the erection of suitable buildings for the college with the explicit proviso that all of the monies must be restored and with interest. The last sections provided for the appointment of three commissioners by the governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. The three, two representing the agricultural and one the mechanical interests of the state, were charged with the specific responsibilities of recommending a site and an experimental farm for the college, preferably in the central portion of the state and easily accessible by ordinary means of travel and communication. They were also charged with the duty of preparing a detailed plan for the building and organization of the college. A full report from both Commissions to the governor and legislature was due the first of December. 129

Perhaps anticipating quick approval, several memorials from existing colleges appeared on both the House and Senate floors during the same session. On February 21st, March 3rd, and March 14th, several hundred citizens from Columbiana county petitioned the House praying that the congressional grant be divided and applied to Mount Union and two or more existing colleges. 130 The lower house also heard yet another memorial on March 10th from the
presidents of the board of trustees and institute of Heidelberg College requesting a share of the grant.\textsuperscript{131} The week before, Senator Lang had presented a memorial to the upper chamber from the faculty and trustees.\textsuperscript{132} Other factions with a potentially vested interest in the Morrill funds, however, adopted a wait-and-see attitude.

After considerable debate and the addition of several amendments, the Delano bill cleared the lower house by a vote of 66-6.\textsuperscript{133} The measure, now titled 'A bill to Provide for the Sale of Land Scrip and Other Purposes' then moved to the Senate for quick approval.\textsuperscript{134}

As with all pieces of legislation of this magnitude, it managed to arouse its fair share of critics. Especially vehement in its opposition was a strong 'Minority Report' issued by the Senate's Select Committee on the Agricultural College. Two striking, eventually prophetic, criticisms centered on the prospective agents and price of the land scrip. The report, first, remonstrated against the use of county auditors and treasurers as agents, believing that officers of the local agricultural societies would have approached the task with more vigor and enthusiasm. Moreover, the bill, as it was now worded, mandated no fixed minimum sale price as a precautionary measure should the market fail to support the prescribed price of $1.25 per acre. Given the current market conditions and disinterested attitudes of
county agents, the 'Report' predicted disastrous results for the project. 135

In spite of the forebodings, Governor Brough wasted little time in signing and implementing the measure on April 13th. On the same day the measure was signed into law, nominations for the Agricultural College Commission, its composition now revised upward from three to five members, were rushed to the Ohio Senate. Nominated to represent the agricultural interests of the state were David Taylor of Franklin county and Darvin E. Gardner of Lucas county; the mechanical interests, Miles Greenwood and Peter Thatcher of Hamilton and Cuyahoga counties, respectively; and, the military interests, Colonel Christian T. Poorman of Belmont county. All were eventually confirmed by the upper house. 136

Overwhelming legislative approval of the measure, its swift and enthusiastic endorsement by the governor, and the appointment of a select commission to locate the college buoyed the spirits of most of the competing elements in the fray. But their enthusiasm waned within eight months. The 'Senate's Select Committee on the Agricultural College' prediction regarding the sale of the land scrip had been borne out; the sale had fallen miserably short of all expectations. And this even though the Land Scrip Commissioners heeded a State Board of Agriculture resolution which allowed for the downward adjustment of the price of the parcels to eighty cents per acre. But as it turned out, even this figure was too high. Thus, the 'Report' of the Land Scrip Commission sent to
Governor Anderson on 20 December 1865 revealed a bid for only 18,400 acres with only 11,360 accepted, netting only $9,094.40. The reason for the retarded, if not feeble, results is revealed in the body of the Commissioner's 'Report':

Soon after advertising for proposals, we ascertained the other states were selling their scrip for a less price per acre than the minimum fixed [80 cents] as the price for ours. We corresponded with several commissioners of the eastern states to try and adopt a uniform price of 80¢ per acre. But this was not successful. As is usually the case with mere voluntary arrangements, but little attention was paid to this understanding, and those States that did not sell directly at lower rates than eighty cents per acre, placed their scrip in the hands of brokers and other agents, allowing a commission of 5% and 10%, and so forestalled the market. Some, too, have sold in large quantities to responsible parties, for part cash in hand and the remainder on time, with interest, while we were so restricted in our mode of operations as to confine us to simple advertisement, and the acceptance of such bids as might be made at the 80¢ per acre, or more. Several of the States have sold the entire amount of their scrip and realized a handsome sum for it, while we have been able to accomplish comparatively little in that direction. If agents are required to dispose of property in the open market, they must have powers commensurate with those conferred upon others having like property for sale in the same market, or they must necessarily act under great disadvantages, and usually sustain defeat. It is believed that without greater power conferred upon the Commissioners, the scrip of Ohio will not all be sold in less than 10 years.137

The scope of the 'Act' under discussion also called for the selection of a worthy beneficiary(ies) as well as a detailed plan for the organization of the college. The Agricultural College Commission's efforts in the former area culminated in two 'Reports' addressed to the new governor, Charles Anderson. After reviewing liberal propositions from Mount Union College, Farmers'
College, Miami University, the village of Kent, and the citizens of Worthington, four of the five members of the commission issued a 'Majority Report' adjudging that Miami University seemed best suited to fulfill the obligations stipulated in the Act.\textsuperscript{138} It specifically recommended that one-half of the proceeds generated from the sale of the land scrip be immediately appropriated to a newly reorganized Miami University, with the remainder being earmarked for the endorsement of a college in the northern portion of the state. A 'Minority Report' submitted by Commissioner Greenwood advocated Farmer's College as the best choice.\textsuperscript{139}

The commissioners who supported the 'Majority Report', though considering themselves unqualified for the task, nevertheless, forged ahead and made a number of curricular recommendations as well. The new colleges, they said, should include a four year course of study with an honors program and diploma similar, if not equivalent, to other areas of professional study. A series of agricultural and mechanical lectures not available at traditional colleges would be open to students from around the state, as well as for inquiring farmers and mechanics. Finally, it recommended the faculty be organized as follows: President, teaching Rhetoric, Mental and Moral Philosophy, and Constitutional Law; Professors of Agriculture, with Botany; Mechanics, with Natural Philosophy, Geology and Mineralogy; Commerce, with Accounts, Penmanship and Laws of Trade; Mathematics, Surveying and Military
Tactics; Languages; Chemistry and Agricultural Chemistry; Comparative Anatomy, Physiology and Veterinary Art.  

The 'Majority Report' of the Agricultural College Commission and other open ended features of 'the Agricultural College Question' consumed a fair portion of Governor Charles Anderson's Annual Message to the legislature in January 1866. He generally concurred with the views and recommendations of the 'Majority Report', but also alluded to some personal views on the entire matter; views which contrasted sharply with those of his predecessor.

On the nature of the curriculum, Governor Anderson, himself a graduate and former trustee of Miami University, supported a broader, scientific course of instruction. Investigation and discovery, he argued, precedes all fruitful and practical results. Otherwise, agriculture would, once again, be relegated to the fate of the gods. Put succinctly:

... the foundations, out of which the true science and art of agriculture (that kind of agriculture we are discussing), must arise, are so many and deep, that merely special education, without a very general scholarship below it, can never attain to it. And, whenever it is determined to give the agriculturalist a collegiate education, it can only be to the few--it can only be scientific--and, finally, it must ascend from the general to special instructions.  

On the related question of manual labor in the proposed college, the Governor maintained:

... that there is no use in either colleges or schools to teach the mere manual dexterities of Agriculture--as ploughing, hoeing, spading, chopping, and the rest--but
it is the intelligence of the principle to be worked at and wrought out, which this education is to impart. As much manual labor at least, must be maintained, as will serve definitely and familiarly, to exemplify, illustrate and put into visible practice, with its results, the scientific truth, new or old, upon which they must rest.\textsuperscript{142}

The last feature of the 'Agricultural College Question' raised by Anderson centered on the sale of the land scrip. Its current disposition had undoubtedly created an atmosphere of pessimism. What to do. Various suggestions had been made to him, especially that of devising a plan to sell the scrip in larger blocs rather than to individual purchasers. To date, however, neither this nor any other recommendations had yielded any concrete results. And so, the governor commended this particularly vexatious problem to the consideration of the legislature.\textsuperscript{143}

The General Assembly reviewed and resolved many of the issues raised by the Commissioners' Reports and subsequent gubernatorial questions. Its first action, the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution No. 13 ordered the printing of one thousand copies of both the 'Majority' and 'Minority' Reports together with the Report of the Land Scrip Commissioners, as specified in the Act of April 13, 1865.\textsuperscript{144}

Perhaps anticipating further developments on the 'Agricultural College Question', and this in spite of the recommendations of the 'Majority Report', House Joint Resolution No. 12 quickly gained the approval of the legislature. It prescribed:

\ldots that all petitions, memorials, messages, reports, and papers relating to the disposal of the Congressional
Land Grant, and the establishment of one or more agricultural and mechanical college or colleges, be referred to a select committee of one [member] from each Congressional District, and this committee shall be known as the 'Agricultural College Committee.' 145

At least part of the reluctance of many legislators to accept the terms of the 'Majority Report', no doubt, stemmed from the organized agricultural community's insistence that the fund not be divided. Both the State Agricultural Convention and its official mouthpiece, the State Board of Agriculture, officially endorsed the one-college position during their meeting of the previous year. They did so again in 1866, but this time with the additional proviso that it be located at some point accessible from all parts of the state. 146

Shortly thereafter, and perhaps not coincidentally, Senator Willard Warner from the Senate Committee on Agriculture introduced Senate Joint Resolution No. 31 which called for the establishment of a single college, centrally located [emphasis added], and easy of access. 147 Though it failed to gain the approval of the House, its inclusion in both the Senate and House agendas was, undoubtedly, responsible for the increased excitement and activity of many central Ohio communities.

At a January 1866 meeting in the Agricultural rooms of the State House, for example, citizens of Worthington and Columbus sought to devise a strategy which would secure the agricultural college for Worthington. As reported in The Ohio State Journal the following month, the Worthington proposition consisted of the
buildings and grounds of both the Episcopal and Worthington Female Colleges, the Kilbourn House, and an adjoining farm of over 100 acres, with another forty acres available on reasonable terms. All told, the small community was prepared to offer property valued at slightly over $70,000, as well as an additional subscription of $10,000. But even then, all knew this proposition paled in comparison to the lucrative offer extended by Miami University. Accordingly, another resolution committing the citizens of Columbus to raise an additional $100,000 was unanimously adopted.148

Two weeks later, the Journal also reported a large gathering of citizens at Westerville. A committee of five, recently appointed to solicit subscriptions, reported that it had already collected somewhere between forty and fifty thousand dollars, with the fair prospect of raising an additional like amount. Like its neighborhood counterpart, it, too, hoped to solicit additional funds from the citizens of Columbus. Members of the committee also claimed other advantages for the Westerville location including: a central location, only twelve miles north of Columbus; accessibility, a good turnpike to the capital city, and only three miles from the Cleveland and Columbus Railroad; an elevated and healthy terrain; energetic and thrifty citizens; the prohibition of alcoholic beverages; the seat of Otterbein University; and, three churches serving the community. 149
Indeed, the communities of Worthington and Westerville acted as if they were the only competitors for the agricultural college, or at least the front runners. In the 19 February 1866 edition of The Ohio State Journal, an ardent Worthington supporter claimed that in almost every essential point, especially in regard to bona fide offers rather than mere expectations, the Worthington proposition was superior to that of her neighbor's.\textsuperscript{150} Three days later the Journal reported that Westerville had upped the ante considerably and now included an additional two hundred acres of land containing two useful buildings, and a bona fide subscription of fifty thousand dollars, forty more than her central Ohio rival.\textsuperscript{151}

In the same edition of the Journal, a Worthington supporter identified as 'Sharon' offered a nostalgic history of the area as further evidence of the community's worthiness in securing the location of the proposed agricultural college.\textsuperscript{152} Little more than a week later, 'Coticus', a supporter of the Westerville cause, sardonically chides the "romantic" arguments proferred by 'Sharon', depicting Worthington as a still-born community bereft of little, if any, economic or cultural progress during its sixty-year existence.\textsuperscript{153}

Beyond the war of words wielded by Worthington and Westerville, yet another proposition came before the House Agricultural College Committee, but this time from Licking county. The citizens of Newark proposed to contribute approximately one hundred and seventy-five acres, a farm house, and other assorted buildings
to secure the agricultural college site. The citizens' committee also showcased the adjacent county fairgrounds which could host any number of activities mutually beneficial to both the college and the community.  

Shortly after reviewing a number of other propositions, the Agricultural College Committee accepted invitations from the 'big three' to visit their respective communities. The subsequent gatherings at both Worthington and Newark proved to be more of a social affair, than a fact-finding mission. Replete with lavish dinners, fine brass bands, flowery speeches, and other merriments, the Committee must really have labored to reach an objective evaluation. Westerville, on the other hand, avoided the "scrutiny." In a communication received by the Journal on 7 March 1866 and printed in the following day's issue, the Westerville committee withdrew its proposition "... in order that our citizens [of Franklin county] may have an opportunity unimpaired [sic] to unite amicably upon a location that will secure general harmony." Given the verbal acrimony of previous weeks, one can only conjecture as to the reason for the sudden display of public comradery between the two Franklin county communities. Even with the withdrawal, the House Agricultural College Committee made no firm commitment to either of the remaining contestants. Thus, the door remained open, and soon enough others would rush through.

Another responsibility of the House Agricultural College Committee was to review all pending legislation related to the
college question. One such measure, House Bill No. 174, sought to bolster the efforts of the Land Scrip Commissioners, and was enthusiastically endorsed by members of both houses. Its swift passage was due in large measure to the meager returns of the previous year.157 Heeding the advice of the commissioners in the 'Report' of 1865, the new legislation provided expanded powers in order to promote the efficient sale of the remaining scrip. It empowered the commission to sell the scrip at the best possible price, to employ a suitable person or persons (i.e., land agents) to aid them in the sale, and to pay such person or persons such commissions as they might deem adequate in order to secure prompt and vigorous results. Moreover, authorization was given to sell the scrip on terms and for as little as one-fourth down with the remainder due in two, four, or six years, and with interest.158

The new mechanism produced the desired results, though many would later question the propriety of the commissioners' efforts. Filed at the State Auditor's office on 10 December 1866, the second 'Report' of the Land Scrip Commission now lay open to both legislative and public scrutiny. The 'Report' first summarized the poor results of the previous year's sale and the subsequent rejuvenation generated by the passage of the law of 5 April 1866. The rest of the document specifically detailed the results and rationale of the sale of the remaining scrip.

The commissioners, acting under new discretionery powers granted by the new legislation, opted for a new graduated pricing
structure from 80 cents per acre for single lots, to 75 cents for plots ranging from 10,000 acres and up, and 70 cents for 50,000 acre blocs. Even though the new pricing structure was advertised in nearly thirty newspapers throughout the state, sales continued to languish owing in large measure to other states selling their scrip for around 50 cents per acre. After full consultation with Governor Anderson, the commission then determined to put the rest of the scrip up for bid at similarly competitive rates. This strategy catapulted the sale to completion with all but 400,000 acres paid in cash. The 'Report' tallied the final results: 2,937 pieces of scrip for 629,920 acres yielding a total revenue of $340,894.40, or an average of just slightly above 54 cents per acre. Summarizing and perhaps anticipating certain criticism, the 'Report' concluded:

... this state will realize more per acre for her scrip than any other state, except New York and Rhode Island, so far as sales have been made; that we have acted accordingly to our deliberate judgment, for the best interests of the State, and hope our proceedings may meet the approbation of those for whom we have acted.159

For some, perhaps, but not all.

Yet another important piece of legislation passed both legislative houses in the Spring 1866. Senate Bill No. 157, 'An Act Relative To The Establishment of an Agricultural and Mechanical College' was introduced by J. Twing Brooks of Columbiana county. Perhaps not content with the work of the five-man Agricultural College Commission established under the Delano law and ever
mindful of the five-year deadline for establishing the new college, this prudent, if not urgent, statute provided for a college board of trustees consisting of the governor (ex officio), the president of the Ohio State Board of Agriculture (ex officio), and five other persons representing the interests of all the industrial classes. Its primary duties would be to receive, evaluate, and make recommendations regarding any proposals relating to the location of the agricultural and mechanical arts college. Given the composition of its membership, almost anything preferred by the State Board of Agriculture would have undoubtedly been approved by the trustees, and, eventually the General Assembly at large. But other political machinations effectively blunted any quick, one-sided effort to resolve the college problem.\footnote{160}

The most important of these passed the U.S. Congress on 23 July 1866. The new legislation extended to new applicants the time for acceptance of the land grant to three years from the passage of this legislation, and the establishment of the college(s) to five years after filing for acceptance in the General Land Office. Moreover, and very important to the current situation in Ohio, any state which had already accepted the provisions of the Morrill Act would have an additional five years beyond the original stipulation (i.e., five years) to provide a college.\footnote{161} The unexpected extension relieved the tension surrounding the problem of having to hurriedly establish a new college, and guaranteed yet another period of prolonged debate on the issue. To
some observers, however, Ohio's solicitousness on this matter bordered on irresponsible lassitude.

Solicitousness or lassitude, notwithstanding, the year 1867 produced a fair amount of discussion and activity on the agricultural college issue. The state's new chief executive, Jacob D. Cox, reviewed the previous year's activity in his Annual Message to the General Assembly. His descriptive, rather than prescriptive, communication centered on the work of the Land Scrip Commissioners and concomitant vigorous defense of their efforts to dispose of the scrip, the failed attempt to locate the college in either Franklin or Licking county, and a personal recommendation for early and final action on the issue.¹⁶²

Early and final action on the matter is exactly what the organized agricultural community opted for in their annual meeting, and in a manner familiar to the majority of solons in the legislature. President Daniel McMillan's address to the 1867 Agricultural Convention, once again, reiterated the call for the establishment of one college predicting that:

... a very few years will suffice to demonstrate that the establishment of more than one at the commencement will prove to have been a mistake, at the least, but the agricultural public is prepared for one, and will sustain that one.¹⁶³

McMillan's views were echoed in a report from the convention's Committee on Business, and was unanimously adopted by the Convention.¹⁶⁴
Resolutions or recommendations, notwithstanding, legislative activity on the 'Agricultural College Question' continued to be both prolonged and perplexing—a sure sign that those who sought a division of the fund had not yet given up hope. The Ohio Senate, for example, received yet another memorial from Miami University.\textsuperscript{165}

On the other side of the aisle, a 10 January 1867 resolution offered by Mr. Lockwood turned into a logrolling exercise of exasperating proportions. The original resolution read:

\begin{quote}
Resolved, That the committee on Agriculture are instructed to prepare a bill providing for the distribution of the Agricultural College Fund equally between the Miami University at Oxford, the Ohio University at Athens, and the Western Reserve College at Hudson on condition that said institutions comply with the requisition of Congress in relation to that fund.\textsuperscript{166}
\end{quote}

Immediately, Mr. Boynton moved to amend the resolution by inserting Oberlin; Mr. Schneider, Mt. Union College; and finally, Mr. Banning, Kenyon College.\textsuperscript{167}

Two weeks later Representative Asa W. Coan introduced a resolution instructing the House Committee on Agriculture to report a bill appropriating the proceeds of the sale of the agricultural college land scrip to the establishment of an agricultural department in one of the existing colleges of the state. Although Coan clearly had in mind Antioch College at Yellow Springs, any institution (though not many could) which met the following conditions could opt for the grant: suitable buildings valued at no less than one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, accommodations for at least twelve hundred students, one hundred acres of arable
land, and a minimum endowment of one hundred thousand dollars. Indeed, division of the grant had, once again, become a viable option.

But not without opposition. The same legislative session also received a number of petitions either remonstrating against the division of the agricultural fund or calling for the establishment of a single institution. Indeed, political pressure from the agricultural community at-large had intensified, and with the distinct advantage of its official mouthpiece being located in the capital city.

Political pressures and divided opinions precluded the passage of any terminal legislation on the matter, at least during this session of the legislature. Senate Bill No. 358, 'To Establish the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College', bore out this supposition, it failing to gain the support of the House. Other legislation, though faring no better than the Senate measure, anticipated problems which would ultimately have to be resolved before any permanent solution could be reached. One such effort stemmed from the frugal returns garnered from the sale of the land scrip, which, if invested at 6 percent, would yield little more than twenty thousand dollars per year. Many believed additional funds would be necessary if, indeed, a new college was to be established. Thus legislation like House Bill No. 289, authorizing the commissioners of Franklin county to subscribe, through a local tax levy, one-hundred thousand dollars for the
location of the college, surfaced repeatedly, though prematurely. Nevertheless, early legislation similar to this one indicated a willingness on the part of the General Assembly to explore alternate methods of financing the project.\textsuperscript{170}

The 'Agricultural College Question' also exacted continued coverage in the pages of the state's public newspapers during the year. And, as before, their scope focused primarily on both the descriptive and prescriptive components of the problem. From reprinting the Governor's remarks in his Annual Address, to the minutes of the January Agricultural Convention, to Senator Willard Warner's analyses on important legislation, the press continued to fulfill its informational function.\textsuperscript{171} Likewise, continued and more refined articles on the pros and cons of dividing the fund appeared in many of the major newspapers across the state. A sampling follows.

A 15 January 1865 editorial in the \textit{Cleveland Daily Leader} vigorously opposed the establishment of a separate college, and, it argued, for two very good reasons. First, it opposed the creation of a separate institution on the grounds that agricultural colleges, pure and simple, are proven to be failures in their very nature. There simply was not enough material in the science of agriculture, at least in those branches of popular and practical use, to make up a college course. In the editor's opinion, all of the science to be learned relating to agricultural application could be accomplished in six months. Special, that
is, narrowly exclusive education, is not what is demanded. What
is so desperately needed is an increase of popular education
throughout the state for all classes. And this, at least in the
opinion of the editor, can be more effectively accomplished by
dividing the fund among existing colleges across the state.172

Secondly, the fund was entirely inadequate to finance a sepa-
rate college. Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars was
scarcely enough to construct the buildings of a college, to say
nothing of the additional expense for the competent faculty,
extensive libraries, and necessary apparatus. The editor con-
ccludes that:

The infallible result would be either that the proposed
college would be a sickly, consumptive affair, of fifth-
rate standing, which would die out as soon as it had
expended the appropriation, and would be so weak and
unworthy while it did live, that everyone would be glad
to have it die, or that it would be a constant expense to
the State, adding sensibly to the already too-great bur-
den of taxation under which the monetary interests of the
country are staggering.173

On the other hand, contrasting articles like 'The Agricultural
Elephant' printed in the 1 February 1867 edition of The Ohio State
Journal pointedly opposed the principle of division. The fol-
lowing is a rather lengthy but cleverly written analogy penned by
the author of the article, 'Olentangy':

Notwithstanding his gigantic proportions, this ani-
mal so far from offering to harm any members of our
Legislature, has permitted them to freely approach him,
canvas his merits and demerits from every point of view,
and even to ride upon his back, but being unwilling to
use this animal as nature and the Congress of the United
States intended he should be used, are now actually
trying to make the poor fellow stand upon his head, or submit to being drawn and quartered, to see if, per chance, he can't be made more useful in that unusual and extraordinary posture, or benefit the people more by giving a piece of him to each of the colleges of the State. So docile and desirous of benefitting our people is this quadruped and so completely is he in the power of the members of the Legislature, that it is much to be feared that he will be compelled to submit, to being placed in some unnatural position where his powers for usefulness, as a public servant, will be very much impaired, or that he will be actually slaughtered—though unwittingly—by those who have him in charge.

This animal has thousands of friends throughout the State, who will never consent that his life shall be taken and his body parted to different sections of the State, but unfortunately many of them are unaware of the great danger which now threatens him, and many more are, under the peculiar circumstances, powerless to save. The farmers and mechanics of Ohio for whose benefit this elephant was presented to the State, would respectfully represent that it is imprudent and unwise to kill the goose in the hope of getting an immediate and bountiful supply of golden eggs, and would implore the Legislature to spare the life of this animal—keep all his parts together—use him as contemplated by the act of Congress, and they believe that untold blessings will result to the youths of the great State of Ohio.¹⁷⁴

The heightened bewilderment of the year 1867 gradually subsided during the first few months of the following year. The measured words of Governor Jacob D. Cox in his Annual Message to the legislature certainly played no small role in lending a tranquil perspective to the 'Agricultural College Question'. Rather than carping away at the legislature's seemingly impotent handling of the entire affair, the Governor, instead, blamed the delay on the protracted sale of the land scrip. But, he quickly added, the sale now complete and the money (i.e., $340,894.40) in the Treasury, the time had come when something should be done, and concluded his message with both a summary and a charge:
The Executive messages, reports of commissions, and investigating boards, laid before your predecessors in office, contain full discussion of the various schemes for its application, and the people of the state will look to your wisdom to make the fund available as soon as possible to the classes of our youth and the industrial interests it was intended to benefit. 175

The agricultural community's official position on the matter, however, did not deviate one iota, and, as in past years, found expression in both a major speech and adoption of yet another formal resolution. The gathering of the Twenty-Third Annual Agricultural Convention heard its President, Daniel McMillan, Jr., once again, speak on the topic of the problems of the agriculturist and how the establishment of a separate college would alleviate, if not eliminate, the majority of them. But it first must be born! And unlike the more placid strategy of the Governor, McMillan opted for a forceful impregnation of admonition and reproachment as a means to move the seemingly infertile issue through the legislature.

Regardless of all that has been said and done by the friends of this measure, the august wisdom of our State Legislature has as yet found no better disposition to make of Ohio's College fund than to lock it up in the vaults of our State Treasury, doubtless in the hope that when an account of their stewardship shall be called for, they may return us our own "with usury."

Thus, by the tardiness of our representatives, together with the antagonism of personal and local interests, our State which should have been the first to move in this matter, occupies to-day a humiliating position in the back ground of those which, by commendable action, have outranked us, although some of these are but in their infancy.

As parties directly interested, the members of this convention certainly possess the right of petitioning for
that which is peculiarly their own—and failing to receive this we demand that our preference, at least, shall be respected.

Surely the tithes which for years we have paid as our proportion of Ohio's revenues, entitle us to something in return, and having designated that to which we would have these applied, it is but justice that our wishes be granted.176

The something, at least for the members of the agricultural convention, was not a new thing. After a brief discussion, its members adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the agricultural and mechanical interests of Ohio demand [emphasis added] an early adjustment of the questions pertaining to the establishment of an Agricultural College in this State, in conformity with the act of Congress making the grant of lands for that purpose. The scrip for the lands granted having been sold, and the proceeds realized as we learn more than a year ago. This Convention again declares as it has at its sessions in each of the years 1865, 1866, and again in 1867, its judgment in favor of one college and opposed to the division of the funds.177

Though their tactics differed, both the Governor and members of the Agricultural Convention did, indeed, agree that something must be done now that the land scrip had been sold. The legislature concurred, and subsequently approved House Joint Resolution No. 45, 'To provide for taking immediate steps to agree upon the location of the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, and for the appointment of a joint committee on the subject.' The committee, comprised of eight members of the House and four from the Senate, was authorized to receive, examine, and recommend prospective proposals with regards to a site for the location of the agricultural college and experimental farm.178
But would the establishment of yet another committee serve to mitigate or exacerbate the problem? How many communities would vie for the federal endowment? Would any of them, in fact, be adjudged sufficient for the task? Would the committee's final report be of unanimous consent, and would it acquiesce in the principle of division or consolidation? If not unanimity, would either the majority or minority report(s) subsequently gain the approbation of the entire General Assembly? Indeed, was a solution to the agricultural college question close at hand? Only time would tell.

After only a six month recess, the Adjourned Session of the Fifty-Eighth Ohio General Assembly reconvened its proceedings and did, indeed, address itself to the many questions raised at its Regular Session. The Joint Committee established relative to the location of the agricultural and mechanical college received a number of generous propositions from Worthington, Wooster, Oxford, Urbana, London, and Newark. All claimed special advantages for their location. Regardless, only one found favor with the majority of committee members, and their subsequent report to the legislature revealed their rationale.

The 'Majority Report' concluded that it would be in the best interests of the State to locate the college at Urbana, Champaign county, and chiefly for the following reasons. First, the area's distinct varieties of soils, common to a large majority of counties in the state, allowed for more meaningful experimentation.
Secondly, the city of Urbana being located upon three principal railway routes offered convenient access to both people and industry. Urbana's healthful location and enterprising people were also significant factors in the selection process. But the most overriding consideration of all was the community's generous donation of $120,000 in lands and property which included a building capable of accommodating three hundred students and located on a six acre tract, a four hundred acre farm with an extensive brick barn, two dwelling houses, granaries, and the like, and generous cash contributions from various railway companies. A munificent proposal, indeed.

And yet, the liberality of the Urbana proposition did not evince a unanimity of support amongst the committee members. Two minority reports offered alternative solutions. The first, submitted by Senator William Lawrence, proposed that the General Assembly should accept the proposition submitted by the Board of Trustees of the University of Wooster. The second report, offered by Assemblyman Josiah Thompson, opted for a reactionary solution to the 'Agricultural College Question'. Both the solution and the frustration of the whole affair is captured in Thompson's original resolution to the legislature;

WHEREAS, The Congress of the United States had donated to the State of Ohio a large amount of land for the purpose of establishing an Agricultural and Mechanical College, upon condition that the trust should be accepted and the State become the trustee of the same; and
WHEREAS, said land has been sold, and only the sum of three hundred and forty-two thousand four hundred and fifty dollars and eighty cents has been realized therefrom; which sum is now in the State Treasury; and

WHEREAS, the said fund is entirely too small to sufficiently endow such an institution, and as no considerable portion of said fund can be used in the erection of suitable buildings, large sums of money must be drawn from the State Treasury to erect said buildings, after which annual demands will be made on the same to meet the current expenses of said institution. It is therefore deemed inexpedient to establish an Agricultural and Mechanical College; and as the best means of disposing said fund, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives be requested to use their influence to have the grant of said agricultural and mechanical college fund so modified as to authorize the Legislature of the State of Ohio to transfer said fund to the irreducible debt of the State, and the State be required to pay annually into the public school fund of the State the interest on said fund at the rate of six percent per annum, to be paid to the several counties of the State as the common school fund is now paid.

Resolved, That the Governor of the State be requested to forward a copy of the above preamble and resolution to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress. 181

Each of the reports found sponsorship in the upper chamber of the General Assembly. On 1 February 1869, Senator Golden offered for adoption Senate Joint Resolution No. 75 which sought to legitimatize the Thompson resolution. It failed. 182 Senator Lawrence opted to advance the Wooster proposition himself by introducing Senate Bill No. 329. Within a week parallel legislation (i.e., Senate Bill No. 324) was introduced under the exact same title, 'To Establish, locate and maintain an agricultural and mechanical college in Ohio.' But here is where the similarities
end. Legislative titling, at least in this case, was extremely misleading.

Senator J. Warren Kiefer, author of the Select Committee's 'Majority Report' introduced Senate Bill No. 324 which promoted the proposition put forward by Urbana. Though neither Senate Bill No. 324 nor Senate Bill No. 339 gained the approval of both Houses, Kiefer's bill did enjoy a longer life. After managing to elude the obstructing efforts of Senator Lawrence, Kiefer's bill made its way to the House. But here it ran into even greater impediments, namely the logrolling tactics of a number of representatives. After the House Committee on Agriculture reported the bill back without recommendation, Representative Callen moved that the bill be amended by striking out the word "Urbana" in Section 12 and changing section 18 to read as follows:

It shall be the duty of the board of trustees to permanently locate said Agricultural and Mechanical College upon such lands as may be selected by them near the town of _______, _______ county, Ohio; provided the sum of _______ dollars heretofore promised by certain citizens of said county shall be paid, or secured to be paid by them or by others for them, to said board; provided further, such lands as may be selected shall not be farther from said town of _______ than three and one-half miles; and provided the cost of said lands shall not exceed the sum of one hundred dollars per acre, and not be less than four hundred acres in quantity; and provided that the owner or owners of said lands so purchased shall convey the said land in fee simple to the State of Ohio, as in this act prescribed. 184

The gates thrown wide open, once again a game of filling in the blanks followed with each participant supporting his (or his associate's) special interests. After voting to strike out Urbana
by a vote of 54-28, a queue of enabing propositions flooded the
House floor yielding the following results: London, Madison
County defeated 42-47; Newark, Licking County, defeated 40-47;
motion to postpone the bill, rejected 21-60; Worthington, Franklin
County, defeated 30-53; Wooster [emphasis added], Wayne County
defeated 37-48; London, Madison County reconsidered, passed 46-42.
With the insertion of $125,000 as the sum "promised by its citi-
zens" and the acreage clause "not exceeding four hundred"
approved, the amended bill passed the House of Representatives by
a 54-39 margin on 5 May 1869. The next day the Senate took up
the matter of the House amended bill, and, after some discussion,
voted it be laid on the table. Senator Kiefer moved it be
taken from the table on the following day, but the motion was
overwhelmingly defeated. The measure had breathed its last, and
with it any hope of resolving the "Agricultural College Question"
during the current legislative session.

The Ohio State Journal continued with both its objective
coverage and subjective impressions of the college debate during
the year 1869. The February 5th edition, for example, detailed
the major points of the legislature's 'Majority Report' recom-
mending Urbana as the site for the new agricultural college. It, on the other hand, also engaged in a bit of local boosterism
whenever the opportunity presented itself. In an "objective"
piece of journalism in its April 13th edition, the Journal fairly
described the details of the Worthington proposition, but then
added that it "... is the only one from Franklin County that has assumed shape, and those most interested should see that it stands before the General Assembly in as fair a light as the proposition from other counties. 189

The parochial, if not self-indulgent, views of the *Journal* were further demonstrated in a rather sardonic editorial in the May 8th edition. After reporting the failed efforts of both houses to agree on a location during the current session, the *Journal*, once again, reveled in the prospects of locating the institution in Franklin County. But should central Ohio's most populous county be unsuccessful in its bid to secure the location of the new college, the editor then deemed it more expedient to divide the fund between six or eight of the state's best colleges. 190

The 'Agricultural College Question' continued to elicit a plethora of opinions from its readers, particularly on the subjects of legislative dilatoriness and what members of the agricultural community should do to move the issue off center. On March 17th a letter from 'College' chided the legislature for the unnecessary, if not irresponsible, delay claiming that twenty one of our sister states, comprising every Northern state except Ohio have located the college(s) required under the grant. 191

Other contributors were more direct in their criticism. A letter from 'A Farmer' in the May 14th edition of the *Journal* chastised the legislature for its retardation, and issued a political call for action on the part of the agricultural community.
After noting that the sale of the land scrip had been completed two or three years hence, 'Farmer' exclaims:

And yet the Legislature with a long session held each year and providing for the levying of taxes and the spending of money for all sorts of projects that interested parties, organized "a lobby" to put through, have, after much discussion and the passage of a few useless resolutions adjourned each of these sessions, without doing anything towards the establishment of this college for the productive classes, though the nation has donated the money for its endowment! How much longer the country people are expected to endure this neglect, this down-right dishonesty in refusing to discharge a plain duty, I do not know.

... If therefore, the money that has been given to the state to provide the means for the "liberal education of the industrial classes," as expressed in the act of Congress is ever to be made available for this purpose, it is plain that these classes must organize and fight for it. The Legislature of this great agricultural state, will do nothing for us--will not even allow us the use of our own money--without the pressure of an organized lobby!192

Political action on the part of the agricultural community was an idea enthusiastically seconded by 'Planter' in his letter to the editor printed in the May 26th edition. He specifically supported the action of putting one or more farmers on the state ticket, or, at least, organizing a privately funded lobbying group on their behalf. Commenting on the propriety of both, he explains:

It is quite true that agriculturists have not been persistent applicants for office, like some other classes; and it is equally true that they fill but few of the offices, of either honor, profit or trust, in the country. This is no doubt well for the particular agriculturist who might have been called on to fill the office; but is it better, or even as well for the state? Is it well to degrade a pursuit so indispensable and important in Ohio, as agriculture, by almost wholly
ignoring the agriculturist in the distribution of the offices? It should be borne in mind that it is not a weak, lean, minority that has been standing back and not pressing its claims to a respectful recognition, but that there is a power behind the throne, &c. When the majority sees proper, it will doubtless be represented; and who would object?  

And finally, in a November 23rd letter to the editor from someone signing himself 'Head Waters of the Scioto', a dual message of hope and despair for the agricultural community. After congratulating the legislature on its most recent approval of a Geological Survey for the state, he quickly countered that:

... this does not atone for its almost criminal neglect of the greatest of all the wants and demands of the industrial and peaceful inhabitants of our commonwealth, namely, the establishment of an Agricultural College. 'Scioto' hoped that his Excellency, Governor Hayes, would call the attention of the new legislature to this most important work in his annual address. He would.

Hayes' message to the Fifty-Ninth General Assembly clearly sought to expedite the establishment of the agricultural and mechanical arts college. With the sale of the land scrip completed and the proceeds in the treasury now estimated at somewhat over $400,000 the Governor impelled the Legislature to action with these words:

The manner in which this fund shall be disposed of has been amply considered by preceding General Assemblies, and in the messages of my predecessors in the Executive office. I respectfully urge that such action be had as will render this fund available for the important purposes for which it was granted. It is not probable that further delay will furnish additional information on any of the important questions involved in
its disposition. Much time and attention has been given to the subject of the location of the College. No doubt it will be of great benefit to the county in which it shall be established, but the main object of desire with the people of the State can be substantially accomplished at any one of the places which have been prominently named as the site of the College. I therefore trust that the friends of education will not allow differences upon a question of comparatively small importance to the people at large longer to postpone the establishment of the institution in compliance with the obligation of the State.196

The growing concern, if not impatience, of the Governor mirrored the temperaments of many members of the agricultural community. Many of their criticisms surfaced at the 1870 gathering of the Agricultural Convention, with most of them being levelled at the legislature.197 W. D. Hill of Defiance, for example, lambasted the previous General Assembly for failing to locate the college and offers his rationale for the travesty:

There were, as I before remarked, at least eight or ten propositions made in different localities, in wealthy communities. All of them wanted it—were all ambitious to get it for the local advantages which would accrue to them. What was the result? Wine parties, fat dinners and excursion parties and all that sort of things were gotten up, and the committee of the Legislature were kept running all over the State, not only during the session but during the vacation also, drinking and feasting with the people. And I don't know but that the same kind of thing will be tried again. I don't object to these things in their proper place and at proper times but when men are taken all over the State, and wined and dined in this way, they will have to be smarter men then are generally sent to this General Assembly if they can make up their mind on this or any other question.198

To be sure, the public press closely monitored the activities of the legislature, and also continued to air a variety of viewpoints on the proper distribution of the land grant funds.
Proponents of the principle of division continued to rehash, and, in some cases, refine their views concerning the use of the agricultural fund. The Zanesville City Times, for example, argued that the fund would be:

... ample enough to support and maintain a course of Scientific Lectures in ten or fifteen colleges distributed all over the State, and thus bring the instruction and the lectures within the reach of not only the farmers' sons, but the farmers themselves—those now practically engaged in farming. Upon this plan immediate results would be derived. We would not need to wait until the next generation to see and enjoy the blessings designed to be bestowed by the Agricultural fund.199

The Cleveland Leader also opted for division. Its February 26th edition not only printed in full W. H. Hudson's 'Minority Report' opposing the principles of House Bill No. 29 (i.e., the bill that eventually became law and established a new, separate agricultural and mechanical arts college), it gave it its hearty endorsement as well. Representative Hudson's 'Report' initially summarized the historical development of the agricultural fund, including an excellent overview regarding the major proposals received by the legislature to date:

Several projects have been suggested in the legislature for the disposition of this fund. It has been proposed, as this bill [i.e., House Bill No. 29] proposes, to devote the fund to the establishment of a new university, agricultural in its character; to give it to some one college, already in existence, on condition that it complies with the terms of the Congressional grant; to divide it between the two State Universities at Oxford and Athens; and to distribute it between some three or four of the leading colleges of the State, conditioned upon the establishment therein of agricultural departments, in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress. The present bill proposes the enforcement of the first of these projects.200
Hudson then proceeds to present his reasons why the establishment of a new and separate agricultural college is unwise. He first questioned the true value of a narrow, practical approach to the education of a farmer, and consequently opted for a more general education which would broaden, rather than restrict, the educational and vocational horizons of the state's agriculturists. This, Hudson argued, could best be accomplished by establishing an agricultural department in one or more of the existing literary colleges in the state. Secondly, and closely related to the first reason, agricultural colleges, standing by themselves, have but in a few instances proved to be successful, and those that have remain only because of a willingness to change to something not exclusively agricultural. In the neighboring state of Michigan, for example, there already was strong sentiment in favor of making its agricultural school a separate department of the University of Michigan. Hudson also railed against the establishment of a model farm for the institution claiming that the experience a farmer could gain on his own farm would far outweigh any advantages accrued at some 'fancy farm'. And finally, the establishment of a new and separate agricultural college would, of necessity, insure additional financial burdens on the state. How else would repairs, extensions, modifications, and further improvements on the institution be made? For these reasons, then, Hudson recommended the indefinite postponement of House Bill No. 29.201
The Leader wholeheartedly concurred. The editors believed the views expressed in the minority report:

... represented the views of by far the larger portion of the state. Northern Ohio, it is certain, sides with the views expressed by the report, and a careful consideration of the question must, we believe, lead to the conclusion it supports. ... We commend the report as an exhaustive, and it seems, invincible argument in favor of the distribution of the fund.202

The Ohio State Journal, in a March 15th editorial, also opposed the creation of a new separate agricultural school. Insufficient funding, contempt upon the cause of liberal education, perilling existing collegiate institutions, the inexpediency of large model farms, and the redundancy of offering courses available in existing colleges, were all factors which prompted the editors to conclude that the most expedient disposition of the four hundred thousand dollar grant lay in dividing the fund and attaching departments of agriculture to four or five of the leading colleges in the state.203

Despite its editorial penchant for apportionment, the Journal also printed a number of letters opposed to the division of the fund, as well as a number of proposals manifesting the principle of consolidation. J. H. Creighton from Athens writes in the January 17th edition:

The idea of putting all this into the keeping of some existing College with two or three additional professorships is to defeat it. From what we have seen we fear that the whole matter will fall into hands that have never had anything to do with agriculture and have no interest in it or love for it, and perhaps do not even believe in such a College. It is time when friends
should speak out. Let the matter go into the hands of its friends and not those that want the funds for other purposes.

How preposterous to put the affair of a medical college into the hands of doctors.

Now unless this whole matter be left to the councils and management of real and practical amateur agriculturists great blunders will be made. 204

John H. Klippart, long-time Corresponding Secretary of the Ohio State Board of Agriculture similarly, but perhaps more caustically, derides the folly of dividing the agricultural fund between existing collegiate institutions. He poignantly asks, if a third of a million dollars were available to educate physicians, lawyers, or clergymen, would the medical community, for example, consent to have money donated for a "Medical and Surgical College" divided between Gambier College and Berea College with the understanding that chairs of medicine and surgery be established in each of them? Or if the money were donated for a law college, would the lawyers of Ohio consent that the fund be divided between the Deaf and Dumb and idiotic asylums with a chair of law in each? They were after all, he argues, state educational institutions. And finally would the theological community acquiesce in the division of the fund for a Theological School between the Reform School at Lancaster and the Girls' Reform School at Sulphur Springs with a class of theology in each of these? These rhetorical questions all were designed to lead to one and only one conclusion:

These are one and all perfectly parallel cases. Congress donated the proceeds of 630,000 acres of land for an
Agricultural and Mechanical College, and it is just as right and proper to divide the fund between Starling Medical College here in Columbus, and the Homeopathic College in Cleveland as it is to divide between Oxford and Athens, and all the thinking farmers in Ohio regard it in this light.  

And in an address delivered before the House of Representa-
tives on the evening of March 1st, and printed in the March 4th edition of the Journal, Klippart openly challenged the assertion that the farmers of Ohio would gain greater benefits by grafting agricultural departments onto existing collegiate institutions. He exclaimed:

Ohio stands confessedly at the head of all the Agricultural States in the Union. I have the figures to prove that area for area, inhabitants for inhabitants, Ohio has more horses, cattle, sheep, wool and swine--more bushels of crops than any other state in the union; and yet, I ask you, honorable members of the Ohio Legislature, what has anyone--nay, what have these Colleges all collectively done for Agriculture in Ohio? Absolutely nothing! Then, are they not all failures from the Agricultural standpoint?  

Judge Thomas C. Jones, one of the state’s most ardent sup-
porters of the principle of consolidation, openly charged the Ohio General Assembly with its clear and immediate duty in the March 9th edition of the Journal:

Gentlemen of the Ohio Legislature! - the industrial classes of your state, to whose benefit this money has been pledged, expect that you, as honorable men, will see to it that it shall not be fraudulently diverted to other objects. The object is, mind you, to secure to such of the sons of the farmers and mechanics of Ohio as desired the benefits of complete mental training, the opportunity of obtaining it in connection with instruction in the principles of their own calling. The fund is large enough to give them a better endowment than any college in the state has. The State must no longer neglect the
great duty it owes to these toiling classes, the producers of all its wealth. If an argument were wanting to prove the necessity of providing the means for the liberal education of these classes, surely it would be unnecessary to do more than point to the unequal content we observe in the discussion of this question. On the other hand, the "learned professions," the colleges and all their friends with all the advantages that learning and eloquence and distinguished positions, can render - while on the other, and in favor of the industrial classes, we have only the plain petitions of the farmers and the mechanics, pointing you to the law, and asking that provision be made by which their sons, too, may "go to college", in as much as the money has been provided to pay for it! Was there ever a plainer case?207

And just one week prior to the enactment of the Cannon legislation, (i.e., House Bill No. 29) the Honorable Ralph Leete proferred yet another one of a seemingly unending queue of proposals regarding 'The Agricultural Question.' In the March 15th edition of the Journal, Leete initially criticized the legislature's current deliberation of establishing a "state farm" and concluded that it would be "... better for the interests of education, that the fund continue at interest, for years to come, then that it should be wasted in the way provided in House Bill No. 29."208 But on the other hand he also opposed dividing the fund between the two "state universities" claiming that Ohio has no state universities, and, that, in fact, both are dominated by the two leading Protestant denominations--the Methodists at Ohio University and the Presbyterians at Miami University.

Neither of these proposals, in Leete's opinion, served the best interests of the industrial classes of Ohio. Claiming that there were no intellects of high order in her numerous colleges,
nor in any manner connected with her educational system. Leete proposed that the state reclaim the revenues of the three townships of university lands established under the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, and, in conjunction with the $409,000 land grant fund now in the treasury, lay the foundations for a great state university to be located at the state capital. His vision for Ohio undoubtedly paralleled those of New York where the seeds of wise stewardship eventually blossomed into a great state university at Ithaca. 209

Though perhaps not exhibiting the august wisdom of the Empire State, the Ohio General Assembly did finally manage to pass enabling legislation which would subsequently give birth to a new and independent agricultural and mechanical arts college. But not without opposition. Proponents of the principle of redistribution or division voiced their claims of legitimacy throughout the 1870 session. Senate Joint Resolution No. 31, for example, sought to, once again, distribute the proceeds of the sale of land scrip into the common school fund. 210 Mr. Dougherty introduced Senate Bill No. 135, 'To establish the University of the State of Ohio', a feeble attempt to seemingly unite the endowments of Miami and Ohio universities with the proceeds of the Morrill fund in order to create one grand state university. 211 Senator Woodbridge presented a petition from the citizens of Ross County favoring the use of the proceeds of the agricultural college fund in connection with the state universities already established (i.e., Ohio and
Miami universities). And just one week prior to the passage of legislation establishing an agricultural and mechanical arts college, Senator Hubbel offered for adoption Senate Joint Resolution No. 45 which instructed Ohio's congressmen to use their influence to procure the passage of a law extending time to the state of Ohio for locating the college until January 1880. Despite the unbridled enthusiasm displayed by their legislative votaries, all of these bills and petitions did not gain the successful approbation of a majority of the legislature.

The House of Representatives, on the other hand, would produce the single most important piece of legislation in almost a decade. On 12 January 1870, the Honorable Reuben P. Cannon introduced House Bill No. 29, 'To establish and maintain an agricultural and mechanical college in Ohio'. Within two months, and after beating back repeated attempts at either outright dismissal or, at least, postponement, the measure reached the upper chamber. Just two weeks later, the measure was signed into law. The Cannon Act and 22 March 1870 have since been regarded as the charter act and official founding date of the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical Arts College, later renamed The Ohio State University.

The provisions of the long-awaited statute are herein detailed. Section One titled the new institution the 'Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College' which would be established in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress passed July 2, 1862. Sections Two thru Six vested the government of said
college in a board of trustees, consisting of one member from each congressional district (i.e., 19 in all), and appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate for a term not to exceed six years. Section Six of the Act specifically empowered the Board to adopt by-laws, rules, and regulations for the government of the college; to elect a president; to determine the number of professors and tutors, elect the same and fix their salaries; to remove any of said faculty from their position for just cause and to prescribe the course of instruction and the extent and character of the experiments to be made. The next nine sections outlined other sundry duties and responsibilities of the Board and other state officials in relationship to the establishment and control of the new college. Section Sixteen prescribed that all of the funds, including the interest now accumulated, hereby be vested in either state or federal bonds. And finally, Section Seventeen empowered the board of trustees to permanently locate the Agricultural and Mechanical College with due consideration of the following factors: it be located upon lands of not less than one hundred acres, it be reasonably central and accessible in its location, and, it, in conjunction, with the other conditions, be determined by the receipt of moneys, lands, or other property donated by any county, town, or individual. Final approval of its location must be sanctioned by no less than three-fifths vote, and accomplished no later than the fifteenth day of October 1870.
If the Cannon Act can be termed foundational in the establishment of the new agricultural and mechanical college, other legislation passed by the Fifty-Ninth General Assembly proved to be ancillary. Senate Bill No. 54, for example, authorized the investment of interest accumulating on the agricultural college fund. It designated the funds received from the sale of the land scrip be made part of the irreducible debt of the state of which 6 percent interest would be paid to directly support the institution. And on the same day the Cannon bill was signed into law, Representative Joy introduced House Bill No. 288 which authorized the several counties of the state to raise money to secure the location of the new Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Reaction from the leading interest groups was predictable.

James W. Ross, newly elected President of the State Board of Agriculture, in his January 1871 address to the State Agricultural Convention revealed:

The successful location of our [emphasis mine] agricultural college the past season after years of strife and combats, will be another reason why this year [1870] will not soon be forgotten .... [and] its successful opening and existence is most certainly an indispensable need to the thrift, success and welfare of the agricultural community; and whatever tends to the development and prosperity of agriculture and the mechanic arts, is a State duty and a national benefit.

Reaction from those favoring division generally mirrored the short but terse editorial statement of The Cleveland Herald:

The Agricultural College Bill has passed the Senate as it came from the House--namely, an independent
college. The fund so far as answering the object intended by Congress, might as well have been cast into Lake Erie or the Ohio River. We make the prophecy that time will prove the College to be a failure, and the fund to have been wasted.219

Commendation or cavil, notwithstanding, provision for the establishment of the agricultural and mechanical arts college had been made. The long-awaited linch pin legislation provided the necessary framework crucial to the development of that institution. Even so, the road to educational nirvana would be gutted with pitfalls as many seemingly imponderable questions remained unresolved. What kind of role would Governor Rutherford B. Hayes and his successors play in the development of the institution? For example, what type of men would Hayes select as trustees? Given the guidelines established in the charter act, where would the trustees ultimately decide to locate the new institution? Would its manifestation incite irreconcilable institutional or regional jealousies? What would the mission (i.e., curricular thrust) of the new institution be, and, once decided, would it be supported by a cross-section of the population throughout the state? And finally, given the projected expenses for increased faculty salaries, upkeep and maintenance, and provisions for expansion, what new sources of income, if any, could be tapped to insure a viable, if not thriving, condition? Indeed the answers to these and other related questions lay in the hands of future trustee members, as well as state lawmakers and executives, and
constitute yet another chapter in the development of what was to become The Ohio State University.
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CHAPTER IV, THE COMPETING FACTIONS

The protracted duration of the fray was due, in large measure, to the multifarious nature of the various competing elements. At first glance one can fairly discern two major pressure groups vying for the federal largesse. On the one hand, there was the agricultural community whose most powerful agency ultimately supported the principle of consolidation, and, thus, the creation of one, new separate agricultural and mechanical arts college, and, on the other hand, a number of colleges in the state which supported the principle of division, and, thus, the superaddition of the new agricultural and mechanical arts colleges or departments onto their existing institutions. But a closer examination of these major interest groups reveals a discordant, if not splintered, approach within each group toward resolving the issue. An analysis of these major and minor factions will, no doubt, enhance our understanding of the decade-long fray, and is a subject to which we now turn.

The Collegiate Competition

The nature and the concomitant problems of Ohio's abundant but unsystematic provision for higher education, undoubtedly, prolonged the debate over the ultimate disbursement of the Morrill
funds during the decade of the 1860's. Both the number and the
type of her collegiate institutions posed unique, if not signific-
ant, problems for the legislature in its attempt to mediate the
fray. Insufficient endowments, dilapidated buildings and equip-
ment, declining student enrollments, especially during the years
of the Civil War, and a general disenchantment with both the pro-
cess and products of the 'system' beset the majority of Ohio's
colleges. Assuredly, then, a potential $400,000 endowment, either
wholly or partially procured enlivened the imagination of even the
most sickly college. Some indeed appeared willing to sell their
'souls' to snatch the rare prize.

Hence the halls and offices of the Ohio statehouse rever-
erated with the sounds of carefully contrived arguments from
lobbyists representing the interests of no less than nine col-
legiate institutions. Whether speaking separately or in concert,
most of their polemics centered on one or another of four salient
arguments. Many institutions based their claims on historical
grounds, loudly affirming tradition either as a strength or as a
weakness, and, in either case, central to a proper disposition of
the grant. Some posited a special political-legal relationship
between themselves and the state, and thus the reality of implicit
obligation to foster and nurture their growth and development. A
third assertion, one which nearly all proclaimed, was primarily
due to the possible broad interpretation of the language in the
federal legislation regarding the mission of the new college, and
was focused on the educational-social objectives already manifest in their inherent institutional objectives and their overt curricular programs. Another factor, although one which put most of the claimants on the defensive, was religion, and, consequently, most of the prospective beneficiaries felt impelled to disavow, or at least to contradict, their denominational heritage or ties. And, of course, many of these several claims were inextricably linked with one another, but sometimes in an adversarial relation.

The collegiate competitors in the fray seemed to cluster into one of three distinct groups. First, the Ohio and Miami Universities, which for decades claimed the title 'state universities,' saw in the grant a means whereby the state could rectify past injustices and elevate them to a position of lasting prominence among the colleges in the state. The claims of both the Farmers' College and Oberlin College centered on their unique attempts to establish, either directly or indirectly, an agricultural college or department before the Morrill legislation became law. And, finally, there were a handful of denominational colleges which, either for traditional or progressive reasons, sought to include an agricultural college at their location.

The Two State Universities: Ohio and Miami. The actions of both Ohio and Miami Universities, either jointly or independently undertaken, represent the most intensive and steadfast effort of any of Ohio's collegiate institutions which sought to gain the agricultural grant. From the time the state of Ohio agreed in
1864 to accept the provisions of the federal statute to less than five months prior to the passage of the Cannon Law in 1870, both institutions, though Miami at one time with more success, sought, at the least, a portion of the munificent grant. Their trustees, presidents, faculties, and alumni all served as loyal lobbyists in the chambers of the state legislature, in the meeting rooms of the State Board of Agriculture, and in the halls of academe. A truly formidable array of strategists awaited the call, poised and confident that their institutions would eventually share in the princely prize.

The first extant evident which suggests the idea of a cooperative effort to acquire the grant appeared in the 26 February 1863 edition of The Athens Messenger. The author, identifying himself simply as 'D', criticized State Auditor Taylor's December 1862 Report, especially the conclusion that the state ought not accept the grant because the potential disadvantages far outweighed the advantages. 'D', on the other hand, argued that if the proceeds from the grant were used wisely, reciprocal advantages to both the state and its institutions would eventually accrue. Specifically, he raises the propriety of dividing at least part of the fund between the two state universities, thereby increasing their endowments and enabling them to be what they were designed to be—namely, first class institutions of higher learning.

'D's' formula for wise stewardship called for the immediate sale of 500,000 of the grant's 630,000 pieces of land scrip. If
sold at a minimum of seventy-five cents per acre, the sale would yield $375,000 which, if invested at a rate of five percent, would yield an additional annual income of $9,375 for each university or more than double that of their current endowments. The remainder of the scrip would be sold at a later date, presumably garnering an even higher yield, and used in accordance with the financial exigencies of the times. Moreover, awarding the grant to the state institutions would actually mitigate the state's financial commitment since many of the professorships, buildings, and other necessary requirements of the agricultural college were already in place. Summing up, he concludes that:

The grant should be and will be accepted by the state; and the only consideration is how to employ it in the best possible manner for the interest of the people, in accordance with the provisions of the law. I cannot for a moment doubt that its employment in connexion with our present State Universities, is indeed the best possible manner of using it.  

Such a premium would have been welcomed at either institution since both suffered from anemic endowments. At Miami, for example, the report of a special five-member committee chaired by John M. Millikin offered a number of alternative methods for increasing the institution's endowment. That it sorely needed additional funds is revealed in the opening lines of the 1863 Report to the Board of Trustees:

It is obvious that the necessities of Miami University, at the present juncture are not only great, but of an urgent character. This institution is, in no particular, what it should be. Aside from the superior advantages of its location, being in the very heart of the most
favored, rich, and populous portion of the West, and the peculiar natural beauty and attractive areas of the particular site, it is lamentably deficient in many important features essential to win the favor and patronage of ambitious students. There is nothing pertaining to the College Buildings, which is not in the most uninviting and unsatisfactory condition. These are not only repulsive in their appearance, but there is not one safe, appropriate, or suitable room for the proper accommodation of either the faculty or students. Everything is either in a dilapidated or disordered state. The Chapel, Library Room - the President's, Secretary's and Professor's rooms - the Laboratory and rooms designed for the use of students, are all utterly unfit for the purpose to which they are appropriated.  

Several options for meeting its financial dilemma were presented. The first proposed by the committee was subscription and from one or all of the following sources: the citizens of Oxford, the alumni, and the public-at-large. Another called for the immediate cessation of activities in all but the preparatory department for a period of years to be fixed by the committee. But the one which engendered the most enthusiasm and support was a resolution introduced by Dr. G. Volney Dorsey which called for the formation of two committees from the respective Boards of the state universities for a joint effort to memorialize the legislature for an equal division of the land grant fund.  

The Board then proceeded to select its members of the landgrant committee. It was an impressive trio with both substantial credentials and influential ties. The first member, G. Volney Dorsey, was a former Ohio Secretary of the Treasury, and an active participant in the state's annual agricultural conventions. Chauncy N. Olds had served in both houses of the General Assembly
and would become State Attorney General in 1865. The third member, John M. Millikin, a trustee for almost a quarter century, was also an avid agriculturalist who would later promote the Miami cause during several sessions of the Agricultural Convention. The three would now wait for the response from their sister institution at Athens.

It came soon and decisively. At a special meeting of the Ohio University Board of Trustees on 28 September 1863, a three-member committee was appointed to act in concert with the committee from Miami University. The union was complete.  

The first of a number of jointly contrived tactics unfolded in 1864 when members of both committees presented a memorial to the Ohio legislature which called for an equal division of the national grant between the two universities. The document, itself, proffered a number of arguments which, during the years of the fray, were repeated often and forcefully.

The first, and in their view the most legitimate argument, centered on their special designation as 'state universities', and with it the implied obligation of continuous and substantial support. Specifically, the memorialists maintained that both Miami and Ohio Universities were:

... the only two seminaries of learning in the State under the peculiar patronage of the State Government. In both these Institutions the Trustees are appointed by the Governor of the State, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and their management and control, as well as the selection of all the members of the
Faculty, being under the direction of the Board of Trustees, they are, to all intents and purposes, regulated by the action of the State, and responsible to the Government thereof. The honor and dignity of the State being thus involved in their well-being, it should endeavor by all means to render them worthy of the great educational interests of the people committed to their care.  

But in the opinion of the memorialists the State of Ohio had done little in promoting their well-being. They charged that the two universities:

... have long since found their endowments wholly insufficient for the extended field of usefulness which they are expected to fill, and this not from any fault of their own, but by the action of the very laws and regulations under which they have been placed by the State; hence, unless this usefulness is entirely to cease or at least become very much circumscribed, some means must be adopted to increase their power of doing good, and enable them to occupy the exalted station as seats of learning to which the name of State universities should entitle them.  

For the trustees of each university, then, it was clear that their current endowments (i.e., $4,000 at Ohio University and $6,000 at Miami University), limited under state statutes, should be increased, and that the most viable, if not justifiable means to accomplish this end were the proceeds to be gained from the sale of the land scrip. And for three paramount reasons.

First, division of the fund between the two state universities complied with many of the provisions of the national statute, including and especially Section Four. More than one college could [emphasis added] be endowed. Both universities already incorporated scientific and classical studies in their curriculums,
and both were willing to attach an agricultural college (department) onto their existing structures. Hence, the plan was not only practical; it was also pedagogically sound. Emphasizing the latter point, the memorialists argued that:

... our State universities, as at present conducted, are really only literary and classical seminaries, devoted exclusively, or very nearly so, to instruction in mere science or literature, independently of its direct application to any of the professions or pursuits of life. To add to them a department in which the 'leading object' shall be to teach any of these branches in such wise as to apply them particularly to law, to medicine, to agriculture, or the mechanic arts, is only to carry out the great end for which, in the beginning, these and all other universities were really founded.¹¹

Secondly, a division of the fund would insure a proper endowment for both institutions. The memorialists speculated that if one-half of the 630,000 acres were sold at seventy-five cents per acre with the remainder sold at one dollar per acre, the total sum, invested at six percent, would yield an additional income of $16,000 for each school. Add this amount to their present incomes and both universities would enjoy permanent endowments of over $20,000—a sum which would render them worthy of the great commission entrusted to them.¹²

And, finally, it was argued that the benefits of attaching agricultural colleges to existing institutions far outweighed those resulting from the creation of new and separate colleges. Buildings already in place, courses already entrenched, and professors already intact, marked but a few of these advantages. Moreover, many of the country's leading states acquiesced in this
principle. Especially noteworthy was the current effort underway in Massachusetts to unite the proceeds from the congressional grant with the agricultural school at Harvard University. President Thomas Hill heartily endorsed the principle of attachment at the Cambridge institution, and argued the same propriety for Ohio in a private letter dated 19 February 1864:

If agricultural colleges founded by such States as Ohio, do not contain or foster Professorships that shall positively advance the pure science on which agricultural science depends, to what source this side of the Atlantic shall we look? Must we forever depend upon Europe, on countries totally differing from ours in soil and climate, for our agricultural science, disseminated in our schools? Or will the great State of Ohio in her central position establish such an agricultural college, that from its successive ranks of graduates, shall at length arise American Liebigs and Boussingaults of our own? 13

In their concluding remarks, the memorialists underscored their belief that the interests of the state, its universities, and its leading enterprise would best be subserved under the proposed plan:

In no way certainly can this be so well effected in our State, as by uniting our agricultural school with those universities now under the protection of the State. The usefulness of these institutions will thus be greatly enlarged, and they will become worthy of the State by which they are founded and cherished; the science of agriculture will be placed on a substantial basis of actual and experimental knowledge, and we venture to declare that the legislature that shall perform this great and truly laudable work for the people of Ohio, will be entitled to their lasting gratitude, and the time of the establishment of our agricultural school will be marked as a most important era in the history of the State. 14

Though the next session of the legislature failed to endorse the joint proposition, optimism remained high at both institutions. Both were determined to redouble their efforts. At its
annual meeting in June 1864, the Ohio University Board of Trustees approved a resolution which called for the formation of a five-man watchdog committee to be present at Columbus during the next legislation session, and whose primary task was to secure a favorable disposition regarding the agricultural college endowment. The measure was overwhelmingly approved by the full Board. A week later, a similar resolution introduced by Dr. Dorsey was approved at Miami. Both committees pledged their mutual support, and the Athens-Oxford alliance was further solidified.

Support for the location of an agricultural college at the State universities also permeated the ranks of their faculties. At Miami, for example, O. N. Stoddard, Professor of Natural Philosophy and Chemistry underscored the theoretical rationale for a broad-based approach to the science of agriculture affirming:

"... that mental discipline cannot be secured except by study in all the great departments of human knowledge; that our curriculum is none too extensive to fit a man for any post; and that none of its subjects are foreign in fact to any laudable occupation. Instruction in one department only, will make, not large-minded men, but quacks. Hence to make an intelligent farmer even by the administration of a little Chemistry, Natural Philosophy and Botany is absurd. Hence an agricultural college will succeed when there lies at its foundation just such a course of study substantially as we have here."

The arguments and strategies of both institutions, however, wielded but negligible influence on the State School Commissioner, E. E. White. His 1864 Annual Report nullified, at least in part, the claims of both universities to the grant. His plan to divide the fund between a new and separate professional school and
three existing collegiate institutions sought to reconcile the language and intent of Section Four in the national statute. Thus, the creation of a professional school would comply with the provision that the 'leading object' of the college shall be the thorough instruction in the areas of the agricultural and mechanical arts; organizing separate departments in three existing colleges would, on the other hand, comply with the 'liberal studies' provision of Section Four. But awarding the grant, either wholly or in part, directly [emphasis added] to existing institutions would not conform to the spirit and letter of the statute's provisions. An Ohio or Miami University, he argued, would find it difficult, if not impossible, to subordinate its established classical curriculum to a more vocational one. At best, then, the state universities' only hope lay in receiving a fraction of the grant as two of the three adjunct departments proposed under the Commissioner's plan. This, too, seemed highly improbable since the wording in the Report clearly stipulated that the remainder of the fund be distributed between three well-endowed [emphasis added] colleges.

Governor Brough's views on the subject must have similarly diminished the enthusiasm of the most ardent supporter at either institution. His 1865 Annual Report postulated an even stricter interpretation of the Act than that of the School Commissioner's. The Governor concluded that the primary object of the national statute was to institute a new and distinct species of education.
This, then, precluded the attachment of an agricultural department onto any existing literary institutions. Only the creation of a new and separate institution of practical utility would do. Thus, in order for any existing college to qualify, it would have to radically change its charter—a task of immense, if not impossible, proportions. Moreover, and here the Governor seemed to be directing his comments towards both state universities as well as the legislature itself, colleges which sought the federal grant because of insufficient endowments should perhaps seek other means of funding from the state. This particular grant, in Brough's judgment, lay outside the sphere of existing educational contingencies.

Arguments, pro and con, regarding the candidacy of the two state institutions also surfaced during the state agricultural convention in January 1865. The first occurred during a presentation given by State Board Secretary John H. Klippart on the subject of agricultural colleges. Reporting on the memorials presented by these (and other) institutions at the last legislature and their intent to do the same at its next session, Klippart attacks their sudden interest in agricultural education charging

... that the trustees, directors, stock-holders, and professors of every one of these institutions have so very suddenly discovered their perfect adaptability to be transformed into agricultural colleges and teachers of practical agriculture and veterinary science. They can not claim that they were ignorant of the value and the necessity for agricultural education, and if their institutions were so well adapted for this purpose, why was not some attempt made to teach it? 20
A full and free discussion on the 'Agricultural College Question' followed the Secretary's presentation with support for the state institutions, especially Miami, in evidence. The first measure of support came from Colonel Connell of Fairfield County. Like many of his associates, the Lancaster native predicted a wild scramble for the funds. But unlike many of his colleagues, he predicted a meager return from the sale of the land scrip. For this reason he thought it altogether impractical to talk of creating a new and separate college. The Ohio and Miami universities, already state property, could easily be converted into agricultural colleges.

The fullest measure of support, however, came from one entrusted to promote the special interests of Miami University---namely, G. Volney Dorsey. His ministration went beyond a mere distribution and explanation of the 'Memorial' presented to the last legislature. When some members of the convention, both in and outside its meeting rooms branded Miami University as one of the 'spavined institutions' which grovelled after the grant, Dorsey indignantly responded: "Miami University asks nothing for which she is not prepared to give a full equivalent to the State, to the agricultural fund, and to the friends of Agricultural Colleges."  

Dorsey's defense of Miami marked it as a literary institution ranked among the highest in the West. Contrary to her critics, Miami's current condition would continue to safeguard, if not
enhance, its reputation. Buildings valued at more than $50,000, valuable chemical and philosophical apparatus, 7,000 volumes of valuable books, debt free and with $10,000 cash on hand, and an annual income of over $6,000, Dorsey argued, was not symptoms of an anemic, some charged moribund, institution. Additionally, the language of the Fifth Section of the national statute specifically held that 'No portion of said fund nor the interest thereon shall be applied, directly or indirectly, under any pretense whatever, to the purchase, erection, preservation or repair of any building or buildings.' Awarding the endowment to an institution like Miami, with buildings and apparatus already in place, would not only meet the explicit provisions of Section Five, it would also make additional funds available for instruction in those areas closely related to the agricultural and mechanical arts.

Indeed, professorships beneficial to the education of the agricultural student already comprised a fair portion of its curriculum. Responding to an earlier charge that a broad, liberal education would be tantamount to 'educating all the farmer out of a man,' Dorsey carped:

Sir, the thing is impossible. You can no more educate the farmer out of a man than you can educate the lawyer or the physician out of a man. There is no part or branch of learning which may not become useful to the accomplished farmer as to the accomplished gentleman in any pursuit in life. We have heard long enough about the education proper for a farmer. The education proper for a farmer is what is proper for any other well-informed and thoroughly educated man, and the nearer he approaches to a thoroughly educated man, the nearer is he to a perfect agriculturalist.
It was clear, then, that both state institutions aspired to become full-fledged universities, and viewed the national grant as a means to that end.

Finally, the national act specifically charged the legislatures of the respective states with the responsibility of wisely disbursing the proceeds from the sale of the land. To wit, Dr. Dorsey simultaneously reminds and chastens those who might think otherwise:

The Trustees of Miami University are appointed by the State authorities, and are subject to their control. It is entirely competent for these authorities to direct the manner in which the connection is to be formed and carried out between this institution or any other State institution and the colleges founded under this grant. 24 Statuary expediency, both implicit and explicit, marked the crux of both the Miami and Ohio claim.

John M. Millikin, the other trustee from Miami University, also addressed the convention on the subject. He spoke to the more practical, though implicitly political, considerations of dividing the grant between several of the existing colleges. Indeed, one very important question demanded an immediate and exact answer. Was there any possibility of establishing a new and separate institution in any portion of the state before the five-year compliance provision, now with only two and one-half years remaining, expired. 25 Not even the remotest chance, the Major argued. And what could Miami University do? Millikin simply replied: "With buildings sufficient for any such school, with
ninety acres of land, and with ten thousand dollars on hand, she could inaugurate an agricultural college within a period of ten months." Practical necessity seemed to be yet another reason for supporting the principle of division.

Shortly after the close of the agricultural convention and in response to a letter from Miami Board President Fergus Anderson, the full board met in Columbus at the State Treasurer's office.

"...for the purpose of taking such steps as may be deemed advisable for obtaining a portion of the fund donated by Congress for the support of Colleges, passed in July, 1862 and for the consideration of such other questions as may be presented." This seemingly unilateral action by the guardians of the Oxford institution resulted in two important strategies relative to the national grant. The first directed Dr. Dorsey to invite Corresponding Secretary Klippart and School Commissioner White to meet with the Board during the evening session and to present their views on the potential uses of the grant. The trustees also requested that the three-man committee of Messers. Dorsey, Olds, and Millixin proceed to plot yet another course of action for securing at least a share of the endowment. A new strategy, one which seemingly excluded the Ohio University, was unfolding and due in large measure to the anticipated passage of Delano's land scrip bill (House Bill No. 294) with its attendant five-man site selection committee."
The Board wasted little time in preparing and presenting its proposition to the new gubernatorial commission. At its June 1865 meeting in Oxford, the following proposal was unanimously adopted:

The Miami University, the Legislature of Ohio assenting thereto makes the following propositions to the State of Ohio, for one-half of the Agricultural fund

1. Miami University will furnish, for the use of the Agricultural College, all necessary buildings and will keep the same in repair, from the present funds of the university. The Board has determined to raise $50,000, and in addition, they can add to this $25,000 for the purpose of the new buildings.

2. Miami University will at once establish an Agricultural College, of the character prescribed by the act of Congress, and appropriate to the support of that College all the income derived from the Agricultural fund.

3. Miami University will apply all their present funds arising from the ground-rents and tuition fees, which are not required for the buildings to the support of the professorships having the least connection with Agricultural and Mechanic Arts.

4. Students of the Agricultural College shall be entitled to the benefit of the Library, apparatus and professorships supported by the present funds of the University.

5. Miami University offers for the use of this Agricultural College forty (40) acres of land adjoining the town of Oxford, either to be part of an experimental farm or to be sold for the purpose of purchasing one elsewhere; also the sixty (60) acres of the campus for ornamental and landscape gardening.

6. The present income of the college—amounting to from $11-$15,000 will be added to the income arising from the Agricultural fund, and the whole applied to the support of a college, in which shall be taught the branches of learning related to 'Agriculture and the Mechanic arts', and 'military tactics' not excluding other scientific and classical studies.29

Four months later the Board amended its original proposal and affirmed that

... in view of the proposition to locate in connection with that [Miami] University, by the State of Ohio, an
Agricultural College, hereby agree that if such a loca-
tion is made, we will resign our positions as such
Trustees, in order to enable the State to reorganize the
Board of Trustees in a way suited to its additional en-
dowment.\textsuperscript{30}

Miami was, indeed, intent on acquiring a part of the munificent
grant—and at almost any cost.

Miami's patient and persistent efforts seemed to have yielded
success. A 'Majority Report' submitted by four of the governor's
five-member commission recommended that Miami University be
awarded one-half of the proceeds from the sale of the land scrip.
It applauded and acknowledged the Miami proposal as the best of
the lot, and recommended that all of its provisions be approved by
the legislature. The mode of academic governance prescribed by
the commissioners included a restructuring of the Board to twenty
members, one-fourth of whom would be chosen from the State Board
of Agriculture, as well as the creation of an executive committee
to oversee the management of the college.\textsuperscript{31}

The signatories of the 'Majority Report', perhaps in anticipa-
tion of almost certain criticism from those who were fighting for
a new and independent college defended their decision with these
remarks:

Under the act of Congress there can be no delay.
Here is a college of our own, which it is both our right
and duty to use. How can it be better employed? Its
usefulness depends upon enlarged endowment; how can this
best be done? It adds no new name to the numerous cata-
logue of schools, and should not excite jealousy of any
of the friends of education.

The kind of assistance we have received from eminent
educators of the State, lead us to hope that this effort
may meet their approval, and be cheered by their friendly aid. It is their University as well as ours; they can do much to help or hinder the undertaking. Its success will be a common blessing--its failure a common loss.32

The 'Report' came under fire at the January 1866 Agricultural Convention in Columbus. Darwin E. Gardner, an agricultural representative from Lucas County and a member of the four-man committee submitting the 'Majority Report', sought to defend the work of the commission while laying open to scrutiny the Miami proposition itself. His initial remarks centered on the tremendous pressure exerted on the commission by several of the state's existing colleges for a division of the fund. This fact, coupled with the failure of a securing a benevolent community which would initially support and eventually sustain such a venture, as well as the time limitations imposed by the original grant for the establishment of the college, compelled the commission to conclude "... that the only place where we had the means furnished for establishing an institution of this kind was at Miami University."33

But the recommendation of agricultural delegate Gardner ran somewhat counter to that of Commissioner Gardner. His final remarks to the Convention confided that he would rather have them

... adopt any other plan than mine, I shrink from the responsibility of presenting any plan--but having been upon the commission, I ask a favorable consideration of our labors, that if you do not commend it you may at least present a better. I care not if it be an entirely different course; [just] so that it secures the object we desire--the elevation and education of the industrial people of the country.34
Gardner's lukewarm support of the 'Majority Report', as well as an abstention from any recommendation on the subject by the Convention's Select Committee, prompted a spirited debate over this very controversial issue. One delegate from Hamilton County, for example, chided certain members of the Convention for their misapprehension of the Miami University proposition:

It might be known that I have never been in favor of taking the University. That is our property; it belongs to the State of Ohio. Its ground was given for educational institutions. As to giving it for any other purposes—for an agricultural and mechanical institution—we have the right to take our own property and change it in any direction. As I understand from Mr. Gardner, they propose to surrender that property, the faculty resigning. The Legislature has the right to do what they please with it for educational purposes. Why do we stand here caviling about this thing, when in a few short months the grant will revert back? We may as well stand while the house is burning, and contend whether we shall put the fire out by buckets or send for the engine. It has been said by Mr. Lang, it is but an experiment at best. Then why not recommend the acceptance of Miami University? It is true it is a little one-sided, but it would not take long to go there from the most remote part of the State. While we are quarreling it will be like the dog with his meat—while grabbing at the shadow we will lose the substance.

Thomas C. Jones of Delaware County did not see it this way and, consequently, opposed the Miami proposal for a number of reasons. The first was location. With Oxford located at the extreme southwest corner of the state and with a second college being contemplated in the northeast quadrant, the students, in particular, as well as the people of the state at-large, would be required to travel further to reach one of these institutions than a single one located in any one of its central counties. A second rebuttal
centered on the fiscal impropriety of establishing an agricultural college at Oxford:

The Miami University, with the $6,000 annual income, is unable to maintain itself; if it were not so, we should not find the trustees proposing this arrangement. The buildings are so poor that they cannot, in their present condition, be longer occupied, and the University has only $15,000 with which to replace them. 37

Finally, and, perhaps, most importantly, the Judge in a footnote to his original remarks (He had not previously read the Commissioners' Report), simultaneously clarified and criticized the Miami Board of Trustees' proposed arrangement in regard to the legal status of the institution should the legislature adopt its recommendations. From the manner in which the proposition was stated earlier in the convention, Jones had the impression that the present charter was to be dissolved, all the property surrendered to the state, and a new institution established. But a careful examination of the wording of the Board's proposition had, in the opinion of the Judge, revealed otherwise. The trustees, in fact, had been very careful to preserve their old organization with all of its current rights and privileges. The legal effect of all this Jones pointedly went on to say:

... is, that Miami University is to continue, and its officers are, in all respects, to control and manage the same, as enlarged by the Congressional endowment. Students may now and will be instructed there as heretofore, and may graduate without any instruction in the agricultural course. We shall have precisely the distinction between the classical, or college course proper, and the course in the studies relating to agriculture and the mechanic arts so generally opposed by the public. All degrees in both departments will be conferred by "Miami
University." It is true the present Board of Trustees propose to resign; but they do not, by this, at all change the legal effect of the proposition as already stated.38

Others were not as diplomatic in their evaluation of the 'Majority Report'. William Lang of Seneca County, speaking as a member of the Select Committee appointed by the agricultural convention to investigate and report on the work of the Commission, caustically remarked:

Our opinion is, that the action of this convention last year should not be stultified by action in a contrary direction now. And so we are now not in favor of dividing this fund, making two bites of the cherry, and thus cripple the appropriation of Congress. Better, far better, that we allow the fund to be forfeited than that we should build a nuisance upon the State of Ohio, that we take up rotten, decaying institutions and breathe artificial life in them, and then let them die out again.39

In a similar vein yet another delegate from Lucas County carped:

"I would rather see a new institution arise with vigor and power, then take any dilapidated and death-stricken carcass into our arms and endeavor to regenerate it."40

Rising in defense of the Oxford institution was Fergus Anderson, not only the President of the Butler County Agricultural Society but also of the Miami Board of Trustees as well. He vigorously defended the university against its assailants. The institution, he asserted, is in as successful an operation as at any time in recent history. Not elegant buildings, true, but sound, strong walls, strong oak floors, and recitation rooms of high stories. Not on the best financial footing, to be sure, but
even considering the deliterious effects of the war, still able to accumulate fifteen thousand dollars over the past five years. Not in a central location, this cannot be denied, but, nevertheless, accessible from all parts of the state by railroad. Anderson's impassioned plea, notwithstanding, the Agricultural Convention voted, once again, for a one-institution policy.

The failure of the Agricultural Convention to embrace the 'Report' of the commissioners, no doubt, disappointed supporters of the Miami cause. But in another part of the capital city, one of her own arose and defended the recommendations of the commission. Governor Charles Anderson, a former Miami graduate and trustee, addressed the subject in his Annual Message to the legislature. Differing with his predecessor over the nature and scope of the curriculum at the new agricultural and mechanical arts college, he flatly asserted that "...whenever it is determined to give the agriculturalist a collegiate education, it can only be to the few--it can only be scientific--and, finally, it must ascent from the general to the special instruction."42

Challenging Governor Brough's assertion that only a practical, egalitarian education, that is, 'a new and distinct species of higher education', can serve the industrial classes, Anderson argues that:

Aristocracy, personal, social, and political, is a bad thing--generally a contemptible spirit--but it is in the nature of things that letters is necessarily an aristocracy. We may rail against the truth but we cannot help ourselves. The Bacons, Newtons, Keplars, and Agassizs of
this world can never be a multitude. I beg pardon for all these truisms (to some). But are they not stoutly denied? And are they not incontestibly not merely true, but the essence of the controversy? I conclude this part of the topic with but one more remark. When we have determined upon the policy of educating farmers in colleges or universities we have passed the point of most of these discussions. That determination establishes our choice of a liberal education, and liberal education means—itsel.43

Thus, the Governor concluded

. . . that all things considered, this Committee has decided upon the best course which the State can now pursue in the premises. I commend to the General Assembly a careful consideration of this excellent document.44

Miamians throughout the state breathed anew.

The outlook at Ohio University, on the other hand, was bleak.

All of the attention given its Oxford counterpart in both the 'Majority Report' and Governor's Message, undoubtedly, discouraged many of its supporters. The foreboding turn of events prompted President Solomon Howard, in his Annual Report of 1866, to declare that:

. . . something must be done to retain our hold on the confidence, and meet the demands of the public on the University. Most of the colleges of our country having during the last few years received large additions to their endowments are still earnestly endeavoring to increase them. We greatly need additional endowment. We shall not very long be able to maintain a fair position among the Sister institutions of the State. . . .The State is our patron. To her we must look.45

The Board of Trustees concurred and in June 1866 appointed yet another committee to press the question of a further endowment upon the legislature.46
Meanwhile, the high spirits of Miami University advocates throughout the state were quickly dashed with the passage of House Joint Resolution No. 12. The creation of a new Agricultural College Committee, whose major function was to receive and evaluate new petitions and memorials relating to the agricultural college grant, could only mean that the 'Majority Report', in general, and the Miami proposition, in particular, was in jeopardy.

The creation of a new review agency was, indeed, evidence of fresh thinking by the legislature. The committee's specific recommendation of accepting any propositions of at least $100,000 from communities interested in establishing an agricultural college was a clear sign that the General Assembly had not wholly decided in favor of the principle of division. Indeed, the pendulum seemed to be swinging back in the other direction.

Further evidence of waning support for the 1865 'Majority Report' could be deduced from the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution No. 31. It held that the purpose for which the Morrill statute had been approved would best serve the state of Ohio by the establishment of a single college, centrally located, and easily accessible by all of its patrons throughout the state. Though it failed to pass the lower house, it was clearly a cause for dismay at Miami as it was soon learned that the newly established legislative committee received three generous propositions from the central Ohio communities of Worthington, Westerville, and
Newark. Although none of these sites were selected, supporters favoring the principle of consolidation seemed, at least for the moment, to have gained the upperhand.

Despite the ominous signs, the Miami Board of Trustees continued to vigorously lobby for the grant. At its June 1866 meeting, Major Millikin urged that a new committee be appointed to, once again, make application to the legislature for one-half of the interest which would accrue on the monies arising from the sale of the land scrip.49 Thus, the Board continued to opt for a strategy which would at least keep the spirit of the 'Majority Report' a viable alternative before the legislature.

Though the 'Agricultural College Question' seems to have polarized the legislature into two distinct blocs (i.e., those supporting the principle of division and those favoring consolidation), a significant number of Ohio lawmakers remained uncommitted. Owing to reluctance or ignorance, this bloc of assemblymen wanted more time to study all the issues involved. One such issue centered around the sale of the land scrip. The miserable returns of the preceding year prompted the Ohio legislature to pass House Bill No. 174, "To Amend the Act Entitled 'An act to provide for the sale of land scrip and other purposes.'"50 Indeed, many of the uncommitted legislators would not side with either faction until the complete results of the sale were known. How else, they argued, could they properly discern whether there should be, or for that matter could be, one or more colleges established.
Passage of the Act of 23 July 1866 by Congress extending the deadline for the establishment of an agricultural and mechanical arts college another five years (i.e., until 1872 for Ohio) allowed this uncommitted bloc more time to thoroughly study the alternatives. A good thing, too, since the final results of the sale of the land scrip would not be known until December of that year.51

The additional term also allowed the proponents of consolidation more time to intensify their lobbying efforts. Time, on the other hand, dissipated much of the popular support for the 'Majority Report'. For now, at least, the Miami proposition was a dormant, if not dead, issue.

Though the external factors of 'untimely' legislation certainly hampered Miami's efforts at procuring part of the grant, there can be no doubt that other, more internal, factors had at least an equally deliterious effect. Most notable among these was the issue of its current financial condition and the charge by most of its critics that the grant represented nothing more than a veiled attempt to bail out an ailing institution. Indeed, a close examination of both the record and views of its own stewards seem to corroborate this criticism.

Attempts to enlarge its endowment had become a regular part of the Trustees' agenda since the beginning of the fray, and had concentrated on sources other than the agricultural grant. Though its books consistently reveal a cash forward balance during the
peak years of discussion over the 'Majority Report' (e.g., 1866 balance: $1,473.39; 1867 balance: $703.16), it belied the true (i.e., relative) condition of the university. Relief was neces-

sary.

Acutely aware of the seriousness of the problem, the Board, once again, entertained the possibility of state aid but this time under any guise. At their annual meeting in June 1867, the Board mused:

We believe it has been too easily taken for granted that no state aid for the University can be expected from the State. This has undoubtedly so far been the case, but we believe a change is now taking place on this sub-
ject. During the past year the Legislature of the State of Indiana has appropriated Eight-Thousand Dollars per annum for the support of the [State] university, and during the past year our own Legislature gave a large vote in favor of a large sum for the Agricultural College proposed to be established.

We believe that the time will come when the State will feel compelled to aid their own Universities. To this end it is our duty to press the subject on the at-
tention of the state authorities in hopes that eventually some aid may be obtained from this source.\(^53\)

And press they did with yet another resolution calling for the Agricultural College committee to memorialize the legislature for a share of the agricultural grant.

Undoubtedly the most revealing source of information about the true condition of the university was President Robert L. Stanton's inaugural address delivered to the public at-large on 27 June 1867—just two days after the passage of the Board's resolution. Regardless of his intention, it could not have come at a worse
time. The unusually somber oration entitled "The Present Condition and Wants of Miami University" might well have been subtitled 'The Coup De Grace of the 'Majority Report'." It was, indeed, the ammunition its detractors had waited so long for.

Miami University, its eighth President warned, had reached a crisis in its history. Though adorned with an illustrious past, commensurate with any college in the nation and, perhaps, of the highest repute in the West, the half-century year old institution, nevertheless, had recently fallen prey to the fierce competition of other, some even younger, institutions (e.g. The University of Michigan at Ann Arbor). He then both chides and admonishes his audience declaring that:

... we can no longer live upon the past, when our duty will not be done by attending the holiday ceremonies of Commencement, by enjoying an alumni dinner, by making pleasant speeches, by recounting the incidents of college life in years gone by, and by joining hands and circling around that noble tree in the Professor's yard and singing "Auld Lang Syne"--things in themselves entirely appropriate. Sterner work is demanded by each one who claims to be a friend of the University, if its career is to be anything else than downward from this day henceforth.55

Stanton, then, launches on a sobering, if not despondent, comparison with its own past averring:

It has not to-day so many branches of study separately pursued, nor so many chairs separately filled, nor so many instructors actually employed, as it has frequently had during several periods of its history--even twenty-five years ago, as I discover from consulting its catalogues. This is not because the light upon the dial plate of the educational world is moving backward. It is moving forward with rapid strides, and it is for this very reason that this comparison of the University with itself presents so disheartening a contrast.56
The critique ends with a scathing appraisal of the facilities now in place. Stanton argued that although most of its buildings, once superior to those of any similar institution west of the Alleghenies, could be refurbished for a modest sum, the same could not be said of the university's main edifice. His contemporary description of that structure must have certainly pressed into the minds of many a legislator still contemplating the most prudent use of the agricultural college funds:

... the main edifice, crowning yonder beautiful elevation, in which is the chapel, with the library, the society halls, the grammar school, and certain recitation rooms, is a dilapidated pile, presenting its broken panes to the howling winds of autumn, its shattered roof to the drenching rains of summer, and its doorless halls to the drifting snows of winter; the butt and the jeer of all passers-by, fair game for the ruder boys, a grand old monumental pile for preserving the quaint architecture of a bygone age, but repulsive to every gentleman who brings his son to the University, and a standing reproach and a shame--I say it respectfully--to every one who claims the University as his Alma Mater.57

The principal cause of this shame, at least in Stanton's mind, was the lack of money. Stanton both admonishes and encourages the commencement audience on this subject saying:

Give me the money--I ask nothing more--and I will build you a college or university in any suitable place, with ample buildings, libraries, apparatus, cabinets, with the ablest corps of instructors the times can furnish, and with students crowding all its departments. Money will procure all this, and nothing else will.58

But from what source? Though a state university Stanton predicted that Miami would never receive a dollar from the state. This was especially true of the agricultural college fund, and for
several reasons. First, many legislators, especially in the lower house, railed against and exhibited both a prejudice and consequent misrepresentation of the facts about the university which, in the mind of Stanton, at least, was difficult to understand in public men—especially those concerning a public institution whose interests they should seek to protect, rather than defame. Secondly, other legislators would, undoubtedly, feel compelled to represent the interest of those colleges located in their own districts. A final impediment, not only for Miami but for Ohio University as well, was their unfavorable location south of the National Road, when, in fact, the preponderance of population growth lay north of this demarcation. For all these reasons, then, Stanton concludes that there was not even a ray of hope that Miami University would procure any portion of the national endowment.  

59 He also discounts the Church as a potential benefactor arguing that:

..the churches, as such, have their own congregational and denominational enterprises on hand, which always claim their first attention—building church edifices, sustaining pastors, establishing academies, endowing theological seminaries, besides sustaining all their missionary operations—matters which make a constant drain on them for money. 60

The last, and Stanton reasoned, perhaps, the university's best hope lay with the friends and alumni of the institution. The town of Oxford, indeed, all of Oxford Township, owed its very existence and prosperity to Miami University, and, consequently, should be
expected to contribute liberally to her present needs. Similarly, another appeal should be extended to the alumni of the university--its beneficiaries, some of whom were men of substantial means who could, no doubt, aid her nobly in, this, her hour of need.

But what if no additional income can be procured from any of these sources? Should all else fail, what was the final alternative? Presaging an event manifested some six years later, Stanton opted for closing the institution for a period of no less than twenty years. This, he argued, would allow the university's current funds (i.e., township rental income, cash on hand, etc.) to accumulate until it could be put on a level equal with endowments of other first-rate institutions, thereby making it equal to the demands of the times. Miamians, as well as Miami observers, awaited a response to the charges and recommendations of its new President.

The Board of Trustees quickly reconvened in special session and was evidently impressed with the propriety of the new President's approach for increasing the college's endowment. They resolved to put the university buildings in complete repair by immediately raising the sum of $50,000. One-fourth of that amount would be raised by the citizens of Oxford Village and township with the rest presumably coming from both alumni and friends of the university. Did this new strategy, coupled with the prevailing disappointments of the past few years, mark the end of the
university's efforts to gain a share of the land grant? Only temporarily.

The question of finances, in general, and state aid, in particular, also filled the better part of President Howard's Annual Report to the Ohio University Board of Trustees during the same year, but with vastly different conclusions than those deduced by his Miami counterpart. After commenting on the limited progress of the special committee organized the previous year to secure an appropriation from the state, Howard reiterates his plea:

We must have additional endowment, or we cannot hope to hold our present position among the Sister Colleges of the State. The time we believe is near when she will no longer act the Stepmother towards the University, but will recognize her obligations and liberally endow the Institution.

The question then comes up with great interest to the Trustees, Faculty, and friends of the University--What can be done? What can we do? that the wants of this part of the State may be met. The only answer we have to give is this, that we continue earnestly to press this subject upon the attention of the State.63

The Board of Trustees concurred, but no immediate action was forthcoming.

Meanwhile, support for another Miami proposition surfaced again during the 1868 State Agricultural Convention. After listening to a lengthy and equally familiar speech on the importance of establishing one new college by T. C. Jones, the President of the Convention, Daniel McMillan, both reminded and chided his associates of his prediction four years ago:

... that you would fritter away your time, and would, in a few years, be just where you are now. I know my
friends think I am the champion of Miami University, and
want to turn that into an Agricultural College. But
where are you now? With money in your treasury, you have
no probability of its being taken out soon. Now, I want,
in my lifetime, to see this experiment tried with this
agricultural fund. I confess I have not a particle of
faith in any college established under the auspices of
the State Board of Agriculture.64

Support for both state universities also appeared during the
1868 session of the General Assembly in the form of this lengthy
but revealing resolution:

Whereas the Congress of the United States granted
the State of Ohio, at one time, forty six thousand acres
of land, and at another time, twenty-three thousand acres
of land to establish and support two universities, in
which the arts and sciences should be taught; and the
legislature of Ohio accepted said grants; and, to carry
their purposes, did, in the year 1804, incorporate Ohio
University, and granted the forty six thousand acres of
land to that institution, and in 1809, incorporated the
Miami University, and in aid of the aforesaid, granted
the said University twenty three thousand acres of land.

And Whereas, In said acts of incorporation the
Trustees of the aforesaid Universities were directed to
lease said funds forever, reserving, however, in the
leases a right of re-valuation at stated intervals, and
the Trustees proceed to lease said lands in pursuance
of said acts of incorporation; that the Legislature sub-
sequently modified said acts in such form that the lessees
of said lands claimed that they were not subject to re-
valuation and it having been decreed by the Courts (11th
Ohio Reports, p. 134) that said right was not surrendered
by the terms of said act, the Legislature, therefore, ex-
pressly prohibited said Universities from exercising any
rights of revaluation and the State refuse said Universi-
ties the privilege of testing this right in the Courts of
the State.

And whereas, By the action of the Legislature a
grant of lands amply, sufficient under judicious manage-
ment, for the maintenance of said universities in a high
state of efficiency and prosperity, has become wholly
inadequate for said purposes, and that the lessees of said
lands now pay to the said Universities for the use and
occupation of the lands aforesaid, an amount for less
than the taxes from which they have been relieved; there-
fore:
1. Resolved, That the State of Ohio is under obligation to the United States, to the people of Ohio, and the interests of education, in the acceptance of and the management of said grants, to support and maintain said institutions in a condition of usefulness and efficiency, warranted by a reasonable and intelligent care of said grants.

2. Resolved, That for the purpose of complying with the purpose and spirit of said grants of land, and in full satisfaction of all claims whatever, which said Universities may have on the State of Ohio, the proceeds arising from the sale of the land granted by the Government for the establishment of Agricultural Colleges be equally divided between the Ohio and Miami Universities, on the express condition that they agree to carry out the interest and purpose of said grant.

3. That the Judiciary Committee is hereby instructed to carry into effect the purpose of the foregoing resolutions.

The same session also produced a revivalism of both interest and action on the part of both state institutions, especially after the adoption of House Joint Resolution No. 45. The formation of a bi-cameral committee responsible for receiving, examining, and recommending proposals for the location of the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical Arts College surely must have quickened the heartbeats of many Ohio and Miami devotees. Both institutions hastily devised strategies which they hoped would net them at least a portion of the federal endowment.

The Miami Board of Trustees, at its annual meeting on 30 June 1868, passed a resolution to memorialize the newly appointed legislative committee, with the terms being substantially the same as its 1865 offer. The Board, undoubtedly, believed that the condition, or at least the image, of the university rather than
its proposal nullified its earlier attempt at winning legislative approval.

The task of improving the condition of the university, either substantially or conceptually, clearly fell on the shoulders of its President. And given his stark contrasting evaluations of the institution vis-a-vis his 1867 Inaugural, and 1868 and 1869 Annual Reports, that is, from bad to good to worse, one wonders if Stanton, perhaps in conjunction with a prior contrived strategy with the Board, did not indulge in a bit of wholesale vendibility. Regardless, his Second Annual Report (1868) portrayed the previous year as one of great prosperity with markedly increasing enrollments, with an expanding curriculum and consequent enlargement of the faculty, and with a sound plan to renovate a substantial number of buildings on the campus.67

Stewards of the 'New Miami' presented its plan to the new legislative joint committee in Columbus. It was one of six major propositions, and each site was visited by committee members. Details of the Oxford visit are sketchy. It was reported that the delegation from Columbus was received by officials of the university at the local train depot. After the business of surveying the grounds and reviewing the proposition, a formal reception was given in their honor at the home of one of the professors. Everyone seemed to be in high spirits on this occasion. That is, almost everyone.
Pranksters, no doubt, champions of classicism, staged a scene of their own convictions with regard to the latent meaning of the Committee's visit to the Oxford institution. As members of the faculty and student body filed into the chapel the morning after the Committee's departure back to Columbus, most were surprised, if not aghast, to find a haystack in the middle of the floor flanked by a plow, harrow and a farm wagon. Nibbling or nesting at or in the hay were two horses, a cow, pigs, ducks, and some chickens. And hanging from the platform in the midst of this misplaced scene was a sign dubbed 'Agricultural College'. Whether news of this mischievous event ever reached the State Capitol, and whether it had any influence on the Committee's final decision, is not clear.

The formation of the bi-cameral agricultural college committee also exacted the attention of the officers and board members of the Ohio University. Perhaps reacting to Miami's seemingly go-it-alone policy of the last three years, its trustees decided to incorporate a similar strategy of their own. As in the past, the motivation for such an action centered on a lack of financial resources. This, as well as a possible remedy, was reiterated in President Howard's 1868 Annual Report to the Board:

The wants of the University are very pressing. The income of the institution is not sufficient to carry it on as it might should be. The inflation of the currency and the increasing demands of the times have made us comparatively poor. What can be done is the question. We have (sic) hoped to receive help from the State. Our expectations thus far have failed. Help from this source we think is remote.
It might be well for the Board to enquire whether consideration might be offered sufficient to induce our State to unite the fund provided by the congressional grant for agricultural and mechanical purposes with our own Fund. We believe a course of study could be adopted as would meet the views of the friends of both grants, or fund. We merely throw out this suggestion.  

A committee responding to President Howard's 'Report' recommended that another committee be appointed with full power to confer with the joint Agricultural College Committee, and to make such overtures on behalf of the Board that they deem wise and prudent in order to secure the location of the agricultural college at Athens. But would the unilateral strategy of either institution yield any better results than that of their previous joint effort? Almost a year would pass before either of them would receive a definitive answer.

During the interim, the question of additional endowment through alternative methods was raised at both locations. In Athens, for example, the question seems to have been on the minds of many of its citizens. One such individual expressed his views in a letter to the The Athens Messenger. After extolling the virtues of the local university and its graduate, the correspondent, 'H.S.', could, nonetheless, conclude that the institution was in general need of additional funding. But from what source? Again, the traditional theme is trumpeted: "The State is our patron. The relation she sustains to us demands she should afford the necessary relief. But she has hitherto turned a deaf ear to our
cry. We trust she will yet give us aid. In the meantime, we cannot wait." His solution, albeit a temporary one was the solicitation of one thousand dollars from twenty-five men who have, or have had, a vested interest in the continuing success of the university, and he promised to be one of the twenty-five.

The Messenger, itself, decried the terrible restraints under which the local university labored, and cited the plethora of existing colleges in the state as the primary reason for the dearth of existing resources. The editors railed on:

No, we are opposed to any more starved colleges being set on foot.

Let us endow what we can of those now struggling for life enough to carry them through another year or two, and let the rest, if they must insist on "filling their spheres" and doing their "great work in society", still continue to "stare fate in the face" until "something turns up" in the course of the works of Providence, especially designed to bless and foster them. Fully one half our colleges "are waiting for something to turn up".

But the real reason so many of them are starving is that there is no necessity for them—the community does not need them. Why, there are colleges enough in Ohio to accomodate four or five states, and really, the same may be said of nearly every Western State.

Despite its forebodings, and others like it across the state, the legislature appeared to be on the verge of adding yet another college to the multitude. A majority of the Agricultural College Committee publicly reported its findings and recommended Urbana as the site for the new Agricultural and Mechanical Arts College. A strong 'Minority Report' favored Wooster as its location. Regardless, those existing colleges which had already sought the grant, including and especially Miami, knew that recommendations
did not always manifest themselves into legislation, as was evidenced by the 'Majority Report' of 1865, and ultimately with these 'Reports' as well. Nevertheless, while the protracted debate over the propriety of these choices wrangled on over the next several months, Miami, like its Athens counterpart, suffered for immediate and increased endowment, and proffered new alternatives in order to secure it.

And press hard it should. Its efforts to raise an additional $50,000 for major renovations (1867 Board Resolution) had fallen short of the mark. Having raised only one-half of the original goal, the Board decided to memorialize the legislature for the remaining $25,000 during its next session—the same one which would be debating the relative merits of the Urbana and Wooster propositions. And though a bill (Senate Bill No. 399) asking for the Miami appropriation did gain the solid endorsement of the Senate's Standing Committee on Universities and Colleges, it failed to gain the approval of the General Assembly. It likewise rejected both the 'Majority' and 'Minority' Reports of the Agricultural College Committee, and plans for yet another assault on the agricultural grant by both state institutions seemed likely.

The Athens Messenger, by now seemingly weary of the whole affair, cited its reasons for the legislature's impotency, and proffered what it considered to be the only rational solution to the 'Agricultural College Question':

The establishment of a college for the single purpose of educating young men in the theory of farming can
result in no good to agriculture, and will not supply but little more than is already taught in most of our colleges of those branches that are considered necessary to the thorough education of a farmer. The division of the fund between the Ohio University at this place, and the Miami University at Oxford, both State institutions, it seems to us would be the easiest solution of the question, and an act which the state, in justice, owe these institutions. If the law of Congress making the donation of lands to the State for the purpose of establishing an Agricultural College, can be so construed as to permit the General Assembly to make a division of the funds arising from the sale of the lands by the establishment of an Agricultural Professorship in each of the universities named, then it is the plain duty of the legislature to divide it between the Ohio and Miami Universities. Such disposition of the fund would result in some good to the people of the State, and relieve the tax payers from an annual appropriation to support a separate institution.74

A similar feeling was emerging on the other side of the state. The financial status of Miami University bordered on embarrassment. The first sign of trouble could be sensed from President Stanton's Annual Report of 1869 which noted a decrease in student enrollment from the previous year, and blamed it on the pecuniary stringency of the times.75

The response to both Stanton's Report and news that the legislature had, once again, failed to locate a permanent site for the agricultural college was a special meeting of the Board of Trustees held at Dayton on 13 November 1869. Here the strategy of securing the agricultural fund seems to have come full circle with the adoption of the following resolutions:

1.) Resolved that a Committee of three be appointed to confer with the authorities of Ohio University in regard to pressing on the Legislature the division of the Agricultural Fund between the two Universitites.
2nd.) Resolved that a Committee of seven be appointed whose duty it shall be to press on the Legislature of the State, the appropriations of one-half of the proceeds of the Agricultural Fund for the establishment of an Agricultural College in the University and that the expenses of said Committee in the matter be paid by the University.

3rd.) Resolved, that each member of the Board of Trustees be requested to aid in carrying out this movement.76

The idea of another joint proposition to secure the agricultural grant evidently did not interest the stewards of Ohio University. Miami's independent strategy of the past five years, undoubtedly, soured relations between the two governing bodies of the schools. A lack of bilateral cooperation at this level, however, did not impair the common vision or resolve of its chief stewards especially in regard to the alarming conditions and common fate suffered by both institutions. Evidence of this shared view inked the pages of a somber letter from President Solomon Howard to Governor Rutherford B. Hayes in 1869:

Let me suggest that the two State Universities demand urgently the attention of both the Executive and Legislature of the State. Seventeen years of my life I have most fully devoted to the promotion of the interest of the Ohio University. And I speak understandingly when I say the time has come when the Ohio University must have additional endowment or be closed up. . . . Where shall we look for help? The relation of the State to us excludes all help from denominations or sects. The state is both the patron and Trustee of the universities, and she alone can give the needed relief. Legislative action by taking away from them the right of safe appraisement deprived the Universities of their inheritance, and now it ought in part at least to restore what it took away.

We respectfully and earnestly ask your Excellency to call the attention in your message to the approaching session of the Legislature to the pressing need of these institutions. The interests of education throughout our
State demand that these Universities should be liberally endowed. Their failure would involve the state in shame and disgrace. We cannot afford to close up these universities or suffer them to exist in their crippled condition while brassing the name of the State.\

The Governor's reply, a short but ineffectual response, was penned a week later and in part read:

The whole subject has been frequently called to the attention of the Legislature by Executive Messages, Memorials, and the reports of Committees. The failure of former efforts to secure favorable action leads me to doubt the expediency of making any general recommendations, unaccompanied with specific plans of relief. If you will enlist your Senator and Representatives in favor of some just and practicable measure which they will urge the Legislature to adopt I shall be glad to contribute my aid to its success.

Shortly after the brief exchange between the two chief executives, another potential solution to the state university dilemma took root. It called for the consolidation of the endowments from both state institutions with that of the agricultural grant in order to establish one grand state university. An article from the College Courant by an Ohio Professor reprinted in the 24 November 1869 issue of, and enthusiastically endorsed by, The Miami Student (the university's student newspaper) effectively presents the case:

The question to be decided is: Shall a new college be founded, or shall this [agricultural] fund be given to some existing institution? There are in Ohio two State universities,—the Ohio, at Athens, and the Miami, at Oxford,—both of them as State institutions a disgrace to the State that fosters them. Shall we have a third sickly State institution, or can these three be united into one true university, one that will be an honor to the State and the country? Ohio—the third state in the Union in wealth and population—should have within its
own limits a Yale or a Harvard, and not be obliged to look beyond for the means of a higher education. Our people demand a State university equaling that of our sister State, Michigan,—nay, surpassing that noble university in the proportion of our greater wealth.

It is for the Legislature to decide whether we shall have such a university, or whether this fund be squandered in order to pamper local pride.79

In its subsequent issue, The Miami Student detailed the deleterious, if not disastrous, consequences surrounding the absence of a first-rate university in the state. After surveying the college catalogues of four universities outside the state, it found that 238 students listed Ohio as their home. It calculated that if each student took with him no less than $400 each year, a sum total of nearly $100,000 is lost from the state's economy per annum. It conservatively estimated that four times that number actually attended out-of-state institutions with an annual loss to the state amounting to nearly half-a-million dollars! Moreover, and even more important, was the loss of human resources since often times these students became permanent residences of those states. A baleful warning regarding this trend and what the newspaper viewed as yet another potentially contributing factor to the malaise concludes the editorial:

Now to retrieve this disgrace, and to put her [Ohio] properly up to the advance of other States, and to keep her own talent in her borders, she must do something for her higher institutions of learning. Even now the Legislature talks of founding another college, thus frittering away her resources, and dividing her interests, which will banish the bright talent the last ten years have so abundantly proven Ohio to possess.80
Bolstered by like rhetoric across the state, both the Miami and Ohio universities eagerly anticipated the opening of the Fifty-Ninth General Assembly in January 1870. Indeed, the air of expectancy heightened after Governor Hayes broached the topic of the land grant in his Annual Message, giving the distinct impression of a neutral posture regarding its apportionment but equally adamant in resolving the issue as quickly as possible. Rekindled hope buoyed spirits at both institutions.

The current legislative session would, indeed, invoke the names of both the Miami and Ohio universities as, at least, partial beneficiaries of the grant but in ways not always to their liking. A petition from the citizens of Ross County mirrored the Miami Board of Trustees' proposal which called for the proceeds of the agricultural fund to be divided between the existing state universities, and certainly one which was met with equal favor at both Oxford and Athens.\textsuperscript{81} The rest of the proposals, however, were not endorsed and, in some instances, denounced for reasons to become more apparent as time went on. Senator Dougherty introduced legislation which sought to unite the endowments of both the Miami and Ohio universities with the proceeds derived from the agricultural grant in order to establish one grand state university.\textsuperscript{82} The Dougherty legislation, no doubt, served as the catalyst for yet another proposal which sought to unite all three endowments for the same purpose but with Columbus specifically designated as the college site.\textsuperscript{83} But those proferring the Miami
cause sought to maintain institutional autonomy, and, thus, sub-
mergence, or even merger, proved to be out of the question. As-
surely, then, its unwillingness to yield to these principles, 
coupled with the burgeoning influence of those claimants ad-
vancing the cause of a new and separate institution, resulted in 
the passage of the Cannon Act, and with its ancillary legislation, 
any hope of the Oxford or Athens institution gaining a share of 
the federal grant died.

The question of merging both state institutions with the new 
Agricultural College at Columbus [emphasis added] surfaced again 
during the 1871 legislative session, but this time at the behest 
of the new college's Board of Trustees. The proposal met with 
stiff opposition from many members of the Miami community as is 
evidenced by a scathing editorial in the 22 March 1871 edition of 
The Miami Student. Indeed, a "new" spirit of self-autonomy, if 
not self-righteousness, pervaded the entire tone of its appraisal:

Looking at the case attestively and fairly, we are unable 
to discover anything that can justify the Agricultural 
Board in asking for such a transfer. The measure appears 
to us to be one solely of self-interest, a grand scheme 
to enable them to set forth their college in a better 
light, and to give it an exalted position among the in-
stitutions of the State, according to the purpose 
enounced (sic) in their charter where it is stated 
that they 'intend the Agricultural College to represent a 
light in a high place, illuminating all those coming in 
its spheres.' In what better way, we ask, could such in-
tentions be carried out than by opening their college 
with the reputation of Miami? To our mind none presents 
itself.64
What would be the outcome of such an action? The editorial concludes with a potentially lethal consequence, but skillfully uses it as a springboard to positive action stating that:

The carrying out of the proposed measure would be certain death to Miami; yet we imagine that with the affection her friends have for her, the mere proposal of such an unjust scheme will in all probability be the means of brightening her prospects.85

But would it.

Though able to permanently ward off the apostles of coalescence, Miami's future remained anything but bright. She still required additional funding given the rising costs of higher education and the accursed fixed income upon which her fate had rested for over half a century. Successive attempts by its trustees and other officers and friends of the university to procure additional monies failed miserably.86

The frustration, bitterness, and resentment felt by all concerning the current financial dilemma of the once prosperous, if not prestigious, institution is conveyed by President Stanton in his Fifth Annual Report to the Board of Trustees in June 1871:

The reason of all this is, we have nobody to appeal to--neither the State nor the Church--nor even the Alumni. No alumnus has even given to Miami University, since it was founded for any purpose, an amount sufficient to make an ample scholarship. . . .These (western) colleges command this munificence because they are institutions of the Church, and some of these gifts have been realized within two years. But let the appeal be made for Miami University, and the uniform reply is, 'The State owns it, let the State aid it'. And thus the State hangs about its neck as an incubus. And knowing all this--while we free the weight of this nightmare upon the breast--we resolved most solemnly to rid ourselves of the State, or at least to try--and stop at resolving!87
And on that bitter note, Stanton resigned.

In spite of the appointment of a new President pro tempre, as well as the complete reorganization of the entire university, the Old Miami breathed its last in 1873, ironically the same year the new Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical Arts College opened its doors. As fate would have it.

The destiny of Ohio University, though not as grievous as her sister institution, certainly travailed for years. President Howard's final Report to the Board of Trustees in 1872, reminiscent of dozens before it, portended the cause and consequence of the university's condition stating that:

... the poverty of the institution is such as to prevent meeting the improvements which are absolutely necessary and unless means are devised to increase the income of the University it cannot any longer hold its position among the Colleges of the state.

No immediate aid was forthcoming, but it did hang on--barely.

The closing of the Oxford institution and the destitute existence of the university at Athens might have been avoided had they received a fair portion of the munificent grant. Many non-partisan observers of the fray believed that their legal status as state universities should have been reason enough to merit a share of the endowment. Evidently that strength was overshadowed by a number of weaknesses, not the least of which was the lack of a solid agricultural tradition. This, however, was not the case at both The Farmers' College and the Oberlin Collegiate Institute (The Ohio Agricultural College) where agricultural education was
at least an integral part of their environments for a number of years.

The Farmers' College. The Farmers' College proposition was the first attempt by an existing institution to secure the benefits of the land grant act. Located at College Hill, just north of Cincinnati, the history of the institution, dating from the mid-1840's, served as a two-edged sword bolstering the arguments of antagonists and protagonists alike. Though an analysis of its past is requisite to a thorough understanding of its candidacy, let us first turn our attention to its strategies during the years of the fray itself.

The first, perhaps circuitous, reference to Farmers' College potential bid for the funds came during the 1863 State Agricultural Convention. A premature discussion among the delegates, concerning the possible uses of the grant ensued. During the debate, the representative from Guernsey County, no doubt, offended many supporters of the Farmers' College when he alleged:

Our circumstances make it a necessity that we should establish some institution by which the farmer shall be educated in his profession. All the leading branches of business have institutions for the special education of those who intend to pursue those callings. The young men who expect to practice law, medicine, theology, or merchandise, are properly educated; but where has been the opportunity for the young farmers of Ohio to be educated in their profession? There has been no agricultural college in which they might acquire that science and gain that practical knowledge of their business which are so essential to its profitable prosecution. [Emphasis Added]
The representative from Hamilton County, on the other hand, seemed to be obliquely favoring a Farmers' College candidacy averring that endowing three or four smaller colleges is preferable to funding one grand overshadowing university. After citing the soon to become popular financial and pedagogical arguments favoring a division of the funds, he concludes: "Then almost every farmer's boy could attend one or the other; then scientific knowledge could be increased; experiments and results would be multiplied as many times as your colleges."  

Whether or not these statements portend a political veil either rejecting or promoting the cause of the College Hill institution is not altogether clear. Regardless, supporters of the college took direct action at a special meeting on 25 February 1863. Dual committees of stockholders and trustee agreed to coordinate press before the legislature a proposition promoting the Farmers' College as one of the colleges to share in the federal grant.  

Less than a week later, Representative Flagg presented a memorial from both the trustees and stockholders of the college proposing to donate the college to the state.  This memorial, no doubt, set the stage for the introduction of House Bill No. 368 by Representative Peter Zinn of Cincinnati. The measure, like the memorial, specifically urged the legislature to accept the donation of Farmers' College in order to fulfill the conditions of the act of Congress passed July 2, 1862. But it died in committee
for lack of interest. Though the setback was disappointing, it was not catastrophic as the legislature did not commit to any particular scheme or site during this session.

The next session of the legislature revealed a similar scenario, but this time it would be played out in the upper chamber. Samuel F. Cary, the brother of the president of the College, and other citizens of Hamilton County, acting as a committee representing the directors and stockholders of the institution, solicited the Senate to accept the donation of Farmers' College in order to fulfill the conditions of the Morrill Act. 95

This memorial, no doubt, served as a catalyst for two additional measures introduced in the upper house. Senate Joint Resolution No. 30 directed a committee of eight members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and ten from the House Committee on Colleges and Universities to visit Farmers' College, and then report on the expediency of designating it as one of the institutions sharing in the proceeds of the federal grant. 96

The committee's 'Report', dated 26 March 1864, though favorably depicting the school as an excellent institution of higher learning, nevertheless, circumspectly hesitates to give the institution its outright endorsement. A review of the 'Report', however, does give us a contemporary view of the college, and, with it, additional insight into the reasons for the marked enthusiasm generated by its supporters for the procurement of the agricultural fund.
It first reported the scope and condition of the college's property as follows:

... that the college building proper stands centre of a campus of seven acres, is a brick edifice containing a chapel, two society halls, four large recitation rooms, and the second and third stories of the two wings divided into rooms for students - that the Academy building now used as a college boarding house, is of brick, two stories high, properly arranged for the purpose for which it is used - that on the lot with the college are two other buildings, one a two story brick used as a boarding house, the other a three story brick containing twenty-four rooms for students - that Polytechnic hall is a neat two story brick with a centre and two wings, located in the botanic garden, the wings used as professors' residences, the rear rooms of the centre for the manager of the farm, the first floor of the centre being divided into two rooms, one for a lecture hall, the other for a students workshop, while the upper room is a large and conveniently arranged laboratory - that there are on grounds three colleges and a large barn - that the apparatus belonging to the college is only in passable repair. 97

Questions about the soil, farm, and botanic garden were also laid to rest the Committee reporting:

The soil is what is termed an argillaceous limestone soil, and is therefore susceptible of a very high state of improvement. Being strong, it becomes eminently adapted to experimental farming with such products as there may be any desire to test under any circumstances - There is no land on the farm but what is easily worked, and is just rolling enough to give a pleasing variety to the surface. A portion of the farm, about 15 acres, is now covered with forest trees, chiefly the oak. This portion is adapted to the culture of the grasses, the soil being more moist than any other part of the farm. The general slope of the land is southeasterly, and therefore protected from cold northerly or westerly winds so fatal to the early and less hardy products of the soil. There is a fine fruit orchard on the farm consisting of the usual varieties of well selected fruit. The whole farm appears under good cultivation, and the remains of crops indicate that abundant harvests have rewarded the toil of the husbandman during the past year.
The fences are reasonably good on all parts under review by us. The Botanic Gardens adjoining Polytechnic Hall is a most beautiful place, and is planted with almost every variety of useful and ornamental trees found in America or Europe. Much labor has been expended upon it, and the winding walks and carriage ways so neatly graveled cannot fail to impress the beholder with the fact that neither labor nor expense has been spared in beautifying this delightful place; especially is this the case around the artificial lakelet, which is embowered by so many rare and rich deciduous evergreen trees.98

All told the value of the property offered as a free gift was conservatively estimated at $127,500. The only conditions, if they be called that, were that two small endowments—one of $10,000 for a professorship of Practical Agriculture, and another of like amount for a professorship of Chemistry—continue in perpetuity and be named Carey and McMicken respectively.99 The Joint Committee, perhaps aware of the many proposals now before the legislature and with them a concomitant sense of bewilderment on the part of many individual legislators, closed their report with the lukewarm recommendation that

. . . the trustees and stockholders of Farmer's College be requested to leave open their proposal now before the General Assembly, in order that future action may be had upon this subject, with due regard to the highest and best interest of the whole state.100

In spite of the tepid endorsement, proponents of the College Hill institution forged ahead with the introduction of Senate Bill No. 57, 'To Enable the State of Ohio to accept the donation of the Farmer's College of Hamilton County, as tendered by the trustees and stockholders of said College, for the uses and purposes contemplated in the act of Congress of the United States, approved July 2, 1862.'101
Through the next two legislative sessions, the measure seems to have picked up no appreciable support and, consequently, died in committee. Another year had passed and Farmers' College still had not been designated a recipient to receive the grant. But neither had any other institution, and so a faint glimmer of hope persisted.

During the 1865 State Agricultural Convention, a few of its members voiced and voted opinions and resolutions directly antithetical to the cause of the Farmers' College candidacy. Perhaps none was more adamant than that of John H. Klippert. The Board Secretary specifically criticized the curricular thrusts of those literary institutions (i.e., Farmers' College, Miami University, and Ohio University) which lobbied the last session of the legislature for the agricultural college grant asserting:

I believe that I am not misstating the facts when I assert that not a single series of lectures have been delivered in any one of them on the subjects of practical agriculture, veterinary surgery, or practical botany. In one of these institutions, [no doubt, Farmers' College] I am informed, several courses of lectures on hypothetical agriculture were delivered, and although having an abundance of chemical apparatus, not a single analysis of soils has been made, not a single manure analyzed.102

Klippert's satirical criticism continues with a series of sardonic questions, the answers to which, in at least his estimation, can lead to only one conclusion:

Has agricultural education become so suddenly popular, or have these institutions, during their entire term of existence, studiously ignored it? Did the professors not know that many of the ablest scientific minds of the nineteenth century were devoted to the investigation and development of the science of agriculture; and that there is now an agricultural literature in existence which will
compare favorably with if not absolutely outrank that of many of the sciences taught in these institutions... [Thus] It will be found much more difficult to teach agriculture and the mechanic arts in one of those institutions, which for a series of years heretofore has enjoyed a purely literary or classical reputation, than in an entirely new institution.\textsuperscript{103}

And so Klippert, along with a majority of his Convention associates, voted for a new, one institution resolution which would become the official cornerstone of that agency's policy throughout the entire fray.\textsuperscript{104}

Not all of the agricultural community at-large, however, agreed with Klippert's assertions, especially in regards to Farmers' College. One such partisan was Representative Fielding who propounded his views on the floor of the House on 24 January 1865:

I hold, and so understand the Congressional grant, that the college is to teach practical agriculture--not theoretical--but to teach all the practical manipulation; not simply a series of lectures describing how things are to be done, but to have the operations performed in the presence of, if not by the students... The Farmer's College, at College Hill, has everything ready to go to work, and the only objection to accepting it is a question of location, I do not think this is a proper time or occasion to discuss the subject of location.\textsuperscript{105}

Further support for, at least the clarification of, the Farmers' College proposition emerged from the pages of the agricultural press. Among the more penetrating ones was an editorial printed in the 18 March 1865 edition of The Ohio Farmer. It reported on and seemingly favored an amendment advocated by Representatives Stanton, Fielding, and Bloom of Hamilton, Shelby, and Richland counties respectively which would give one-third of the proceeds from the
college scrip to Farmers' College with the remaining two-thirds going to other institutions.

The editorial also extracted from the pages of the Commercial the text of Representative Bloom's rejoinders concerning two specific objections to the Farmers' College proposal. The first, regarding the criticism of its location in the extreme southwest corner of the state Bloom counters by stating that it is near the center of the mechanical interests of the state, and was practically accessible by railroad car to every station in the state. The second objection centered on the number of acres necessary for the successful operation of an experimental farm. Bloom retorted that the farm at College Hill was larger than would ever be required for scientific experimentation. As for teaching boys to plow, Bloom contended that the resident farms were the best places for this and all other practical application of scientific truths.

Bloom concludes his defense of the Farmers' College proposition with a censure of his own. Specifically, he chides those who supported the establishment of a new college claiming that the $150,000 now contemplated with the passage of the Delano Bill would be insufficient to inaugurate a new college, and cited as an object lesson the additional expenses incurred by the new idiot asylum approved by the legislature at its last session. By the same ratio estimates Bloom predicted that an appropriation two or three times the amount now contemplated from the sale of the land scrip would be required
to complete the establishment of a new college. But all of this, he concludes, is unnecessary because:

...we can save all this by accepting this munificent offer of Farmer's College, and send our sons to-morrow, and avail ourselves at once of the benefits accruing to them of such an institution—and the State will have added at least $200,000 to the Congressional grant without taxing the people a dollar. 106

Two weeks later, a strong, if not vitriolic, reaction to Bloom's remarks appeared in The Ohio Farmer. A 'Member of the State Board of Agriculture' wrote: "Of all the projects claiming a portion of this endowment I regard that of the Farmer's College near Cincinnati as the most insidious and dangerous." 107 Why? 'Member' is critical of the proposition, the institution, and its location. Although the proposition before the legislature asked for only one-third of the income from the Congressional grant, 'Member' theorizes that this is but an entering wedge; the gentlemen from Hamilton County knowing very well that once a start is made, the likelihood of procuring the entire fund was assured. He also cites the inadequacy of the current model farm at the college stating that: "...we want fields for corn, wheat, hay, meadow, pastures, and c., and with the different varieties of domestic animals presenting an illustration of the highest and best farm managements in all its departments." 108 And, finally, he argued that its location would not only vitiate the morals and habits of its students it would also preclude getting the type and amount of land commensurate with the experimental and illustrative nature of a first-rate agricultural college. This was a
consideration far more important than being near a great manufac-
turing center since the principles of mechanics could be deduced in
the laboratory and the shop which required no special conditions of
climate or soil. 109

The Ohio Farmer, quick to respond, defended the accurate re-
porting of its March 18th editorial, but denied the charge that it
constituted an outright endorsement of the Farmers' College proposi-
tion. Nevertheless, a lengthy editorial in its 1 April 1865
edition seems to have further positioned itself on the issue by
challenging a few of 'Member's' arguments utilizing the Joint Legis-
lative Committee Report of 26 March 1864.

First, its response to the criticisms by 'Member' regarding the
College Hill proposal. The only problem The Ohio Farmer could find
in the otherwise munificent gift was the stipulation that the pro-
fessorships of Practical Agriculture and Chemistry must continue and
were to be named Cary and McMicken respectively, an imposition de-
scribed by the tabloid as not very burdensome. 110

Secondly, those criticisms about its location were countered
with a host of exemplary comments extracted from the 1864 legisla-
tive committee 'Report'. Particularly noteworthy and regarding
'Member's' censure of the college being in proximity to a large
city, the newspaper quotes the 'Report' as stating that;

... there is probably within the State no more beautiful
or healthy location for a college than College Hill. It
would be difficult to find in this or any other State a
neighborhood the restraints of which would be more salu-
tary upon the habits and characters of the students. The
high social position, the refinement and taste, and the elevated moral tone of the community, are considerations of the utmost importance in the consideration of the subject.111

And finally 'Member's' criticism that the small amount of land (92 acres) attached to the college would be insufficient for use as an experimental farm brought this direct argument from the editors:

It is not barely possible that he confounds the two ideas of "experimental farming" and "extensive farming"! If we are to "exhibit" to visitors a large well-tilled farm, perhaps the latter term would be the proper one, but if modes of cultivation as applied to varied products is the object, would not the farmer apply to something less than a broad domain?112

The passage of the 'Act of April 13th 1865', and, with it, the establishment of a commission to locate one or more sites for an agricultural college, impelled supporters of Farmers' College to action. A committee appointed by the college trustees forwarded to Miles Greenwood, a Cincinnatian and member of the five-man commission, a request that the college be accepted by the state in accordance with the conditions and provisions prescribed in the Morrill Act. Other sundry papers accompanied the correspondence and included the original Memorial sent to the legislature, as well as a copy of the 1864 'Report of the Joint Committee.'113

Six months later in December 1865, the Commission rendered its findings. A 'Majority Report' signed by four of its five members recommended that Miami University be awarded one-half the grant with the remainder to be adjudicated to another college in the northern part of the state at some future time. On the other hand, a
'Minority Report', submitted by Miles Greenwood, advanced the candidacy of the Farmers' College. In it, Greenwood reminded his colleagues that a new and distinct species of education had been prescribed, and that an institution like Miami, traditionally classical in scope, could not conform to this creed. Other, more practical, reasons, he argued, should also eliminate Miami from any serious consideration. Farmers' College, on the other hand, had had a history of agricultural hegemony and also lay in close proximity to the mechanical and manufacturing emporium of the state, and, in the opinion of Greenwood, were reasons enough for it to be awarded at least a portion of the agricultural grant.114

Despite Greenwood's enthusiastic endorsement, criticism of the Farmers' College proposal intensified, not only from those who supported the establishment of a new college, but also from those who preferred the principle of division. One such reproof appeared in the pages of the public press. A letter from someone using the sobriquet 'Oxford' appeared in the 3 April 1866 edition of *The Ohio State Journal*. Though enthusiastically advancing the principle of division, especially on behalf of the Miami University, the author concurrently excoriates the attempt by Farmers' College to secure a portion of the fund:

There are neither funds on hand nor accruing interest on rents, from which they are expected. Immediately, and in all future time, the State would be required to annually appropriate all needed means for rebuilding and keeping in repair and good conditions all the present buildings, and for constructing such others as might be necessary for the new college. . . . It is not wonderful that she
proffers to give herself away. It would be marvellous, however, if, under all the circumstances, she should receive acceptance and the doors of the State Treasury should be opened to supply her present pressing wants and to meet all her necessities in all future time. That would be the manifestation of such a wild and profligate disregard of economic and equitable considerations, that it is doing injustice to the wisdom and fairness of the Legislature, even to suppose that it is possible.\textsuperscript{115}

Opposed by supporters of both division and consolidation and facing staggering financial deficits which ultimately led to the sale of its Model Farm in May 1866, Farmers' College could no longer compete. A fitting epitaph appeared on the pages of The Ohio Farmer in its 19 January 1867 edition:

After the conclusion of last session's labors of the legislature, the Trustees of the institution known as Farmer's College, at College Hill, withdrew their competition for the Ohio Agricultural College and sold their [model farm] lands in small parcels, for building lots and suburban grounds, to the citizens of that locality, so that College Hill is entirely out of the ring.\textsuperscript{116}

Any analysis of the attempt by Farmers' College to secure the agricultural land grant would be incomplete without a searching inquiry into its annals, especially given the paucity of contemporary data concerning the pros and cons of its candidacy. Indeed, her protagonists most surely would have pointed to a plethora of institutional evidences which, at least in their minds, should have effectively bolstered its land-grant aspirations, and is a subject to which we will now devote most of our attention.

Any historical investigation of the Farmers' College must begin with Freeman Grant Cary. The drive, sacrifice, and vision of this one man elevated Farmers' College to a place of prominence in the
sphere of Ohio higher education during the mid-nineteenth century. Though perhaps not attaining the agricultural prominence he had envisioned, the establishment of Farmers' College, nevertheless, did mark a unique opportunity for the industrial classes to attain a level of educational relevance and excellence heretofore relegated to the speeches and writing of utilitarian theorists throughout the country.

Cary, thirty years an educationist, began his career shortly after his graduation from Miami University in 1832. His first venture as founder and director of the Pleasant Hill Academy located just north of Cincinnati flourished for over a decade. Emphasizing a broad liberal studies curriculum, featuring an eminently qualified faculty which included a former president and professor of Miami University and supporting an average of 120 students per year from five states, the institution may very well have been the best academy in the West. 117

Cary, a fruit-grower of some repute, was also an active member of the Hamilton County Agricultural Society. The combination of his training as a scholar and avocational interest in the field of agriculture, no doubt, served as a catalyst for a speech made before the Society on 11 August 1832. In it he called for the establishment of agricultural colleges and 'pattern farms' throughout the country. Raising farmers from their current state of scientific and political ignorance was crucial to the formation of the complete agriculturist and, in the opinion of Cary, entirely linked to the acquisition of a
thoroughly liberal and scientific education. Thus, the seeds for an agricultural college having been planted, the only ingredient necessary for fruition was time.

Gestation came quickly. At a meeting of potential stockholders spearheaded by Cary, it was determined to establish "...an institution of learning especially suited to the wants of the agricultural and business community." Over 400 individuals, mostly farmers, paid the $300 subscription fee to help inaugurate its establishment. Soon thereafter, a bill entitled "An Act To Incorporate the Farmers' College of Hamilton County" was enacted into law on 23 February 1846. Section Five of the legislation set forth its primary goal: "The object of this association shall be to direct and cultivate the minds of the students in a thorough and scientific course of studies, particularly adapted to agricultural pursuits." Pleasant Hill Academy had been transformed into a college.

The idea of a liberal and scientific education for the industrial classes did, indeed, seem to be the mark of distinction for the new college. Proof of its desire to accomplish this twofold objective is revealed in several different sources. First, Professor Scott made his remarks on the subject during the ceremonial laying of the college cornerstone on 13 April 1846:

We lay, this day, the foundation of an Institution which we trust will be an extensive and lasting blessing to this and unborn generations - an Institution in which every young man of talent and enterprise may, if he will, acquire such a higher scientific education as will place him on a footing of eminence, respectability, and influence, in any of the spheres of business and active
life; while at the same time the faculties and means will also be afforded for the pursuance of a higher classical course, to those whose taste, cvenience [sic], and objects in life may demand it. We wish thus to do away with the monopoly and aristocracy of learning and to equalize, in a greater degree, the benefits of a higher education in community.\textsuperscript{122}

Scott's remarks were also laced with indignant prophecy, fully a dozen years before the first Morrill bill, and, no doubt, served as piercing fodder for protagonists of the Farmers' College candidacy during the years of the fray:

But where is the governmental provision, in this State, or in any other of the States, for an Institution of the higher grade, of the practical character contemplated in this? These things ought not be so. But we need not look for it to be otherwise till we have, by private enterprise, shewn the way. This day we commence the effort. We will lead, and others will follow, till, we trust, similar Institutions will rise up all over our land, to bless and benefit the mass of society, to raise up another and better, because a more educated and intelligent, kind of agriculturists, mechanics, and business men, than the present or any previous generation, and to go down with their blessings, in the advancement of society, to unborn generations.\textsuperscript{123}

Its faculty also represented an amalgamation of both the liberal and practical pursuits of the institution and included: Freeman G. Cary, A.M., President and Professor of Moral Philosophy and Rhetoric; Robert H. Bishop, D.D., Professor of History and Political Economy; John W. Scott, D.D., Professor of Chemistry And Its Application to Agriculture And The Arts; John Silsby, A.M., Professor of Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, and Astronomy; Joseph Wilson, Professor of Ancient and Modern Languages; and George S. Ormsby, Teacher of the Primary Department.\textsuperscript{124}
The building itself was completed on 1 September 1847 at a cost of $12,498.24. The magnificent structure measured one-hundred and twenty feet across, forty-eight feet deep, three stories high, contained twenty-seven rooms, and in front, majestically carved in stone above the portal were the words, THE FARMERS' COLLEGE.125

But what was the Farmers' College? Indeed, the paramount question posed by many agriculturists throughout the state was: "Is the Farmer's College any more agricultural in character than ordinary colleges?" Just one month after the main edifice was completed this specific question was raised by a reader writing to The Ohio Cultivator and elicited this rather contradictory reply:

We do not possess very particular information in regard to the studies pursued, or the sciences taught at Farmer's College; but we believe they do not differ essentially from those of other collegiate institutions in the land. The name Farmer's College, we presume, was not designed to convey an idea that it is an agricultural school, in the ordinary sense; but simply that it is a college adapted to the wants of a farming population - to such as desire to obtain a sound practical education, at a moderate cost.126

Indeed, the question of the true, if not overriding, nature of the college was a particularly vexatious one during its early years, and an issue which would especially haunt it during the years of the fray. An analysis of its first six years of existence, however, definitely seems to depict an institution of liberal and scientific learning adapted to the ideals and pursuits of the industrial classes.

Evidences of its early thrust came from Cary himself. Commenting on the institution's first fiscal crisis in March 1850
during which he personally contributed $10,000 from his own estate, we get a vision of the man and his mission:

Did I this day know that our enterprise would be finally successful, that a spirit would be awakened all over our land, to put forth similar efforts, increasing the facilities and inspiring the desire for the more liberal mental training [emphasis added] of the million, resulting in the proper modification of our college to suit the age, I would be willing not only that my money should be exhausted, but that my life's best energies be spent even to its close in the accomplishment of such desirable results.127

Another indication of the broad, if not experimental, thrust of the institution centered on its elective method of study. This, Cary and others argued, was the primary difference between it and other institutions of higher learning. Specifically, Cary is quoted as saying: "... every man had a special right to that kind of education which would be of greatest value to him in the prosecution of useful industry."128 Many supporters argued that given enough funds Farmers' College could, indeed, become the great university of the West.

And finally, profiled in the school catalogue for the year 1851, Cary proffers a program which was generally suited to fit gentlemen in all walks of life:

We aim in the first place, to develope the mental powers of each pupil, and then give to that development such a direction as may suit his genius and taste, and the occupation for which he is destined. An examination of our course of studies will show that, while we afford opportunities for mastering those departments of science which are most susceptible of application to agriculture and the mechanic arts far greater than other institutions furnish, we have made ample arrangements to meet the wants of those who aspire to become scholars in the highest sense of the word.130
To be sure, then, Farmers' College and its progenitors did accede to something vastly different than the traditional classicism which permeated the majority of colleges throughout the land. And yet, it could not totally ascribe to being a purely agricultural college, as prototyped in Europe for example. Weighty questions pressed heavily into the minds of its guardians, especially Cary. Should the college shun its namesake and move into the mainstream? Or, should it gamble its entire future by becoming one of a few droplets in the trickle of schools opting for agricultural specialization. For the insightful Cary, at least, neither extreme warranted serious consideration as he almost singlehandedly moved to implement what seemed to be the ideal compromise--the creation of a separate Department of Agriculture and, with it, perhaps, the West's best hope for a great educational center encompassing all of the practical, scientific, and classical studies.

Though not extant in the contemporary literature, and perhaps even muddled in both the public and private press during the years of the fray, a thorough understanding of Cary's scheme is paramount, since it surely must have been, one of, if not the single most important strength of the Farmers' College proposition to secure the land-grant funds. The plan was launched on 9 February 1853 when the Board of Trustees adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That an effort be made at once to raise the sum of $100,000 by donation, to secure a farm and establish an Agricultural Professorship and Department of practical Agriculture and Horticulture, and constitute a building fund, and that a committee of three be appointed
to prepare a subscription and put the same into the hands of the Agent to be by him circulated during his collections of the scholarship fund.  

Shortly thereafter, the Committee appointed to prepare a subscription for the funds to establish the new department issued its 'Report'. Of particular note was its prefatory remarks which described the work of the new Department, as well as an attending rationale of its importance:

It was the original design to connect with this Institution a farm for scientific and practical experiments in Agriculture and Horticulture, including the analysis of soils and fertilizers and their adaptations to the various products of the earth. Agriculture must ever be the commanding interest of the West, and a College furnished with ample facilities for applying the principles of science to husbandry and the mechanic arts is indispensable in developing the resources of the country. Many fertile fields are becoming sterile for the want of a knowledge of the laws of production, and few, if any, yield one-half the crops which a less amount of labor, scientifically employed, would return.

The 'Report' also reemphasized the necessity of raising an additional $100,000 to accomplish the task. The Board of Trustees concurred, and appointed none other than Freeman Cary to act as its agent.

On 17 September 1853 the die was cast. Freeman G. Cary officially resigned the Presidency of the Faculty of the College in order to become the President of the new Department of Agriculture and Horticulture, and concurrently submitted a lengthy report detailing the plans for the new addition. Section Four detailed its primary objective:
The great object should be to give full instructions on all subjects pertaining to Scientific Agriculture and Horticulture; show the means to be employed to recover worn-out lands, and restore them, by the least possible expense, to virgin fertility; produce upon the farm, by improved modes of culture, the best grains, grasses, fruits, and vegetable, as well as specimens of native and exotic plants, flowers & c. 134

Other noteworthy features of the plan included: an experimental farm of some 75 to 100 acres, an annual Exhibition or Fair, an agricultural library, and a detailed four year course of study. 135

The mid-1850's would, indeed, mark a high tide of prosperity for the institution. The new President of the college, Isaac J. Allen seems to have set the tone in his Inaugural Address of 1854:

With an ample legislative charter: free from debt; its financial condition sound and prosperous; its buildings, fixtures, investments and endowments worth $135,000; its buildings and grounds beautiful, ample and commodious; its halls filled with students; its Professors faithful and capable; its philosophical and other demonstrative apparatus extensive and efficient; its Trustees and Faculty united and harmonious; its location healthful and beautiful, even to the measure of a proverb; its social atmosphere normal and refined; and the Queen City of the Kingly 'West' within our vicinage - all combined to attain the highest point of success to which even our hopes may aspire, and to render the institution, at once, a most beautiful home and profitable school for the student desirous of prosecuting study in any department of education, practical or speculative - in the language ancient or modern, and in the science, physical or philosophical. 136

Allen also left little doubt as to what he considered to be the institution's ultimate goal--namely, that of a true university. He firmly believed:

... from a certain and positive conviction that the wants of the public, and the demands of the age, require such modification in the arrangement of studies, such
adoption and incorporation of the practical sciences appertaining to the useful arts and all the (industrial) pursuits into the course of university education, as may prepare young men to enter upon and prosecute those pursuits, not only with an understanding of the philosophic and scientific laws on which they rest, but also with a ready knowledge of the practical duties which those pursuits require. Let us not be misunderstood. We neither abbreviate nor diminish the usual college course; we rather extend and amplify. We do not, by any means, repudiate the study of the ancient classics; on the contrary, we recommend them strenuously. But, we do not make them a sine qua non to the honors of the Institution, when the full equivalent of intellectual development and mental cultivation are attained.137

The years 1854-56 were notable ones for the institution, as several new contributions and innovations, particularly in the areas of industrial education, effectively bolstered its reputation. They included: a $10,000 donation from Charles McMicken in order to establish a professorship in Agricultural Chemistry, hosting the National Convention of the Friends of Industrial University Education, yet another donation of $10,000 by Freeman Cary's father, William, in order to establish the "Cary Professorship of Practical Agriculture", the adoption of new by-laws by the Board in organizing a new Farm Department comprised of three professorships, the completion of the laboratory known as Polytechnic Hall at a cost of $7,000, and the founding of the nation's first collegiate journal, The Cincinnatus, devoted solely to the development of the agricultural and mechanic arts.138

The Cincinnatus, inaugurated in January 1856, served both as a resource for the latest scientific and practical advances in the fields of agriculture and the mechanical arts and as a forum for the
more weighty political issues concerning the progress and promotion of the industrial classes. The newspaper's editor, Freeman G. Cary, also did not hesitate to defend or promote the college whenever it was deemed expedient. The first issue, for example, entered an essay entitled "Our Present System of Agriculture - Its Defects and Remedies." In it, Cary statistically points out the effects of the rapid deterioration of the soil, and is critical of the contemporary sources (e.g., agricultural societies, fairs, and lectures) of information which, up to this time, have been utilized to deter land wastage. He then goes on to categorically state that only organized institutions of higher learning can solve contemporary problems in agriculture, as well as provide a means for the discovery of new scientific principles. Sounding a theme readily attributable to most agricultural institutionalists, Cary chorused:

The want of such institutions is the true reason why this species of knowledge is not more highly appreciated in our country. Amidst all the efforts to popularize science, and build up colleges, there is not in all North America one agricultural college, where a farmer may learn the elements with which he constantly deals, or the laws which govern them. And we affirm without fear of contradiction, if agricultural science shall ever make any advance in our country, it will never be done without such institutions, with all the means and appliances furnished them, of proper teachers, and text books, and laboratories, with extensive apparatus, and with a sufficient quantity of ground to test experimentally the principle and doctrines taught. In short, theory and practice must go together, without which all efforts at improvement must fail.139

After sighting the progress made in those European countries where agricultural colleges have been established and criticizing
the impeded progress toward the same goal in this country, Cary concludes that:

It belongs to Ohio - to the enterprising citizens of Hamilton county - to have made the first successful effort at establishing a department for the promotion of scientific agricultural and horticulture. It will be one object of this journal to awaken and diffuse interest on the subject of Industrial University education, and as far as possible unite the friends of progress in similar efforts.¹⁴⁰

This claim of exclusivity not only permeated the pages of the nationally distributed tabloid, it also appeared in the College's 1854 and 1855 Catalogues as part of the announcement of the opening of its Agricultural Department:

Pursuant to the original design of the Institution, particular attention is given to instruction in those branches of Natural Science more directly appertaining to Agriculture. And we now have the satisfaction of announcing to our patrons and to the public that the Department of Instruction in Scientific and Practical Agriculture and Horticulture is now fully organized under three appropriate professorships, with a Model and Experimental Farm, where with to demonstrate and make practical the lessons of science - the First Complete Institution of the Kind Organized on the Continent of America.¹⁴¹

Claims of first-ever distinctions rarely go unchallenged. Cary's assertion was no different as Joseph R. Williams, President of the newly-established Michigan Agricultural College at Lansing, claimed for his school this pioneering achievement in the West.

Addressing the issue in the August 1857 edition of The Cincinnatus, Cary conceded that it (Michigan Agricultural College) was indeed the first such college established under the auspices of state patronage and by direct constitutional provision. Unique and without
precedence. Even so, Cary was unremitting in his first-ever claim and went to great lengths to defend this contention. Perhaps his most classic defense appeared in the pages of the August 1857 edition of *The Cincinnatus*, one in which proponents of the college during the competition for the land-grant fund, no doubt, reveled:

For years we have plead the cause of such Institutions; we have endeavored to demonstrate their necessity, and to the extent of our ability have labored for their up-building. Farmer's College though strangely ignored in certain directions, claims to be a pioneer in the great work. Her history dates back when not an institution of the kind was to be found in our broad land; and the doctrines she then promulgated [sic] are the same as those now so eloquently held forth by the President of this new Agricultural College. While we would not pluck a laurel from the brow of the President or the State that thus lays claim to the establishment of the "pioneer Agricultural College in the West", we would simply state the fact that Farmer's College of Ohio has already a history from its incipient movement of near a quarter of a century, and as a regularly endowed College of over twelve years; and has been instrumental in education, to a greater or less extent, over two thousand young men, some of whom are men of influence and position in several of the States of this Union, and not a few in foreign lands as Missionaries or pioneers.142

*The Cincinnatus* also distinguished itself as a force for hastening and hastening government to patronize the cause of industrial education in this country. An article entitled "The Claims of American Agriculture Upon The Patronage of Government", for example, specifically criticized the notion that agriculture having done so long and well without government assistance might just as well continue to do so. The editor did agree with the premise, but not with its conclusions stating:

The efforts of the people are greatly diminished by the want of sufficient means, and in the very nature of
things must stop far short of consumating the desired end. Associated enterprise has been brought into requisition and had in some instances, as in the establishment of the Farm Department of the Farmer's College, accomplished what is praise-worthy; but such efforts will never be able to pursue, and it is unjust to require then to pursue such a system of investigation as shall fully and successfully develop the great science of rural economy.143

The article not only pinpointed problems, it also preferred solutions, and with an attendant rationale:

Now what is imperiously demanded for the promotion of scientific agriculture is the endowment of a sufficient number of institutions, fully, liberally, to give support to scientific instructors. Let there be at first four located in different parts of the Union with sufficient ground connected therewith to subject to the test of experiment, the various seeds, cuttings, etc., obtained through the United States Patent Office, let these institutions be well supplied with apparatus, good well-furnished laboratories, under the direction of men of science. Institutions thus manned, with all needed appliances, would do more for the advancement of this profound science in a decade of years then all that would be accomplished for the next century under the present system, if system can be said to exist.144

The Cincinnatus especially detailed the evolutionary stages of the first Morrill Bill providing facts and insights crucial to a thorough understanding of its significance. The article appearing in the February 1858 edition commenced with these resounding words:

Never since the formation of our Government has a more important measure been submitted to Congress, for their calm and decided deliberation and action: none that contemplated weightier interests, or if wisely carried out, would be fraught with more salutary and wide spread benefits. It would at once be an index and a harbinger of a more advanced civilization than the world ever saw.145

The article then pointedly claimed that the time was ripe for this mode of agricultural advancement and that the government ought to take the lead in its promotion:
The State of Agricultural Knowledge at the present
time is characterized by an accumulation of facts, all
unclassified and unarranged, like brick and stone piled
around the site of a great edifice, ready to be arranged
into a spacious building, awaiting the hand of some
master builder equal to the task of putting together the
discordant parts and construct from them a symmetrical
whole. Here then is a vast science demanding instructors
and multitudes in readiness to receive her utterances.
Is it not the time to arise and build? And is it not the
duty of Government to aid in the work?146

And finally, after detailing the provisions of the bill, Cary
concludes with this direct charge to Congress:

It is our sincere hope that party influences and the ex-
citing topics now pressed upon the attention of Congress
may prove no let or hinderance to the passage of this
Bill having within its purview and for its object the
conferring advantages of a physical, intellectual, poli-
tical and social nature, not only immense but incalcul-
able.147

Successive issues kept its readership abreast of continuing de-
velopments in Congress. The June 1858 edition reported a sign of
progress when the bill passed the House of Representatives, and also
listed a page-long checklist of benefits to be derived once the mea-
sure had been approved by the Senate and signed by the President.148
Yet another progress report appeared in the November 1858 edition.149
And finally, the April 1859 edition of The Cincinnatus reported on
President Buchanan's veto message and included a full printing of
the bill, the objections proffered by the President, and an exten-
sive point-by-point refutation of the President's objections by
Cary. All of this was prefaced by a bitter denunciation of the veto
power especially in the face of a matter of such importance and uni-
versal appeal:
It is the boast of our country, that we live under a Republican Government: that here the people are sovereign, and make their own laws. It would be true, if it were not for that shred of monarchy incorporated into our Constitution—The veto power. The exercise of this power, since the formation of our Government, has been of rare occurrence, as it has been of doubtful expediency. Especially, when that power arrays itself against the decided and deliberate decision of the people, through their representatives in Congress.

It has served proper, for special reason, to which we would here advert, for our President to interpose his authority in opposition to the Senate and House of Representatives, in the passage of the bill known as The Morrill Land Bill, for the endowment of Colleges for the promotion of Agriculture. To the passage of this Bill, the people have looked with more real interest, than any measure introduced for the last half century, simply because it had in view the promotion of their interests—the elevation of the farmer and his calling, and his enlightenment in all that pertained to the profound science in which he is daily employed. This was no party measure, whatever aspect it might have been made to assume by the political wire-workers at Washington. The Agricultural Press, throughout the country—and there is no better index of the sentiment of the people—fully indorsed it, and many have advocated it with zeal and ability.150

One can only conjecture whether political or professional motivations prompted the editor of The Cincinnatus to pay special attention to the evolution and implications of the Morrill legislation. Evidence of the former may have surfaced in the February 1858 edition when Cary denounced Sullivant D. Harris' comments in the Ohio Cultivator which disparagingly labeled the lot of the College Hill institution as being dead, or at least crippled. The head of the Farm Department then proceeded to enumerate its many agricultural accomplishments. At the time of the writing, passage of the Morrill legislation seemed assured.
Moreover, serious financial problems loomed ominously on the horizon, and the potential windfall realized from the federal grant, no doubt, livened the spirits of the guardians of Farmer's College. Any part of the federal windfall would have been welcome given the January 1857 financial statement which reported an institutional deficit of $3,696.09.\textsuperscript{151} Exactly one year later, Cary, perhaps sensing the veto of the Morrill legislation, urged the Board to approve yet another (independent) attempt to procure governmental aid. Although the unilateral proposal gained the quick approbation of the trustees, it, unfortunately, elicited only negligible support in the National Assembly.\textsuperscript{152} This setback coupled with the eventual veto of the Morrill legislation were, undoubtedly, decisive factors in Freeman Cary's decision to resign his position as President of the Farm Department during the Autumn of 1858.\textsuperscript{153} The full measure of the severity of the problem manifested itself in a Report made to the Board of Trustees during the same year as it summarized the financial dilemma of the institution over the previous six years:

Thus it will be seen that the College proper is absorbing the capital to the extent of about $2,500 per annum, which will increase as the present income diminishes, unless new sources [emphasis added] can be found.\textsuperscript{154}

The urgency of the problem prompted Board members at its annual meeting in June 1859 to appoint a committee "...to examine the lands of the Farm Department and report at the next meeting the best plan in their view of dividing and disposing of the lands to raise a revenue for the benefits of the College."\textsuperscript{155} Eventually other
measures were also implemented in order to alleviate the growing financial deficit and included: a reduction in the number of faculty members, a reduction in the salaries of the existing faculty, and, in order to attract the more traditional student, a suggestion of a name change for the college as early as 1861.\textsuperscript{156}

Hopes soared again at the College Hill institution as a Second Morrill bill was enacted into law in July 1862. Immediately, supporters of Farmers' College rallied to her side, but it soon became apparent that she would not prevail in the fierce competition. Given the failure of the college to secure a portion of the federal grant and the deliterious impact of the Civil War on student enrollment, desperate measures were called for. In January 1866 the Board of Trustees sought to press upon the legislature a measure which would allow them to dispose of certain lands in order to re-plenish a depleted treasury.\textsuperscript{157} Shortly after the approval of this 'Enabling Act', the Board determined to sell all the lands of the College, as well as its buildings with the exception of the main college edifice and the 7 and 42-100 acre lot upon which it stood.\textsuperscript{158} And though the sale eventually yielded $54,845.17, it was not enough to sustain the college.\textsuperscript{159} A great debate ensued, and the choice between liquidation or perpetuity emerged as the only two logical choices. By a narrow 76-68 margin, the latter option prevailed with the decision to reorganize and then open during the Autumn of 1873--the same year the new Agricultural College at Columbus would open its doors.\textsuperscript{160}
Oberlin. Oberlin, like many of her counterparts, initially assumed the role of curious bystander. Only after it became apparent that the Ohio General Assembly would, indeed, accept the provisions of the federal grant (i.e., with the passage of Delano's House Bill No. 4 on 9 February 1864), and only after it was convinced that no quick solution to the disbursal of the monies was evident (i.e., the refusal of the General Assembly to adopt the recommendations of either the 'Majority' or 'Minority' Reports of December 1865), did it decide to actively enter the competition.

A meeting of the College's Prudential Committee on 16 December 1864 set the wheels in motion. Professors Cowles and Fairchild were appointed a committee to represent the interests of the college at a statewide gathering of delegates from other institutions slated for the 27th of the month in Columbus. The chief topic of discussion centered on the propriety of memorializing the General Assembly for an allotment of the national grant for agricultural colleges among the principal existing colleges of the state. Though no official records of the meeting remain extant, it, undoubtedly, whetted the singular appetites of several, if not all, of its participants.

Even so, no evidence of direct involvement by Oberlin appears until the latter part of 1866, no doubt, due in large measure to the waning support of the 1865 'Majority Report'. Counsel from one of its most distinguished alumni may have also hastened its decision. Governor Jacob D. Cox, class of 1851, wrote to the college's Prudential Committee urging them to avail themselves of the opportunity of
procuring a portion of the grant. And, following his advice, the Committee at a meeting held on 26 November 1866, after a general interchange of views on the subject, voted to take those measures necessary to secure one-third of the grant. President Fairchild, Professor Ellis, and George Kinney were then appointed a committee to take charge of the matter. Shortly thereafter, the name of Oberlin College appeared in the pages of the Ohio House Journal as a possible donee of the grant. This, however, would be the only legislative consideration afforded the northeast Ohio institution.

Oberlin's reputation for innovation and reform in the sphere of Ohio higher education, no doubt, emboldened her supporters to diligently press for a share of the federal largess. Its first Annual Report (1834) proclaimed its broad educational objectives:

Its grand object is the diffusion of useful science, sound morality, and pure religion among the growing multitudes of the Mississippi Valley. It aims also at bearing an important part in extending these blessings to the destitute millions which overspread the earth. For this purpose it proposes as its primary object, the thorough education of Ministers and pious School Teachers, as a secondary object, the elevation of the female character, and as a third general design, the education of the common people with the higher class in such manner as suits the Republican institutions. . . .

Though most of the denominational colleges throughout the state endeared themselves to the education of ministers and teachers, only a handful tended to the female and industrial segments of the population, and none with quite the pioneering spirit of Oberlin College. It was the first college in the state, or for that matter, the nation, to admit women on an equal basis with men, one of the
few which accepted blacks, and an innovator in the field of industrial education—especially for the agrarian class.

One of the chief attractions of the institution during its early years was its Manual and Domestic Labor Department. The Reverend John Jay Shipherd, one of the founding fathers of the college, detailed the scope and importance of the Department in 1833 stating that it

...will receive unusual attention, being not (as is too common), regarded as an unimportant appendage to the literary department; but systematized and incorporated with it. A variety of agricultural and mechanical labors will be performed by the students under circumstances most conducive to their health and support. All will be required to labor probably four hours daily.165

This Department was, unquestionably, the life-line of the institution for the first fifteen years of its existence.

The Oberlin idea inextricably bound college and community together. The Oberlin Agricultural and Horticultural Society founded shortly after the establishment of the college provided a rich intellectual feast for both the citizens of the town and the outlying areas. Professors from the college frequently lectured on subjects of practical and scientific value, and, together, with other members of the organization, bore a direct influence on the founding of the Lorain County Agricultural Society.166

One member of that Society, Dr. Norton S. Townshend, was called to serve as a trustee of the Oberlin Institute in 1845. Later referred to as "The Father of Agricultural Education in America," Townshend's active interest in the promulgation of higher education
for the industrial classes spanned a period of nearly four decades.\textsuperscript{167} At Oberlin, he served as the driving force behind the creation of one of the state's first agricultural colleges. Its establishment most assuredly thrust Oberlin into a position of prominence, at least, respectability, during the years of the fray over the Morrill grant, and is, consequently, a topic which demands careful analysis. The subject was first broached on 22 August 1846 when Trustee Townshend recommended that a series of lectures be delivered on agriculture at the college.\textsuperscript{168} Less than a week later, he submitted a proposal for the establishment of an agricultural school.\textsuperscript{169} And though the trustees commended the plan to the favorable consideration of the Faculty and Prudential Committee, it would be eight more years before it would actually be in place. During the interim, professors Townshend, Dascomb, and Fairchild kept the idea alive by periodically delivering lectures on topics of agricultural importance under the auspices of the Lorain County Agricultural Society.\textsuperscript{170}

Renewed interest in establishing a college surfaced again during the Spring of 1854. A letter dated 17 March 1854 from Norton S. Townshend to Professor H. Cowles identifies the initial groundswell of support. Several prominent Ohio agriculturists, including Thomas Brown, editor of The Ohio Farmer, urged Townshend to reconsider the proposal of eight years past. Brown believed that a few well-placed articles by Townshend in his, and other agricultural newspapers across the state, could easily generate enough monetary support to pay the professors for the lectures. Cowles and Townshend agreed
that this was a propitious time for action and proceeded accordingly.171

Within six months, a prospectus was issued and entitled "Ohio Agricultural College, Oberlin, Lorain Co., O". It was designated that the college's primary object was "to place within the reach of farmers, both old and young, the means of acquiring a thorough and practical acquaintance with all those branches of science which have direct relations to Agriculture."172 The plan of studies proposed to give lectures in all areas of agricultural science during the winter months when regular classes were recessed. The members of the faculty and their respective areas of specialization were also listed and included: James Dascomb, M.D., Chemistry in all its applications to agriculture; Norton S. Townshend, M.D., Comparative Anatomy and Physiology, History and Description of Domestic Animals, and Veterinary Medicine and Surgery; John S. Newberry, M.D., Geology, Mineralogy, and Botany; and James H. Fairchild, A.M., Natural Philosophy, Agricultural Mechanics, Meteorology, Farm Implements, Elements of Engineering and Land Surveying, Rural Architecture, Landscape Gardening and Farm Book-keeping.173

The school would commence on the first Monday in December and continue for three months. Tuition for the course was placed at forty dollars for the term; room and board would be available in the town for approximately two dollars per week. And most importantly, the prospectus emphasized the permanent nature of the institution, and was therefore, incorporated as the 'Ohio Agricultural College'.174
M. B. Bateham, editor of the Ohio Cultivator, hailed the opening of the college with these gracious words:

Indeed, we know of no place in Ohio where a course of lectures of so much ability could be secured at so moderate a cost, and with so much promise of permanent advantage to agriculture, as at Oberlin; hence we hail this arrangement as a most auspicious omen to the cause in which we have so long engaged, and we sincerely hope that hundreds of young men of Ohio will avail themselves of the opportunity thus afforded them for becoming scientific as well as practical agriculturists, especially as it can be done at so little cost, and without interfering with the period of active farm labor.\textsuperscript{175}

And just one week before the commencement of classes, it focused on the historical and practical significance of the new venture stating that it would be

\textit{... the first experiment of the kind in the west — a system of independent agricultural Lectures, for, and to, farmers. Many literary institutions, east and west, have held out inducements of this kind, but for want of patronage or capacity, have failed to realize a beneficial result.}\textsuperscript{176}

Editor Bateham (and others) visited the classes at Oberlin during its initial session, and subsequently printed his assessment of the school in the newspaper's first edition of 1855. Though generally shed in a favorable light, Bateham pinpointed two problems which would continually plague the Oberlin experiment. First, the nature and scope of instruction. To this Bateham admitted that their

\textit{... expectations had risen so high, that we were in some danger of forgetting that the lectures were treading mostly upon new ground, and mostly without the aid of that guidance from books which can be found in almost every other department of teaching.}\textsuperscript{177}
The other problem centered on the sparse attendance, particularly of Ohio patrons, to wit Bateham cracked:

Our only regret was to find the number of students attending the lecture so very few, and most of them residents of distance States. This is a reproach to the farmers of Ohio which, we trust, another season will see wiped out, for we cannot believe that the farmers of the greatest agricultural State in the Union, will be the last to appreciate the advantages which the Ohio Agricultural College affords for imparting to young men a knowledge of the sciences that pertain to agriculture, and which every farmer should understand. 178

The meager attendance may well have accounted for the decision to move the Ohio Agricultural College to Cleveland. Though lectures and lecturers essentially remained the same, there was no appreciable increase in the number of students during the 1855 session. Another dismal year would surely mark the demise of the floundering organization.

In an attempt to head off such a disaster, Norton S. Townshend issued a rather lengthy exhortation in an open letter to Ohio farmers in the 15 October 1856 edition of the Ohio Cultivator:

Is not such an Institution needed in Ohio? Are there not hundreds of young farmers that desire precisely the instruction this institution was established to impart? Such was the conviction of its founders and therefore without waiting for the Legislature could be induced to make an appropriation for a State Institution which would have required years to put in operation, they went to work with the best means they could command and such aid as they could obtain. For two seasons the teachers have labored without any compensation other than the pleasure derived from a consciousness of having faithfully endeavored to promote a public good. The classes have been very small and the income from tuition fees insufficient to pay expenses; if the coming winter does not bring a large class the enterprise must be abandoned. Shall the only agricultural college in the State (and at
present in the whole country) die for want of the sympathy and support of the farming community? Have the farmers of Ohio no sons for whom they desire such a course of instruction? If they have will they not send them the coming winter? Are there no young farmers who can make arrangements to be absent from home three months while they attend one Session in the Agricultural College? If they can and desire such a course of instruction, will they not take the matter into consideration at once.\textsuperscript{179}

A mid-November editorial in the \textit{Ohio Cultivator} supported the appeal of Dr. Townshend, and consequently urged its patrons to enroll in the December classes. And, as a gesture of support, the newspaper purchased a scholarship from the college which would soon be awarded to a \textit{Cultivator} boy.\textsuperscript{180}

Though pockets of support could be discerned from various quarters around the State, pleas from educators and editors alike generally fell on deaf ears. And time was running short. Only one other source of revenue remained, and Townshend determined to lobby for it—namely a permanent appropriation from the Ohio General Assembly.

Senate Bill No. 219, "To Promote Agricultural Education In Ohio", was subsequently introduced during the next session of the Ohio General Assembly.\textsuperscript{181} The measure specifically sought an annual appropriation from the treasury of $16,000 for the Ohio Agricultural College in order to secure for the citizens of the state free instruction in the various branches of science that relate to agriculture. Though the bill was favorably reported back from the Committee of the Whole, a 'Report' by the Senate Committee on Universities, Colleges, and Academies dashed any hopes for its success.\textsuperscript{182}
The 'Report' cited Constitutional and practical, if not political reasons, for its decision, and perhaps marked a precedent for the future. Section 7, Article 1 of the Ohio Constitution, the Committee argued, declared it the duty of the General Assembly 'to encourage schools, and the means of instruction'; a system which may be obtained by 'a thorough system of common schools.' Thus, it was the opinion of the committee that the kind of education contemplated in Senate Bill No. 219 transcended their constitutional obligations, since instruction of this sort, though necessary and beneficial to a large class of people, did not, as such, have universal appeal. Furthermore, it argued that if an appropriation of this sort be made for one institution of the kind named, then justice and equality would demand like appropriation for other similar institutions, and the committee already had under consideration another proposal of a similar nature. (i.e., Farmers' College). Thus, the committee recommended that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The *Ohio Cultivator*, not surprisingly, pressed for its passage, and scorned its failure. A letter from an interested reader penned shortly after its introduction into the Senate and reprinted in the 1 February 1857 edition sought to lay a proper perspective:

Our younger brothers in Michigan are ahead of us. Their farm of 700 acres is bought—a building has been erected, and the school will be opened in April of this year. We are glad they evince so much enterprise. We are sorry that Ohio is so far behind. Cannot something be done in this direction by the present Legislature? Cannot this body at least give some aid to the Ohio Agricultural College which has so nobly commenced the work of public instruction in scientific Agriculture?
A week later the tabloid went on record as strongly endorsing
the creation of the college, and, at once, railed against those
whose primary responsibility it was to get the measure on the
books—a remonstration which would be repeated over and over again
during the competition of the 1860's. Who was to blame for the
inertia of this measure, or for that matter, any attempt to foster
agricultural education at a higher level?

... the farmers themselves—the very men whose
occupation and interests are at stake—they are chiefly
the men who are indifferent and opposed. Now, farmers,
is it not so? Look into our Legislature, who are the ad-
vocates of this bill for a Farmers' College? They are
lawyers, merchants, doctors & C. But who are the major-
ity of the Legislature? They are farmers. Now friends,
farmers, awake to your duty, and press through, a bill to
endow yourselves with another free school; a farmers free
school; a school where farming shall be taught, as though
it had principles, and should be learned. Let every
farmer who takes our paper, bestir himself and see that
his representatives is awake, and right on this matter.
Get right about it, and see that it is not lost, through
neglect. If it is, we are very much mistaken in our
farming community. 185

And finally, a fitting epitaph for the Ohio Agricultural College
inked the pages of the 1 March 1857 edition of the Cultivator. In
an effort to scorn recalcitrant legislators and farmers alike, the
tabloid reprinted a gracious testimonial from the third and what was
to become the final class of the college:

Whereas, The third course of lectures of the Ohio
Agricultural College have come to a close, and we, the
students, feeling our indebtedness to the Professors of
the College, do hereby offer the following resolution:

Resolved, that we tender to the Professors our sin-
cere thanks for the instructive manner in which they have
treated the various natural sciences relating to Agricul-
ture; that we shall ever feel our obligations to them for
the kindness received, and the earnest and abiding interest they have manifested for our improvement; and assure them that they will ever hold a high place in our memories as Instructors and Pioneers in the great course of Agricultural Education.

Resolved. That we wish to assure the agricultural community that the facilities here offered for obtaining a knowledge of the various sciences relating to their professions [sic], demand their earnest consideration, and that we believe the College is worthy of their unanimous support.186

Too little, too late.

The Denominational Interests

Though shackled by their own religiosity and seemingly bereft of any conventional claims to the agricultural land grant, a number of traditionally denominational colleges throughout the state actively campaigned for at least a share of the federal endowment. It, therefore, behooves us to presently examine the individual strategies and rationales of these institutions in order to assess the legitimacy, at least, effectiveness, of their candidacies. Particular attention will be given to evidences of agricultural tradition at each of the competing institutions, but all criteria, real, imagined, or conjectured will be fully scrutinized.

Mount Union College. Mount Union's efforts to secure a portion of the grant generally parallels the embryonic stages of its history. Established on 9 January 1858 as an independent college, its broad curriculum included separate Classical, Scientific, and Teacher Preparatory Departments. Fashioning itself as a progressive institution for the masses, its progenitors, undoubtedly, recognized
the practical and political merit of securing a portion of the land grant.

From the outset, then, officials at the college, especially its President, O. N. Hartshorn, lobbied hard for the establishment of an agricultural college by means of the national endowment. Hartshorn's strategy centered on wooing perhaps the state's single most influential man in the agricultural sector—namely John H. Klippart, Corresponding Secretary of the powerful Ohio State Board of Agriculture. Within two weeks after the General Assembly accepted the provisions of the national statute (i.e., the Delano measure passed 9 February 1864), Hartshorn rushed to Columbus where on 19 February 1864 he spent half the day with Klippart discussing the reciprocal advantages of naming Mount Union as a recipient of the agricultural endowment.\(^{187}\) Klippart's appointment as a life trustee of the college Board was in all probability a shrewd political maneuver designed to place the college in a more favorable position to secure a portion of the grant. The election of E. E. White, State Commissioner of Education, to the Mount Union College Board of Trustees was, undoubtedly, just as coincidental.\(^{188}\)

The Hartshorn - Klippart connection intensified when the corresponding Secretary accepted Hartshorn's invitation to deliver a pio- gnant agricultural address at Mount Union in March. The lengthy oration emphasized the necessity of establishing a first-rate state system of higher agricultural education. And although Klippart did not specifically mention Mount Union College as being an integral
part of that system, his subsequent role in assisting with, if not shaping, a policy of procurement for its Board clearly marked his intentions.\textsuperscript{189}

Two days before Klippart's arrival, an announcement in the \textit{Ohio Repository} (the Canton Weekly) informed the citizens of Mount Union and Alliance of separate meetings in their respective communities in order to discuss the propriety of petitioning the legislature to grant at least a portion of the 630,000 acres of the federal grant to Mount Union. It was announced that Klippart would be the main speaker and that his speech would center on both the object and importance of the federal land grant.\textsuperscript{190} Shortly thereafter, several citizens of Stark County and trustees from the college jointly penned and endorsed a legislative memorial requesting a share of the federal endowment for the college.\textsuperscript{191} The evidence indicates on this, as well as other occasions, Klippart obliged President Hartshorn's requests to assist him in perusing, if not actually editing, memorials before their official presentation to the legislature.\textsuperscript{192}

Despite the trustees seemingly inexorably policy of securing at least a portion of the federal grant, other, more influential, forces sought to check, if not thwart, any further movement in this direction. In a lengthy commencement address delivered at Mount Union in June 1864, Reverend Bishop Edward Thomson surveyed the diverse means of support extended to colleges throughout the state. National and state government support of higher education, he argued
must, by Constitutional fiat exclude all private colleges. This was especially true of the recently legislated princely provision for agricultural colleges. In the absence of public funding and in order to raise private education to a position of parity, the Church, Thomson argued, provided the only secure measure of liberality. And for Mount Union College, at least, this meant even stronger ties with its Methodist heritage. Otherwise, it most certainly would perish. 193

The sectarian brandishment, notwithstanding, efforts to secure a portion of the grant actually intensified. A debate in the General Assembly over the propriety, if not legality, of awarding the grant to any of the existing colleges of the state brought forth not only a staunch defense of the principle of apportionment but also a strong feeling of local pride from Mr. Martin of Stark County who averred that:

In the county I represent is one of the finest college buildings in the State. It is situated at Mount Union in a healthy neighborhood where lands of good quality can be obtained cheap. The building is entirely new and arrangements are being made to present it to the State for an Agricultural College. 194

The 'Act of April 13, 1865' creating the five-man Commission designated to select a site(s) for the agricultural college impelled the Mount Union Board of Trustees to further action. At its annual meeting in June of that year, it was determined to appoint a special committee, and in conjunction with an Executive Committee, evaluate and actuate all such steps and measures with reference to the whole
subject of the Agricultural College and its potential relation to Mount Union College. 195

Within months, members of the Executive Committee presented a formal proposition to the Commission. The unique document actually proferred two proposals, with Klippert's hand in it almost a certainty. The first sought to establish an agricultural college [emphasis added], and though under the control and government of the state would, nevertheless, offer to its students free access to the literary college's grounds, buildings, and apparatus. The second overture called for the creation of a smaller agricultural department or experimental station to be governed either by the state or the college as the legislature saw fit, and, of course, in full compliance with the provisions set forth by the national statute. It was clear, then, that Mt. Union College was ready to utilize either all or a portion of the munificent grant. 196

Though enthusiasm ran high in the small northeastern Ohio community, neither it nor the proposition mustered much support amongst members of the Commission during their visit. By November, even the local newspapers realized that all was not well, conceding that Miami University had gained the upper-hand. 197 The Commission's 'Majority Report' released in December did, indeed, favor Miami. And for all intents and purposes the dream of establishing an agricultural college at Mount Union had come to an end. 198

Wooster College. Wooster's endeavor to secure the location of the agricultural college waxed interwovenly with the conceptual
stages of its development. Formally incorporated in December 1866, during the height of the Morrill controversy, its candidacy, more vividly than the others, illustrates the profundity of the principle of division and the onerousness of denominationalism. On balance, the Wooster proposition perhaps represented the single most plausible answer to the Agricultural Question by an existing denominational institution.

The history of Wooster is inextricably tied to the Presbyterian Church. Unable to gain a complete and permanent foothold at the Miami University in Oxford, the vanguards of the Church determined to establish a purist haven at some other location in the state.199 Reverend James Hoge's message, no doubt, exemplified the complete will of his associates stating that the Church:

... is deeply impressed with the importance of founding an institution of learning to be under the control of the Synods of Ohio and Cincinnati; and that such an institution is now necessary to the purity and progress of Presbyterianism and to our occupying that position which as a church would enable us not only to educate our own children in our way and thus save them to the church, but to take our part also in the training of the common mind of the country.200

Sectarian pride, if not politics, also entered into the decision, and is evidenced in the heavy-handed quotation from a fund-raising letter distributed to every Presbyterian pastor and church throughout the state:

In the State of Ohio nearly every denomination except our own has embarked in this work. One denomination has already four colleges under its control. Unitarianism in its struggle to become an organized denomination has one. How shameful, how sinful it is that Presbyterianism, the very Pioneer in education, should have none.201
Concurrently, the Wooster architects were just as interested in creating a grand university. At the June 1868 Board of Trustees meeting, one of its members spoke directly to this issue insisting that:

The felt want of the people of the State is not another college to go crippling and begging through a feeble and ineffective existence. Starving its professors and mortifying everyone in any way connected with it, but a strong, flourishing institution, whose faculty, relieved by a liberal salary from the embarrassing cares and vexations of economizing for a living, may give full play to their enthusiasm in the cultivation of literature and science, and thus inspire in their pupils a generous ambition not merely to prepare themselves for a passable performance of duties but to take a foremost part among men of scholarship and investigation.\(^\text{202}\)

Scholarship and investigation in an institution similar to the one contemplated at Wooster would require a tremendous amount of monetary support, and so the Board of Trustees at its June 1868 meeting determined to raise its initial goal of an endowment from $200,000 to $500,000.\(^\text{203}\) The enlargement was, undoubtedly, prompted by the Board's ambitious plan to initially create four colleges: a Scientific College, a Classical College, a Medical College, and a Law College. And with the entire state currently buzzing over the creation of yet another Legislative Committee (House Joint Resolution No. 45) charged with the responsibility of determining a proper location for an agricultural college, talk of its inclusion in the grand design of Wooster University quite naturally emerged.

By October of the same year, the Board of Trustees decided to make a proposition for the location of the State Agricultural
College at Wooster, and presented the following memorial to the Honorable F. N. Thornhill, Chairman of the Committee on Agricultural and Mechanical College:

If the Legislature will permanently locate the State Agricultural College at Wooster, Wayne County, to be managed by a Board of Control, one-half of whom shall be appointed by the State, and the other half by the Trustees of the University of Wooster (vacancies to be filled by appointment, by authority of the party having power to elect on the expiration of the term of office), then the Trustees of the University of Wooster, in behalf of the citizens of Wayne County, guarantee to furnish all the buildings that may be necessary for recitations, libraries, experiments, cabinets, apparatus, and store rooms; and further, an experimental farm of such number of acres as the Committee may deem necessary, and for this purpose thirty-thousand (30,000) dollars is guaranteed, and grant the students of the Agricultural College access free of tuition to all the instruction of the professors of the Scientific College, provided like access is given to the students of the University to the instructors of the Agricultural College. We further guarantee on our part, to furnish at least six professors for the instruction of the Agricultural College, by the 1st of November, 1869; and we further guarantee to keep the buildings and farm in good order and effective condition. 204

The proposal also gained the support of the local community. At a November 1868, meeting held in the town hall, a number of citizens from Wooster and its adjacent areas gathered to discuss the propriety of locating the agricultural college at Wooster. By meeting's end, the participants not only unanimously endorsed resolutions supporting the scope and intent of the trustees' proposal, they also urged them to take whatever steps deemed necessary to bring the college to Wayne County. 205

The seemingly generous proposition elicited as much skepticism as support among several members of the Agricultural College
Committee. In order to allay any misconceptions about its proposals, especially in regards to the relative autonomy of the proposed colleges, both the university and community committees at Wooster issued yet another circular directed to members of the Selection Committee. Partial institutional governance, it argued, represented a well-thought out concept which would keep political machinations to a minimum. By allowing the Wooster Board of Trustees the perogative of selecting half of the governing body of the college, men specially devoted to education, the institution could effectively counterbalance the overtly political handiwork of partisan politics.

Moreover, by only electing one-half of its members, fears of Woosterism eventually swallowing up the college would also be allayed. Opponents of institutional grafting contended that an indiscriminate shifting of monies from one college sector to another was inevitable. Though, this might be a valid argument against all other existing institutions in the state, the Committee believed that logic of this kind rang hollow in the face of the Wooster proposition, and for several reasons. First, the Wooster University would consist of several different kinds of education, each with its own infrastructure and quest for excellence, and, therefore, would not, for example, just depend on the classical college, for sole financial support. Secondly, the proposed half-million dollar endowment would insure the success of the proposed colleges and, consequently, guard against the temptation to 'borrow' from one another during times of crises. And finally, equal representation
on the Agricultural College's Board of Governors would theoretically insure against any such attempts of 'majority' manipulation by either side.

The circular also criticized the fact that, except for the Insane Asylum located at Newberg, no other state institution had been located in this sector of the state. Locating the Agricultural College at Wooster would, to a great degree, rectify this injustice, and with no small measure of reciprocal benefits to the state. The agricultural belt running through Wayne, Columbiana, Stark, Ashland, and Richland counties exhibited a variety and abundance of all farm productions. Where better a place to locate an Agricultural College than where experimentation on soils, seeds, fertilizers, drainage, minerals, and elements of nearly every kind would, undoubtedly, flourish?

And finally, the committees addressed the oft repeated argument of the potentially pernicious influence religion would have over the proposed agricultural college with this acrimonious chastisement:

No greater evil can be done to society than to educate its young men to believe that science acknowledges no God. Here is the hidden root whose fruits have been so calamitous to Europe. The results of such teaching are even worse in a republic than in a monarchy. When the mass recognizes no God or divine government, then order is at an end, for oaths of office and the swearing of witness become an idle form, while deceit and falsehood have no check but the fear of civil punishment.

The joint effort at clarification, however, failed to sway enough members of the Agricultural College Committee, as a majority issued their 'Report' in favor of the site at Urbana. Nevertheless,
a strong 'Minority Report' submitted by Senator William Lawrence kept the Wooster proposition alive. Not surprisingly, his 'Report' reiterated and emphasized the many salient points of the Wooster proposition including: its independent college structure, first rate facilities, freedom from overt political interference, an ideal location, the support of the local community, and its prompt availability.207

Senator Lawrence carried the fight to the floor of the upper chamber by introducing Senate Bill No. 330. However, neither it, nor its counter measure, Senate Bill No. 324 (the Urbana legislation), carried the full chamber, and the question of locating a site for the agricultural college would lie fallow for yet another year.208

_Heidelberg College_. Heidelberg's endeavor to wrest part of the agricultural fund from the state coffers proceeded primarily as a direct result of the dire economic straits it found itself in during the early and mid-1860's. A rapidly depleting endowment with no immediate means of replacement, the consequent resignation of one of its Presidents after serving a tenure of only one year, and the reduction of its faculty to a mere three professors seems to justify the designation heaped on it by yet another of its Presidents as "one of the darkest periods in the history of the College."209 Not surprisingly, then, the Presidents of both the College and the Board of Trustees memorialized the House of Representatives in 1865 for at least a share of the agricultural grant.210 Even though its detractors viewed its condition as a portent of its grab-bag mentality,
its candidacy was not altogether void of some legitimacy—at least in the minds of its stewards.

The mind-set and consequent rationale of the trustees most assuredly centered on the institution's initial attempt to establish a comprehensive system of education at the Institute. Its intended sphere was described in its catalogs of 1850 and 1851:

It is our intention to establish Heidelberg College upon a broad and comprehensive basis. This will be done, not by sweeping alterations in the usual collegiate course, nor by the substitution of new studies in the place of that comprehensive CULTUS that has hitherto been regarded as the proper foundation of a liberal education; but by the establishment of additional course of instruction, designed to meet the peculiar wants of the different classes of the community, thus bringing within the reach of all an appropriate, and, as far as possible, a thorough education.²¹¹

Thoroughness, at least in the minds of its progenitors, meant both intellectual integrity and applicability for the various pursuits of life. Consequently, the original curriculum, designed by both trustees and faculty, was comprised of six different areas of study. The Classical, Scientific, Normal, Ladies, and Farmers' Departments would consist of four years of study; the Academic, or Preparatory, the customary two.²¹² And though only the classical and scientific courses would ultimately be retained, the college's early attempts to satiate the intellectual and practical appetites of the masses, especially the agricultural segment of the population, was most assuredly the catalyst which actuated the 1865 Memorial.
The attempt to create and sustain a Farmers' Department during the early 1850's was its most ambitious endeavor. The college's interest and enthusiasm waxed interwovenly with that of the legislature's and resulted in the introduction of Senate Bill No. 135. The measure, entitled 'Granting Lands for the Agricultural Education to the Trustees of the Heidelberg College', eventually elicited a six-page report from a Senate Select Committee in December 1852.

The Committee 'Report' initially remonstrated against the paucity of agricultural educational opportunities throughout the state and nation. It specifically recommended that a number of Farm Departments, which would also include first-rate experimental farms, ought to be established at various colleges throughout the state in order to alleviate this problem. The first test should come at Heidelberg College, and for a number of reasons. First, the college's unique commitment to serving the peculiar interests of the industrial classes as espoused in the original design of its curriculum. Secondly, the proper cultivation of lands in the northwest sector of the state would greatly enhance the potentially wealthy and industrial pursuits of the region by attracting and contributing to a stable population. The Seneca County region already produced the largest yield of wheat in Ohio, and the fostering care of the state would go far to capitalize in, this, and other areas of agricultural production as well. And finally, locating the first Farm Department in the northern half of the state, would, at least for the time being, partially redress the gross imbalance of higher
educational support given by the state south of a line drawn through the capital city (e.g., Ohio and Miami Universities). 213

Indeed, the last argument may very well have been the crux of the 1865 proposition as well, especially in light of Commissioner E. E. White's comments in his 1865 Annual Report which sought to resolve the Agricultural College Question by spreading the revenue from the agricultural grant to several existing colleges throughout the state. Nevertheless, support for the Heidelberg candidacy was most assuredly one-sided, as no official legislation supporting it can be found in either the pages of the House or Senate Journals during the years of the fray.

**Western Reserve College.** Western Reserve's seemingly cursory interest in securing an allotment of the federal land grant more than likely stemmed from President Henry L. Hitchcock's continuing efforts to lift the college out of the financial doldrums. Yoked by the inherent divisiveness of the Plan of Union (1801), the college, during its first three decades of existence, failed to elicit the solid support of either the Congregational and Presbyterian hierarchies. Non-denominational by design rather than by choice, the college was euphemistically described by one of its Presidents as neither "flesh nor fowl nor good red herring". Moreover, the establishment of the Oberlin Collegiate Institute a mere forty miles from Hudson assuredly exacerbated an already alarming situation. Thus, the selection of H. L. Hitchcock as President in 1855.
A graduate of Yale (1832) and the Lane Theological Seminary (1837), the staunch Presbyterian minister immediately assumed the duties of chief financial agent for the college. Hitchcock first sought to press those subscribers who had reneged on their earlier pledges, successfully capturing eighty percent of the outstanding subscriptions. He also engineered the appointment of a number of prominent Presbyterian pastors to the Board of Trustees who would be generous in their support of the college. The pastorate of the Second Presbyterian Church in Columbus yielded Hitchcock a number of influential political contacts, thus, establishing yet another source of potential aid. Years of diligence by the resourceful Hitchcock resulted in the expungement of the entire school debt by 1864, and, thereafter, new sources of permanent support were being contemplated. ²¹⁴

During the same year, the Ohio General Assembly approved Delano's House Bill No. 4, accepting the provisions of the Morrill Land Grant Act. Just four days after its enactment, Hitchcock visited John H. Klippart and discussed the prospects of locating an Agricultural College at Hudson. Though not immediately sanguine about the prospects, Hitchcock's meeting with the Secretary of the State Board of Agriculture certainly signaled a willingness to explore the possibilities. ²¹⁵

The grant's potential as a new and permanent source of revenue for the college, undoubtedly, manifested considerable debate at the college. The consequent dialogue resulted in the passage of a Board
resolution dated 14 July 1864 which named President Hitchcock and others a committee to study the feasibility and implications of affecting an effort to secure a portion of the agricultural college land grant.216 A year later the Board voted that the Committee continue its investigation, but no concrete action was ever taken.217

Still, the name of Western Reserve College does appear in the official minutes of the Ohio House Journal as a possible recipient of the agricultural college grant. Representative Lockwood's original Resolution of 10 January 1867 sought to persuade the newly appointed Committee on Agriculture to prepare a bill which would distribute the national endowment equally between Miami University at Oxford, the Ohio University at Athens, and the Western Reserve College at Hudson. The rationale for including Western Reserve in the original proposition may very well have stemmed from a number of geopolitical considerations though no concrete evidence of this can be substantiated. Regardless, the Lockwood Resolution (and its numerous substitutes) failed to gain the approbation of the House, and, concurrently, the question of a viable Western Reserve candidacy was laid to rest as no official action was ever taken by college officials to capitalize on this brief legislative exposure.218

If they had chosen to do so, a Western Reserve proposition would have merited some consideration. Hitchcock's predecessor, President Pierce, had embarked on an ambitious program of expansion which included the establishment of a medical department at Cleveland, and three others, including an agricultural school, at Hudson.219 The
appointment of Forrest Shepherd, a student of Benjamin Sillman at Yale, to the Professorship of Agricultural Chemistry and Economic Geology bolstered the spirits of agriculturists throughout the state. The 15 February 1852 edition of the Ohio Cultivator enthusiastically detailed the mode and scope of instruction reporting that it would:

... consist of recitations and lectures on Agricultural Chemistry and Geology, and the Natural History of plants and of insects destructive to vegetation; and will be adapted to the practical wants of Farmers and horticulturists in this part of the country. Particular instruction will be given in a class in the practical analysis of soils and plants— and the thorough examination of fertilizing agents. More general instruction will be given by lectures to the members of the class, and also to those who may not wish to enter into the more scientific details of the art.

Further attempts to establish a formal Agricultural Department, however, proved futile and subsequently resulted in the resignation of Mr. Shepherd in 1856, the resignation and concomitant dismantling of the school's Agricultural Chair, perhaps, a victim of the more ambitious program undertaken by the Ohio Agricultural College at nearby Oberlin.

Antioch College. Antioch's attempt to secure a portion of the agricultural grant should be construed as no more than a potential quick-fix solution to some rather serious long-standing financial embarrassments. A long-standing feud between Christian and Unitarian Board of Trustee members over principles of progress literally paralyzed subscription efforts, and subsequently culminated in the suspension of classes at the college from 1862-1865. The generation of an additional $100,000 endowment during the interim,
undoubtedly, saved the college from certain extinction. But by no means did the addition of $6,000 in annual income typify the financial condition of a first-rate college. Ever mindful of the tenuous situation, Board members kept a vigilant eye out for new sources of income. 222

One Board member, the Reverend Asa W. Coan, in his capacity as a member of the Ohio House of Representatives, viewed the recent turn of events in regards to the agricultural grant as a potentially propitious omen for the college at Yellow Springs. The passage of the Congressional Statute of 23 July 1866 giving the states an extension of five more years to establish their agricultural college(s) and the subsequent introduction of the Lockwood Resolution into the Ohio House in January 1867 calling for a bill dividing the agricultural fund among several existing colleges, once again, threw open the floodgates of prospective donees. 223 Two weeks later Mr. Coan followed with a resolution of his own instructing the Committee on Agriculture to report a bill appropriating the revenues from the agricultural land scrip to the establishment of an agricultural department in one of the existing colleges of the state. The rather prodigious requirements (i.e., suitable buildings valued at no less than $150,000, 100 acres of arable land, accommodations for at least 1,200 students, and a minimum endowment of $100,000) stipulated in the measure seems to have exclusively favored an Antioch candidacy, especially when compared to those of other denominational colleges which had already been mentioned as potential beneficiaries. 224 Two
days after its introduction, the Board of Trustees at Antioch resolved that Mr. Coan be a committee to look after the interests of the College in regard to state funds for agricultural purposes. But the Coan resolution, as well as any other measures which preferred the principle of division, gained only spotty support in the Assembly, and no further movement in the direction of Antioch College is recorded in either Board of Trustees or legislative records.

Kenyon College. The inclusion of the name of Kenyon College in the logrolling session which followed the introduction of the Lockwood Resolution in January 1867 must have assuredly provided a brief moment of amusement among stewards of the college. Its perverted candidacy seemed least likely to succeed, and for several reasons. First, its strictly denominational cast of Episcopalianism was bolstered by a $250,000 endowment, thereby insuring its continued autonomy. Secondly, though the school did provide a brief course of lectures in 1847 on the application of chemistry and kindred sciences to agriculture, its governing body never attempted to use it as a springboard to wrest a portion of the grant for itself. In fact, the Board of Trustees never once addressed the Agricultural College issue during the eight-year long fray. Finally, an argument postulated by Columbus Delano in the 11 February 1865 edition of The Ohio Farmer, undoubtedly, squelched any thought of a viable Kenyon candidacy specifically, and, perhaps, the principle of division generally:
. . . Kenyon College has one thousand acres of very desirable and appropriate land for an agricultural college, it has, as I suppose, all the necessary buildings; has to a great extent much of the requisite apparatus; it is in the county in which I live, but I cannot vote to give this endowment or even a part of it to Kenyon, because Kenyon cannot sell or transfer her franchises and the State cannot accept Kenyon with the franchises. Hence it is utterly out of the question for Kenyon to present any claim with the remotest hope of succeeding in getting any of this fund. And what is true of Kenyon is true of all the other colleges in the State.\(^227\)

Indeed, supporters of the principle of division must have been dumbfounded after learning that they would not receive even a sliver of the federal pie. Little did they know, nor could they know, that it was due more to the disunity of the consolidationists than to any serious flaws in their arguments, and which both fostered the delay and falsely bolstered their hopes. An understanding of the discordant views and actions of the consolidationists surrounding the establishment of an agricultural college is of paramount importance, and is one of a number of subjects which we bear upon presently.

**The Agricultural and Mechanical Factions**

Agriculturalists, for decades the dominant economic force in the state, eventually found themselves floundering over a number of social issues crucial to their advancement. This was especially true in regards to their views and promotion of formal education at every level. Progress in this area proved to be negligible as several key issues continually plagued those who sought an effective solution to the problem.
Once the battle over the value of "book-farming" had been won, questions about the nature, quantity, and relative position of agricultural study in the curriculum were immediately raised. Answers, as early as the mid-1840's and not coincidentally paralleling the burgeoning influence and power of both the State Board and agricultural press, were often advanced and debated but rarely to the point of decisive action by a majority of agriculturalists. This was especially true with regard to those problems surrounding the establishment of an agricultural college in the state.

Even so, the two decades which preceded the controversy over the Morrill Act did, at least, manage to crystallize the two major issues which seemingly stifled progress in this area: attachment to an existing college versus the creation of a new and separate institution, and the thrust of the curriculum, be it practical, scientific, liberal, or any effectual combination. Both of these issues continually plagued proponents of the agricultural college movement through the years of the competition (1862-1870), the curricular issue lingering on even longer.

Although the organized agricultural community held distinct and important advantages (superior numbers, optimum resources, influential and informed leaders, and propitious lobbying location) over their institutional competitors during the years of the Morrill controversy, these two issues effectively split this powerful faction into a number of smaller splinter groups. Though usually a solid bloc on most issues affecting their station, this one pitted
agriculturalists (or their spokesmen) from the northeast and southwest against those in the central portion of the state. Leading members of the State Board were oftentimes at odds with their counterparts from the agricultural press. Nevertheless, forceful personalities representing each of these splinter groups emerged and in the end proved to be a major factor in resolving these difficult problems.

Mechanics, on the other hand, remained relatively quiet during the years of the fray, and for two very good reasons. First, the establishment and flourishing condition of the Ohio Mechanic Institute at Cincinnati, undoubtedly, satisfied the current needs of this vocational group. Secondly, any new mechanical invention associated with agricultural advancement would by its very nature involve the mechanical community (and Institute), and, as a result, leading members of this segment of the industrial population opted to watch the fray from the sidelines confident that no matter what the outcome, benefits would eventually accrue to them. An overview of the Institute and critical analysis of the various agricultural factions during the decade long fray will certainly be scrutinized later in this chapter, but for now let us turn our attention to the formative years of the agricultural college issue.

Commentary on the necessity and nature of agricultural education, especially at the highest levels, filled many pages of both the State Board's Annual Reports and copies of the agricultural press during the dozen or so years preceding the introduction of
Morrill's legislation. The earliest editions of The Ohio Cultivator received a number of letters which preferred solutions to this new and, in some ways, exciting dilemma. The 15 February 1845 edition, for example, printed a letter from Norton S. Townshend who, though not sanguine about the prospects of a lone agricultural institute, nevertheless, stressed the urgent need for higher agricultural education across the state. Thus, the formation of a series of lectures on geology, mineralogy, chemistry, botany, physiology and zoology during the winter months at several different locations throughout the state (e.g. Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland) seemed, at least for Townshend, to be a most sensible solution.  

The twin themes of practicality and practicability were also prevalent in a number of summer and autumn issues of the agricultural gazette. One reader discounted the creation of a National Agricultural Institute similar to those described in Coleman's account of European agricultural colleges stating that "None of these seems to be well adapted to our country [since] all of them look to the formation of a superior class, a kind of priesthood among the farmers to superintend and direct the rest." No, this arrangement would not do in these United States.

A practical plan of education for the industrial classes also appeared in the pages of the 15 October edition during the same year. The measure, which was being debated in the Ohio General Assembly, promoted the creation of a number of distinct high schools (People's Colleges) throughout the state. These schools, it was
argued, would in all ways parallel the course of studies at the best academies, and would also include several practical courses in agriculture and the mechanic arts. What would be the net result?

Instead of a few [students] as at present being taken and educated at the Colleges, and hence sent back, not to mingle on terms of equality of the people, but to pursue the learned professions, and be placed in a circle of society above them; under the proposed institution the many would be educated at home in the people's colleges, and remain on the farms and in the workshops, and, by their enlightened minds and virtuous manners, lead our happy State to the gates of glory.230

Not all agriculturalists, however, believed that practicality and accessibility should be the main thrust of agricultural education at the higher levels. Many argued for exclusive agricultural colleges or at least attachments of departments of agriculture and mechanics to existing institutions which would train up professionals who would not only learn the rudiments of a practical agricultural education but who would also devise new scientific principles for the advancement of agriculture. An endorsement of this view appeared in the 1 July 1846 editorial of the Ohio Cultivator:

Among the most encouraging signs of the times, we regard the progress that is now being made in the establishment of institutions for the thorough education of young men as scientific and practical farmers. Nothing, in our opinion, will tend so directly to elevate the profession of agriculture to that position which it ever deserves to occupy in public estimation, or to greatly promote improvements in the practice of farming in the country. --We hope the time is not far distant when several [emphasis added] of these institutions will be established and sustained in Ohio.231
Members of the State Board of Agriculture also offered a variety of views on the subject of higher education for the agrarian class. Allen Trimble, its President for a number of years, argued in 1848 that although it was too late for the present generation of farmers to reap the benefits of a scientific knowledge of their profession, such was not the case for the rising generation of agriculturists. He, therefore, urged Ohio to follow the example of literary institutions in other states and attach agricultural departments to several of its existing institutions.232

The following year Trimble again reiterated the importance and rationale of agricultural education at the highest level, though he now seems to be pressing for a new and separate college. Ohio, though providing ample opportunity for the literary advancement of her youth, had not yet, in his opinion, provided a single institution for the practical or scientific advancement of the agrarian population. Not even the Farmers' College of Hamilton County, to which he had alluded to the previous year, had met the necessary conditions, though it admittedly came closer to their needs than any other institution in the state.233 For this reason then, Trimble trumped what may very well have been the first direct call for a new agricultural college in Ohio:

... let us, at once, either with the aid of the State or by individual effort, establish and endow an Agricultural College in Ohio, at which our young men may acquire not only a literary and scientific, but a thorough practical, agricultural education.234
He surmised that if this experiment was successful, it may, indeed, impel existing colleges to be more responsive to the educational needs of Ohio's agrarian population.

Trimble's idea gained little support from his colleagues and the subject lay dormant for two years. It surfaced again at a meeting of the State Board in 1850; its devotee was, once again, none other than the indefatigable Trimble. This time, in addition to the college itself, he also argued for the inclusion of an experimental farm.

The first full and free discussion over the question of agricultural education and progress by members of the organized agricultural community took place during its annual agricultural convention in 1851. A resolution introduced by Trimble urging the legislature to fund an experimental farm under the control of the State Board and then relocating the Deaf and Dumb Asylum to that location was met with both enthusiasm and alarm. One member of the convention viewed the Trimble resolution as an excellent measure, one designed to meet the special interests of the agrarian class while, at the same time, aiding the cause of humanity. Others concurred, though perhaps favoring one argument over the other. Still others viewed the resolution as a useful tool for further discussions about the entire issue of agricultural education.

Opponents of the resolution thought it ludicrous. They believed that the primary object of an experimental farm was to educate farmers who were in command of their full faculties and who, thus,
would be able to communicate their discoveries in the readiest manner. Moreover, our system of government and modes of policy were not adapted to class institutions, and the experimental farm as it was conceived in the proposed resolution would tend to divisiveness among the population. Consequently, they recommended the establishment of professorships of agricultural chemistry at the state colleges.

Mr. Trimble then explained his failure of some years past to convince the legislature of the propriety of attaching an agricultural professorship to one or both of the state's colleges. It was thought then that learned professors did not generally sympathize with this area of study, and since he saw no further evidence of any movement in this direction he thought it time for a new approach. Trimble's reasoning did not change the minds of his detractors as they pointed to a number of agricultural departments successfully in operation at many eastern colleges. They also reiterated their opposition to separate and exclusive education of any kind. The Convention, though split on the issue of what to do with an experimental farm, nevertheless, passed a resolution urging the State Board to look into the propriety of making an application to the legislature for a sum of money to locate a tract of land and establish an experimental farm. It bore no fruit.

An address by William Lawrence to the Logan County Agricultural Society on 20 October 1851 and reprinted in the State Board's Sixth
Annual Report broached the subject of an agricultural college first lamenting its absence and resultant consequences stating that:

This great first art, this great first science, whose element is the 'earth and the fulness thereof' has no humble college, with professors devoted to its teaching, and hence a recent legal publication proposes to exclude farmers from the Jury box, because 'their talk is of bullocks', and not of Blackstone and Coke. If we would, as we should, elevate the science and business of agriculture—advance the standards of intelligence amongst those engaged in it then we must have our conventions, national as well as State and county, devoted to that object.237

Lawrence goes on to say that the discovery and dissemination of knowledge in agriculture should not, as it had been in the past, be limited to just practical experience and agricultural journals; no, the time had come to establish Departments of Practical and Scientific Agricultural in colleges throughout the land. Europe had over 350 of these schools, but in Ohio there was not one. The reason, Lawrence surmised, was that public sentiment did not demand it. In a country like the United States where public opinion is especially influential, all it would take is a slight effort to mobilize it and the desired object would be won.

Indeed, the only agent of popular agrarian mobilization seemed to be the Agricultural Convention at-large which, in 1853, opted for a bold new approach to the problem with the adoption of a resolution urging the State Board to memorialize the General Government for a school of applied science and agriculture, as well as urging Ohio's current congressmen to press for the donation of 200,000 acres in each state for agricultural colleges.238 Evidently the action was
not popular enough as neither the state nor national assemblies produced the desired object.

The establishment of both the Farm Department at Farmers' College and the Ohio Agricultural College at Oberlin produced mixed results on the part of conventioneers and editors of the state's agricultural press between the years 1854-1856. A resolution introduced at the 1854 agricultural convention suggesting that the Ohio Agricultural College was worthy of the most liberal state patronage was laid on the table since little information about the northeast Ohio institution was as yet available. Thus, they remained steadfast in their belief that the best means of endowing a permanent agricultural college was through a permanent congressional grant, and subsequently adopted two resolutions designed to meet that end. The first essentially mirrored the resolution passed one year earlier which called for a donation of 200,000 acres of land. The second called for the State Board to furnish the president of each county agricultural society blank petitions who, after collecting the required number of signatures, would then forward it on to their respective congressman. This approach seems to have breathed its last, however, when a similar resolution requesting 100,000 acres was laid on the table the following year.

The Ohio Cultivator, on the other hand, produced a number of inaugural and progress reports on the State's first additions to the sphere of higher agricultural education. Its second issue of 1854, for example, announced the formation of the Farm Department at
Farmers' College. Later in the same year, it hailed the opening of the Ohio Agricultural College and printed the school's entire prospectus for the coming academic year. Though subsequent issues included an enthusiastic endorsement, a progress report on the editor's visit to the institute, an announcement of the paper's decision to purchase one of its scholarships, and strong endorsement of a State Board resolution asking for an appropriation of $6,000 from the legislature, the newspaper failed to engender the kind of enthusiasm and support necessary for its survival which after only three short years ceased its activities. The same fate eventually befell its counterpart at College Hill shortly thereafter.

Though skepticism and lack of interest on the part of farmers more or less doomed the state's first two experiments in higher agricultural education, many agriculturalists still believed it to be beneficial, if not crucial, to the further advancement of the agrarian class—though not always for the same reasons. Mr. G. Sprague, for example, writes in the Board's Tenth Annual Report that the college issue was the next important movement which the agrarian class must rally around. And why did the current Corresponding Secretary of the State Board believe it to be paramount?

The science of Agriculture is based upon experience and the strongest argument in favor of Agriculture reading and Agricultural Schools, is, that by these means, the experience of those who have practiced the best modes of culture for a long period, and have been eminently successful, is carefully gathered together, and placed in the proper form before the student. He thus obtains what he could not avail himself in any other way—the benefits of combined intellect and the results
of numerous and carefully conducted experiments. He learns a thousand facts at once, which, if left to grope his way in the dark, he would never learn. The results of successful experiments, he can adopt as his guide, and those that have proved abortive, he can shun. He learns in a brief period, what thousands would gladly know, who have toiled in profitless labor for a lifetime, without learning.245

Others believed that more than practical or scientific results could be expected from a kind of institution. In the same Report, another contributor thought the college's goals should be even broader, but warned of the difficulties inherent in trying to provide a liberal education for members of the industrial classes:

It is not the policy of our public men to have us thinkers—much less actors—except on the farm, and for the farm. Were we to think, their occupation would be gone. Science and Sophistry—educated workers and educated talkers, will never agree. Ignorance and prejudice, are their soil—which, periodically stirred with words, and watered with professions, yields them a precarious support. And they will not endanger their power by voluntarily increasing our means of knowledge, extended to the masses.

Our bright sons are welcomed to the old colleges, and the "old professions," and to places of power and trust, when they go out from among us. For new blood is necessary to perpetuate old families. But universal, liberal education, would break the prestige of caste and custom. . . .246

And, thus, for purposes of convenience and economy he would label this new institution an 'Industrial University'.

The introduction of Morrill's first bill in December 1857, undoubtedly, stirred both the hearts and minds of agriculturalists throughout the state, though not always for the same reasons.

Colonel S. D. Harris, agricultural editor of the Ohio Cultivator
expressed his reservations about the intent of the measure in an editorial dated 1 January 1858:

If we were in favor of the independent endowment of any literary institution, we would be in favor of this scheme most of all; but when we see so many of our liberally taught scholars, with the soul of manliness and reliance educated all out of them, we cannot but question the claims which the friends of such institutions set up for public patronage. The men who move the world to-day, are the men who have come up by their own strong endeavor. Until we see better fruits from these proposed schemes, we shall adhere to our old convictions,—that the SCHOOLS OF THE PEOPLE are the best nurseries of genius.247

Responding to an inquiry by Joseph R. Williams, the President of the Michigan Agricultural College, to explain his reasons for his antagonistic view on the legislation, Harris responded in the next edition that, simply put, the people do not demand such a measure. This is clearly demonstrated in the fact that almost every attempt to raise up an agricultural college has thus far failed. If the people would demand institutions such as these, there would be no need for the national government to artificially prop them up. Put succinctly, Harris believed:

... that every tub should stand on its own bottom, and know that men are more diligent and prudent when they are obliged to carve their own way. A child always carried in arms, will not learn to walk the gait of a man.248

Ohio's newest agricultural gazette, The Ohio Farmer, countered the views of the Cultivator expressing its support for the establishment of agricultural colleges. Its 27 June 1857 edition, for example, presented a number of statistics which showed Ohio producing many times the number of crops and livestock as its neighbor
to the North, but with one unnerving conclusion: "These figures show that Ohio is many times more wealthy than Michigan; yet, while Michigan can give $100,000 to endow an Agricultural College, Ohio is too poor to give a farthing for this end." It is not surprising, then, that editor Thomas Brown had these favorable comments about the Morrill legislation:

We have received a copy of this bill from its author, and hope that our Ohio representatives will use their utmost endeavors to pass it into law... As this is one of the few measures unconnected with party, and the object is one which will, undoubtedly, produce good effects upon the producing classes, we hope that the men who till the soil, and sweat at the anvil, will rally to its support.

John H. Klippart, a former associate editor of The Ohio Farmer and recently appointed to the influential position of Corresponding Secretary of the State Board of Agriculture, expressed his first full views on the subject of an agricultural college in the Board's Twelfth Annual Report which went to press a few short months after the introduction of Morrill's first bill. He begins by reviewing the plethora of opportunities for professional education in the state, and was quick to comment that although law schools, theological schools, and medical schools were plentiful in Ohio, there was not one agricultural school within its borders—and with the following deliterious consequences:

The result of this negligence is calculated to confer preferment on professional life; to elevate it, and give it advantages and facilities to obtain knowledge over the agriculturalist; to be strengthened and built up, whilst the agriculturalist is bound hand and foot, and left to grapple with ignorance and error. Is it all
surprising that many ardent and aspiring young men should abandon farm life, and the dull routine of agricultural labor, and rush into professional life, where they see that public sentiment as well as legislative action, has bestowed so many manifest advantages?251

Klippart goes on to say that most young men would be willing and content to labor on the farm if they had the opportunity to further their understanding of the science and theory of agriculture. After enumerating a number of potential areas of study—chemical analysis of the soil, vegetable and animal physiology, comparative anatomy and physiology, and agricultural mechanics—Klippart concludes that:

Could these young men be afforded the facilities for becoming as learned in the science of agriculture, as are others in Law, Divinity, or Medicine, we would no longer hear of wheat 'freezing out,' or of the midge destroying one-third of the crop; nor of farmers being obliged to occupy the background in society.252

The Corresponding Secretary also points to the exemplary success of the agricultural colleges and experimental farms in Europe (Germany, France and Denmark), as well as those states (Michigan, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Connecticut) in this country which had already given their support to this enterprise, and to those states (Kentucky, Georgia, and Tennessee) which had bills supporting agricultural colleges still under consideration. And all this goes on while the first agricultural state in the Union in many respects could boast of nothing in this direction, which all led Klippart to conclude that:

The propriety of establishing an agricultural college by legislative authority is so manifest that no labored argument is necessary to sustain it. The present excellent system of common schools, established in this
State by the Legislature, is a sufficient guaranty that this question will meet with proper attention from those whose duty it is to guard with jealous care the interests confided to them, and to contribute, in every legitimate way, for the promotion of the common interests of the people.253

During the following year, Klippart again repeats his call for both an agricultural college and experimental farm.254 Speaking to both farmers and legislators alike, he rhetorically asks them what a 3 percent increase in agriculture's $350 million economy would do for their pocket books and the state's coffers. A small investment now in a first-rate agricultural facility would, at least in Klippart's mind, yield munificent returns for years to come. He drives home this point by showing the dramatic increase in production in Prussia after the establishment of its agricultural schools and colleges. Klippart is convinced, then, that agricultural colleges in connection with model farms or agricultural experimental stations are necessary for important scientific advances in agriculture, and would benefit both the farmer individually and the states collectively.

Other influential members of the State Board also voiced their opinions on the matter of agricultural education. President Norton S. Townshend, in his December 1859 'Report', noted the recent introduction of several standard works on agricultural subjects into the district school libraries—yet another of Klippart's recommendations.255 The increase of Farmers' Clubs, where topics of agricultural importance were both disseminated and discussed, also, contributed to the agricultural progress of the state. And yet, despite
these advances, more was needed. Especially important was the creation of both a geological survey and an agricultural college.

Regarding the persistent criticism of maintaining educational institutions at public expense, especially those designed to promote peculiar class interests, Townshend had this to say:

... but when the fundamental importance of the agricultural interest is borne in mind, such expenditures may probably be justified by an enlightened economy. The prosperity of the State, and its ability to meet all its pecuniary obligations, depend mainly on the estimation in which agriculture is held among the people and the intelligent and profitable manner in which it is pursued.²⁵⁶

Moreover, failure to promptly establish a college would undoubtedly result in an annual migration of young Ohio farmers to those states where these colleges already existed, and, perhaps, in their permanent loss to those jurisdictions as well.

Two years later, another State Board President, Darwin E. Gardner, called for the establishment of a school or schools for the instruction of youth in the practical duties of agricultural pursuits by the State. Perhaps, the only advantage that Ohio could boast of on this subject was that it could profit by the successes and failures of other states who had already started work in this area. Little did he realize that it would be nearly a decade before the General Assembly would make its final decision on the matter.²⁵⁷

Thus, the years preceding the final passage of the Morrill Act produced a great deal of debate on agricultural education, but little more—especially in regards to an agricultural college. The futile attempts at Oberlin and Farmers’ College seems to further
point to the fact that no one pre-eminent idea about the nature, control, and scope of the institution had matured in the minds of the leading agriculturalists. The passage of the Morrill Act, however, would compel them to make these kinds of decisions—or lose the largest educational endowment in the history of the state.

Before turning to the fractious behavior of the various splinter groups within the agricultural community during the years of the fray (1862-1870), let us first briefly turn our attention to another kind of effort already underway in Cincinnati. Indeed, while the agriculturalists were debating over the type of institution that would best serve them, the mechanical community had already established an institution of their own—namely, The Ohio Mechanics Institute. A brief history of the institution reveals a number of important facts related to the behavior of the mechanical community during the years of the Morrill controversy.258

The impetus for the creation of the institute came from Dr. John D. Craig, a popular teacher of natural philosophy from the East, who while lecturing to a number of influential Cincinnatians encouraged them to:

... emulate the enlightened cities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, and form an institution for the invaluable purpose of diffusing the light of science over every department of the useful arts and manufactures, and for letting the ingenious artisans and mechanics see that the practice of their respective arts was capable of being derived from the great and immutable laws of nature; a knowledge which would help them to extend and improve their respective arts beyond any known limits, and raise those who practiced these arts to a rank in society which their utility entitles them.259
Shortly thereafter, officers were chosen and a constitution was adopted; the year 1828 was the inaugural one for The Ohio Mechanics Institute.

The earliest years of the school were lean ones. Its curricular offerings were limited to chemistry, geometry, and arithmetic, and consisted of a number of lectures at various locations throughout the city. Almost immediately, then, the need for a building was felt, and the directors determined to purchase an old church as its first permanent location. The Board also approved the purchase of a large quantity of mathematical and philosophical apparatus, and, thus, the Institute had its first building and requisite equipment.

Like most fledging institutions of the day, money became both an immediate and enduring problem. Unable to make the initial payment on the four thousand dollar purchase price of the building, several of the Directors agreed to advance the necessary funds. Attempts to raise the money by selling stock and/or subscriptions to the citizens of Cincinnati failed, and another location was contemplated. Fortunately, arrangements were made with the trustees of Cincinnati College to hold its lecture series there—an economical move which proved crucial to the institute's very survival.

The Institute's first successful endeavor to reduce its debts was an exhibition held during the Spring of 1838. Not only did it free the school from most of its debt, it, more importantly, sparked a new interest and enthusiasm within the community which now had
become more aware of its purposes and advantages. The contribution list increased dramatically.

A new and permanent location was again contemplated, and culminated in the purchase of the "Bazaar" in February 1839. For a time things went on in an excellent manner, but the remote location of the building eventually diminished both interest and attendance. Once again, a committee was formed and a decision was made to abandon its present location for a more favorable site.

After several budget-cutting measures including the rental of several smaller buildings to hold its lectures, the 'members' of the Institute decided to try a new radical approach. A new constitution was adopted and the Board of Directors reorganized. Miles Greenwood, the same gentleman who would later serve on the 1865 Agricultural College Commission, was elected president. Primarily through his efforts the Board raised over $18,000 by subscription and founded the Institute's first permanent home—Greenwood Hall.

The curricular organization of the school proceeded along familiar lines with lectures being employed on scientific subjects. In 1854, the curriculum consisted of twenty-six lectures on chemistry, thirteen on natural philosophy, twenty-six on philosophy, and thirteen on geology. Everything was oriented to usefulness, that is, anything that would directly and immediately benefit the mechanical community across the state. A course on natural philosophy, or chemistry for example, centered on the properties and uses of woods, metals and other materials regularly used by mechanics. Two years
later several classes were formed in bookkeeping, penmanship and German; attendance, however, was sparse. Admission fees to the lectures, about two cents per session, did not even cover one-third of the fees charged by the instructors, and was, consequently, yet another financial burden to be reckoned with.

Thus, yet another assault on the large indebtedness ($10,000) of the institution commenced in the Spring of 1856. The most important campaign, indeed, an ingenious step on the part of the Directors, began after hearing of the Cincinnati Common School's plan to construct a new facility to house its library, session rooms, and offices. The OMI Board offered them the use of the institute's valuable library and part of the first and all of the second floors in exchange for the liquidation of its debt. The contract was agreed to a year later, and the institution was finally debt free. Other benefits of the joint venture soon became apparent, including the reduction of operating expenses, a number of joint lectures, and sharing of library resources. This was, to date, the institution's finest hour.

The years after 1857 could best be described as both transitional and expansionary. One of the Director's more innovative creations was that of a museum of the arts and sciences which was

... an exhibition of works of art, discovery, science, and invention where the young mechanics of Cincinnati could come and study the production of older minds, appropriate what they might find useful, and couple these appropriations with their own ideas.260
The industrial museum would, indeed, serve as a catalyst for advanced scientific research until its final dismantling in 1958.

Another successful innovation of the Board was the creation of the School of Design during the autumn of 1856. With its Artistic, Mechanical, and Architectural Departments, it became exceedingly popular with a number of Cincinnatians. The principal of the school, in his annual report of 1857-58, stressed the importance of design not just on the local but also on the national and international levels as well. Indeed, this school of the Ohio Mechanic Institute would exceed all expectations, and did, indeed, bring it national recognition.

The Civil War, itself, had a deleterious effect on the institute as it did on most of the colleges across the state. Attendance dropped sharply, some lectures were cancelled, and even its annual exhibitions were abandoned for a time. During this time, the Board of Directors adopted a program of austerity which was revealed in the minutes of its March 1865 Report:

One of the principal objects that has been kept in view by us, has been not to deteriorate the Institute, in any manner or respect, for its future operations, by incurring risky and costly experiments, which would in all probability assume pecuniary embarrassment; but, by all just means, to increase, rather than diminish, the treasury of the Institute, in order to be more fully prepared for every opportunity that might be presented for greater usefulness in the future.261

Thus, a prudent attitude, not a dollar of debt, and a balance of over $3,000 in the treasury insured a stable, if not thriving, future for the Institute—with or without any part of the Morrill land grant funds.
Though reaction to the passage of the federal endowment might have been readily predictable in the mechanical community, it was anything but that from their industrial counterparts. The organized agricultural community, at its annual convention in 1863, devoted much of its time to the implications and potential uses of the agricultural grant.\textsuperscript{262} Little did these members realize, that the debate would last over seven years. Perhaps indicative of the rocky road ahead were the opening remarks of the convention's President who either carelessly or mistakenly labeled the legislation the Act of April 2, 1862 [emphasis added]!

Thomas C. Jones then moved on to express his views on what should be done with the grant in Ohio. First, the college must be a state institution, though above and beyond the reach of partisan influences. Thus the governing body of the new institution should primarily consist of members of the State Board, nine serving alternate three year terms and three independent members for a total of twelve. This composition would, undoubtedly, insure that the institution would never become a political football—to be tossed about for only political gain between elections.

His second viewpoint focused on the nature of the institution. Indeed, the question posed by the judge must have been on everybody's mind—namely, 'What is an Agricultural College?' For Jones, at least, it was an institution whereby its main object was to "elevate the position of the Farmer."\textsuperscript{263} It should be a college equal in thoroughness of instruction to any in the land.
And, finally, it should have an experimental farm designed and utilized for observing the discovered and approved principles of agricultural colleges from across the nation. The practical-mechanical part, thought Jones, could be acquired at home thereby saving precious time for more advanced experimentation and theorizing.

The President of the United States Agricultural Society also felt compelled to remark on the subject and offered his opinions on a variety of topics. Mr. Hubbard first echoed Jones' sentiments regarding the superintendence of the proposed college. The organized agricultural community should, indeed, be the majority voice for the institution. Secondly, if it was the intent of the convention to memorialize the legislature, he strongly recommended that a bill accompany it so that it might be acted upon at once before other political maneuvers were attempted. And, finally, what did Hubbard envision the institution to be? A grand state university. Why? His answer not only indictsthe current status of the state's colleges, it also added yet another dimension to the question of the scope of the new institution. He hoped that it:

... may become in truth, as well as in name, the University of Ohio. I hope I will wound no one when I say that, although I am a trustee of the Ohio University, we have no university in Ohio. As a trustee of the Ohio University, I should be very willing that it and the Oxford institution should unite and put their funds with these funds, and have one great University for the State. 264

Other members were just as eager to offer their views on the 'Agricultural College Question'. R. M. Montgomery (Mahoning
County), during the afternoon session, broached the topic with a re-
solution that the State Board memorialize the General Assembly to
accept the grant and to speedily organize such an institution, but
with no specific bill attached as Mr. Hubbard had suggested earlier
in the day. When queried about the omission, Montgomery believed it
more important at this point to gain legislative acceptance of the
measure and that time and due consideration would be given to the
form it should take.

Mr. Darwin E. Gardner of Toledo (Lucas County) concurred with
the broad view taken by his northeastern Ohio counterpart. Implicit
in his (and others as well) reasoning was the inherent assurance
that the State Board, as the official mouthpiece of the state's
agrarian class, would be given free reign by state legislators.

Note the confidence, even brashness, in his comments:

We have been consulted by the Governor of the
State--and it may be fairly inferred that other State
authorities, including the Legislature of the State, will
not be unwilling to listen to the voice of this Conven-
tion--made up of the properly constituted delegates and
representatives of the most stable, and, I might venture
to say, the most virtuous of the population of the
State--in regard to the management of this munificent
trust. 265

And, like Hubbard, he envisioned a broad-gauged institution

"... where our sons may meet together for acquiring information as

profound as can be obtained in any university; where they may wit-

ness, also, the practical work of life." 266

Other members of the convention, however, favored a more re-
stricted curriculum. Citing the paucity of true agricultural
colleges in the country, D. B. Pierson sought to correct this imbalance by proposing that the new institution(s) advance the practical knowledge of agriculture. One great overshadowing institution would, in his opinion, limit the accessibility of its patrons and, therefore, proposed that two smaller practical schools be strategically located within the state.

W. B. McClung took umbrage with the inference drawn from Mr. Gardner's remarks that the farmer needs a place to build up his image arguing that: "There is no longer any need of the farmer's son being scouted as a 'country Jake'. He is not dependent on any particular college for his education. He stands in your halls of legislation equal to any other man." 267 Thus, what is necessary is not a broader education for the agricultural classes; what is necessary is a more thorough education which will elevate and dignify the science of agriculture.

Mr. Hugh Broome of Cambridge is even more adamant on the necessity for a practical-scientific approach:

There has been no agricultural college in which they might acquire that science and gain that practical knowledge of their business which are so essential to its profitable prosecution. . . . There is no branch of business followed by mortal men that really requires as practical an acquaintance with the various branches of science as that of farming. All the natural laws for the production and government of organized and inanimate life—animal, vegetable and mineral existence—need to be understood and applied by the farmer; and if he is ever to become the master of his business that he may become, we must have schools where all this knowledge can be acquired. 268
N. B. Gates succinctly states the case for a strictly agricultural college and farm stating: "A great deal of our farming is slipshod, it is superficial, and we must remedy this failing." 269

And, finally, J. M. Walden of Hamilton County is fearful of what one grand central institution might portend in a series of seemingly rhetorical questions that precluded the revenue from the sale of the land scrip to exceed $30,000 per annum ($630,000 x 5 percent):

What would be the tendency of an institution with such an income? Was it not the purpose to make your Harvard and your Yale Colleges popular? Was it not intended to make your Universities of Ohio popular? But who are the sons that are educated there? Not the young men who are toiling half the years that they may go to school the other half.270

Walden concludes that it would be more practical and beneficial to divide the fund between three or four institutions in each quarter of the State. Immediately, a motion to insert the words 'one or more, as may be thought advantageous' to the original (Montgomery) resolution was agreed to, and the revised resolution was then adopted.

A memorial penned by a committee of the State Board was presented to the legislature shortly thereafter, and generally reflected the mood of the convention.271 It first proferred a rationale for the urgency of accepting the grant:

It is an indisputable fact that the fertility of the soil of our State is diminishing under the system or want of system pursued. The average production per acre of all our principal crops has lessened for several years, as the report of this Board to the General Assembly will show. In Ohio agriculture is by far the greatest of our industrial interests; three fourths of the population of
the State are directly dependent upon it for subsistence, and to the same source a large portion of the remainder is not less certainly, though perhaps less directly, indebted.272

The memorial then expresses concern over the number of young farmers who are leaving the profession, and points out that the defection rate in Europe had been significantly lowered and was directly attributable to the increase of agricultural colleges on the continent. And though by the letter of the statute the state had five years to establish the institution, it saw no reason why the institution could not be put into operation sooner. Finally, it cautioned against the misapplication of the fund, and, therefore, hoped it would be guarded against the influence of political partisanship.

The eloquence and soundness of the memorial, notwithstanding, the General Assembly did not pass legislation accepting the grant during its 1863 session. A free-wheeling discussion of the reasons for its failure and subsequent strategies for getting it accepted consumed a fair portion of time during the 1864 Agricultural Convention.273 Judge Thomas C. Jones criticized the fact that while the majority of states had already accepted the grant and located lands in the profitable regions of the West, Ohio ashamedly had nothing more than 630,000 pieces of paper to show for its effort. Part of the blame, he argued, must be shouldered by the Convention itself which unwisely limits itself to making important decisions for its constituents to a single day. He hoped, however, that the matter of the agricultural college grant would be thoroughly discussed, and
offered his view that the Convention ought to first concern itself
with specific action(s) to get the grant accepted first and be con-
tent to decide its disposition at a later date.

Other members of the Convention quickly reacted to Jones' remarks. Mr. Darwin Gardner offered what he thought to be a practi-
cable resolution: that the State of Ohio ought to accept the grant
for the establishment of agricultural colleges as soon as possible.

N. B. Gates of Lorain County agreed with the remarks of Judge Jones
concerning the brevity of the business sessions of the Convention
and offers a strategy and rationale for overcoming this deficiency
stating:

We do our legislation in one day at railroad speed and
accomplish very little. We ought to spend one week here
at least--two would be better. The necessary agricul-
tural legislation ought to be thoroughly considered by
us, for it is presumed that we understand our business
better than those who are not practical agriculturists.274

Mr. William B. McClung of Miami County, however, believed that
the agriculturalists' lack of direction seemed to confuse many mem-
ers of the legislature, and knowing that they had another year to
decide on its disposition could only agree to obey any decision on
the matter. Indeed, the memorial penned by members of the State
Board offered no specific directions as to the scope and governance
of the institution; no, for the most part, it only offered an apolo-
getic and noble rationale for its acceptance. Meanwhile, all manner
of propositions had inundated the General Assembly, some of them
seeking to divide the grant. McClung's closing statement left no
doubt as to his position on the entire matter:
Now, it looks to me that we ought to have this college in one place. If we divide up the grant and endow several institutions, we will find we shall have less influence than with one thorough institution [emphasis added]. Here lies the one great difficulty in our way—we do not put forth in any movement a oneness of effort.275

Mr. Darwin Gardner felt no compulsion to censure either the legislature or the State Board for the delay. Legislative inaction, he believed, stemmed from both the State Auditor's adverse Report and the practical contingencies of carrying on with the War. But with the union victories at Gettysburg and Vicksburg during the previous year, as well as a number of effective arguments which have since blunted the sharp attack of the auditor, Gardner predicted an auspicious climate of clear thinking on the subject. The fact remained, however, that the measure must first be accepted by the state, and he urged the passage of his original resolution. It was—unanimously!

Once the grant had been accepted (Delano's House Bill No. 2), a number of comprehensive plans regarding its disposition were introduced, including and especially those of the School Commissioner (White) and Governor (Brough).276 Yet another important proposal appeared during the same period, one which would add both substance and controversy to the already vexatious 'Agricultural College Question' in Ohio.

John H. Klippart, the Corresponding Secretary of the State Board of Agriculture, prepared a lengthy and thought-provoking paper on the subject of agricultural colleges, and which was read to the 1865
session of the Agricultural Convention. The first section of
the paper detailed the historical development of vocational agri-
culture in Europe, paying particular attention and commendation to
the Prussian system of agricultural education. Klippart believed
that its auspicious position in Europe was due in large measure to
the success of its sixty-nine agricultural colleges and experi-
mental farms, as well as a number of experimental stations located
throughout the country. To substantiate his claim, the Secretary
tabulated the prodigious growth rate of a variety of crops over a
period of one hundred years, observing that it paralleled and must,
therefore, be directly attributable to the growth and flourishing
condition of these important institutions.

But what of agricultural production in Ohio? Though one of the
leading agricultural states of the Union, was there still not room
for improvement? Indeed, was this not the single most important
question surrounding the current controversy over the best possible
use of the federal land grant? In Klippart's mind, at least, it
was. Nowhere in the state could a farmer actively undertake to
learn those techniques and practices which would net him a more
prosperous livelihood. Up to this point, analysis of soils was
mere guesswork, mechanical applications remnants of the old trial-
and-error method, and business skills a series of helter-skelter
reactions to a complex market system replete with hucksters preying
on innocent, mostly ignorant, yeomen. A practical and profitable
solution to the plight of the farmer was demanded.
The munificent grant from the federal government could, indeed, resolve most, if not all, of these problems if used wisely. For Klippart that meant the creation of a new agricultural college and experimental farm which would teach agriculture as a practical science, and would, therefore, include coursework in agricultural chemistry, veterinary science, practical agriculture, botany, geology, civil engineering, mechanics, etc. And even though a competent corps of professors would more than likely not be found in this country, he hoped to lure the best minds of Prussia and England to Ohio. In short, what Klippart ultimately envisioned was a professional school, and one on a par with those already existing in the areas of commerce, law, theology, and medicine.

Klippart simultaneously warned the convention that forces intent on diluting the strength of the grant had already made known their intentions. At the last session of the legislature Miami University, Ohio University, and Farmers' College presented their claims, proffering all manner of enticements in order to receive a share of the federal endowment. Klippart, dubious of their sudden interest and perfect adaptability in teaching courses in practical agriculture dryly remarked: "This studied neglect of agricultural science at these institutions is what causes many reflecting minds to regard their present generous offers as being actuated by motives of very doubtful character." Division of the fund would only be acceptable after [Emphasis added] the central or principal institution had been put into successful operation, and, then, only
if surplus funds were available. Otherwise, their [emphasis added] genuine interest would have to impel them to offer these courses on their own.

The afternoon session of the convention proved to be more boisterous than contemplative. After thanking Mr. Klippart for his paper on agricultural colleges, the convention called for its Committee on Business to present its report on those matters which needed immediate attention. At the top of the list was the question of what action the convention ought to take in regard to the agricultural grant. At the behest of one of his colleagues, John M. Millikin of Butler County began with a careful reading of that portion of the Governor's (Brough) Annual Report which dealt with the disposition of the grant. After the reading, Sullivan D. Harris of Cuyahoga County moved that the convention adopt a resolution which would endorse the views of the Governor. W. B. McLung of Miami County followed with a substitute resolution of his own which rather obliquely called for one distinct college as the best possible use for the grant. These maneuvers invited, no, guaranteed, a spirited, if not divisive, debate on the entire matter.

Thomas C. Jones of Delaware County, subsequently, began the inquiry by inviting representatives from both Marietta and Delaware Colleges to voice their views on the disposal of the grant. Dr. Andrews, the President of Marietta College, spoke first and immediately denounced the principle of division stating that the existing colleges had no right to the grant as all were established for the
promotion of general education. As to their prospects without the federal grant, Andrews carped ". . . if they are good institutions they will get [other] endowments; if not worthy, let them die." 280 For Andrews, at least, the question was not whether the grant could be used to increase their endowments, but whether the state could use them to advantage in carrying out the provisions of the national statute. Regardless, Andrews envisioned a more noble endeavor and one which in many ways paralleled the ideas of the Corresponding Secretary. The new institution must be a professional school, one that followed [emphasis added] a general four year course of instruction. Commenting further on this aspect of the subject, he explains: "To expect that the whole education of one who intended to devote himself to agriculture, should be given in an agricultural college, would be as preposterous as to expect arithmetic to be taught in law school, or geography in a medical school." 281 He felt no compulsion to establish "feeder departments" at existing colleges boldly arguing: "You cannot afford to throw this labor and money away on the stupid ones." 282 Every single penny of the grant must be invested into a first-rate professional school.

Professor Merrick of Delaware College then rose and presented his views on the subject. Unlike many of his colleagues, he did not believe that the colleges of the state were about to engage in a mad scramble for the agricultural grant. To be sure, most of them could not afford to be connected with the enterprise as the
facilities for the endeavor would cost more than what they would realize from the grant. This was not to say, however, that some of the better-endowed institutions could not, with a relatively modest sum of money, contribute to the whole scheme. Indeed, Merrick envisioned a few of these colleges providing students with the necessary preparatory training before their transfer to the great (new) central institution. This plan, he argued, was as just as it was expedient.

Colonel Connell of Fairfield County opposed the McLung resolution calling for one new college. He differed with his colleagues over the projected sum of money to be derived from the grant, arguing that the present glut of lands for sale in the market place bode poorly for the agricultural scrip and predicted that speculators would snatch it up at relatively cheap prices. In his opinion, then, there would not be enough money to effect any great object. Moreover, he opposed the establishment of an experimental farm exclaiming: "The lawyer is not educated in Court, nor the physician in the sick chamber."283 For all these reasons, then, he thought the fund should be apportioned to the two State institutions which would be converted into agricultural colleges.

After a careful reading by Commissioner E. E. White of that portion of his Annual Report relating to the land grant, Thomas C. Jones sought to both clarify and amplify his own personal views on the entire matter. For the Judge, at least, the issue(s) was primarily a legal one, and, as such, proceeded to examine the
language of the law in Section Four of the national statute. First, it was a college that was to be established, a word used to designate an institution of learning of the highest order. Thus, an attachment of a department onto an existing institution would clearly violate the letter of the law. Secondly, the college so endowed must be one where "the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies," & c., "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts." No existing college in the state had this as its leading object, and Jones doubted they would want to even if they could. Thus, any movement in this direction would, in his opinion, circumvent the intent of the law. But what was the spirit of the law, especially in regard to the mission of the new institution? Should it be a college based solely on the manual labor system? Their miserable record spoke for themselves. Was it to support only practical and scientific studies as intimated in both the Governor's and Corresponding Secretary's proposals? He thought not. Then what? The Judge clearly envisioned an institution where liberal studies would be commingled with the practical and scientific, and, thus, one which would provide an education equal to the best universities in the land. Having said all this, Jones was inclined to adopt the views of the McLung resolution, that is, of establishing one institution in accordance with the Act of Congress.
Darwin Gardner of Lucas County generally agreed with the views of Judge Jones but not always for the same reasons. He opposed the division of the fund among existing colleges for two reasons: first, they could not patronize them all as fairness would dictate, and, secondly, classical institutions had in the past either ex- cluded, at least isolated, members of both the agrarian and mechanical classes. It was, indeed, time for the creation of a university where every member of the industrial class had at least the same opportunity for as thorough an education as their tradition al counterparts.

G. Volney Dorsey, a long-time trustee of the Miami University, then spoke at length about the necessity and benefits of attaching a new agricultural college to an existing university. First, the record had shown that those colleges which had been made to stand alone uniformly failed while those under the aid and protection of an existing literary institution were almost uniformly successful. Secondly, the best universities already taught many of the branches of knowledge related to agricultural education including: animal and vegetable anatomy, physiology, botany, zoology, animal chemis- try, etc. And, finally, attachment is pedagogically sound, Dorsey stating that:

... all learning is, to some extent, a unit, and every part is dependent on some other part and must receive aid and support from it. Our Universities were intended to embrace colleges of every description, from law, medi- cine, natural science and agriculture, and all else which may contribute to the improvement and well-being of men; and until they do this they fall short of the great object for which they have been founded in the State.
And, of course, it was his belief that the two state universities at Oxford and at Athens would best subserve agricultural education in this manner.

Judge Newton of Mahoning County presented what he believed the farmers of the state desired from the land grant. In short, an independent college of their own where, like the Smithsonian Institute, its labors would be confined to making new discoveries and establishing and publishing new facts. Knowledge and practice of well-known conventions would only lead to wasteful repetition and a squandering of the generous gift of Congress. What was needed was revelation, not repetition.

The Chairman was then asked to repeat the original resolution, and Harris, himself, was asked if he would continue to press for its adoption. He replied that he had not pressed the question, that the Governor's proposal could stand on its own and did not need an argument. Not everyone agreed, however, that his was the best solution to the problem at hand.

Mr. Gardner, though acknowledging the interest manifested by the Governor's proposal in this matter, had, during these proceedings, observed a genuine difference of opinion among members of the Convention. Though many endorsed the views of the Governor, support for the opinions of the other speakers (White, Klippart, Andrews, Merrick, etc.) was just as much in evidence. The Convention was simply not ready to make any specific recommendations, and, thus, sought to substitute the original resolution with the following:
Resolved, That the General Assembly is requested to take early and prudent steps for the establishment of a college [emphasis added] for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts, pursuant to the act of Congress of July 2d, 1862. 285

The Gardner resolution provoked much spirited debate. Judge Jones concurred that early action on the subject was necessary since the grant designated that unless the state took definitive action for the establishment of the college within five years, both the proceeds and remainder of the land scrip would revert back to Congress. John Millikin of Butler County agreed that the time was short, that two and one-half years was not long enough to establish a new and separate institution (he was a Miami University supporter), and that it was inexpedient for the Convention to express any hasty and immature opinions as to the best mode of appropriating the land grant funds. Gardner quickly moved to clarify the intent of his resolution which, he argued, was not designed to preclude any specific location of the college, only to urge the legislature to take early measure in getting it established. The resolution as it now stood left the matter of location open and free for the General Assembly to do that which it deemed best. Millikin recanted his opposition to the resolution which then gained the unanimous approbation of the Convention.

The agricultural press, relatively silent during the first two years of the controversy, broke that pattern in 1864. The Ohio Farmer began printing a weekly series of articles and lectures under the heading 'Agricultural Colleges.' Penned by John H.
Klippart, the series was actually a forum for the Secretary's views on the 'Agricultural College Question' as evidenced by the following excerpt from the March 26th edition:

From this it will be seen that not only theory, but actual and practical agriculture is to be taught in these Colleges—that each and every College which may be established will require a complete and eminently competent agricultural faculty. It is a great mistake to suppose that an agricultural "Department" under the charge of one or two professors, who will devote half of their time to this department, and the other half to the literary or classical department of a College, as has been proposed by several Colleges in the State will answer the requirement of the law of Congress establishing these Colleges. Agriculture must be the leading feature of these Colleges—all other studies subordinate, and the moment that agriculture is made subordinate to any other studies that moment is the grant violated and the rights of the institution forfeited.286

The editors of the agricultural tabloid, William Fairchild (General Editor) and Sullivan D. Harris (Agricultural Editor) actively sought the views of their patrons on this issue with this editorial invitation:

... it may be well enough to have a public discussion of the matter, with the view of determining the most efficient mode of using the prospective fund. This is a question in which all the people of Ohio are interested—its final decision must be arrived at within the next four years—and to save us from a crude and hasty plan, it is best that those who have given the subject thought should put their thoughts before the public and thus determine whether they will stand the test of a thorough examination.287

Harris wasted little time in voicing his own views on the subject. In an editorial dated 14 January 1865, he seems to have altered his position on the divisionist-consolidationist
controversy, no doubt, being influenced by the lengthy debate at the Agricultural Convention stating:

... but we have, as yet, seen no argument which convinces us that the best plan for the general diffusion of the benefits of the donation is to be found in limiting the capacity of the school to a favored few, which must necessarily be the case if but one institution is founded—leaving all but those favored ones to derive their portion of its advantages from the very small rills which may be presumed to flow from the honored graduates of the one university. 288

The year 1865 was, indeed, a pivotal one for 'The Agricultural College Question'. In that year, the U.S. Commissioner of the Department of Agriculture instructed John H. Klippart "... to proceed, under a commission from the Department of Agriculture, on a tour of agricultural information through Great Britain and the continent of Europe. The specific object of the tour to be to collect information relative to agricultural education. ...." 289

The venerable Secretary (and his family) was provided a handsome stipend for his five-month fact-finding mission. All eagerly awaited his Report which filled nearly one-hundred pages of the State Board's Twentieth Annual Report, and which, not surprisingly, supported, if not strengthened, his (and others) position calling for the establishment of one, new, practicalist-scientific college in Ohio. 290

During the same year, the five-man Agricultural College Commission appointed by the governor issued its recommendations concerning the disposition of the agricultural college grant. A 'Majority Report' supported the Miami University proposal which subsequently
became the main topic of discussion during the January 1866 Agricultural Convention. 291

Darwin Gardner, a member of the Governor's Commission, spoke first. His decision to sign the 'Majority Report' ran counter to his resolution approved by the Convention during the previous year, and, for this reason, his opening remarks focused on the rationale for his altered position. First, much pressure had been exerted on the Commission by an influential group of divisionists who argued that it would be far better to enhance the usefulness of the present institutions than to add yet another college to the multitude. A second factor was the appalling failure rate of those independent agricultural colleges established both at home and abroad. Thirdly, and inextricably tied to the second argument, was the stark realization that the state having borne the burden of fighting a great war could in no way contribute to this kind of contingency. Fourthly, a generous proposition from any number of communities, particularly Columbus, failed to materialize. And finally, when the deadline for the committee to make their report drew near and having only a handful of proposals to choose from, both he and the majority of the commission concluded that the proposition of Miami University was the best of the lot. To wit, he explained: "Here, and here only, had we the means furnished for carrying on an institution without the expenditure of a single dollar from the State; so that it need not be such a failure as to forfeit the congressional grant." 292 He closed his remarks by asking the members of the Convention for a
careful consideration of the Commission's recommendation, and if they did not accept it, to at least present a better one.

The proponents of a new and separate institution were, indeed, nervous, if not alarmed, by the recommendations in the 'Majority Report', and one of their own, W. B. McLung, spoke directly and forcefully to the issue during the session:

If this college that is engrossing so much attention here and elsewhere, is to be an institution for the benefit of the farmers and mechanics of Ohio, let us look well to it that it goes not out from under our hands. If we don't look after it ourselves, nobody will look after it for us... The project has gone back so far. It was a want of concert of action that the thing has been left until this late day. If that agricultural college of Ohio was intended to promote the agricultural interests, and increase the wealth of Ohio by increasing the productions, and by giving us a system of education that would give us a higher skill, let us take hold of it and make it our [emphasis added] institution by our action as well as by name.293

The curricular issue was yet another topic broached during the opening session of the Convention, and supporters of both the narrow and broad gauge approaches eagerly awaited the opportunity to expound on the relative merits of their positions. S. D. Harris left little doubt where he stood on the issue asserting:

It is not to elevate the farmers' boys that we desire an agricultural college, but to put them in a position where they can accomplish the most good for themselves. ... If we provide the means for the farmer's sons of Ohio that will make them intelligent and enable them to understand the theory and practice of agriculture, and those branches of commerce and mechanical arts that belong to agriculture, we shall have a truly agricultural college.294

J. C. Stevens of Hardin County took another view. He argued that if labor is to be dignified, if labor is to be elevated, and if
labor is to approximate the standards of the other professions, then it must begin by thoroughly educating the industrial masses. Then, and only then, would the pursuit of agriculture become a worthy aspiration for the younger generation. Furthermore, the parliaments of Europe were filled with members of the industrial community who were thoroughly educated, and he saw no reason why it should not be the same in this country. Once this was accomplished, it would not be necessary to hire lobbyists to sway their congressmen; they would be able to take care of their own interests. The munificent grant from the federal government, he argued, could do all this and more but only if they steward it wisely.

Mr. T. F. Joy of Delaware County fairly echoed the sentiments of his Hardin County associate, and also asserted that: "The study of many sciences are not needed for the law but it gives him expansion of mind, power to comprehend and act. These qualifications are as necessary for an intelligent farmer as for any other profession in life." If this but be accomplished, their spheres of influence will be multiplied and their influence felt at all levels of government.

A committee appointed to investigate and report on the recommendations of the Agricultural College Commission ('Majority Report') divulged its findings to the Convention at-large during the next day's morning session. After briefly, but fairly, reviewing its contents, the committee disclosed its decision to abstain from any official recommendation, but, concurrently offered this advice:
we can see no good reason why we should now depart from the action of this body at its last session [one independent college with an experimental farm]. Let us be careful that we may not step out with the left foot foremost, and give the wrong direction to march of time. Attach this grant to any college established and endowed for other purposes, you strip it of its independence, and it will fail in its utility. It is an experiment at best. As such let it be independent, clear of dead weights. Let it live upon its own merits or die amidst its worshipers. 296

The committee's report sparked a heated debate over the recommendations of the Commission, specifically, and those unresolved questions surrounding 'The Agricultural Question' generally. Mr. William Lang of Seneca County, a member of the Convention's ad hoc committee, charged that only commissioner Gardner actually visited the institution at Oxford, and that the rest of the committee took his word for what he saw, and signed the 'Majority Report'. Though being properly corrected on this error by Mr. Fergus Anderson of Butler County, Lang, nevertheless, still favored the position taken by the Convention the previous year--namely to make it an independent institution.

Mr. F. D. Parrish of Erie County added even more fuel to the controversy. Though a member of the Convention's ad hoc committee and though compelled to be away from the city for a time, he, nevertheless, complained that he had not been permitted to examine the draft before final action was taken. Only now could he comment on the sum and substance of the document, and consequently, made the following assessment. As long as the agricultural interests of Ohio maintained complete control over the whole institution of Miami
University, he thought the recommendations of the Commission proper, even salutary. Why? His greatest fear was that the state would do nothing, and with the time limitations imposed by congress fast coming to a close there was really no choice in the matter.

Mr. J. K. Green of Hamilton County criticized that section of the ad hoc committee's report which simultaneously abstained from any recommendations while concluding that the convention ought to steer the same course it had set at the previous years convention. Having said that, he also charged that many misapprehended the Miami University proposition. Many agriculturalists had acted like they had an inherent right to the grant. But, he argued, they did not. It was the state's, and the state, having jurisdiction over both the grant and the college, could take whatever measures it deemed necessary and beneficial for the general population. And even though the recommendations of the Agricultural College Commission were a little one-sided, he saw no other alternative in the matter.

Judge Thomas C. Jones then spoke at length on both his opposition to the 'Majority Report' and his views on what the agricultural community ought to strive for. He opposed the 'Report' on a number of grounds, namely: it did not meet the requirements of the Morrill Act, its expense (two colleges and farms rather than one of each), Miami University's dilapidated condition and extreme southwest location, and a probable extension of time to establish a college granted by Congress.
If not the recommendations of the 'Majority Report' specifically and the principle of division generally, then what? Jones' answer was both bold and direct—one new institution which would unite the liberal with the practical education of the industrial classes. And why should these classes be liberally educated? Jones answers:

... why is it necessary that the lawyers, the preachers, or the statesmen should be so educated? It is not so much that their knowledge of Greek and Latin can be practically applied in their calling, as that the mental culture imparted improves the intellect, and increases their influence among men. By such studies with the higher branches of mathematics and natural and moral philosophy, the intellect is improved and understanding expanded.298

And the criticism that such a system would produce results that are both exclusive and aristocratic was met with this retort:

The benefits are not confined to the few who acquire this high culture, but are by them, as well all know, diffused among all with whom they are associated. They become teachers in the local institutions of learning; they make scientific experiments in their neighborhoods; they enlighten their neighbors through the press, and they advocate the interests of their class in the public assemblies.299

For all these reasons, then, Jones concludes that one college, uniting the liberal with the practical spheres of education, and preferably located in the central portion of the state, would certainly be better than two prohibitory institutions set at some extreme locations within the state.

S. D. Harris took issue with Judge Jones on two particulars. First, he did not believe that the 'Majority Report' specifically contemplated a division of the fund. Its language, as he interpreted
it, provided for the current appropriation of one-half the fund with
the remainder awaiting the logic of time and circumstances. And
although the 'Report' hints at the establishment of another college
in the northern part of the state, it did not specifically mandate
it. In his view, then, the 'Report' would not necessarily compro-
mise his long-standing record of opposition to the division of the
fund.

Jones also criticized the assertion made by Jones that the
entire agricultural community should strive to be educated up to the
same capacity as those in the other professions. Harris cracked:
"If this College is to get up an aristocracy in agriculture, I would
rather have this project fail."

And so, the time for its estab-
lishment running out and the Miami University proposition sound,
Harris concluded that the Convention had no other alternative than
to accept the recommendations of the 'Majority Report'.

Mr. Lang, on the other hand, cautioned against any hastiness on
the part of the Convention. It was his belief that since only one
state (New York) had approved a formal plan under the original Act,
it was highly unlikely that Congress would penalize those states which
still had the matter under advisement. This, he confided, was the
reason for the ad hoc committee's decision to abstain from any
specific recommendation, that is, to allow the convention to formu-
late a suitable position within the parameters of the resolution
passed the previous year.
The discussion having run its course, Mr. McClung offered this resolution to the Convention:

Resolved, That the donation made by Congress to the State of Ohio, for the endowment of colleges for the benefit of agricultural and mechanical arts, ought to be appropriated to the establishment of one college, at some point convenient of access for the State at large, attached to which should be an adequate farm for experiments. And that while at this college the leading object should be to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanical arts; provisions should also be made for instruction in all the branches taught at the best colleges in the land, so as to promote the liberal education of the industrial classes.

Even though the resolution was adopted and the one-institution policy solidified, the thorny problems surrounding the nature of the curriculum would continue to persist.

The agricultural press also had much to print and say about the events of 1865. The burgeoning popularity of the divisionists provoked a number of negative responses from its patrons but none with quite the force and zeal of John H. Klippart's. In the February 18th edition of The Ohio Farmer, for example, he painstakingly described the legal problems associated with any attempt to divide the agricultural fund.

In a legal point of view this grant is a trust confided to the State, and the State becomes the trustee of Congress in securing the object and in the manner designated by the act of July 2d, 1862. Can the State change the terms of this grant? If this donation were an unconditional gift to the State, then the State would be sovereign in the premises, and would require no franchises; but it must be remembered that Congress has not abdicated or transferred its sovereignty in this matter, but has especially reserved it; hence the sovereignty vested in Congress, the State can be trustee only, and hence the State acquires franchises which it cannot
transfer or dispose of. This is the practical difficulty which must be overcome if the State divided the fund, or if it accepts any of the present Colleges, as Athens or Oxford, to become Agricultural Colleges under this grant. 302

An 18 March 1865 editorial reaffirmed its position that "... an agricultural college should not be made a wing or tail piece to an existing institution in the State." 303 But its opposition to attachment did not preclude its support for a division of the fund. The agricultural gazette specifically recommended the establishment of two new separate agricultural colleges to rival and watch over one another—a double incentive to do their best.

This kind of editorializing brought a quick and sharp response from one of its patrons who criticized the notion of founding two colleges when practically everyone was predicting the sale of the land scrip to yield an annual income of no more than $25,000. 304 In the same edition of The Ohio Farmer, its editors sought to simultaneously answer the objections of its critical correspondent while seeking further to clarify some misconceptions and opinions on other issues related to the 'Agricultural College Question'. The editorial first went to great lengths to explain that the views of the newspaper on this specific issue were those of the General Editor (William B. Fairchild) and not of its Agricultural Editor (Sullivan D. Harris). In regard to the number of colleges to be established, the newspaper argued that the original law of Congress left that question an open-ended one stating that "at least one college shall be established" and, thus, no restrictions were either stated or
implied. And finally, a clarification, perhaps modification, on its divisionist stance included the reordering of existing colleges for purposes described in the grant:

There are perhaps other institutions in the State that might be willing to submit their property and organization to the State—but as we know of none that have publicly signified this fact, we mention but the two. We are not to be understood as an advocate for Farmer's College, Mt. Union College, or any other institution—we simply desire that the utmost available use shall be made of the expected fund—that this shall be accomplished at the least expense to an already over-taxed people—and that all unnecessary restrictions as to the public benefits to be derived from a liberal practical education under the liberal act of Congress shall be avoided. 305

The newspaper, in its 15 April 1865 edition, also gave its assessment of J. H. Klippart's recent fact-finding mission in Europe:

We are not able to see the great advantage likely to accrue from the visit of the "honored Secretary" of the State Board to Europe. Personally we are very glad that Mr. Klippart had an opportunity to gratify a long-cherished desire to go abroad, but for all the good it will do the people of Ohio to collect and publish statistics of European colleges, we would not give a hill of beans. American agriculture, and especially American education cannot be built on European models, which Mr. K. is disposed to regard as pretty near right. 306

One of the newspaper's most prejudicial attitudes regarding the subject of the agricultural grant was revealed near the end of 1865 when it responded to the following criticism printed in a recent edition of The Ohio State Journal:

If two colleges are established, neither of them will or can be what one alone might be. One horse may be kept in good condition on a gallon of oats at a meal, but if this gallon is to be divided between two horses neither of them can have much hope of getting fat, to say the least. 307
To which The Ohio Farmer quipped:

Here is a characteristic confession! The idea that somebody ought to get fat out of the operation is peculiarly a Capital City idea, where people have been so long in the habit of being stall-fed at the public expense, that they have very dim notions of personal liberality. 308

Thus, the Cleveland-based gazette remained adamant in its separatist but multiple institutional policy, and would become obsessed in its attempt to deny Columbus the prize.

The newspaper's position and prejudice, notwithstanding, the following year generated three principal developments which effectively bolstered the enthusiasm and position of the consolidationists. The first was the creation of a new legislative committee appointed to screen and evaluate all new petitions and memorials related to the disposition of the congressional land grant (House Joint Resolution No. 12). 309 The second major development of 1866 was the passage of another national statute which effectively extended by five years the time Ohio (and others) had to establish its college(s). 310 And, finally, the 'Report' of the land scrip commissioners revealed that the revenues from the sale of the scrip would yield about half of what most people predicted when the subject was first undertaken.311 Reaction to these latest developments by both conventioneers and the agricultural press was both swift and predictable.

Judge T. C. Jones, a member of the new nineteen member legislative committee, spoke of its decisions and limitations during the annual Agricultural Convention of 1867. The committee concluded
that since the final proceeds from the sale of the land scrip fell woefully short of earlier predictions, that since only 10 percent of the fund could be utilized for the purchase of a farm, and that since no part of the fund was to be used for the erection of buildings, the legislature would be unwilling to sanction any location or accept any proposition under $100,000. The general condition of the state treasury practically mandated this judgment. Jones was also critical of the fact that it was only an advisory committee and, therefore, not empowered to select a site. Had they been given the power, the Worthington proposition, for one, would have probably been acceptable to them. The long and short of it all, however, was that any talk of establishing more than one college was now unrealistic since $20,000 in annual income would barely be enough to support one. 312

The Ohio Farmer took note of the new Agricultural College Committee in its 10 February 1866 edition commenting that its unwieldy size might get in the way of any real progress. Reports of a generous proposition from the community of Worthington gained a reluctant yet surprising endorsement from the newspaper. In spite of its Columbus connection and dearth of a variety of soils, it would spare the state from seeking additional revenue, and, thus, for the moment, at least, was the best that could be hoped for. 313

Within two weeks, however, the newspaper reversed its position and, once again, reiterated its support for awarding the grant to an existing institution under the right conditions [Emphasis added].
This view, it argued, should not necessarily be construed as an outright endorsement of the 'Majority Report' (1865) per se, only a recognition of the fact that Miami University had already agreed to willingly change its existing organization in order to meet statutory requirements. If any other institution would make the same unconditional and liberal offer, it, too, would receive equal consideration. And it endorsed this same view after the Report of the land scrip commissioners had been made public later that year.

In April 1866, and largely in response to the retarded progress of the Committee's work, The Ohio Farmer painted a rather gloomy picture of the current status of the entire 'Agricultural College Question', and seemed to get at the core of the problem:

If we could all think alike upon this question—or if we had some one or two to think for us—there would be a reasonable prospect of arriving at the point where action would commence; but as long as men, with the perversity peculiar to poor human nature, will think for themselves, we appear likely in Ohio to fail in the main object, and the "noble grant" from Congress—to wit: land scrip that, in the multiplicity of homestead laws, land bounties to soldiers, and other contrivances by which to get rid of the public lands without pay, does not appear to find a market—prove a fruitless gift. But we have an abundance of faith, and no slight development of the organ of hope—so we will rest easy.

Indeed, three different views about the nature of the institution seems to have solidified into well-defined factions by 1866, each with its spokesmen trying to sway professional and public opinion to their side. Sullivan D. Harris, leader of the practicalists, reviewed their position early in 1866:

Any farmer, any farmer's boy, is a fit subject for an Agricultural College. But it should be a rule adopted
in the system of instruction, that practice, actual practice on the farm, be connected with the school. ... They must be brought up farmers. Hence these Colleges must be made schools for farming, and nothing else. And it is the business of the people to see that the school is not made a school for the spoils of office, to which these institution—all institution—are tending. We must make the College a farm. That is the simplicity of the thing and sums it up. The school must not be a grand thing to dazzle and to flatter. It must be the homespun thing that the farm is and the mind. Learn to do; at the same time learn how to do; that is farming. Let our schools so teach; and let each farmer see that they do. Now is the time, as our Colleges are being established.317

Judge Thomas C. Jones, the acknowledged leader of the university party, sought to clarify their position on the matter with these remarks delivered to the 1867 Agricultural Convention in Columbus:

... but the objection prevails everywhere, that existing colleges have to educate men to what are called "the learned professions," the influence of which is to educate our young men away from the mechanical arts and agricultural pursuits. Our idea is, that agricultural and mechanical instruction shall be the leading objects, and should be the fashionable thing to be inculcated upon all of the students of such an institution as we want.318

But the convention sought first to get the thing and, therefore, took no sides in the ongoing dispute, and, as it had done in the past, voted to adopt a one-institution policy.319

And in an address delivered before the District Agricultural Convention in Springfield, John H. Klippart, once again, reviews the benefits of the scientific approach based on the German model:

... I think the love for farming in Germany is in a great degree due to the many and excellent agricultural schools and colleges, where they are early taught that it requires just as much brain and cultivated intellect to farm systematically and successfully as it does to make a mark in any of the learned professions. I live in the hope that should we be successful in establishing the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, there
will then be indoctrinated into the youth of this country that same love for the agricultural occupation which I everywhere found in Europe. 320

The Agricultural College Committee's inability to locate a suitable site for the college coupled with the meager returns of the land scrip sale breathed new life into those colleges which still favored a division of the fund (i.e., the attachment of an agricultural department). Indeed, the turn of events brought forth a spate of proposals in the legislature which preferred the principle of division. Though no one measure gained the support of the entire General Assembly, it was clear to all that the battle over the control of the endowment was far from over. 321

Impatience, if not frustration and bitterness did, indeed, permeate the ranks of the consolidationists. This was glaringly apparent in President Daniel McMillan's speech to the Agricultural Convention of 1868 in which he pinpoints the probable causes and sure effect of the current state of affairs:

Thus by the tardiness of our representatives, together with the antagonism of personal and local interests, our State, which should have been the first to move in this matter, occupies to-day a humiliating position in the background of those which, by commendable actions have outranked us, although some of these are but in their infancy. 322

McMillan ended his lengthy, and sometimes caustic, address with an emphatic call for the creation of one, and only one, agricultural college. 323

The ensuing discussion on the business of the agricultural college, though shorter than in previous years, was also marked by
an atmosphere of reflection and frustration. The refusal of the General Assembly to accept any of the propositions submitted to its nineteen member committee (Senate Joint Resolution No. 12) prompted several members of the convention to question the propriety of establishing one new [emphasis added] institution. One of them, Daniel McMillan, no doubt, shocked many at the Convention when he cracked: "I confess I have not a particle of faith in any college established under the auspices of the State Board." He, like a growing number of his associates, adamantly opposed a division of the fund among existing institutions (i.e., attachment), but favored the transformation of one of these (his choice was Miami) into an agricultural college. Hence, the agricultural resolution adopted by the Convention in 1868 was laced with both frustration and flexibility:

Resolved, That the agricultural and mechanical interests of Ohio demand [emphasis added] an early adjustment of the questions pertaining to the establishment of an Agricultural College in this State, in conformity with the act of Congress making the grant of lands for that purpose. The scrip for the lands granted having been sold, and the proceeds realized as we learn more than a year ago. This Convention again declares, as it has at its sessions in each of the years 1865, 1866, and again in 1867, its judgment in favor of one college and opposed to the division of the funds.

Heeding the Convention resolution as well as Governor Cox's impelling call to action, the General Assembly established yet another Agricultural Committee (House Joint Resolution No. 45), this time bicameral but, once again, only with the authorization to
receive, examine, and recommend proposals for the site of the college. Although its creation produced a number of generous propositions, some of which found sponsorship in the legislature, none were able to muster enough support to gain the necessary votes for approval in both houses.

The Ohio Farmer, ever mindful of its practicalist stance and concerned that the whole of the grant might be lost, promoted a unique, some would say asinine, scheme in its Independence Day issue of 1868. It proposed that the entire agricultural college fund be given to John Kirkpatrick's County Infirmary Farm in Cuyahoga County where its wards could properly and profitably rehabilitate themselves.

Incongruity or local politics, notwithstanding, at least part of the reason for the novel scheme was the newspaper's infuriation over the seemingly implacable position taken by the 'university party'. It delivered its most scathing attack to date in an August 1868 editorial:

The question of an Agricultural College in Ohio, under the endowment of the Congressional land grant, has become a chronic bore. Certain people assuming to lead in the matter, set up an ideal of the institution which they would have, and become offended when other less ambitious parties suggested anything less than a grand university which should rival or exceed any of the existing institutions of the State. Less ambitious parties presuming to argue their favorite plan of a practicable institution, have been set down as the enemies of the Agricultural College and the educational interests of the people. The consequence has been and now is, that to avoid the lofty censures of the University party, more modest men have quietly retired from the field, feeling that they could have no sympathy with such an institution, under the name of an Agricultural College.
Five years have been spent in fruitlessly beating about the bush, and today we seem to be further from a favorable solution of the question than we were at the beginning. 329

Two weeks later, a gentleman signing himself 'Buckeye' responded to both the substance and spirit of the July 4th and August 8th editorials. He blamed the delay in locating an agricultural college on the General Assembly's inability or unwillingness to resolve the problem, especially its failure to grant previous Agricultural College Committees the power to decide on its location. 'Buckeye' is also critical of The Ohio Farmer's caustic remarks about those who support a broad-gauged institution, and, specifically, asks Colonel S. D. Harris for a helping rather than hindering hand in the whole state of affairs. Harris' reply was predictable:

Why bless you! We are ready to help when our help will do any good; but how can we help while you, and those of your way of thinking, hinder with all your might, by weighting down the College movement with impossible conditions? It is thou that troublest Israel—not we of the OHIO FARMER'S way of thinking. Get down from your high horses, and take hold like reasonable men, if you expect to enlist the sympathies of the people in behalf of an Agricultural College.330

Four months of reflection over 'Buckeye's' plea for cooperation, however, seems to have tempered the Colonel's view on the single most important issue of 'the Agricultural College Question'—namely, getting the institution established. At the 1869 Agricultural Convention, after extolling the merits of his practicalist vision for the new college, Harris surprised the majority of delegates by holding out this (temporary) olive branch admitting that "...the
best means to attain the objective is to strike for the object itself and attend to the details afterwards.\textsuperscript{331} His promise to refrain from any more infighting over the nature of the college may very well have accounted for the absolute silence on the matter from the editorial columns of The Ohio Farmer over the next twelve months. This act of partial reconciliation proved to be fruitless, however, as the legislature, once again, failed to approve a number of bills tied to its establishment. Indeed, agriculturalists of every persuasion must have wondered if the agricultural college nightmare would ever end.

It would, but not without more tired, if not trite, debate. The 1870 Agricultural Convention, in many ways reminiscent of the 1863 session devoted much of its time to discussing the potential uses of the grant.\textsuperscript{332} Norton Townshend spoke first, and framed his presentation around a cluster of practical questions. The first, what kind of school should it be? He began by listing the two primary purposes of education: (1) to give mental training and development and (2) to communicate useful knowledge. In the sphere of higher education, the literary colleges almost wholly embraced the first view, while medical and commercial colleges devoted most of their efforts to the latter function. It was Townshend's opinion that the new agricultural college clearly fell into the second category, and clarified his position with a series of rhetorical questions:

Do we need another college in Ohio where young men may obtain the mental discipline that will prepare them for professional life by a five or six years' drill in the
classics and other college studies? Have we not already more of such schools than can find students? Then why should we create another? Do we not rather want an institution where the young men who are preparing to engage in agriculture, or some mechanical employment, may obtain in a few months, or a year or two at furthest, so much of science as will enable them to understand the rationale of their daily work? In short, it is a polytechnic school we want.

Secondly, how would the school be conducted, that is, its mode of operations? Sounding very much like the old, but now defunct, Ohio Agricultural College at Oberlin, Townshend's plan incorporated both a winter and summer term. During the winter months lectures would be delivered on subjects such as mineralogy, geology, chemistry, natural philosophy, botany, zoology, and the like. The summer months would also see the same courses but taught in a different manner. Textbooks and recitations would provide the theoretical foundations; the lab, shop, nursery, and field their practical applications. Such an arrangement, he argued, would open up the college to every age group of the agrarian class--the old as well as the young.

And, finally, what would be the requirements of a new agricultural college? Townshend believed the following would make a good start: five or six good instructors, two or three good halls, a laboratory, a cabinet of specimens in natural history, a good 'working' museum, a library with adjacent reading rooms, and a farm. He also thought that the college should be located near a city with all of its advantages which would include: a variety of religious denominations since the college would be non-sectarian, boarding
houses, and proximity to greenhouses, nurseries, agricultural and other machinery, various wares and fabrics, and livery stables. In short a practical facility near an enterprising environment. This is what the agrarian class deserved; this is what they demanded!

John M. Millikin had a much different view. According to the Butler County representative, the opinions expressed by Dr. Townshend essentially paralleled those of the State Board. And though he had great respect for all of these gentlemen personally and had over a number of years agreed with their opinions on a number of subjects, on this particular subject he disagreed with them in toto. The key issue, in his view, was not what the State Board proposed the college to be; rather, it was what Congress has required the state of Ohio to do in faithfully carrying out the provisions of the Morrill Act.

And what was it that was mandated in the federal statute? Millikin admitted that the initial draft of the bill prescribed a very restrictive curriculum, but as time and men matured the law, a more comprehensive view prevailed. Quoting Morrill himself:

The bill proposed to establish at least one college, accessible to all, but especially to the sons of toil, where all needful science for the practical avocations of life shall be taught, and where neither the higher graces of classical studies, nor that military drill our country now so greatly appreciates, will be entirely ignored. 334

It was Millikin's contention, then, "...that the best educators in Europe and the United States are in favor of teaching agriculture and the mechanic arts in connection with the other
literary institutions of the country, or if an original one is to be
created, to make it as full and comprehensive as possible.\textsuperscript{335} His
conclusion was based on a number of premises which he believed were
readily discernible to all who would see.

He first utilizes the arguments of Dr. Newton Bateham, State
Superintendent of Public Instruction in Illinois, to substantiate
the inclusion of scientific and classical studies in the curriculum,
and, thus, a full and comprehensive university:

Those branches of learning which are 'not excluded',
and for which the trustees are to provide at their dis-
cretion, are embraced in the comprehensive phrase of
'other scientific and classical studies.' The boundaries
of the present inquiry are thus sharply defined, both
inclusively and exclusively. If the trustees have ar-
ranged a course of study embracing 'such branches of
learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic
arts, and also military tactics,' they have strictly
complied with the law; and if in addition to these they
have also provided for some 'other scientific and classi-
cal studies,' they have done precisely what the law in so
many words allows and empowers them to do. Indeed, a
much stronger interpretation of the clause, 'without
excluding other scientific and classical studies,' is
held, by many eminent lawyers and jurist, to be legiti-
mate, if not even obligatory. In their view, it would be
by no means an unwarrantable construction to regard the
italicised words in the above quotation, as but another
form of requirement—as coupling the duty of not ex-
cluding certain studies, with that of including certain
other studies, and embracing both alike in the positive
injunctions of the statute.\textsuperscript{336}

In speaking of the Illinois Industrial University, Bateham said:

The grand distinguishing feature, purpose and hope
of this university, is to form a closer alliance between
labor and learning; between science and the manual arts;
between man and nature; between the human soul and God,
as seen in and revealed through his works. These I hold
to be the aims and hopes of this university. And we hope
to attain them, not by a less extensive and thorough
course of instruction than is given in other universities, but by a somewhat different course. The one palpable, essential and indispensable condition is, that the education for which they provide must be equal in all essential points—in extent, in comprehensiveness, in thoroughness and in inspiration and power, with that afforded by the old colleges and universities of the country. Our course of study must be as broad; our apparatus, libraries, cabinets and other auxiliaries and appliances must be as ample and as good; our professors, lecturers and teachers must be as able and earnest, as learned, adapted and devoted as theirs. 337

A second consideration was the relatively small sum ($400,000, including interest) yielded from the sale of the land scrip. Excluding the 10 percent which may be used for the purchase of a site, Millikin did not believe the remainder sufficient to establish and [emphasis added] carry on the work of a new institution. Although other states (e.g., Massachusetts, $375,000) had given liberally for their success, Ohio could not be counted on to do the same as evidenced by the languishing condition of the two state institutions at Oxford and Athens.

Yet another factor was the plethora of colleges already in existence throughout the state. Even if you omitted all of the Catholic colleges, Millikin estimated that there was still sixteen others in Ohio. By comparison, the whole of New England states had twelve colleges, and, thus, Ohio had 33 percent more colleges than this entire region. But not as good, as the most conservative estimates had shown that these out-of-state colleges drew a large number of students and $150,000 annually from the Ohio economy. Hence, the state could ill afford to weaken and impair its existing
institutions by creating yet another college; instead, it should strive to strengthen them so as to stem, even reverse, the annual tide of scholastic emigration.

And finally, what had experience shown in regards to what other states had done with the grant? According to Millikin, five states (West Virginia, New York, Illinois, Kansas, and Maine) had organized new comprehensive universities, eight states had united their funds with existing literary institutions, and four states (Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Maryland) had given the fund to pre-existing agricultural colleges. And the results thus far? All of the institutions in the first two classifications were doing exceedingly well, but only one (Iowa) out of four in the latter category could boast of any measurable success. And so, the experience of these states, a broad interpretation of the language in the original Act, and an inadequate endowment with little or no hope of additional financial support from the state, compelled Millikin to conclude that Ohio had no choice but to unite the fund with an existing institution.

W. D. Hill of Defiance County, though differing with the conclusion drawn by Millikin, did agree with one of his presuppositions. The reason why the college had not been established was the fear over increased taxation. In full range of a number of legislators attending the session, Hill stated flatly: "Has anybody ever heard a voice raised upon this floor, or in the General Assembly, or any other in the country, against taxation for other purposes? Ohio
has been too niggardly on the subject of taxation in the right
direction." An increase of one-twentieth of a mill on each
dollar would yield $50,000, and this, coupled with the funds from
the national endowment would, indeed, build up and maintain one
grand institution which would rival all others in the land and,
thereby, insure Ohio's position as one of the nation's leading
agricultural states. And, again, he queried the legislators in the
room: "Now what is one-twentieth of a mill on the dollar to the
people of Ohio for such purpose?"

Dr. Townshend rose again and sought to set the record straight
on another matter. The charge had been repeatedly levied that the
reason for the delay in establishing a college was the discordant
views of farmers and mechanics from across the state. Townshend
argued that the farming and mechanical interests of Ohio had always
known what they wanted, but that the armies of friends, officers,
professors, and attorneys from existing institutions had repeatedly
confused the issue with their specious arguments.

Millikin took umbrage with this statement. He was a farmer, he
was an agriculturalist, he was as much in favor of teaching the
agricultural and mechanical arts as any gentleman in the hall, but
he was also a trustee of an existing institution (Miami) which, to
his way of thinking, would best utilize the grant and, thereby,
better serve the interests of the industrial classes across the
state. His conclusion? Farmers did not agree on this subject!
They did, however, agree that enabling legislation must [emphasis added] be passed soon or else all would be lost, and, subsequently, adopted by unanimous vote [emphasis added] the following resolution which was offered by Townshend and seconded by Millikin:

Resolved, That this Convention most respectfully request the General Assembly of Ohio to take prompt measures to organize an Agricultural and Mechanical College, in accordance with the terms of the law of Congress. 340

Thus, the issue was, once again, left in the hands of the legislators.

While the legislature was debating the issue (and for the last time), two old adversaries again spoke their minds on the subject.

In the 29 January 1870 edition of The Ohio Farmer, Thomas C. Jones reiterates his position in favor of a broad-gauged university and offers this eloquent rationale for its creation:

Have we no other desire respecting our sons than that they shall be able to feed and clothe themselves, and to pass through life as comfortably as possible? Though they be farmers and mechanics, is it our purpose that they shall know nothing else, and have no higher aspirations than such as relate to these material things? Is it not possible that statesmen and philosophers may be found among men of these vocations? It is certainly desirable, and highly necessary to the prosperity of these great interests--agriculture and mechanics--that some of those employed in these industrial pursuits, should be qualified to represent these in our public assemblies, and to compete there with the most gifted and accomplished representatives of other callings and professions. But we can never hope for such representatives and advocates of our interests, until we discard the absurd notion, that those engaged in agriculture and the trades, are to be farmers and tradesmen and nothing more; and that they need no other education that such as qualifies them for carrying on these branches of business. 341
Harris, in typical fashion, replied:

...we are quite willing he shall ride his high horse in the presence of the readers of the Ohio Farmer; but he must not expect us to agree with him, for we deprecate any such misapplication of the agricultural college fund in Ohio, and if the law requires such a thing, then we are for re-constructing the law, or giving it fits.\textsuperscript{342}

And in a later edition, Harris deprecates the unnecessary financial burden a 'grand institution' would impose on the state of Ohio:

After sacrificing the Congressional land grant for about fifty cents an acre, it would be better to sink the whole beggardedly pittance in the classic waters of the Scioto, than to expend it in an attempt to maintain a splendid fraud upon the people which like the horse leech's daughters shall continually cry--give! give! and, become a den of thieves or an asylum of cormorants, for all coming time.\textsuperscript{343}

Six weeks after these diatribes, however, charter (the Cannon Act) and ancillary legislation establishing one, new separate institution passed the legislature.\textsuperscript{344} Their passage prompted this satirical response from Harris:

We believe the law is the nearest possible approach to what the people demanded, though a very (otherwise) intelligent minority, think it is very far removed from what will be best for the people to have; and in passing the bill to a law, we presume many members of the Legislature were actuated by the same motive which caused the man to get up in the night and give a person bread--for the very importunity of the askers, rather than that they took any deep interest in the matter.\textsuperscript{345}

The mood in the capital city, on the other hand, was one of measured felicity, and summed up by John H. Klippart in an address to the 1871 Agricultural Convention:

For an entire quarter of a century has the Ohio State Board of Agriculture faithfully, unfalteringly,
honorably, and honestly striven to secure the establishment and endowment of an agricultural college; and now that success had finally crowned the efforts of the past in this relation, let not the board feel that its duty toward the college has ceased, but rather that new and more important duties now devolve upon it, in order to secure from the institution the best and greatest possible results for the agricultural and mechanical communities. 346

During the same session, the President of the Convention, James W. Ross of Wood County, also praised the efforts of both the State Board and the Agricultural Convention for this latest victory. But there would be other battles to be waged, and issued the following portent:

What the particular curriculum shall be, is not yet determined by us. We intend making it classic, in the true definition of the term; that is, the teaching to be pure, correct, refined, of the highest order, and more varied and extensive than the course usually found in our State universities; but whether it shall include, at the outset, the ancient but now unspoken languages, is an unsettled question. 347

To be sure, no matter what the answer to the unsettled question, it would be inexorably unsettling to many who had taken their places and had voiced their opinions in the convention hall over the past eight years.
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CHAPTER V, CONCLUSIONS

The passage of enabling legislation by the General Assembly in 1870 ended one of the lengthiest and most acrimonious chapters in the history of Ohio higher education. The nearly eight-year long debate over the disposition of the Morrill land grant fund may very well have been the most protracted in the nation. Indeed, it has already been demonstrated that while Ohio was in the final stages of making its decision, at least seventeen other states had already determined the employment of their appropriations. Alas, many of these had institutions that were in full operation and doing what many Ohio reformers could only dream about! But why? Why did one of the leading agricultural states in the nation, if not, indeed, the first, languish in its decision to implement the most generous endowment in the history of the state? Let us examine some of the reasons for the delay.

Any searching inquiry into the answer to this question must begin with the Act itself—the conditions and circumstances surrounding and warranting its origination, its provisions, and its language. Both the legislative and executive branches of the national government cautioned against a number of practical problems which did, in fact, exacerbate and extend the debate in a
number of states, including and especially Ohio. The first was the expected, but exaggerated value of the proposed college lands which, at $1.25 per acre, must have surprised even its most optimistic supporter, given the plentiful supply of available lands at substantially lower prices. Perhaps this was one of the reasons why the second Morrill bill increased the land formula by one-half (i.e., from 20,000 to 30,000 acres per representative). Secondly, critics in both the legislative and executive branches opposed the creation of any new colleges on the grounds that there was already an overburdenance of them in most of the states. Ohio, perhaps more than any other state in the Union, suffered under this cumbersome condition. And, finally, there was the argument that given the current climate of higher education in this country, agricultural colleges could not stand by themselves. The Ohio Agricultural College at Oberlin, most assuredly, was one of the many grim reminders, if not object lessons, of this truth. And yet in spite of all these forebodings, Morrill (with others) was eventually able to convince a majority of the nation's leaders of the feasibility, necessity, and propriety of the plan. But it would only become law with adequate safeguards.

Many of these safety provisions sought to preserve the totality of the fund: mandating that all of the expenses incurred before, during, and after the sale of the land scrip as the exclusive responsibility of each state, compelling the states to provide for no less than a five percent return on the monies collected from the
sale of the college scrip, and by placing restrictions on the use of
the fund (i.e., no portion to be used for the purchase, erection, or
repair of buildings). Furthermore the respective legislatures were
required: to accept the Morrill Act within two years, to establish
a college(s) within five years of acceptance, to replace any lost
funds, and to have each of its colleges submit an annual progress
report to various agencies.

Ohio labored under these restrictive dictums. The early
Report of the State Auditor warned of their potentially di-
sastrous consequences, including and especially a substantial
increase in taxes for the state, and, as a result, the legislature
delayed its acceptance of the Act for more than a year. Ohio had
quickly handicapped itself in the race for the country's choicest
lands. Delays in the sale of the land scrip and subsequent de-
pressed returns, as well as the extended debate over the number and
type of institution(s), pushed Ohio's compliance with the five-year
establishment clause to the limit. The passage of yet another
congressional statute extending the time for its establishment
proved to be but a two-edged sword in Ohio (and perhaps others as
well), saving the endowment, to be sure, but also insuring four
more years of rancorous debate between the competing factions.

The broad construction of the language in Section Four of the
Act, ostensibly written to accommodate variant conditions within
each state, also extended the debate in Ohio as all manner of
interpretations (i.e., proposals and propositions) inundated the
General Assembly. The clause that designated the establishment 'of at least one college' marked the heart of the controversy between the consolidationists and divisionists. Able and enthusiastic proponents for both positions were drawn from the ranks of the agriculturalists, academia, state government, and the press, and, who, subsequently, prosecuted a number of plausible schemes. The debate over the clause imparting the nature of the curriculum was just as spirited. Distinct factions supporting the university, scientific, and practical approaches cropped up, and, with their respective spokesmen carried the fight to the halls of both the Agricultural Convention and General Assembly. And to make matters all the more complicated, the two issues were sometimes fused. For example, S. D. Harris, though a long-time consolidationist, unabashedly reversed his position once he realized that the creation of a single institution would more than likely result in a broad-gauge system (i.e., an university). Sorting through the maze of positions, let alone fully understanding their implications, undoubtedly, confused even the most sagacious legislator.

The bewilderment of the Ohio General Assembly was, indeed, another contributing factor to the lengthy duration of the competition. Its relative inexperience, some would say apathy, in matters related to the special education of the industrial classes, its antipathy towards increased taxation, and the apparent linkage of the two issues in the State Auditor's Report, may very well have handicapped its efforts to resolve the matter. But there can be no
doubt that legislative delay on the 'Agricultural College Question' stemmed more from uncontrollable and unpredictable external factors than from any inherent impotency or prejudice within its ranks. For example, the factors impinging on the belated and ineffectual sale of the land scrip were outside its purview. And a flurry of propositions (from seemingly every faction) antedating the final tally, as well as the scope of some of the proposals before, during, and after the sale must have confounded the keenest of minds in the halls of the General Assembly. Disagreement within the organized agricultural community was yet another factor which stymied progress in the legislature. True, a majority of agriculturalists did rally around a one new institution policy during the last five years of the fray, but no clear signal as to its nature emerged. The legislature, growing weary of the whole affair and painfully aware of yet another approaching deadline, eventually forged ahead and passed enabling legislation which placed the curricular issue (and others) in the hands of the new college's board of trustees. One must, indeed, wonder if the end result could have been any better, given the circumstances.

Yet another component which prolonged the fray was the compelling arguments of a number of existing institutions. The two state institutions at Athens and Oxford initially argued for an equal division of the fund. Traditionally, they were the oldest colleges in the states carved from the Northwest Territory, and subsequent offspring of The Land Ordinance of 1787. Both were
conceived at or about the time of Ohio statehood, and, for all intents and purposes, were thought to be educational wards of the state. But these young fledgling institutions came to expect more than they got. Their initial endowments, though adequate for their early years, proved to be wanting as time passed and their needs matured. Though gaining reputations that far exceeded their resources, the state, rather oblivious to it all, took a number of obstructive actions (e.g., reneging on the revaluation of their lands) which eventually threatened their very existence. Were they wards or orphans of the state? Dividing the federal grant between them, they argued, would at least ameliorate those injustices.

This dual strategy was eventually abandoned by the Oxford institution which, with the aid of a number of influential lobbyists, came very near to procuring a part of the grant for itself on two different occasions. In the end, however, neither institution gained a farthing of the endowment; one eventually being forced to close its doors, the other barely leaving theirs ajar.

Although both The Farmers' College of Hamilton County and the Ohio Agricultural College at Oberlin could boast of no special relationship between them and Columbus (though they dearly tried), their position of agricultural hegemony was, nonetheless, convincing. The addition of the Farm Department and printing of The Cincinnatus at the College Hill institution provided members of the agrarian class in southwest Ohio and neighboring states a uniquely comprehensive curriculum. The practicalist-scientific approach of
the Ohio Agricultural College provided its constituents with a unique opportunity to conveniently advance their careers. Both were established and guided by men of prominence and vision, and, who later proffered their time, talents, and treasures to the cause of their respective institution during the competition for the land grant. But in both cases, it was all for naught.

Of the remaining collegiate institutions mentioned during the years of the debate, three were primarily motivated by financial considerations, two by expansionary visions, and one not at all. Heidelberg, Western Reserve, and Antioch, with barely a trace of agricultural tradition in their pasts, nevertheless, schemed to secure a portion of the agricultural fund in order to replenish their depleted treasuries. On the other hand, both Mount Union and Wooster (especially the latter) envisioned the Agricultural College at their locations as part of a grand scheme to fashion full-fledged universities, and which, they insisted, would fill a great void in the sphere of Ohio higher education. As for Kenyon, it was too secure in its tradition, in its religiosity and in its grand endowment to be concerned about the agricultural grant one way or the other. A good thing, to, as neither, it, nor any of the rest of the colleges received a dime of it.

The disconcerting and fractious behavior of the organized agricultural community was perhaps the foremost cause of the seemingly interminable nature of the agricultural college debate. Though the basic questions relevant to the establishment of an
agricultural college had been well-turned prior to 1862, the implanta-
tion of the Morrill Act compelled the agricultural community
to fashion their answers into brick and mortar. Hence, the
creation of a number of factions which, with their able and en-
thusiastic spokesmen, propounded their arguments over both the
scope and nature of instruction in the proposed college(s) ad
nauseum during eight consecutive sessions of the Agricultural Con-
vention. The mosaic of positions all stemmed from the evolutionary
process of attempting to satisfactorily articulate the differences
between agricultural education and the education of the agricul-
tural class.

Given the plethora of existing institutions, both literary and
practical, as well as a number of proposals which sought to incor-
porate them in their schemes, a further question arises as to why
their appropriation was rejected by a majority of the organized
agricultural community. Most, if not all, of the schemes theoretic-
ally positioned these institutions as worthy beneficiaries of the
grant, so why the exclusion? Simply put, it did not support them
because it did (would) not control them. Control of the college
was, indeed, a key issue both before, during, and after the years of
the fray. It was implied in the first call for its creation in
1849, intimated in the Agricultural Convention's series of resolu-
tions calling for the establishment of one, new and separate insti-
tution from 1865 - 1870, and assumed in the self-complacent remarks
of a number of agriculturalists during the 1871 Agricultural Convention. Indeed, this was only one of two popular misconceptions brought about by the passage of the Cannon Act, the other being that its incorporation ended any further legislative involvement with the college. But the battle for control would, in fact, be decided by Governor Rutherford B. Hayes' newly appointed college board of trustees and their successors for a generation to come. As for the disposition of the legislature, its passage of enabling legislature marked only the beginning of a long, sometimes stormy, relationship with what would become The Ohio State University.
APPENDIX A

THE MORRILL ACT OF 1862

CHAP. CXXX. - An Act donating Public Lands to the several States and Territories which may provide Colleges for the Benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there be granted to the several States, for the purposes hereinafter mentioned, an amount of public land, to be apportioned to each State a quantity equal to thirty thousand acres for each senator and representative in Congress to which the States are respectively entitled by the apportionment under the census of eighteen hundred and sixty: Provided, That no mineral lands shall be selected or purchased under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. And be it further enacted, That the land aforesaid, after being surveyed, shall be apportioned to the several States in sections or subdivisions of sections, not less than one quarter of a section; and whenever there are public lands in a State subject to sale at private entry at one dollar and twenty-five cents per acre, the quantity to which said State shall be entitled shall be selected from such lands within the limits of such State, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to issue to each of the States in which there is not the quantity of public lands subject to sale at private entry at one dollar and twenty-five cents per acre, to which said State may be entitled under the provisions of this act, land scrip to the amount in acres for the deficiency of its distributive share: said scrip to be sold by said States and the proceeds thereof applied to the uses and purposes prescribed in this act, and for no other use or purpose whatsoever: Provided, That in no case shall any State to which land scrip may thus be issued be allowed to locate the same within the limits of any other State, or of any Territory of the United States, but their assignees may thus locate said land scrip upon any of the unappropriated lands of the United States subject to sale at private entry at one dollar and twenty-five cents, or less, per acre: And provided, further, That not more than one million acres shall be located by such assignees in any one of the States: And
provided, further, That no such location shall be made before one year from the passage of this act.

SEC. 3. And be it further enacted, That all the expenses of management, superintendence, and taxes from date of selection of said lands, previous to their sales, and all expenses incurred in the management and disbursement of the moneys which may be received therefrom, shall be paid by the States to which they may belong, out of the treasury of said States, so that the entire proceeds of the sale of said lands shall be applied without any diminution whatever to the purposes hereinafter mentioned.

SEC. 4. And be it further enacted, That all moneys derived from the sale of the lands aforesaid by the States to which the lands are apportioned, and from the sales of land scrip hereinbefore provided for, shall be invested in stocks of the United States, or of the States, or some other safe stocks, yielding not less than five per centum upon the par value of said stocks; and that the moneys so invested shall constitute a perpetual fund, the capital of which shall remain forever undiminished, (except so far as may be provided in section fifth of this act,) and the interest of which shall be inviolably appropriated, by each State which may take and claim the benefit of this act, to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.

SEC. 5. And be it further enacted, That the grant of land and land scrip hereby authorized shall be made on the following conditions, to which, as well as to the provisions hereinbefore contained, the previous assent of the several States shall be signified by legislative acts:

First. If any portion of the fund invested, as provided by the foregoing section, or any portion of the interest thereon, shall, by any action or contingency, be diminished or lost, it shall be replaced by the State to which it belongs, so that the capital of the fund shall remain forever undiminished; and the annual interest shall be regularly applied without diminution to the purposes mentioned in the fourth section of this act, except that a sum, not exceeding ten per centum upon the amount received by any State under the provisions of this act, may be expended for the purchase of lands for sites or experimental farms, whenever authorized by the respective legislatures of said States.

Second. No portion of said fund, nor the interest thereon, shall be applied, directly or indirectly, under any pretence whatever, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings.
Third. Any State which may take and claim the benefit of the provisions of this act shall provide, within five years at least no less than one college, as described in the fourth section of this act, or the grant to such State shall cease; and said State shall be bound to pay the United States the amount received of any lands previously sold, and that the title to purchasers under the State shall be valid.

Fourth. An annual report shall be made regarding the progress of each college, recording any improvements and experiments made, with their cost and results, and such other matters, including State industrial and economical statistics, as may be supposed useful; one copy of which shall be transmitted by mail free, by each, to all the other colleges which may be endowed under the provisions of this act, and also one copy to the Secretary of the Interior.

Fifth. When lands shall be selected from those which have been raised to double the minimum price, in consequence of railroad grants, they shall be computed to the States at the maximum price, and the number of acres proportionally diminished.

Sixth. No State while in a condition of rebellion or insurrection against the government of the United States shall be entitled to the benefit of this act.

Seventh. No State shall be entitled to the benefits of this act unless it shall express its acceptance thereof by its legislature within two years from the date of its approval by the President.

SEC. 6. And be it further enacted, That land scrip issued under the provisions of this act shall not be subject to location until after the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three.

SEC. 7. And be it further enacted, That the land officers shall receive the same fees for locating land scrip issued under the provisions of this act as is now allowed for the location of military bounty land warrants under existing laws; Provided, their maximum compensation shall not be thereby increased.

SEC. 8. And be further enacted, That the Governors of the several States to which scrip shall be issued under this act shall be required to report annually to Congress all sales made of such scrip until the whole shall be disposed of, the amount received for the same, and what appropriation has been made of the proceeds.

APPROVED, July 2, 1862.
APPENDIX B

DOCUMENTS PERTAINING TO THE FARMERS' COLLEGE

OUTLINE OF PLAN FOR FARM DEPARTMENT OF FARMER'S COLLEGE

First, A tract of land, of from 75 to 100 acres, should be secured for an experimental farm and gardens adjoining, or in proximity to the College.

Second, This department, in all its practical details and experiments, should be under the management of an individual as President, who, in conjunction with the President and Professors of the College, should prescribe the course of study, under the supervision of the Board of Directors.

Third, The Farm Department should be optional on the part of those attending the Institution; and in all cases where pupils are sufficiently qualified by previous studies to enter this department, they should be required to matriculate according to the prescribed rules, as in the College proper.

Fourth, The great object should be to give full instructions on all subjects pertaining to Scientific Agriculture and Horticulture; show the means to be employed to recover worn-out lands, and restore them, by the least possible expense, to virgin fertility; produce upon the farm, by improved modes of culture, the best grains, grasses, fruits, and vegetables, as well as specimens of native and exotic plants, flowers, & c.

Fifth, Instruction should be given in the field and garden, the results of all experiments noted, mode of culture, expenses, & c., kept, and full and accurate reports made from time to time.

Sixth, When the Department shall have been fully organized, there should be upon the ground, annually, an Exhibition, or Fair, the object of which should be to call together the patrons of the Institution, to witness the result of their efforts, and receive or communicate anything new or valuable, which has been ascertained. There might be an exhibition of fruits, grains, vegetables, & c., and the patrons be invited to compete for artifices and diplomas, as at other fairs. At this yearly festival reports of experiments might be read, and addresses made, which would be of great value to the public, and do much to awaken an interest, and impart dignity to the Agricultural pursuit.
The best plants, seeds, grains, grasses and fruits would thus be made known, and disseminated for culture throughout the State.

Various inventions might be tested, and the best implements ascertained, the suggestions of scientific men be reduced to experiment & c., & c.

Seventh, The grounds should be ornamentally and tastefully laid out, and the conservatory, greenhouse, apiary, winery, and various fruitage, properly located and kept in a model way. The entire arrangement should be such as to become a place of interest to the scientific and lovers of the beautiful.

Eighth, Theoretical and practical Agriculture and Horticulture should be studied under the direction of a scientific and practical man, as Geography and History are now studied in our best schools and colleges. Those sciences, intimately connected with, or having a relation to Agriculture, should be pursued more thoroughly than they are in any of our colleges, and applied to the useful purposes of life.

Botany, for instance, would be studied, not as a mere catalogue of names and classes of vegetable productions, but as embracing vegetable physiology, and the artificial improvement of plants, the cultivation of grains, grasses, fruit, and ornamental trees.

In Chemistry, the student should be exercised in the laboratory, and taught to manipulate in the analysis of soils, and other substances, and directed to the developments furnished by the application of this science on the farm, and in the garden. So in geology, mineralogy, entomology, & c., & c.

Ninth, The course of study in the Farm Department should be so extensive, that those completing it should be inferior to none in the Classical Department, in mental discipline, and variety of attainment, and be entitled to receive equal honor.

Tenth, An agricultural library, embracing all the standard works, and the principal current publications, relating to this department, should be procured, and made accessible to students.

Eleventh, While it should be obligatory upon the students of the College to work upon the Farm, an opportunity should be furnished to those who desire it, to make their manual exercises contribute to their health, and their pecuniary advantages, under such regulations as might be prescribed. The whole plan should be so arranged as to make it not only profitable, but highly creditable for young men to labor.

Twelfth, That the reader may form some idea of the course of instruction which could properly be adopted for this department, we would present the following, as well suited to the end in view, which might, from time to time, be modified according to the demands of society.
I. FARM DEPARTMENT OF FARMER'S COLLEGE, FOUR YEAR COURSE

A. Freshman Class

1. First Session

Ray's Second Part Algebra
Bonncastle's Mensuration of Surface and Solids, as
    applied to Artificer's Works
Wilson's American History
Natural Philosophy
English Composition
Ornamental Drawing

2. Second Session

Plane Geometry
Anatomy, Physiology, and the Laws of Health
Stephen's Book on the Farm Commenced
Field Lectures on Agriculture and Horticulture
Essays on Practical Agriculture
Drawing Ground Plans and Elevations

B. Sophomore Class

1. First Session

Plane Trigonometry and Surveying
Davies' Descriptive Geometry
Stephen's Book of Farm, with Field Lectures
Isometrical and Perspective Drawing
Essays on Scientific Agriculture, Etc. . .
Garden Designs, Laying Out of Grounds

2. Second Session

Solid Geometry and Spherical Trigonometry
Davies' Shades and Shadows, With Exercises in Drafting
Political Economy
English History
Field Lectures, with lessons from Natural History
Essays on History, Agriculture, Etc. . .

C. Junior Class

1. First Session
Davies' Analytical Geometry
Olmstead's Mechanics
Mental Philosophy
Rural Economy
Rural Architecture
Essays on Various Subjects
Lectures on Farm

2. Second Session

Davies' Calculus
Robinson's Astronomy
Elementary Chemistry
Wayland's Moral Science
Philosophy of History
Landscape Gardening
Essays on Moral Science, Etc. . .

D. Senior Class

1. First Session

Philosophy of Rhetoric
Civil Engineering
Agricultural Chemistry with Chemical Field Lectures
Entomology, with Field Lectures
Essays on Rhetoric, Etc. . .

2. Second Session

Geology and Botany, with Field Lectures
Coleman's European Agriculture
Paley's Natural Theology
Alexander's Evidences of Christianity
Essays on Various Subjects
Prize Essay on Agriculture or Horticulture
Prize for the Best Drawing or Model

Additional lectures on: Chemistry, Geology and Mineralogy, Neutral Philosophy, Sacred and Profane History, Anatomy and Physiology, Embracing the Laws of Health.
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